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**IMPORTANT**

The Evaluation Survey is not included in this booklet.  
It will be emailed to you soon after the conclusion of the Workshop.  
Your comments will assist us in planning future workshops.
Welcome to the AALS Workshop for New Law School Teachers and to the legal academy! This is an exciting time in your career as you begin to establish your identity as a teacher, scholar, and community citizen. This is also an exciting time as legal education and our roles as faculty are undergoing significant transformations. You are uniquely poised to bring your energy, insights, and leadership to our profession’s future.

Over the next few days, the Planning Committee members hope that you will gain some valuable insights and practical information on how to be an effective classroom teacher, a productive scholar, and an active citizen in your institution and beyond. We have recruited a diverse group of professors with a wide range of experience and expertise. What all the presenters share, however, is a generosity of spirit and a commitment to helping you develop your career. So please ask questions, share your concerns, and take advantage of the opportunities to learn from such a devoted and talented group of colleagues.

This workshop is unique in that it brings together law teachers from all different fields, including clinical and legal writing. The Planning Committee recognized the value of learning from each other without boundaries or distinctions, right from the beginning of your academic career. Our roles are more similar than they are different, and we become even better teachers and scholars when we integrate ideas and pedagogy from other fields.

We are all delighted to be with you at the beginning of this journey and look forward to an exciting workshop.

Congratulations!

Jennifer Rosato Perea
Northern Illinois University College of Law
Chair, Planning Committee for 2014 AALS Workshop for New Law School Teachers

Fabio Arcila, Jr.
Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center

Cheryl Hanna
Vermont Law School

Carol L. Izumi
University of California Hastings College of the Law

Barbara A. Schatz
Columbia University School of Law
Dear Colleague:

On behalf of AALS President Daniel B. Rodriguez, President-Elect Blake D. Morant, and the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools (AALS), it is my privilege to welcome you to the AALS and to the law teaching profession.

Established in 1900, the AALS is an association of 178 law schools, committed to promoting excellence in legal education. As the learned society for legal education, we are also very much your organization and that of your nearly 10,000 law faculty colleagues throughout the nation. Over the years, many of us have benefited from work we have done under the umbrella of the AALS. Our AALS involvement has connected us to faculty beyond our home law schools and has led to career-enhancing collaborations in both scholarship and teaching.

The Association values and expects its member schools to value:

1) a faculty composed primarily of full-time teacher-scholars who constitute a self-governing intellectual community engaged in the creation and dissemination of knowledge about law, legal processes, and legal systems, and who are devoted to fostering justice and public service in the legal community;

2) scholarship, academic freedom, and diversity of viewpoints;

3) a rigorous academic program built upon strong teaching in the context of a dynamic curriculum that is both broad and deep;

4) a diverse faculty and staff hired, promoted, and retained based on meeting and supporting high standards of teaching and scholarship and in accordance with principles of non-discrimination; and

5) the selection of students based upon intellectual ability and personal potential for success in the study and practice of law, through a fair and non-discriminatory process designed to produce a diverse student body and a broadly representative legal profession.

Association activities encompass many areas that may be of interest to you, particularly our professional development programs for law faculty. In May and June of 2015, for example, AALS will hold a Conference on Clinical Legal Education and a Midyear Meeting that includes a Conference on Measuring Learning Gains, a Workshop on Family Law, and a Workshop on Forty Years for Formal Equality. Detailed information on the professional development schedule for the coming academic year can be found on our website at www.aals.org/calendar/
The work of the AALS is done largely by volunteers through its committees and sections. There are more than 90 AALS sections representing subject matter areas and other common interests. Becoming involved in one or more Sections will connect you to colleagues all over the country. Sections also construct the majority of the Annual Meeting program, and will provide you throughout the year with an ongoing source of information on your fields of interest through the AALS web-based community platform that many sections use.

The next AALS Annual Meeting, which will be held on Friday, January 2 through Monday, January 5, 2015, in Washington, DC, will bring together more than 3,000 law faculty and administrators. At the Annual Meeting, each section presents a program of interest to its members. There are also workshops (day-long professional programs) and other special programs, including some based on the theme selected by the president of the Association for the year. The theme of President Daniel B. Rodriguez is “Legal Education at the Crossroads.”

The AALS also sponsors a scholarly papers competition for those who have been in law teaching for five years or less. The winning author presents the paper at the Annual Meeting. The deadline for the 2015 Scholarly Papers Competition is August 8, 2014. To learn more about the competition go to http://www.aals.org/services_deansmemos.php and select AALS Deans Memo 14 - 13. The competition announcement is also included in this booklet. At the Annual Meeting we will celebrate the previous year’s teaching award honorees from member schools. Faculty often tell us that perhaps the most important part of the Annual Meeting is the opportunity to meet colleagues informally across generations and to develop ongoing interactions with them over the years.

The Association currently has fourteen standing and special committees, composed of law teachers appointed by AALS Presidents. Appointments are typically for three-year terms, and each standing committee includes members appointed by three successive Presidents of the organization. The subjects covered by the committees range from membership review to recruitment and retention of minority law teachers and students. Nominations for these committee positions are encouraged and should be made in the spring.

The Association’s Journal of Legal Education, which is published quarterly and distributed to all law faculty, is an excellent platform for the exchange of ideas and information about legal education, legal scholarship, and innovative teaching. The Journal is currently co-edited at Northeastern University School of Law in Boston and Southwestern Law School in Los Angeles. The co-editors are Jeremy R. Paul and Margaret Y. Woo of Northeastern University School of Law. Molly Selvin of Southwestern Law School is associate editor. The Association also co-sponsors the Journal of Clinical Legal Education. The AALS Directory of Law Teachers is published annually. Your Dean’s office can assist in ensuring that you are included in the Directory listings.

As you begin your career in law teaching and are understandably focused on developing your own courses and advancing your scholarly agenda, I encourage you to become involved in the AALS as you begin what we hope will be a long, productive, and satisfying career.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Judith Areen
AALS Executive Director
SPONSORS

AALS would like to thank and recognize the following companies for their generous contributions to support the association's many goals and activities.

Foundational Gifts ($100,000 and over)
West Academic
Foundation Press

Sponsor Gifts ($15,000 and over)
LexisNexis
Wolters Kluwer Law & Business

Contributor Gift ($10,000 to $15,000)
Law School Admission Council (LSAC)

We would like to thank the following for their donations to AALS for the 2014-2015 Academic Year
Carolina Academic Press
Complete Equity Markets, Inc.
Howard University School of Law
The John Marshall Law School

UPCOMING EVENTS

www.aals.org/calendar

2014
Faculty Recruitment Conference
Washington, D.C.
Thursday, October 16 – Saturday, October 18, 2014

2015
Annual Meeting
Washington, D.C.
Friday, January 2 – Monday, January 5, 2015

Law Clinic Directors Workshop
Rancho Mirage, CA
Sunday, May 3 – Monday, May 4, 2015

Conference on Clinical Legal Education
Rancho Mirage, CA
Monday, May 4 – Thursday, May 7, 2015

Early June 2015 Midyear Meeting
Locations not yet determined

  Workshop on Measuring Learning Gains
  Workshop on Next Generation Issues of Sex, Gender, and the Law
  Workshop on Shifting Foundations in Family Law
Wednesday, June 18, 2014

4:00 – 8:00 p.m.
Registration

6:00 – 7:15 p.m.
Small Group Discussions
See your handout for small group assignment and meeting room location.
First Year Teachers
Experienced Teachers
Clinical Teachers
Legal Writing Teachers

7:30 pm
AALS Sponsored Dinner

Introduction
Jennifer Rosato Perea, Northern Illinois University College of Law, and Chair, Planning Committee for 2014 AALS Workshop for New Law School Teachers and Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers
Speaker: Frank H. Wu, University of California, Hastings College of the Law

8:45 – 9:30 p.m.
Dessert and Coffee Reception
Attendees can mingle and enjoy a reception of mini desserts and coffee in a relaxed atmosphere after the opening dinner.
Thursday, June 19, 2014

8:45 – 8:55 a.m.  
Welcome  
Judith C. Areen, AALS Executive Director

8:55 – 9:30 a.m.  
Introduction and Overview of the Legal Profession  
Jennifer Rosato Perea, Northern Illinois University College of Law, and Chair, Planning Committee for 2014 AALS Workshop for New Law School Teachers and Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers

9:30 – 10:00 a.m.  
Plenary Session: What Makes an Effective Law Teacher?  
Michael H. Schwartz, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, William H. Bowen School of Law

Educational experts have found that many factors contribute to significant and lasting learning in students. Dean Schwartz will discuss some of the attributes and behaviors shared by extraordinary teachers.

10:00 – 10:30 a.m.  
Plenary Session: Differences in How Students Learn and Are Motivated  
Emily B. Zimmerman, Drexel University School of Law

Effective teachers understand that what learners bring to the classroom is just as important as what the teachers bring. This session will help new law teachers learn more about students’ perspectives in order to facilitate learning and promote a positive classroom experience for both students and teachers.

10:30 – 10:45 a.m.  
Refreshment Break

10:45 – 11:35 a.m.  
Introduction: Designing Courses and Classes to Maximize Student Engagement and Learning  
Jane H. Aiken, Georgetown University Law Center

11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.  
AALS Luncheon on Teaching – Small Group Discussions with Box Lunch  
(see your handout for small group assignment and meeting room location)
1:15 – 2:30 p.m.  
**Plenary Session: Modeling Teaching Methods**  
Grand Ballroom  
Lobby Level

Susan J. Bryant, City University of New York School of Law  
Lawrence C. Levine, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law  
Nancy Levit, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law

Effective teachers often use a variety of teaching methods to maximize student engagement and learning. In this session, three “master” teachers will demonstrate some of those teaching methods, which can be adapted to different learning environments.

2:30 – 2:45 p.m.  
**Refreshment Break**  
Grand Ballroom Foyer  
Lobby Level

2:45 – 4:05 p.m.  
**Concurrent Sessions: Designing Courses and Classes to Maximize Student Engagement and Learning**

These concurrent sessions will build on the previous sessions, as successful law professors discuss how knowledge about teaching and learning can be incorporated into law courses across the curriculum as best practices.

**Clinical Courses**  
Virginia  
Second Floor

Susan J. Bryant, City University of New York School of Law

**Legal Writing Courses**  
South Carolina  
Second Floor

Anne M. Enquist, Seattle University School of Law

**Large Classes**  
Pennsylvania  
Second Floor

Lawrence C. Levine, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law

**Seminars**  
Delaware  
Second Floor

Robert Jackson, Columbia University School of Law

**1L Courses**  
Grand Ballroom  
Lobby Level

Meredith J. Duncan, University of Houston Law Center
Thursday, June 19 continued

4:15 – 5:15 p.m.

**CONCURRENT SESSIONS**

These hands-on sessions will focus on the role of a law teacher as a supervisor of clinical students or a supervisor or advisor to student writing projects. The third concurrent session is intended for law teachers without significant experience in the classroom, and will include topics such as identifying class goals and creating a syllabus, selecting a casebook, preparing for class, and use of technology.

**Supervising Clinical Students**
Elliott S. Milstein, American University Washington College of Law
Second Floor

**Supervising Student Writing (First Year, Seminar)**
Daniel L. Barnett, Lewis and Clark Law School (University of Hawaii, William S. Richardson School of Law - July 1, 2014)
South Carolina
Second Floor

**Teaching 101**
Michael H. Schwartz, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, William H. Bowen School of Law
Grand Ballroom
Lobby Level

5:30 – 6:30 p.m.

**AALS Reception**
Colonial Room
Lower Level

---

Friday, June 20, 2014

7:45 – 8:45 a.m.

**AALS Section on Minority Groups Q & A with Coffee and Breakfast Pastry**
Moderator: Katrice Bridges Copeland, Pennsylvania State University The Dickinson School of Law
Colonial Room
Lower Level

8:30 – 8:45 a.m.

**Coffee, Tea and Breakfast Pastry**
Grand Ballroom Foyer
Lobby Level

9:00 – 10:00 a.m.

**Plenary Session: Assessment**
Rory D. Bahadur, Washburn University School of Law
Grand Ballroom
Lobby Level

In this interactive session, participants will learn different methods to evaluate students and provide feedback throughout the semester. The session will also cover exam creation, grading, and post-exam review.

10:00 – 10:30 a.m.

**Refreshment Break**
Grand Ballroom Foyer
Lobby Level
10:30 am – 12:00 p.m.

**Plenary Session: Managing Student Challenges in the Classroom and Beyond**
Josephine Ross, Howard University School of Law
Gemma Solimene, Fordham University School of Law
Ron Tyler, Stanford Law School

Students can pose challenges to law teachers ranging from disrupting the classroom to challenging the teacher’s authority in grading. The presenters will offer expert advice for navigating these kinds of issues.

12:15 – 1:45 p.m.

**AALS Luncheon - Diversity and Current Research on Implicit Bias**
Rachel Godsil, Seton Hall University School of Law

2:00 – 3:15 p.m.

**Concurrent Sessions: Institutional Relationships, Commitments and Service**

How can you find a good balance so you can be an effective teacher, a productive scholar and a good citizen? When should you say “yes” or “no” to service, and what kinds of relationships should you build with the time that you devote to service? The first three concurrent sessions will focus on service and professionalism for tenure-track, clinical, and legal writing faculty –who have similar but sometimes distinct commitments inside and outside the law school.

**Tenure Track**
Veryl Victoria Miles, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law

**Clinical**
Michael Pinard, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law

**Legal Writing**
Christy Hallam DeSanctis, The George Washington University Law School

In the session below, Dean Rosato Perea will provide a dean’s perspective to assist VAPs, Fellow, and other teaching candidates to better understand legal academia and navigate through the hiring expectations.

**Entry Level/Job Market Track (Visiting Assistant Professors, Fellowships)**
Jennifer Rosato Perea, Northern Illinois University College of Law

3:15 – 3:30 p.m.

**Refreshment Break**
3:30 – 4:30 p.m.

**CONCURRENT SESSIONS: MANAGING AND BUILDING INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS – THE “SHADOW WORK” OF BEING A LAW PROFESSOR**

**Concurrent Session #1**
*For Attendees with Last Names from A-C*

Co-Facilitators:
Fabio Arcila, Jr., Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center
Christy Hallam DeSanctis, The George Washington University Law School
Josephine Ross, Howard University School of Law

**Concurrent Session #2**
*For Attendees with Last Names from D-M*

Co-Facilitators:
I. Bennett Capers, Brooklyn Law School
Gabriel “Jack” Chin, University of California at Davis School of Law

**Concurrent Session #3**
*For Attendees with Last Names from N-Z*

Co-Facilitators:
Carol L. Izumi, University of California, Hastings College of the Law
Michael Pinard, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law

In addition to producing scholarship, teaching classes, and providing service, part of being a law professor entails managing and building multiple institutional relationships – formally and informally – with students, faculty, and staff. Interactions with each of these constituencies can present challenges for which there is no law school handbook. For example, students often turn to faculty with personal and career challenges in addition to educational questions. Faculty and staff do the same, sometimes explicitly asking a colleague – a junior colleague – to intervene on their behalf. Navigating these and other demands is part of the “shadow work” law professors invariably are called upon to perform. At the same time, this “shadow work” can present important opportunities – such as building a relationship with the development officer – which may provide an important prism through which to see the law school and may even lead to resources in the form of grants. In this session, the facilitators will discuss the many opportunities and challenges presented by the important, if informal, institutional relationships law faculty build.

4:30 – 5:30 pm
**AALS Reception**

5:30 – 6:30 p.m.
**AALS Section on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues – Informal Gathering**

Co-Moderators:
I. Bennett Capers, Brooklyn Law School
Josephine Ross, Howard University School of Law
Saturday, June 21, 2014

7:45 – 8:45 a.m.  
**AALS Section on Women in Legal Education Q & A with Coffee and Breakfast Pastry**  
Colonial Room  
Lower Level  
Co-Moderators:  
Leigh Goodmark, University of Baltimore School of Law  
Wendy Greene, Samford University, Cumberland School of Law  
Speakers:  
Megan LaBelle, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law  
Naomi Schoenbaum, The George Washington University Law School

8:30 – 9:00 a.m.  
Coffee and Tea and Breakfast Pastry  
Grand Ballroom Foyer  
Lobby Level

9:00 – 10:00 a.m.  
**Plenary Session: Different Methodologies and Approaches to Scholarship**  
Grand Ballroom  
Lobby Level  
Gabriel “Jack” Chin, University of California at Davis School of Law  
L. Song Richardson, University of Iowa College of Law  
(University of California Irvine School of Law - July 1, 2014)

There is not a one-size fits all approach to the development of scholarship. The presenters will provide an overview of different methodologies and approaches that might be used in the life cycle of one’s scholarly career.

10:10 – 11:15 a.m.  
**Concurrent Sessions – Scholarship**  

**New Teachers**  
I. Bennett Capers, Brooklyn Law School  
Second Floor  
This session will guide new writers on how to develop a coherent scholarly agenda and get started on a first publication.

**Experienced Teachers/Those Who Have Already Written**  
Lisa H. Nicholson, University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law  
Lobby Level  
If you already have a few publications under your belt, this session will provide advice on how to reassess your scholarly agenda and continue the path of finding your voice through scholarship.

11:15 – 11:25 a.m.  
Refreshment Break  
Lobby Level

11:25 am – 12:15 p.m.  
**Small Group Discussions**  
See your handout for small group assignment and meeting room location.
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Biographies of Planning Committee Members and Presenters

Aiken, Jane H. Professor & Director, Community Justice Project, Georgetown University Law Center. JD, 1983, New York Univ.; BA, 1977, Hollins Coll.; MA, 1985, Georgetown. Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center; William M. Van Cleve Professor of Law, Washington University School of Law (04-07); Prof., Wash. St. Louis (97-04); Prof., South Carolina (92-98); Prof., Ariz. State (85-91); Advoc. Fellow/Clin. Instr. for Applied Legal Studies Georgetown (83-85) Subjects: Clinical Teaching (15); Evidence (15); Family Law (10); Torts (10); AIDS & the Law (5) Books and Awards: Gerry & Bob Virgil Ethic of Serv. Award Memberships: American Law Institute; American Bar Foundation Fellow; Carnegie Acad. for the Scholarship of Tchg. & Learning (Fellow, 2000); Order of the Coif

Arcila, Fabio Professor, Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center. JD, 1994, Cal., Berkeley.; BA, 1991, Michigan. Visiting Prof., Brooklyn Law School (11-12); Visiting Assoc. Prof., Fordham Univ. Law School (08-09); Prof., Touro Law Center Litig. Assoc., Fried Frank (01-04); Clerk, Hon. Julio M. Fuentes U.S.C.A. 3rd Cir. (00-01); Clerk, Hon. Julian Abele Cook Jr. U.S.E.D. MI (97-99); Staff Att’y, Legal Services of Southeastern MI (94-97) Subjects: Civil Procedure (9); Criminal Procedure (5); Administrative Law (4); Federal Courts (2); Welfare Law Books and Awards: James Madison Prize (from Soc’y Hist. in the Fed. Gov’t) for 50 B.C. L. Rev. 363 (2009): (10); Professor of the Year: (07) Memberships: 3d Nat’l People of Color Legal Scholarship Conf.-Planning Comm.-2010; Northeast People of Color Legal Scholarship Conf.-Planning Comm. NY


Bahadur, Rory D. Associate Professor of Law, Washburn university School of Law. JD, 2003, St. Thomas University; MA, 1992, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami; BSc, 1990, University of the West Indies. Associate, Downs & Associates, P.A. (03-04) Books and Awards: West Outstanding Scholastic Achievement Award: (03); West Outstanding Scholastic Achievement Award: (01)

Barnett, Daniel Distinguished Professor of Legal Writing at Lewis and Clark Law School, Lewis and Clark Law School. BA, 1982, University of the Pacific. Visiting Distinguished Professor of Legal Writing, Lewis and Clark Law School (09-09); Associate Professor of Legal Reasoning, Research & Writing, Boston College Law School (95-12); Assistant Professor of Legal Reasoning, Research & Writing, Boston College Law School (92-95); Visiting Assistant Professor of Legal Reasoning, Research & Writing, Boston College Law School (90-92) Distinguished Professor of Legal Writing, Lewis and Clark Law School Subjects: *Other/Non-Listed Books and Awards: Boston College Distinguished Teaching Award: (04); Boston College Teaching with New Technology Award : (07) Memberships: ; Board of Directors:Legal Writing Institute; Chair:Section on Legal Writing, Analysis and Research, Association of American Law Schools Massachusetts; California
Bryant, Susan J. Professor, CUNY School of Law. JD, 1973, Georgetown University Law Center - Test; BA, 1970, Xavier; LLM, 1980, Georgetown. Prof., CUNY School of Law; Acting Assoc. Dean, Acad. Affairs. (94-96); Dir., Clinical Programs (89-08); professor, CUNY School of Law; Dir., Clin. Prog. Hofstra (76-83); Dep. Dir., Com. on Defense Servs. DC Bar (75-76); Fellow, Prettyman Legal Intern Prog. Georgetown (74-76); Att'y, Defender Ass'n of Phila. (73-74) Clinical Teaching (36); Family Law (15); Legal Research & Writing (15); Trial & Appellate Advocacy (10) Books and Awards: AALS Clinical Section Award Contributions to Clinical Education: (96) Memberships: SALT, Board of Governors, CLEA; AALS (Chair, Sect. on CLE, 1981-83).

Capers, Bennett Associate Dean for Intellectual Life and Associate Professor of Law, Hofstra Law School. JD, 1991, Columbia.; BA, 1988, Princeton. Asst U.S. Att’y, NY (95-04) Criminal Law (7); Evidence (5); Criminal Procedure (5); Law & Literature (3) Books and Awards: Hofstra Univ. Dist. LectureStessin Award: (09)

Chin, Gabriel “Jack” Professor, University of California at Davis School of Law. LLM, 1995, Yale.; BA, 1985, Wesleyan Univ.; JD, 1988, Michigan. Professor of Law, UC, Davis; Chester H. Smith Prof., University of Arizona, Rogers College of Law (04-11); Dir., Program in Criminal Law and Policy (04-11); Prof. of Public Admin. & Policy, University of Arizona, School of Government and Public Policy (04-11); Prof., Univ. of Ariz. (03-04); Interim Assoc. Dean, Cincinnati (02-02); Vis. Prof., New York Univ. (01-01); Rufus King Prof., Cincinnati (01-03); Prof., Cincinnati (99-01); Assoc. Prof., Cincinnati (98-99); Asst Prof., Western New England (95-98); Assoc. Appellate Counsel, Legal Aid Soc. of NY Crim. App. Bur. NYC (92-94); Assoc., Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom (90-91); Clerk, Hon. Richard P. Matsch U.S.D.J. (89-89) Criminal Law (15); Criminal Procedure (15) Books and Awards: Immigration and the Constitution; Affirmative Action and the Constitution; New York City Police Corruption Investigations, 1894-1994 Memberships: AII; Am. Soc. for Legal Hist.; Reporter, ABA Standards for Criminal Justice: Collateral Sanctions and Discretionary Disqualification of Convicted Persons: American Bar Association; Reporter, Uniform Collateral Consequences of Conviction Act: Uniform Law Commission New York

Copeland, Katrice Bridges Assistant Professor, Penn State University.


Duncan, Meredith J. George Butler Res. Prof., University of Houston Law Center. BA, 1988, Northwestern; JD, 1993, Houston.. George Butler Res. Prof.; Assoc. Prof. (04-05); Asst Prof., Houston (98-04); Clerk, Hon. Edith H. Jones 5th Cir. Ct. of App. 1993 (96-98); Assoc., Vinson & Elkins L.L.P. Houston (94-96) Subjects: Criminal Law (10); Professional Responsibility (10); Torts (10); Legal Ethics (5) Memberships: Order of the Coif.

Enquist, Anne M. Professor of Lawyering Skills; Associate Director Legal Writing program, Seattle University School of Law. BS, 1972; BA, 1972, New Mexico State; MA, 1977, University of Washington. Director of the Legal Writing Program, Seattle University School of Law; Professor of Lawyering Skills, Seattle University School of Law; Lect., Puget Sound (79-81) Subjects: Legal Writing (32); Gender & Justice (5) Books and Awards: The Legal Writing Handbook; Just Research; Just Writing AALS Section Award: (07) Memberships: Legal Writing Institute; Association of Legal Writing Directors
Godsil, Rachel Eleanor Bontecou Professor of Law, Seton Hall University School of Law. BA, 1988, Wisconsin; JD, 1992, Michigan. Visiting Professor, University of Pennsylvania Law School (07-07); Eleanor Bontecou Professor of Law; Ass’t Prof., Seton Hall (00-03); Att’y, USA S.D. NY NYC (97-00); Assoc. Counsel, NAACP LDF (94-97); Assoc., Berle Kass & Case NYC (93-94); Clerk, Hon. M. Walker U.S.C.A. 2d Cir. NYC (92-93) Subjects: Equality in American Law (10); Land Use (5); Property (5) Books and Awards: Awaking from the Dream: Civil Rights Under Siege of the New Pursuit of... Memberships: COIF.

Goodmark, Leigh Professor and Director of Clinical Programs, University of Baltimore School of Law. JD, 1994, Stanford.; BA, 1991, Yale. Prof. and Dir. of Clinical Programs, University of Baltimore School of Law; Assoc. Prof. (07-12); Ass’t Prof., Baltimore (03-07); Ass’t Staff Dir., ABA Cntr. on Children & the Law DC (00-03); Clin. Instr., Cath. Univ. (99-00); Staff Att’y, Bread for the City DC (96-99); Skadden Fellow, Washington Lawyers’ Com. DC (95-96); Clerk, Hon. Robert G. Doumar E.D. VA Norfolk (94-95) Subjects: Clinical Teaching (10); Family Law (10) Books and Awards: A Troubled Marriage: Domestic Violence and the Legal System; Promoting Community Child Protection: A Legislative Agenda; Keeping Kids Out of the System; Creative Legal Practice as a Community...

Greene, Wendy Associate Professor and Director of Faculty Development, Cumberland School of Law. LLM, 2008, Geo. Wash.; BA, 1999, Xavier University of Louisiana; JD, 2002, Tulane. Associate Professor and Director of Faculty Development, Cumberland School of Law; Associate Professor , Cumberland School of Law; Ass’t Prof., Samford (07-10) Subjects: Critical Race Theory (5); Employment Discrimination (5); Property (3); Remedies (2); Constitutional Law Books and Awards: Harvey S. Jackson Excellence in Teaching Award for Upper Level Courses: (11); Lightfoot, Franklin & White Best Junior Faculty Scholarship Award: (09) Memberships: Law Professors Division, Executive Committee: National Bar Association; Conference Chair: Southeast/Southwest People of Color Legal Scholarship Conference

Hanna, Cheryl Professor, Vermont Law School. JD, 1992, Harvard. BA, 1988, Kalamazoo Coll.. Prof.; Ass’t Prof. (97-99); Vis. Ass’t Prof. (96-97); Ass’t Prof., Legal Writing (95-96); Instr., Legal Writing Vermont (94-95); Ass’t St’s Att’y, Balt. City St’s Att’y Balt. (93-94); Admin. Dir., MD Clinton-Gore MD Democratic Campaign Balt. (92-92) Subjects: Criminal Law (10); Evidence (10); Constitutional Law (5); Jurisprudence (5) Memberships: Phi Beta Kappa; Law & Soc. Ass’n; AALS (Chair, Law & Social Sci., since 1998).

Izumi, Carol L. Clinical Professor of Law, Hastings College of the Law. BA, 1976, Oberlin Coll.; JD, 1980, Georgetown. Clinical Professor, UC Hastings College of the Law; Assoc. Dean, Clin. Affrs. (03-07); Ass’t Dean, Clin. Affrs. (00-03); Professor of Clinical Law, George Washington University Law School (93-10); Clin. Assoc. Prof. (90-93); Clin. Instr., Geo. Wash. (86-89); Assoc. Smink & Scheuermann, P.C. DC (83-86); Clerk, Hon. Harriett R. Taylor DC Superior Ct. (81-83); Ass’t Dir., Public Serv. DC Bar (80-81) Consumer Mediation Clinic (24); Mediation Course (10) Books and Awards: Race, Rights and Reparation: Law and the Japanese American Internment... Memberships: American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution; Ass’n for Conflict Resolu.; ALI.

Jackson, Robert J. Associate Professor, Columbia Law School. JD, 2005, Harvard Law School; BS, 1999, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; MPP, 2005, Kennedy School of Government; MBA, 2000, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania; BA, 1999, University of Pennsylvania. Advisor, Executive Compensation and Corporate Governance, Treasury Department (09-10); Associate, Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz (08-09); Law Clerk, Judge Amalya L. Kearse (05-06) Books and Awards: Taubman Prize, Kennedy School of Government: (05)
LaBelle, Megan Assistant Professor, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law. JD, 1999, University of California, Davis; BA, 1996, University of California, Los Angeles. Visiting Assistant Professor, Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law (08-09); Adjunct Professor, Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law (06-08); Associate, Munger, Tolles & Olson (02-05); Law Clerk, The Honorable Margaret M. Morrow, U.S. District Court for the Central District of California (01-02); Associate, O’Melveny & Myers (00-01); Law Clerk, The Honorable Stephen S. Trott, United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (99-00)

Levine, Lawrence C. Professor of Law, Pacific McGeorge School of Law. JD, 1981, Cal., Hastings.; BA, 1976, Allegheny Coll.. Vis. Prof., New Y ork L.S. fall 2000 (02-07); Dir., Min. Support Prog. (94-96); Prof.; Assoc. Prof. (88-91); Ass’t Prof., McGeorge (85-88); Assoc., Morrison & Foerster San Fran. (83-85); Adj. Prof., Cal. Hastings (82-82); Clerk, Judge Eugene Lynch U.S.D.C. San Fran. (82-83); Assoc., Steinhart Falconer & Morenstein San Fran. (81-82) Subjects: Sexual Orientation & the Law (15); Torts (15); Criminal Law (10); Professional Responsibility (10) Books and Awards: Tort Law and Practice (with Vertri, Vogel, and Gassama), 4th ed.; Understanding Torts (with Davies & Kionka), 1993, 3d ed. Memberships: ALI.; SALT; Order of the Coif

Levit, Nancy Curators’ & Edward D. Ellison Prof., University of Missouri–Kansas City School of Law. BA, 1980, Bates Coll.; JD, 1984, Kansas.. Prof.; Assoc. Prof. (93-98); Ass’t Prof. (90-93); Vis. Ass’t Prof., Mo.-Kan. City (88-90); Assoc., Stinson Mag & Fizzell Kan. City KS (87-88); Clerk, Hon. Frank G. Theis U.S.D.C. D. KS (84-87) Subjects: Jurisprudence (15); Torts (15); Women & the Law (15); Constitutional Law (10); Criminal Law (10); Defamation & Privacy (10); Employment Discrimination (10) Books and Awards: MO Gov’r’s Award for Excellence in Tchg.; The Happy Lawyer: Making a Good Life in the Law (with D. Linder); Feminist Legal Theory: A Primer (with R. Verchick)UMKC Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching; (11); Curators Professorship; Edward D. Ellison Professorship; (09) Memberships: ; Phi Beta Kappa; Phi Kappa Phi.

Miles, Veryl Victoria Professor, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law. JD, 1980, Cath. Univ.; BA, 1977, Wells Coll.. Professor, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law; Dean, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law (05-12); Deputy Director of the AALS, AALS (01-03); Assoc. Dean (97-99); Assoc. Prof. (90-97); Ass’t Prof. (88-90); Vis. Ass’t Prof., Cath. Univ. (87-88); Ass’t Prof., George Mason (83-88); Att’y, Bd. of Gov’rs Fed. Res. Sys. DC (80-83); Subjects: Commercial Law (20); Commercial Paper (20); Creditors’ & Debtors’ Rights (10); Corporate Finance (5) Memberships: American Law Institute District of Columbia; Virginia

Milstein, Elliott S. Professor, American University Washington College of Law. BA, 1966, Univ. of Hartford; OtherLaw, 1997, Univ. of Hartford; LLM, 1971, Yale; OtherLaw, 2001, Nova Southeastern.; JD, 1969, Connecticut. Vis. Prof., New York L.S. (07-07); Dean (94-95); Interim Pres. (93-94); Dean (90-93); Interim Dean, American (88-90); Co-Dir., Nat’l Veterans Law Cntr. (78-84); Acting Assoc. Dean, Fac. Affrs. (77-78); Prof.; Assoc. Prof. (74-76); Dir., Clin. Progs. (72-88); Ass’t Prof., American (72-74); Sr. Staff Att’y, New Haven Legal Assist. Ass’n Inc. (71-72); Lect. & Co-Dir., Legal Clinic Connecticut (69-70) Subjects: Clinical Teaching (41); Alternate Dispute Resolution (15); Office Practice (15); International Human Rights (10); Legal Profession (10); Criminal Law (5) Books and Awards: William Pincus Award for Outstanding Contributions to Clin. Ed.: (92); Lever Award for Contribution to Clinical Leg. Ed: (01) Memberships: AALS (Chair, Sec. on Clin. Edu., 1982, Chair, Com. on Clin. Edu., 1993-94, Exec. Com., 1996-01, Pres., 2000); AALS (Parliamentarian, 2003-2010) CT; DC

Nicholson, Lisa H. Professor, University of Louisville. JD, 1993, William & Mary. BS, 1986, Virginia Tech. Visiting Professor, University of Richmond School of Law (08-08); Visiting Professor, Boston College Law School (07-07); Professor, University of Louisville School of Law; Visiting
Associate Professor, Brooklyn Law School (05-05); Assoc. Prof., University of Louisville School of Law (04-07); Asst Prof., University of Louisville School of Law (00-04); Sr. Assoc., Kaye Scholer Fierman Hays & Handler NY (97-00); Sr. Counsel, U.S. SEC NY (96-97); Staff Att’y, U.S. SEC NY (93-96); Participant Svc. Rep., Depository Trust Co. NY (87-90) Subjects: *Other/Non-Listed; Business Organizations (12); Negotiable Instruments (12); Securities Regulation (12); Contracts II (5) Memberships: AALS Section on Securities Regulations

Perea, Jennifer Rosato Dean and Professor, Northern Illinois University College of Law. JD, 1987, University of Pennsylvania; BS, 1983, Cornell. Associate Dean and Professor, Drexel University College of Law (06-09) Subjects: Bioethics; Children and the Law; Civil Procedure; Family Law; Professional Responsibility. Memberships: American Law Institute

Pinard, Michael Prof. & Director, Clinical Law Program, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law. JD, 1994, New York Univ.; BA, 1990, Long Island Univ.. Visiting Professor, New York University School of Law (08-09); Prof.; Ass’t Prof., Maryland (02-07); Vis. Assoc. Prof., Wash. St. Louis (01-02); Ass’t Prof., Clin. Educ. St. John’s (00-01); Robert M. Cover Fellow in Clin. Tchg., Yale (98-00); Staff Att’y, Off. of the Appellate Defender NYC (96-98); Staff Att’y, The Neighborhood Defender Serv. of Harlem NYC (94-96) Subjects: Re-Entry of Ex-Offenders (10); Re-Entry of Ex-Offenders Clinic (10); Comparative Criminal Process (5); Criminal Procedure (5); Legal Profession (5) Memberships: AALS (CLE Sect., Co-Chair, Sect. on Litig., 2003-04); CLEA (Bd. Mem.)

Richardson, L. Song University of Iowa College of Law. BA, Harvard College. Professor of Law, University of Iowa College of Law; Associate Professor, American University, Washington College of Law (11-12); Associate Professor, DePaul University College of Law (09-11); Assistant Professor, DePaul University College of Law (06-08) Subjects: Criminal Procedure (6); Criminal Law (6); Law And Social Science Books and Awards: AALS Derrick Bell Award: (11) Memberships: Member: ALI Washington

Ross, Josephine Associate Professor, Howard University School of Law. BA, 1981, Oberlin Coll.; JD, 1984, Boston Univ. Assoc. Prof., Howard; Vis. Prof., Mich. St.-DCL (04-06); Vis. Prof., Boston Coll. (93-05); Lawyer, Com. for Public Coun. Servs. Worcester MA (85-92); Clerk, NH Sup. Ct. Exeter (84-85) Subjects: Criminal Justice Clinic (15); Criminal Law (5); Law & Gender (5) Memberships: Phi Beta Kappa.


Schoenbaum, Naomi The George Washington University Law School.

Schwartz, Michael H. Dean & Professor, University of Arkansas, Little Rock, William H. Bowden School of Law. JD, 1987, Cal., Hastings.; BA, 1984, Cal., Berkley. Att’y, Hufstedler Miller Kaus & Beardsley Los Angeles (87-89); Prof. & Assoc. Dean, Fac. & Acad. Dev., Washburn University School of Law. Subjects: Contracts (15); Remedies (15); Insurance Law (5) Books and Awards: What the Best Law Teachers Do; Teaching Law by Design: Engaging Students from the Syllabus to the Final...; Contracts: A Context and Practice Casebook (with Riebe) Educating Tomorrow’s Lawyers Fellow: (12) Memberships: Chair Elect:AALS Section on Teaching Methods

Solimene, Gemma Clinical Associate Professor, Fordham University School of Law. BA, 1984, SUNY at Stony Brook; JD, 1987, NYU. Att’y-in-Charge Immig. Law Unit, The Legal Aid Soc. Bklyn. & NYC (97-99); Acting Ass’t Prof., NYU School of Law (93-96); Staff Att’y, The Legal Aid Soc. Bklyn. & NYC 1989-93 (89-96); Clerk, U.S.C.A. 2d Cir. NYC (87-89) Subjects: Clinical Teaching (15); Immigration Law (15) Memberships: Phi Beta Kappa.
Tyler, Ron Associate Professor of Law and Dir., Crim. Def. Clinic, Stanford.


Zimmerman, Emily B. Associate Professor, Drexel University, Earle Mack School of Law. AB, 1988, Bryn Mawr College; JD, 1991, Yale Law School. Associate Professor of Law, Drexel University Earle Mack School of Law; Associate Professor of Legal Writing, Villanova University School of Law (04-06); Assistant Professor of Legal Writing, Villanova University School of Law (03-03); Academic Visitor, School of Law, City University of Hong Kong (02-02); Legal Writing Instructor, Villanova University School of Law (01-03); Chief, Civil Litigation Unit, District Attorney’s Office (95-01); Supervisor, Municipal Court Unit, District Attorney’s Office (93-95); Assistant District Attorney, District Attorney’s Office (92-93); Clerk, Hon. William D. Hutchinson (91-92) Legal Research & Writing (10) Memberships: Legal Writing Institute
EXHIBITORS

Workshop for New Law School Teachers,
Including Track for Legal Writing and Clinical Teachers
June 18 – 21, 2014

Take the opportunity during refreshment breaks to visit the display tables of the exhibiting companies to view and discuss products, teaching methods and new technologies that can enhance your teaching and career. The display tables are located in the foyer, directly outside of the Grand Ballroom.

CAROLINA ACADEMIC PRESS

700 Kent Street
Durham, NC 27701
PHONE: (919) 489-7486
FAX: (919) 419-0761
WEBSITE: www.caplaw.com

Carolina Academic Press publishes casebooks and treatises for the academic legal community. Offerings range from the classic, Plain English for Lawyers, in its fifth edition, to casebooks in a wide variety of fields such as criminal law, contracts, civil procedure, and torts. CAP also offers treatises, casebooks, and readers in fields ranging from environmental to international law and from legal history to sports law. Titles on law school teaching and an impressive array of introductory books on topics such as legal writing, legal analysis, and starting off right in law school are just a few of the areas available. Check our web site at www.caplaw.com.

LEXISNEXIS

9443 Springboro Pike
Miamisburg, OH 45342
PHONE: (800) 227-9597
PHONE: (937) 847-3097
WEBSITE: www.lexisnexis.com

LexisNexis® is a leading provider of legal education resources that help faculty meet the challenges of teaching the law today. We provide textbooks and tools that make your course and scholarly work easier, including the LexisNexis® Digital Library for Professor Review Copies, Lexis Advance®, LexisNexis® Web Courses, and eBooks with links to Lexis Advance®. Visit our table to enter to win an iPad Mini and learn about our affordable content options, the Law School Publishing website for law school publication information, and how to review publications on-demand using the LexisNexis® Digital Library for Professor Review Copies.
THOMSON REUTERS WESTLAW
610 Opperman Drive
Eagan, MN  55123
PHONE: (800) 486-4876
FAX: (651) 687-5642
WEBSITE:  lawschool.westlaw.com

Thomson Reuters is a leading provider of high-quality education resources, including online legal research services and reference materials for law students, law faculty and law library patrons. The West Education Network (TWEN) is an electronic extension of the classroom, integrating academic tools, WestlawNext research, and other resources in an online environment. Visit the Thomson Reuters booth to learn more about these products and other services and solutions available to law schools.

WEST ACADEMIC
444 Cedar Street, Suite 700
St. Paul, MN  55101
PHONE: (651) 202-4815
WEBSITE:  westacademic.com

Headquartered in St. Paul, MN, West Academic is the leading publisher of casebooks, treatises, study aids and other legal education materials in the U.S. Founded on the principle of making legal information more accessible, and rooted in a long history of legal expertise and innovation, we’ve been a leader in legal education publishing for more than 100 years. Our content is published under three brands, West Academic Publishing, Foundation Press® and Gilbert®

WOLTERS KLUWER LAW & BUSINESS
2700 Lake Cook Road
Riverwoods, IL  60015
PHONE: (847) 267-2731
FAX: (847) 267-2873
WEBSITE:  www.WoltersKluwerLB.com
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Workshop Materials

Workshop speakers were invited to submit discussion outlines for those in attendance. These outlines and other materials are presented in sequence of the program.
Note-Taking Guide

MICHAEL H. SCHWARTZ
University of Arkansas at Little Rock, William H. Bowen School of Law

I. Goals: By the end of this session, attendees will
   A. Be able to identify the characteristics of those law teachers whose classes and lessons the students are
      most likely to remember
   B. Be inspired
   C. Be able to emulate some of the key strategies used by the best law teachers

II. Frustrations in Teaching
    In the space below, respond in writing to any or all of the following questions:
    • What are your greatest frustrations as a law teacher?
    • What drives you crazy when you teach?
    • What would you like to wave a wand and change in your classes?

III. Best Teacher Exercise
    In the space below, do the following:

    1. Identify the teacher or professor from whom you learned the most, the instructor whose lessons have
       most stuck with you to this day.

    2. Describe why the teacher was so effective. What was his/her attitude about the subject? How did s/he
       approach student learning? What were his/her expectations of students? What kinds of things did s/he
       have students do in class? What did s/he think of the students in your class?

    Teacher: ________________________________________________________________

    Why my teacher/professor was so effective: ______________________________________

    ________________________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________________________
    ________________________________________________________________

    B. Common qualities of best teachers?
Results of Best Law Teachers Study

I. How the best law teachers prepare for courses and class sessions

II. How the best law teachers teach

III. Other common qualities of the best law teachers

Methodology Lessons of Best Law Teachers Study

I. Classroom observations (see p. 3)

II. Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (see p. 4)

III. Self-Evaluation Tool (see p. 4)

IV. Exceptional learning: What is exceptional intellectual and personal learning in the context in which you teach? (see p. 5)
Observation Form

Make a hash mark for each instance a particular type of event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Questions Asked</th>
<th>Inappropriate Tech Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open-ended</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 Mins.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closed-ended</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 Mins.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(yes/no)</td>
<td><strong>End of Class</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Speaks in Class (Male-Female)

# of men in class: _______________

# of women in class: _______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who Speaks in Class (Race)

# of SOC in class: _______________

# of WS in class: _______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students of Color (SOC)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Students (WS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities Log

At each of the two minute intervals below, indicate the learning activity (e.g., lecture, Q & A, cooperative learning activity, writing) that is happening in the room. The results can provide faculty members interesting data about their teaching methods.
Questions for Students and Alumni

1. What does _________ do that fosters your learning?
2. How would you characterize the nature of your learning in _________’s classes?
3. What changes in the way _________ conducts classes would better foster your learning?
4. How is _________ different from other teachers you have (have had)?
5. What things (if any) that you learned from _________ will stay with you? What did _________ do that caused those things to stay with you?

Teacher Questions

Learning
1. What is your understanding of how humans learn?
2. What do you want your students to learn?
3. Where does learning take place in your courses?
4. What do you do to motivate students to learn?
5. What do you do to help students learn?
6. What challenges do students have in learning in your classes?
7. What challenges do you have in helping them learn?

Teaching
8. How do you prepare to teach? What questions do you ask yourself as you prepare?
9. What are your primary teaching methods?
10. What are your key assignments?
11. What do students find exciting in your course(s)?
12. How do you start each course? End it?
13. Are there any good metaphors for your approach to teaching?

Relationships
14. How would you describe your relationship with students?
15. What do you like most about your students? Least about your students?

Assessment
16. How do you provide feedback to students during the course?
17. How do you evaluate students?
18. How do you check your progress and evaluate your own efforts?
19. How do you know when you have done a good job in teaching a class?
20. How do you know when you have done a good job in teaching a course?

Global
21. Do you have any evidence of the success of your students in learning what you wish them to learn?
22. Do you have any evidence that your teaching methods contribute significantly to that learning?
23. What is a good metaphor for your courses? (a game, a journey, an obstacle course) How does that metaphor illuminate something about your teaching?
Exceptional Learning

Law School Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised Definition of “Exceptional Learning” in Legal Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional teachers produce exceptional learning. Exceptional learning has two main components: exceptional intellectual development and exceptional personal development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional intellectual development includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• gaining deep, nuanced understanding of a sizeable body of legal doctrine, theory, and policy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing general lawyering skills (e.g., legal analysis and reasoning, case and statute reading, legal research, legal writing, policy analysis and synthesis, critical thinking);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing specific law practice skills, such as drafting legal documents (e.g., contracts, pleadings, briefs and memoranda) and interactive skills (e.g., negotiation, client counseling, oral advocacy, mediation, arbitration, trial advocacy, fact investigation); and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• acquiring professional judgment, asking sophisticated questions, and applying concepts and skills to new problems, law practice, and life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional personal development includes significant growth in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• understanding one's self (one's history, emotions, dispositions, abilities, insights, limitations, prejudices, assumptions) and what it means to be human;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• gaining confidence, skill, and intrinsic motivation to grow beyond one's own expectations and to pursue lifelong learning;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing a sense of responsibility to one's self and others (including moral development);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• enhancing the ability to understand emotions and exercise compassion; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing professionalism and professional identity (e.g., values of the profession, purpose, and the thirst for justice).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your Version: What would you change, add?

Differences in How Students Learn and Are Motivated

EMILY B. ZIMMERMAN
Drexel University School of Law

Effective teachers understand that what learners bring to the classroom is just as important as what the teachers bring. This session will help new law teachers learn more about students’ perspectives in order to facilitate learning and promote a positive classroom experience for both students and teachers.

I. Introduction
   A. A teachable moment – for the teacher
   B. What kinds of differences are we talking about?
      1. Differences among students
      2. Differences between students and professors

II. Law Student Enthusiasm
   A. What is it?
   B. How much of it do students actually have?
   C. Implications for teaching

III. Law Students’ Learning and Assessment Preferences
   A. Empirical research
   B. Implications for teaching

IV. Law Students and Motivation
   A. Intrinsic motivation/Extrinsic motivation
   B. Mastery goals/Performance goals
   C. Incremental theory of intelligence/Entity theory of intelligence
   D. Implications for teaching

V. Conclusion
   A. “Don’t judge a book by its cover”
   B. The “Golden Rule” of teaching (with a caveat)
   C. Inspiration for students and law professors
Selected Resources


Massimiliano Tani & Prue Vines, Law Students’ Attitudes to Education: Pointers to Depression in the Legal Academy and the Profession, 19 Legal Educ. Rev. 3 (2009).


Designing Courses and Classes to Maximize Student Engagement and Learning

JANE H. AIKEN
Georgetown University Law Center

In this session, we will explore a methodology to develop classes that accomplish your goals. Below are some materials that may be of use in inspiring discussion and crafting simulations in your class. This also includes a blank worksheet employing the Backwards Design\(^1\) concept to assist you in thinking through planning classes and offers an example of what the form might look like filled out using a torts example.

I also include Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning As Applied to Law Teaching. This taxonomy identifies the critical stages of learning: Knowledge, Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation and offers examples of how you will know if your students are progressing.

Here is an approach created by Grant Wiggins called WHERE TO that helps you think through how to ensure you have effective learning activities in your class.

Consider:

**Will the students...**

**W** Know Where they’re going (the learning goals), Why (reason for learning the content), and What is required of them (unit goal, performance requirements, and evaluative criteria)?

**H** Be Hooked—engaged in digging into the Big Ideas (e.g., through inquiry, research, problem-solving, experimentation)?

**E** Have adequate opportunities to Explore an experience Big Ideas and receive instruction to equip them for the required performances?

**R** Have sufficient opportunities to Rethink, Rehearse, Revise and Refine their work based upon timely feedback?

**E** Have an opportunity to Evaluate their work and set future goals?

**Consider the extent to which the learning plan is...**

**T** Tailored and flexible to address the interests and learning styles of all students.

**O** Organized and sequenced to maximize engagement and effectiveness.

---

It is also difficult to decide when we should use traditional didactic learning or teach the material through some experiential activity. Below is one way to make that assessment, again drawn from UNDERSTANDING BY DESIGN:

What is most appropriately and effectively covered in a linear and didactic fashion?

### The Logic of “Coverage”

- Present information in a logical, step-by-step fashion. (Teacher as tour guide.)
- Follow the sequence of the book.
- Move from the facts and basic skills to move advanced concepts and processes.
- Expose students to a breadth of material dictated by established goals.
- Use hands-on and other experiential activities selectively because these can take considerable time.
- Teach and test the discrete pieces before having students apply what they are learning.

What is most appropriately and effectively “uncovered” in an inductive, inquiry-oriented, experiential manner?

### The Logic of “Uncoverage”

- Think of the unit as an unfolding story or problem rather than as a guided tour or an encyclopedia article.
- Begin with a hook and teach on an as-needed basis. Don’t front load all of the information before application.
- Make the sequence more surprising and less predictable.
- Ensure that there are ongoing cycles of model, practice, feedback, and adjustment built into the unit.
- Focus on Transferable, Big Ideas.
- Move back and forth between the whole and the parts rather than teaching all the little bits first, out of context. (Think of sports, the arts, and vocational technical projects.)
A Few Teaching Tips for Engaged Learning

Effective simulations

1. Consider using simulations to have your students:
   - Learn new skills
   - Demonstrate mastery of a subject matter
   - Cover a seemingly large amount of content (this might seem counter-intuitive but it can help synthesize large amounts of material)
   - Gain confidence by having a “stand up” experience

2. Have small goals in terms of what you want the simulation to achieve; many times simulations fail because they try to do too much.

3. Realize that students really enjoy doing simulations and learn a lot by doing them. Students like acting like the lawyer they hope to become.

4. Think about simulating what logically is something that happens for lawyers in this point of the course and give them a chance to act at that level in the classroom.

5. Plan for both the simulation and the debrief; debrief can be just as important as what the students do in the simulation, so make sure you leave time for this. Many simulations fail because the faculty members run out of time, and the students don’t learn what worked and didn’t and fail to take the lesson from the simulation.

6. Have the other students participate in the debrief/critique.

7. With critique, always start with the positive. Start with a question such as “what worked well?”

8. Make scenarios realistic and give the role players some meaningful choice, decision, or conflict of motives.

9. Consider involving the students not actively participating in the role play in supporting roles, like the judge, client, in-house counsel, etc.

10. Cut off the role play at a high point. There is no need to let the role play go all the way through. If there is enough to prompt a good debrief, stop it there.

Effective Classroom Discussion

Many faculty members find it difficult to stimulate discussion in class. Below are some hints/techniques that have proven effective.

1. Prepare questions for students to consider while they are doing their homework assigned for each class. This can serve as a departure point for in-class discussions.

2. Ask the students to come to class with questions from their reading or fieldwork.

3. Ask students to write down and hand in (or email you) three questions that arose for them from the class discussion. You can use these to start the next class. Just be sure to answer some of them or students will stop participating.

4. Phrase questions so that students feel comfortable responding. Avoid right or wrong answer questions and choose questions that do not have a single correct answer.

5. Use quick writes and small groups to “prime the pump,” that is, to allow those students who are internal processors as opposed to external thinkers to be on a level playing field at the time of the discussion.
o Pose questions based on a shared experience so that one student's unique experience doesn't get the discussion off-track.

o Ask students to pose the dumbest question they can think of.

o Use brainstorming as a technique to consider range of possible solutions to problems, explanations for behavior, etc.

o Develop a tolerance for silence. (This can be very effective!)

o Assign roles to students.

o Balance the kind of questions you ask:
  - Exploratory questions that probe facts and basic knowledge
  - Challenge questions that explore assumptions, conclusions, interpretations
  - Relational questions that compare ideas, approaches
  - Diagnostic questions probing motives and causes
  - Action questions which call for a conclusion or action
  - Cause-and-effect questions asking for causal relationships between ideas, actions or events
  - Extension questions that link to other parts of the discussion
  - Hypothetical questions
  - Priority questions seeking to identify the most important issue
  - Summary questions that elicit syntheses

o Vary the cognitive skills your questions call for
  - Knowledge skills
  - Comprehension skills
  - Application skills
  - Analysis skills
  - Synthesis skills
  - Evaluation skills
Class Design Worksheet for Backwards Design

I. Goal:

II. Assessment:

A. What predictable misunderstandings or naïve conceptions might students bring to learning with respect to this goal?
   1. 
   2. 

B. What concrete student behaviors would demonstrate successful learning with respect to this goal? What actions/statements will you be looking for?
   1. 
   2. 

C. What concrete student behaviors would be indicators that successful learning has NOT occurred?
   1. 
   2. 

III. Class Design:

A. What learning activity could help students achieve this insight and allow you to observe and assess behavior changes that reflect successful learning?

B. How will the learning activity be structured?

C. How might you narrow the activity sufficiently so that:
   * Students will learn and be able to name and transfer the learning; and
   * You will be able to assess success and failure?

Additional issues to consider:

- How much class time will you devote to this learning activity?
- How many students will actively participate?
- Will you assign reading, reflective exercises, or other activities in advance of class?
- Does the activity require that you provide a substantive introduction in advance of the student activity? What? How much time?
- How will you wrap up the activity and transition to the next teaching segment?
Example of Class Design Worksheet: Torts

IV. Your learning goal for this torts class session is to have the students begin to understand that there are kinds of harms that give rise to a cause of action but not all harms are actionable.

V. Assessment:

C. What predictable misunderstandings or naïve conceptions might students bring to learning with respect to this goal?
   1. All harms result in a cause of action or all harms result in liability
   2. Facts are fixed and context has no impact.

D. What concrete student behaviors would demonstrate successful learning with respect to this goal? What actions/statements will you be looking for?
   1. Student can articulate what a summary judgment motion is and what evidence is pertinent to that decision.
   2. Student can marshal facts in support of or against a motion for summary judgment and recognize the social, political and economic realities that are likely to have an impact on whether the harm is legally recognizable.

C. What concrete student behaviors would be indicators that successful learning has NOT occurred?
   1. Student cannot articulate the factors and standard that influenced a decision for or against summary judgment.
   2. Student cannot distinguish between material and immaterial facts nor articulate how materiality changes depending on context.

VI. Class Design:

D. What learning activity could help students achieve this insight and allow you to observe and assess behavior changes that reflect successful learning?
   a. Performance tasks: Develop a fact-investigation plan for the parties supporting an opposing a motion for summary judgment; Identify the equitable arguments that might make a harm more or less legally recognized; Argue a motion for summary judgment.
   b. Informal checks on understanding: Ask students to identify the critical facts that establish or undermine a claim of negligence.

E. How will the learning activity be structured?
   a. This learning goal can be introduced after the students demonstrate a basic understanding of what constitutes either an intentional tort or the tort of negligence. It should be introduced in stages.
   b. Before giving them a formal lawyer activity (like arguing a motion for summary judgment), I will appeal to their basic knowledge/common sense and describe a situation in which there are arguably relevant and irrelevant facts (an ill-formed problem). I will divide the class in half: one
side argues that this is a harm that should be recognized by the law; the other side argues that this is not something the law should address. I will then ask the students to turn to the person next to them and identify the facts that they believe will make the strongest argument in their favor, the facts that are the most difficult to deal with. I will then ask them to come back to the whole group and report on the results of this discussion. I will put the facts on the board. As the groups report, I will ask them why this fact is material. I assume that we will develop on the board something that looks like a Venn diagram. I will then ask the students to return to their partners and discuss fact investigation plan to develop more information that will undermine the evidence that undercuts their claim and support for the equivocal facts that will lend support to their claim. Return to the group and report on the fact investigation. I will ask the reporters to discuss why they believe what facts they are seeking and why such facts will help their claim. Finally, I will ask the class to reflect on what this means about what harms are recognized as legally actionable.

F. How might you narrowed the activity sufficiently so that:

* Students will learn and be able to name and transfer the learning; and
* You will be able to assess success and failure?

I might have had the students focus only on one type of facts (negative or equivocal) to get more precision in the activity. I would want to make sure that my ill-defined problem is simple enough to generate the range of facts I am seeking and sufficient equivocal (or underdeveloped) facts but not so complicated as to confuse the students or make the discussion veer away from my learning goal. I want to make sure that I ask the probing questions that will help the students see the contextual aspect of facts.

I will assess success or failure by seeing if the students can identify material facts and can articulate why certain other facts might change the weight of that fact.

I will build into future classes more opportunity for this including arguing a motion for summary judgment (or preparing a plan for that argument and bringing it to class for discussion)

Additional issues to consider:

- How much class time will you devote to this learning activity? This activity will take considerable time in class but not the whole class hour.
- How many students will actively participate? I will try to engage as many students as possible.
- Will you assign reading, reflective exercises, or other activities in advance of class? Since much of this is inductive, I will not have any additional material other than their homework assignment. I might ask them to think about how lawyers find out the facts that eventually get adopted (or not) by the decision.
- Does the activity require that you provide a substantive introduction in advance of the student activity? What? How much time? Not here, other than pressing them to identify the component facts (rather than conclusions)
- How will you wrap up the activity and transition to the next teaching segment? I will draw conclusions about how once we know what might move a court materially, we can focus our attention on gathering those facts. I will also point out the importance of deconstructing conclusions. Finally, I will foreshadow that once the facts are gathered, how and whether they are presented becomes much more important.
# Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning Applied to Law Teaching

| **Knowledge:** Recall of Data | Examples: Case Names; Facts of Case; Language of Statute; Procedural Posture  
|  | Key Words: Define, describe, identify, know, label, list, match, name, outline, recall, recognize, reproduce, select, state  
| **Comprehension:** Understand the meaning, translation, interpolation, and interpretation of instructions and problems. State a problem in one's own words. | Examples: Case Holding; Material Facts; Applicability of Statute, distinguish the case  
|  | Key words: Comprehend, convert, defend, distinguish, estimate, explain, extend, generalize, give examples, infer, interpret, paraphrase, predict, rewrite, summarize, translate  
| **Application:** Use a concept in a new situation or unprompted use of abstraction. | Examples: Can cope with hypothetical problems posed by the professor, can create hypothetical problems, can predict outcomes for simple problems  
|  | Key words: apply, change, compute, construct, demonstrate, discover, manipulate, modify, operate, predict, prepare produce relate, show, solve, use  
| **Analysis:** Separates material or concepts into component parts so that its organizational structure may be understood. Distinguishes between facts and inferences | Examples: Can deal with raw facts and determine where the legal issues are, understands how each segment of the course fits together; can distinguish between a fact and a conclusion, can identify logical fallacies  
|  | Key words: Analyze, break down, compare, contrast, diagram, deconstruct differentiates, discriminate, distinguish, identify, illustrate, infer, outline, relate, select, separate  
| **Synthesis:** Builds a structure or pattern from diverse elements. Puts parts together to form a whole with an emphasis on creating a new meaning structure | Examples: Can encounter fact patterns, identify issues and can integrate the learning so to problem solve effectively, can create a usable outline of the material, can make arguments from differing perspectives  
|  | Key words: categorize, combine, compile, compose, create, devise, design, explain, generate, modify, organize, plan, rearrange, reconstruct, relate, reorganize, revise, rewrite, summarize, tell, write  
| **Evaluation:** Make judgments about the value of ideas or materials | Examples: Can cope with ambiguous facts within a problem, predict outcome, and articulate reasoning for prediction  
|  | Key words: appraise, compare, conclude, contrast, criticize, critique, defend, describe, discriminate, evaluate, explain, interpret, justify, relate, summarize, support |
Experiential Learning Demonstration

SUSAN J. BRYANT
City University of New York School of Law

Tell me, and I will forget. Show me, and I may remember. Involve me, and I will understand.
Confucius, circa 450 BC.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. A Word on Experiential Learning

Using the “experiential learning” model, educators intentionally engage learners in direct experience and focused reflections to accomplish various teaching goals, which may include increasing knowledge, developing skills, and clarifying values. Clinical faculty often summarize the model with three stages that form a cycle: Plan, Do, Reflect. Others add additional steps such as Generalize/Hypothesize to explicitly recognize that from the reflection students are expected to develop or refine ideas that will influence planning the next time the activity is repeated. What sets this model apart from simply “learning by doing” is the reflective processing that comes after the doing.

Experiential Learning is a point in the range of Active Learning strategies or techniques devised to better engage students in the learning process. Active Learning is the opposite of Passive Learning, which occurs when students simply await the dispensing of information from instructors. While all of Experiential Learning is Active Learning, not all of Active Learning is Experiential Learning.

In Experiential Learning, students are asked to pay attention to the process: (1) to plan it (2) do it; (3) think about what happened; (4) figure out what was important from the experience; (4) find general trends or truths in the experience; and (5) apply these to a similar or different situation. Plan, Do, Reflect, and Plan again

In law schools, Experiential Learning reaches its zenith in the clinical legal education program where experiences with real clients or simulated lawyering activities provide fertile opportunities to Plan, Do, and Reflect. However, non-clinical faculty can add Experiential Learning to the mix of teaching techniques employed in doctrinal or “casebook” courses to enhance doctrinal learning and prepare students for their clinical work in later years. Experiential learning bridges the divide between knowledge and ideas and where and how they might be used. Authentic learning increases motivation and integration promotes transfer.

B. Experiential Learning Opportunities in the Doctrinal Classroom

In a more traditional “casebook course,” Experiential Learning typically takes the form of periodic role playing in a simulated lawyering task, or in other role-playing that provides support for traditional case analysis.

---

1 This is an edited version of a handout prepared for a panel on experiential learning by Susan J. Bryant, City University of New York School of Law, Charles R. Calleros, Arizona State University Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law, Mehmet K. Konar-Steenberg, William Mitchell College of Law Calvin Pang, University of Hawaii William S. Richardson School of Law. With permission, I have edited it and repurposed it for this conference.
To illustrate, here are ways that Charles R. Calleros uses Experiential Learning in a contracts class, starting from the end of the spectrum in which the experiential component is most subtle:

- Conducting a simulation simply to make some doctrinal material more concrete or subject to visualization, such as acting out an exchange transaction or inviting students to work through documents and transcripts in a file to immerse them in the facts of a judicial opinion or a hypothetical case prior to group discussion;
- Relating classroom lessons to the “real world,” such as through students taking note of contracts or warning labels that they encounter in their daily lives and explaining how they illustrate doctrine being discussed in the classroom;
- Asking students to prepare for class by writing a segment of a brief for each side of a dispute presented in a problem, or by writing a majority and dissenting opinion in resolution of the problem;
- Using simulation to walk students through legal matters that are difficult to teach through readings, charts, and lecture, such as by assigning roles and leading students through an international sales negotiation and letter-of-credit financing through the banking system;
- Helping students consolidate their study of doctrinal law while developing professional identity, skills and values by asking them to work with the doctrine in a professional task, such as by drafting an enforceable non-competition agreement, simulating the counseling of a client about legal rights, or advocating for a client in simulated oral argument or brief writing.

II. BENEFITS OF EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

A. Deep Learning through Doing: Experiential learning engages students, requiring more in-depth understanding to apply knowledge and the knowledge is more likely “to stick” when the student uses it. The learning is multidimensional, engaging emotional, cognitive and skill dimensions.

B. Adding Variety to Teaching Methods: Experience shows that the risk of students “zoning out” is lessened when they are actively engaged and when the teacher varies teaching techniques. For example, simply switching for a few minutes from traditional Socratic method to small-group discussions can dramatically increase the energy and breadth of participation in a classroom. Breaking up the traditional case method with an occasional supporting simulation can result in additional intellectual stimulation.

C. Helping Students to Imagine Themselves as Professionals: Leading students in role-playing can help them to identify as lawyers rather than simply as students. For some students it is their first introduction to the work of lawyers. Experiential learning helps them contemplate the responsibilities and challenges that arise from client representation. When they see how their learning is connected to their future work, they are motivated to learn not just for learning sake but for future clients.

III. CHALLENGES TO ACCOMPLISHING LEARNING GOALS

A. Scarcity of Time: In the typical casebook course, the perennial challenge is to squeeze critically important topics into the allocated classroom hours. Much ground can be covered through assigning reading and providing lecture, but engagement and deep learning is unlikely to take place. Socratic method takes time, and Experiential Learning typically requires significantly more time. Consequently, deriving benefits from the exceptional engagement provided by Experiential Learning requires reduced coverage or covering some topics through lecture.

Potential Solutions:

- **Let Go of Topics:** Or as a compromise, cover some topics through lecture, not for deep learning but simply to highlight them as issues.
- **Adopt A Text That Incorporates Experiential Learning:** Many new texts are including experiential exercises in the book and teachers’ manuals include ideas about how to teach from the exercises.
- **Add Time:** If you have control over the time allotted to your course, such as by converting a 2-unit upper-division course to a 3-unit course, expand your course to permit Experiential Learning and reinforcing currently covered topics rather than cutting them.

B. Added Preparation: Adding Experiential Learning to a course may require additional infusions of creative pedagogy, preparation of supporting materials, and planning the logistics of executing the exercise.

Potential Solutions:

- **Add Experiential Learning Incrementally:** To minimize the burdens of pedagogic change, add one or two new Experiential Learning exercises each year.
- **Benefit from In-House Collaboration:** Ask a colleague who teaches a skills course to lend you a time-tested exercise or teach the class for you.
- **Benefit from the Work of Colleagues Throughout the Academy:** Books, articles, listserv discussions, and web sites can provide classroom-tested ideas and resources for you to adopt or adapt to your needs. For example, the new Lexis-Nexis Skills and Values series and accompanying web course material; various websites on teaching like:
  - http://educatingtomorrowslawyers.du.edu/;
  - http://library.law.umn.edu/researchguides/teachingtools.html;
  - http://www.aals.org/services_curriculum_committee.php
  - Bridge to Practice Series from West Publishers
  - The Skills and Values Series from Lexis Nexis

C. Difficulty of Using Experiential Learning in Large Classes: Actively engaging a large class is difficult. Using Experiential Learning in a large class may appear even more difficult. In reality, it increases engagement throughout the classroom, including in the back row. When a teacher moves from Socratic questioning of a single student to assigning students to negotiate a contract in pairs, the engagement of all students increases. Experiential Learning activities provide great benefits to a large classroom, albeit while raising some logistical challenges. Potential Solutions to Logistical Problems are discussed more fully in section IV, below.
D. Fear of Negative Reactions for Departing from Traditional Methods: Because many law faculty who teach doctrinal courses have never had instruction in pedagogy, we often replicate the teaching methods that we experienced as law students. Faculty who break out of this mold may wonder whether other faculty will view non-traditional teaching methods as less rigorous, or may fear that some students will believe that the time devoted to Experiential Learning in a “casebook course” is wasted.

Potential Solutions:

- **The Fears are Exaggerated:** Avoid exaggerating the risk of negative reactions. If you display competence in traditional methods such as Socratic questioning, all but the most hopelessly conservative of faculty are likely to view with approval, if not envy, your ability to employ various teaching methods. Because students have different learning styles, they too are likely to appreciate being exposed to a number of teaching methods.

- **Explain Your Pedagogy:** Even the skeptical students will appreciate your methods if you explain your teaching goals and connect earlier experiential exercises to doctrinal learning. Skeptical faculty, too, may be positively influenced by explanations of your pedagogy.

- **Use Classroom Time Efficiently:** If you plan and execute an Experiential Learning activity carefully, achieving its goals efficiently, then students and others will be less apt to wonder whether the activity is displacing other teaching and learning opportunities to an excessive degree.

IV. CONSTRUCTING EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING ACTIVITIES TO PROMOTE LEARNING

Choose when to use Experiential Learning, design the context for the experience, identify the tasks for each stage of the activity, and pay careful attention to logistics.

A. Choose When to Use Experiential Learning: match benefits to goals

1. **Employ experiential exercises purposefully.** Identify those aspects of doctrine, theory, lawyer’s role or practice where student engagement in an activity and reflecting on that activity will teach something necessary and valuable to the student.

2. **Identify difficult concepts** where greater contextual understanding will increase student learning and plan Experiential Learning around these. For example, use a contract negotiations exercise to provide a foundation for raising issues regarding the parol evidence rule, a conceptually difficult doctrine for some students.

3. **Identify how lawyers use the law** to benefit clients or broader societal interests and plan an activity giving students insight into the connection between doctrine and lawyers’ work. For example, engage students in drafting a non-competition agreement that requires choices about what to disclose to adversaries about missing or ambiguous clauses, especially when the client has requested a contract clause that is not enforceable. Such an exercise teaches ethical issues and the doctrine of mistake or conscious ambiguity in contract formation.

4. **Make intentional choices about role.** Where students are in role as lawyers, pay attention to explicit and implicit messages about professional values, about lawyer’s work, the law and lawyer’s role in promoting justice and access.
B. **Identify Context.** How close to law practice should the activity be to meet learning goals? Use a variety of contexts including non-litigation contexts to teach lawyer’s identity and purpose.

1. **Exercises:** Context for activities is a non-legal context that promotes learning of underlying concepts. For example, interviewing clinical classmates and using that experience to develop understanding of lawyer-client interviewing, or engaging students in non-legal bargaining exercise to teach concepts of developing contractual obligations.

2. **Role-play:** Context for activity involves students playing a role in a setting that is not designed to be fully faithful to the real world. For example, students are asked to explain the law to a client in a counseling session. Or students are asked to argue the benefits of a statute pending before a legislature. Students do not know the full context of either activity. The counseling exercise drops the student into an on-going attorney client relationship whereas the legislative advocacy role-play involves acting without knowing all of the specifics of the legislative committee.

3. **Simulation:** Students play a role in a situation designed to replicate significant aspects of the real world. Students in the lawyer’s role, in an ongoing and developing matter, exercise choices that have consequences as the representation continues. For example, students may represent a client in an ongoing dispute and take the client through the stages of litigation. Students may also become players in a semester-long simulation playing other roles for example, as students playing workers and teacher playing employer in a semester-long simulation

C. **Focus on the Process and Tasks of the Exercise.** Using the stages of Experiential Learning—Plan, Do, Reflect, Hypothesize—identify the tasks and stages for the exercise. While these stages can be and often are jumped, good Experiential Learning has aspects of these stages even if they are not followed in a linear fashion. In designing an experiential exercise, identify what if any tasks you want students to do and what the teacher’s role will be.

1. **Plan:** Students identify purpose, options, and develop a plan for the activity or task (Teaching decisions: How much time to plan the exercise and how to memorialize the plan? For example, an in-class minute-write or a highly structured plan developed as homework? How much direction should teacher give about content and process of planning?)

2. **Do:** Students carry out plan, make adjustments as needed. (Teaching decisions: what tasks will students do? Not every activity will be suitable for a large class. Simpler more limited exercises may be most appropriate. What roles if any will they play? How long will the exercise run? Will it be in or out of class? What will the teacher's role be during the exercise?)

3. **Reflect:** Students identify what happened, why it happened, how it is the same or different than student planned. What are lessons or insights about law and lawyering? About myself as a developing lawyer? (Teaching decisions: how to engage students: individualized writing or a short e-mailed reflection submitted after class with later summary by teacher; teacher-led large group or teacher-directed pairs/small groups. Devise specific questions or topics to reflect upon? Or more open-ended? Bring small group insights to larger group through discussion?)

4. **Hypothesize:** Generalization that applies to new situation? What would you repeat? What would you do differently? What are the key features that will enable you to recognize similar situations so as to transfer learning?
D. Pay careful attention to logistics of running activities in classroom:

1. **Plan timing of each aspect of the activity: plan, do, reflect, hypothesize.** Do not be afraid to shorten any stage as short intense experiences can teach valuable lessons and longer exercises can sometimes result in a loss of classroom energy. (Think speed dating.) Make sure to allocate time for debriefing and synthesizing lessons.

2. **Put exercise in context.** What do they need to know about the setting? For example, where in the life of the client or lawyer relationship is the task situated? What has already happened? Or how much does it resemble “real?”

3. **Identify the activity’s place and setting.** Will it be individual, small group or large class? In or out of class? If small group consider time allocated to exercise in setting group number.

4. **Clearly define students’ tasks and roles.** Write these out on a smartboard, class website or a hand-out. A classroom full of small groups of people asking “what should we be doing?” is wasted time. Make instructions clear. Moving students quickly into and out of role and task is essential to building students’ confidence that learning is occurring.

5. **Plan teacher’s role.** In allocating time to the stages and planning the teacher’s role, think about how where the teacher’s expertise can add to the learning. For example, how much will the exercise teach by itself vs. how much teacher-led reflection is necessary to tease out the full potential of the activity? If the concepts are difficult, teachers may need to play a role in the planning or even in the doing by role-playing with the students.
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A Dozen Tips For Student Engagement in Classroom Discussions

SUSAN J. BRYANT
City University of New York School of Law

1. Set Participation Expectations In Your Syllabus. Announce that participation and contributions as well as good listening are expected of everyone. Explain that learning how to participate and share conversation space are professional skills that lawyers need. Explain why you value all voices to enrich the conversation. Students have previous participation patterns that may be difficult to disrupt. The “talkers” are used to having the floor and the “lurkers” are used to giving it to them and worse may be otherwise engaged. Importantly, these roles can be gendered and racialized. When that happens, the diversity we seek in classroom conversation is lost.

2. Model Participation Early and Reinforce It With Ground Rules. Disrupting previous patterns and establishing new ones needs to be set from the beginning. From the first day, make sure everyone is participating and keep rough track of contributions to make sure no one is dominating. Set ground rules that disrupt patterns and promote trust. For example – establish a norm that no one talks again until all have spoken at least once unless it is to follow-up in a back and forth discussion. If the same hands go up or jump into conversations, ask for new voices to join the conversation.

3. Make Goals for Conversations Clear. Outlining goals of the discussion allow students to monitor their understanding as the discussion ensues. Clearly articulated goals also help the faculty member to structure the discussion so that is productive. Students have a better idea of what a valuable contribution is and appropriate behavior when they know the purpose of the discussion.

4. Develop Low Stake Ways to Contribute. Ask for a report on work in small group. “Tell us one idea your group developed.” Or give people a quick write to allow them to formulate thoughts to a prompt before you ask for discussion. Warms ups to broader conversations enable greater and often better participation in large group conversations. If the students hesitate to join a conversation or conversation is heated among only a few, call a time out for a quick write.

5. Reward Participation. Some teachers grade contributions but those that don’t reward participation in other ways such as thanking students for participating, affirming their participation through nodding, eye contact, smiling, or moving closer to the speaker.

6. Use Large Group Discussion Techniques that Promote Participation. Start an idea chain that goes around the room with each student contributing an idea. Call on students who are not regulars when they volunteer and do not be afraid to cold call on them if they do not volunteer. Or, let students call on each other after they talk with the only caveat that they cannot call on someone who has already spoken. (Over the years, I have had many students comment that they never participated in class before and they really enjoyed participating in class. They thanked me for calling on them.)
7. **Assign Roles in the Discussion.** Assign Roles whether in small group or large – people who are hesitant to give their own opinion will often offer an opinion when in role of another. Or, assign facilitative roles in the discussion – e.g. some students are assigned to ask others questions about their ideas, others are asked to make contributions that continue a line of conversation, others to surface assumptions, while others summarize/synthesize the conversation.

8. **Include Participation Instructions in Exercises or Role Plays.** For example, “each person will do xxx” or “first one will, then the next will do or tell xxx.” Announce in the middle of the exercise that it is time to change, i.e. “If you have not switched story tellers do that now.”

9. **Motivate Students By Connecting Conversation To Their Work As Lawyers.** When students find positive value in a learning goal or activity, see achievement as possible, and perceive support from their environment, they are motivated to learn and participate.

10. **Use Questions That Spark Conversation.** Generally, questions that ask for multiple interpretations or approaches, different theories to connect to, build on other comments, or ask for facts to support or oppose are ones that will continue conversations. Vary questions used to vary the discussion (e.g., exploratory, relational, diagnostic, cause-and-effect, summary). Avoid questions that have right or wrong answers, as they often will kill conversations.

11. **Live with Silence.** Do not answer your own questions. Reframe them or try to figure out why you are getting silence. (Are they too obvious, too confusing, or do they just take some thought before answering?) Most often students will attempt to answer your question if you give them time.

12. **Build a Community of Learner/Practitioners.** Clinical students are engaged in a common endeavor of representing clients and becoming excellent lawyers. An ethic of commitment to life-long learning and collaborative purpose includes students’ ability to have frank conversations about strengths and weaknesses with each other; to reflect together about ways to improve the practice; and to agree and disagree while listening to each other. A clinical classroom that teaches students these skills is educating students in ways that enable them to be leaders and learners.
Designing 1L Courses and Classes to Maximize Student Engagement and Learning

MEREDITH J. DUNCAN
University of Houston Law Center

I. Being Deliberate: Beginning with the End in Mind
   A. Identifying Goals
      1. Choosing Subject Matter and Course Content
      2. Developing Successful Law Students
   B. Contemplating Differing Learning Styles
      1. Auditory
      2. Visual
      3. Tactile

II. Teaching 1Ls: Shaping Overall Success in Law School
   A. Briefing cases
   B. Reading critically
   C. Preparing for class
   D. Developing good habits
   E. Outlining
   F. Exam preparation

III. Creating Course Content
   A. Selection of Materials
      1. Casebooks
      2. Teachers’ Manuals
      3. Supplements
   B. Creation of syllabus

IV. Crafting Effective Communication with Your Class
   A. Your expectations
   B. Your style
   C. Your goals

V. Contemplating the Classroom
   A. Your Notes
   B. Classroom Slides?
   C. Class Handouts?
   D. Panels

VI. Developing Student Assessments
   A. Exams
   B. Quizzes
   C. Alternative Assessment Tools
Preparation for Session on Goals of Clinical Education

ELLIOTT S. MILSTEIN
American University, Washington College of Law

Attached is a post-interview memo written by your two supervisees (who work as a team) after their first client interview in a civil clinic.

Please read the memo and think about what you would like to accomplish in your supervision session with the team. We will work together to make a list of possible goals and then discuss how to achieve them.

To whet your appetite for the session, I have attached the first five pages from the introductory chapter on supervision from the new book, Bryant, Milstein and Shalleck, Transforming the Education of Lawyers: The Theory and Practice of Clinical Supervision (Carolina Academic Press 2014). In that chapter, Ann Shalleck and Jane Aiken challenge us to be attentive to two arcs, “The Arc of Client Representation” and “The Arc of Student Learning,” in order both to ensure that the case or matter is handled competently and that the students learn at a high level from the experience of being responsible.

TO: Clinic Supervisor, Civil Advocacy Clinic
FROM: Art and Alexandra, Student Attorneys

Supervision Memo for Sept 15

This week we interviewed our new client, Eduardo Gonzales. Mr. Gonzales does not speak English so we arranged for one of the clinic interpreters to interpret for us. That turned out to be unnecessary, however, because Mr. Gonzales brought a friend with him (Carlos) who was able to interpret. Since the clinic interpreter was only available for one hour, it turned out to be a good thing that his friend (who also drove him to the school) was there to interpret.

Eduardo came 45 minutes late to his interview so we had to cut it short to get because Art has a class at 4. We were upset that he kept us waiting for so long since it took us a long time to set up the interview, reserve the interview room, arrange an interpreter. But, we think we did a good job hiding our feelings from him.

Eduardo is a cook at Canale Seafood in Northeast DC. It is a take-out restaurant that sells fried fish and crab cake sandwiches and the like. He says that he works 70 or 80 hours each week and is paid in cash every two weeks. He says that Carlos told him that he wasn’t being paid enough. Carlos says that Eduardo isn’t paid the minimum wage and isn’t paid time and a half for overtime. Carlos used to work there as well and so has a lot of knowledge of the facts.

Eduardo says his boss is very mean and yells at him and the other Salvadorans who work in the kitchen. She is nicer to the workers who serve as cashiers and they are all African-Americans. The client and (most or all) of the Salvadorans are undocumented.

He would like to get paid what he is owed. He has worked under these conditions for 23 months. He is worried that if he complains he will be fired and worse, deported. He sends more than half of his pay home to his family in El Salvador.
Eduardo has no pay stubs or time sheets. When he hurt his back two months ago and missed 3 days of work, his pay check was much smaller and his boss threatened to hire someone to replace him.

We tried to explain to him what it means to file a law suit but we are not sure that he understood us. We told him that the best thing would for us to write a letter to his employer that explained her obligations under the Wage and Hour Law and demand that she pay him what she owes. We think that we should do that before we file an action. Alexandra thinks that we can file an anonymous complaint with DC Labor Department and get him paid without revealing that he is the complainant. We want to discuss that with you.

He signed a retainer so we could represent him. We added a clause to the retainer agreement that he agrees to come to future appointments on time and to cooperate with us.
Supervising Student Writing

DANIEL L. BARNETT
Lewis and Clark Law School
(University of Hawaii Williams S. Richardson School of Law – July 1, 2014)

Outline of Presentation

Understanding the task
- Comparing first-year courses, advanced writing classes, and upper-level seminars
- Focus of supervision: Mentor, teacher, or reader (expert, or novice).

Review of the writing process

Working with different types of writers
- Identifying different types of learners
- Strategies to adapt to different learning styles in writing classes

Getting students started on their projects
- Assisting with topic selection in seminars
- Designing problems in writing classes
  - How easy is too easy?
  - Expertise in subject area

In-class Writing Exercises
- Free writing
- Peer-review
- Other writing workshop ideas
  - Topic selection
  - Topic focus
  - Organizational options

Providing Feedback
- Importance of critique
- Prioritize
  - Ideas over other problems
- Know the substance—different strategies
  - Seminars
  - Writing classes
- Nuts and bolts of doing the critique
  - Pre-critique reading
  - Initial Review of a paper
  - Determine best type of critique
  - Consider amount of detail for comments
  - Provide guidance on priority of problems
    - Positive vs. constructive
    - Prioritize problem areas
  - Assume good faith effort
  - Mechanics of critique
    - Handwritten, electronic, or voice
    - Comment placement: margins or end comments
Writers block and other writing challenges

- Students from different backgrounds
- Writers block in legal writing

Helping students make the transition to practice

- Working with supervisors
- Dealing with feedback in practice
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Teaching 101 Workshop
Note-Taking Guide

MICHAEL H. SCHWARTZ
University of Arkansas at Little Rock, William H. Bowen School of Law

Unit One: Introduction

I. Goals: By the end of the workshop, you will
   A. Be able to write effective learning objectives
   B. Be able to articulate and have articulated a teaching philosophy
   C. Be able to implement best practices for selecting course materials
   D. Be able to make criteria-based decisions about using technology in teaching law
   E. Be able to create a model syllabus

Unit Two: Learning Objectives

Objectives for this Session

After this session, you will be able to:
   • Articulate the role of learning objectives in course design
   • Write goals and objectives, appropriate for your courses

Role of Learning Objectives
Criteria for Effective Goals/Objectives

- Learner-centered
- Encompassing doctrine, thinking skills, lawyering skills, and professional values
- Clear and measurable

Tips for identifying goals objectives:

- Why is my course in the curriculum?
- What is the difference between what a student can do at the beginning of my course and what the student can at the end of my course?
- What do I expect a student to remember and do six months after the end of the course? A year? Five years?
- Is broad or deep learning more important for my students?

Examples of Course Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge/Content Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will be able to articulate and apply, with accuracy, the law that governs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Contract formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Defenses to lawsuits for breach of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Remedies for breach of contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The parol evidence rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contract interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Third party beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assignment and delegation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thinking Skills Learning Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Law</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Refine statutory analysis skills by applying these elements of statutory analysis in the context of environmental disputes: standard of review, statutory language, statutory purpose and policy, overall statutory scheme, legislative history, regulations applying the statute, cases interpreting the statute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lawyering Skills Learning Objectives

Contracts
Students will be able to draft effective versions of the following common contract terms: liquidated damages clause, merger clause, express condition, force majeure clause, clause making timely performance an express condition

Civil Procedure
Students will be able to effectively:
- Draft a complaint that complies with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and applicable case law
- Draft discovery documents that comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and applicable case law
- Make an oral argument on a pretrial motion.

Professional Values Learning Objectives

Civil Procedure
Students will:
1. Demonstrate respect for students, staff, and faculty.
2. Develop an attitude of cooperation with students, faculty, lawyers, judges.
3. Identify ethical issues involved in civil dispute resolution.
4. Begin to formulate his or her version of the moral lawyer.

Writing Effective Learning Objectives
Step 1: Begin with: “After this course, students will be able to…”
Step 2: Select an action verb that describes what the students will be able to do: “define” “articulate” “solve” “produce” “design” “organize” “critique”
Step 3: Complete the objective with the appropriate content: The important doctrine, theory, thinking skills, performance skills, values you want every student to learn
Articulate at Least One Learning Objective for a Course You Will Teach

Knowledge

Thinking Skill

Lawyering Skill

Professional Value

Unit 3: Teaching Philosophy

Syllabus Excerpt Example: Contract Drafting

Teaching Philosophy

The only meaningful measure of effective teaching is student learning. If my students learn, my teaching has been successful. If not, I need to find a different way. I regard my students as colleagues, and I take a personal interest in every student I teach. Students respond to high expectations, both in terms of what they must accomplish and in terms of their capabilities. Students learn best when they think, do, write, speak, collaborate, and reflect. If I am doing most of the talking, my students are unlikely to be learning much.

Your Teaching Philosophy: What do you stand for as a teacher?

Unit 4: Selecting Course Materials

Design Sequence
1. Goals and objectives
2. Formative and Summative Assessment
3. Teaching and Learning Methods
4. Materials
### Purposes of Materials

- Achieve goals/objectives
- Guide preparation
- Support methods
- Facilitate feedback

### Types of Materials

What materials are appropriate for students before, during, and after your classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of material</th>
<th>How you and students will use the material in your course?</th>
<th>How to make the material interactive?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readings (books, articles, codes, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White boards and flip charts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagrams, flow charts, and tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handouts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unit 5: Making Good Technology Decisions

Technology Choices Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Technologies</th>
<th>Uses or Learning Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factors to Weigh in Making Good Technology Decisions

- Learning Goals
- Active Learning
- Benefits and Trade-Offs of the Technology(ies) and all other alternatives
- Alternative Uses of Classroom Time
- Practical Considerations

Best Practices for Using Technology

1. Consider the student perspective
2. Set-up and practice using the technology before you use it with your students
3. Have a back-up plan
4. Use the technology with your students
5. You and your students evaluate the use
6. Plan future uses
Unit 6: Checklist of Syllabus Components

1. Course Objectives
2. Teaching Philosophy
3. Teaching Methods (e.g., Socratic, lecture, small group) and Expectations of Students (e.g., preparation, attendance, computer use, etc.)
4. Assessment and Grading (specify date, types, weight)
5. Required University Components
6. Other Basics (texts, office hours, etc.)
7. Schedule of Assignments and Learning Activities (pages and dates)
Managing Student Challenges in the Classroom and Beyond

JOSEPHINE ROSS
Howard University School of Law

GEMMA SOLIMENE
Fordham University School of Law

RON TYLER
Stanford Law School

At various points during your teaching career, you are bound to find yourself in challenging situations in your encounters with students. You will be responsible for managing the classroom, which will require you to, among other things, be able to assess the level of understanding of the material you are trying to teach and the effectiveness of your teaching, decide what to do about disruptions caused by different behaviors, and respond to statements that are deemed to be problematic. In addition, your interactions and work with students may place you in a position to have to engage with students who are acting unprofessional or irresponsible in some way, students who present with personal difficulties that affect their education, or students who even challenge your authority in some way. You can imagine that in any given situation, with some time and reflection, you would come up with the perfect response or solution to the challenge you are facing, but you often times will not have the luxury of time and need to come up with an appropriate response in the moment. It is difficult to know what to do.

While there are no magic answers to the myriad of challenges that professors may face, this plenary will demonstrate some of the challenges by simulating three situations that involve the use of technology in class, being caught off guard with questions about areas one is not prepared to discuss, and responding to comments in class that can be seen as offensive. Through questions, answers and comments, our goal is to have new teachers recognize the choice points that arise during a class and other encounters with students, and to become comfortable navigating hard situations.

Bibliography of Suggested Readings:

Richard C. Reuben, Bringing Mindfulness into the Classroom: A Personal Journey, 61 J. Legal Educ. 674 (2012)


Institutional Relationships, Commitments and Service

MICHAEL PINARD
University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law

This concurrent session will be comprised of a conversation between me and the attendees that will focus on service opportunities and challenges for clinical legal educators. I will first establish that the three pillars—teaching, scholarship and service—are particularly challenging for clinical legal because of the intense teaching and practice requirements. I will then ask the participants a series of questions, including the following:

What constraints have you faced in your teaching, scholarship and service?

How have you dealt with those constraints?

What strategies have you employed to facilitate teaching, scholarship and service?

After further conversation stemming from these questions I will offer several tips for teaching, scholarship and service, including the following:

Teaching

- Rely on External Constituencies
  - Clinical Legal Education Association
    - Collects scholarship related to teaching
    - New Clinicians Conference
  - Other Steps
    - Seek out great teachers and get ideas
    - Read scholarship focused on innovative teaching (Clinical Law Review)
    - Look for opportunities to teach a doctrinal class if your school allows
      - Greater exposure to students
      - Improves teaching

Scholarship

- Write about your work
  - Use your work to inform your scholarship and your scholarship to inform your work
  - Often have unique insights because of your work
- Rely on external constituencies
  - AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education Scholarship Committee
    - Present work-in progress at clinical conference and
    - Be paired with a mentor
  - Clinical Law Review
    - Hosts a writers’ workshop each fall.
Service

- Get involved!
  - CLEA, AALS Committee on Clinical Legal Education and regional clinical conferences
  - Submit proposals for concurrent sessions at clinical conference or other conferences.
  - YOU ARE AN ASSET TO YOUR SCHOOL IF OTHERS KNOW YOU AND KNOW OF YOUR GREAT WORK
  - Local Service is critical –
    - Be involved with community boards -- fulfills you and benefits your work
  - Institutional service is critical
    - Exceed expectations
  - Make sure that your clinical director sends particulars about your accomplishments to CLEA Newsletter and AALS Newsletter
Managing and Building Institutional Relationships: The Shadow Work of Being a Law Professor

CAROL L. IZUMI
University of California, Hastings College of the Law

MICHAEL PINARD
University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law

We will conduct this session by leading a conversation with the participants that focuses on the “shadow work” of being a law professor. We will begin the conversation by first setting out the three core duties of teaching, scholarship and service:

- **teaching** includes prepping the classes, teaching the classes, meeting with students, representing clients (if a clinical legal education), developing external relationships that enhance teaching (i.e., guest speakers), writing exams and grading.
- **scholarship** includes researching, writing and presenting law review articles and/or bar journal articles, amicus briefs etc. (depending upon the ways in which the institution defines scholarship).
- **service** can be amorphous.
  - Most think of service as participating in the inner-workings of the law school (committee work), furthering the intellectual enterprise of the law school (i.e., student advisors, journal advisors, moot court advisors) and serving externally external capacities (board service, AALS etc.)
  - However, all law professors are called upon to work on tasks that might not fit neatly into these categories.
    - New professors soon learn that other duties are asked and/or expected of us
    - Professors are sounding boards, conduits, crisis managers, formal and informal advisors and mentors. Some of these duties fall particularly on new professors, professors of color, women professors and LGBT professors.

Professors have to navigate these various roles. This process including figuring out how to balance these roles and determining when professors can say no to particular requests or demands, all while making sure that they are doing everything necessary to fulfill their core roles related to teaching, scholarship and service.

We will then explain to the participants that our goals are to talk about these various roles and devise strategies for navigating the terrain. We will then post questions that will draw out these issues. The questions include:

- **What are your professional goals at this point?**
- **To what extent have your various duties been consistent with or furthered your teaching, scholarship and service obligations?**
- **To what extent have your various duties been different than your service, scholarship and teaching obligations?**
- **Where any of you asked to perform any duties that you had not anticipated?**
- **How did you balance these various demands/obligations with your teaching, scholarship and service?**
After facilitating the conversation based on the answers to these questions we will offer several “survival” tips, which include:

- Put everything you do on your cv (i.e., calling admitted students, mooting the trial team, mentoring students). The faculty who are evaluating you for promotion need to know all of your work.
- Write everything you do on giant calendar sheets, for easing reference that will be needed when you are writing your Year-end/annual report.
- You need to figure out when you can say no.
  - This can depend on what is asked as well as who is asking (i.e., your Dean vs. another faculty member).
  - Sometimes you are asked to teach a different class (this furthers teaching).
  - Sometimes you are asked to do something that is unrelated to teaching, scholarship, service.
    - Is it something that can be done relatively easily but is significant to someone?
    - Is it something that will cause you undue hardship?
  - You do not have to say yes immediately – you can ask for time.
- You need to have powerful allies/mentors within the institution.
- You need to develop very positive relationships with staff.
- You need to develop good relationships with alums.
- You need to have a mentor/sounding board outside the institution.
  - You need to get the advice of someone outside the institution.
- You need to focus on developing a reputation both inside the institution (i.e., through your teaching and service) and outside the institution (through your scholarship and service).

We will conclude the session by offering tips on finding mentors and perhaps sharing personal stories related to the above.
Legal Scholarship Bibliography
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Scholarship: Where Are You on Your Scholarly Agenda?

LISA H. NICHOLSON
University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law

I. Is it Time to Revisit Your Scholarly Agenda?
   A. Is “It” still Relevant?
      1. Are your Themes still Connected?
      2. Are you still Intellectually Excited?
      3. Have your Skills changed to better enable you to address new matters?
      4. Have recent Developments in the Law changed your viewpoint?
   B. Type of Scholarship?
      1. Descriptive scholarship – has limited intellectual value and may not be substantial for tenure and promotions. However, it is very beneficial if it will introduce a new scholarly agenda.
      2. Analytical scholarship – traditional type that challenges both the writer and the reader; identifies problem and suggests solution(s)
   C. Has your Target Audience Changed?
      1. Lawyers, judges, legislators, regulatory authorities; if you seek to make a change in the status quo; or
      2. Academics and students; if you seek to inform others or enhance teaching.
   D. Is the Methodology still Functional?

II. Redefining the Methodology/Perspective
   A. Empirical Analysis – qualitative versus quantitative
   B. Philosophical Perspective
   C. Social Science Perspective
   D. Historical Perspective
   E. Interdisciplinary
      1. Law and Economics
      2. Law and Literature
   F. Collaborative

III. Finding New Topics for Existing or Amended Scholarly Agenda
   A. Use Open Call for Papers
   B. Accept Symposia Invitations
   C. Attend More Conferences and Workshops

IV. Finding Time to Write
   A. Set writing office hours (and use them only for writing)
   B. Schedule writing time during summer and semester breaks

V. Getting Back to Scholarly Writing
   A. Don’t forget what you did to be successful in the past
   B. Remember the Process
      1. One sentence at a time
      2. It is okay to scrap and rewrite
      3. Write, then edit
      4. Write footnotes as you go with proper citations
      5. Keep a file of sources – with mark-ups and other notes
      6. Use footnotes to record rough thoughts and reminders
C. Properly Use Librarians and Research Assistants
   1. Have them keep you current on recent developments
   2. They can read drafts
   3. They can check citations
D. Show Drafts to Others
   1. Why? Provides the ability to receive different perspectives on topic
   2. Differentiate what you want:
      a. Closed readings and written comments, or
      b. Quick readings and verbal comments
   3. Using Workshops and Colloquia
VI. Publication Venues
   A. Journals
      1. Law Reviews
         a. General Interest
         b. Specialized
      2. Peer-Review Law Journals
      3. Non-Law Academic Journals
   B. Books and Related Formats
Supplemental Materials
Call for Scholarly Papers for Presentation at 2015 AALS Annual Meeting

To encourage and recognize excellent legal scholarship and to broaden participation by new law teachers in the Annual Meeting program, the Association is sponsoring its twenty-eighth annual Call for Scholarly Papers. Those who will have been full-time law teachers at an AALS member or fee-paid school for five years or fewer on July 1, 2014, are invited to submit a paper on a topic related to or concerning law. A committee of established scholars will review the submitted papers with the authors' identities concealed.

Papers that make a substantial contribution to legal literature may be selected for distribution and oral presentation at a special program to be held at the AALS Annual Meeting in Washington DC, in January 2015. Authors of the presented papers will also be recognized at the Annual Meeting Luncheon. The selection committee must determine that a paper is of sufficient quality to deserve this special recognition, and the AALS is not obligated to select any paper.

Deadline: To be considered in the competition three hard copies of the manuscript must be postmarked no later than August 9, 2014, and sent to: Call for Scholarly Papers, Association of American Law Schools, 1614 20th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20009-1001. Also, an electronic version must be emailed to scholarlypapers@aals.org no later than August 9, 2014.

Anonymity: The manuscript should be accompanied by a cover letter with the author’s name and contact information. The manuscript itself, including title page and footnotes, must not contain any references that identify the author or the author’s school. The submitting author is responsible for taking any steps necessary to redact self-identifying text or footnotes.

Form and Length: The manuscript must be typed, double-spaced, on 8 1/2” by 11” paper in 12-point (or larger) type with ample (at least 1”) margins on all sides and must have sequential page numbers on each page of the submitted article. Footnotes should be 10-point or larger, single-spaced, and preferably on the same page as the referenced text. Each submission must be prepared using either Microsoft Word or otherwise submitted in rich text format. Submissions are limited to articles, essays and book chapters. There is a maximum word limit of 30,000 words (inclusive of footnotes) for the submitted manuscripts. Manuscripts will not be returned.

Eligibility: Faculty members of AALS member and fee-paid schools, including visiting faculty whose “home” school is also an AALS member or fee-paid school, are eligible to submit papers. Fellows and adjuncts are ineligible, as are visiting faculty whose “home” school is not a member or fee-paid school. The competition is open to those who have been full-time law teachers for five years or fewer as of July 1, 2014, (for these purposes, one is considered a full-time faculty member while officially “on leave” from the law school). Co-authored papers are eligible for consideration, but each of the co-authors must meet the eligibility criteria established above. Professors are limited to one submission each. A co-authored submission is treated as an individual submission by each author, and precludes additional submissions by either author. No one who has won the AALS Scholarly Papers Competition is eligible to compete again. Honorable Mention recipients are eligible to enter again.

Papers are expected to reflect original research or major developments in previously reported research. Papers are not eligible for consideration if they will have been published before February 2015. However, inclusion of a version of the paper on the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) or similar pre-publication resources does not count
as “publication” for purposes of this competition. Submitted papers, whether or not selected for recognition, may be subsequently published as arranged by the authors. Papers may have been revised on the basis of review by colleagues.

**Statement of Compliance:** The cover letter accompanying each submission must include a statement verifying:

1. The author holds a faculty appointment at a member or fee-paid school;
2. The author has been engaged in full-time teaching for five years or fewer as of July 1, 2014;
3. All information identifying the author or author’s school has been removed from the manuscript;
4. The paper has not been previously published and is not committed for publication prior to February 2015;
5. The content of the hard copy version of the paper is, in all respects, identical to the electronic version of the paper; and
6. The author must agree to notify the AALS if and as soon as s/he learns that the submitted paper will be published before February 2015.

Each paper author is to indicate up to four subject categories from the list below that best describe the paper. In the event that none of the categories listed captures the essence of the paper or the author feels that another category not listed below best describes the paper, the author is permitted to write-in one topic under “other” that best describes the paper.

**Subject Categories:** Administrative Law; Admiralty; Agency/Partnership; Agricultural Law; Animal Law; Antitrust; Alternative Dispute Resolution; American Indian Law; Arts and Literature; Bank and Finance; Bankruptcy and Creditors’ Rights; Civil Procedure; Civil Rights; Commercial Law; Communications Law; Community Property; Comparative Law; Computer and Internet Law; Conflict of Laws; Constitutional Law; Consumer Law; Contracts; Corporations; Courts; Criminal Law; Criminal Procedure; Critical Legal Theory; Disability Law; Dispute Resolution; Domestic Relations; Economics, Law and; Education Law; Elder Law; Employment Practice; Energy and Utilities; Environmental Law; Entertainment Law; Estate Planning and Probate; Evidence; Family Law; Federal Jurisdiction and Procedure; Foreign Relations/National Security; Gender Law; Health Law and Policy; Housing Law; Human Rights Law; Immigration Law; Insurance Law; Intellectual Property; International Law – Public; International Law – Private; Jurisprudence; Juveniles; Labor; Law and Society; Law and Technology; Law Enforcement and Corrections; Legal Analysis and Writing; Legal Education; Legal History; Legal Profession; Legislation; Local Government; Mergers and Acquisitions; Military Law; Natural Resources Law; Nonprofit Organization; Organizations; Poverty Law; Products Liability; Professional Responsibility; Property Law; Race and the Law; Real Estate Transactions; Religion, Law and; Remedies; Securities; Sexuality and the Law; Social Justice; Social Sciences, Law and; State and Local Government Law; Taxation – Federal; Taxation – State & Local; Terrorism; Torts; Trade; Trial and Appellate Advocacy; Trusts and Estates; Workers’ Compensation.

**Presentation at the Annual Meeting:** The author of any selected paper will present an oral summary of the paper at a special program to be held at the 2015 Annual Meeting. Copies of the paper will be made available for distribution to those attending the presentation.

**Inquiries:** Questions should be directed to scholarlypapers@aals.org
AALS Sections with Call for Papers

The following AALS Sections issued a call for papers to select one or more presenters from an AALS member law school for the Section's program at the upcoming 2015 AALS Annual Meeting to be held January 2-5, 2015 in Washington, DC.

Each Section appoints a review committee and announces the call for papers to its members. Section members submit detailed abstracts or papers for peer review by the Section's review committee. If you are interested, please contact the Section Chair directly for the call for papers details and the submission due date. Section Chairs can be found on pages 117-131.

Saturday, January 3, 2015

10:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

**Sections on Africa and Comparative Law Joint Program**
Topic: Comparative Law Expanded: Methodology and Public Law in Nontraditional Comparative Legal Systems

**Section on Antitrust and Economic Regulation, Co-Sponsored by Section on Law, Medicine and Health Care**
Topic: Competition Policy in Health Care

**Section on Civil Procedure**
Topic: The Rising Bar to Federal Courts: Beyond Pleading and Discovery
(Papers to be published in *Journal of Civil Rights and Economic Development* at St. John’s Law School)

**Section on Indian Nations and Indigenous Peoples**
Topic: Judicial Interpretation of Sovereign Immunity after Bay Mills

**Section on National Security Law**
Topic: National Security Surveillance and the Rule of Law
(Papers to be published in *Journal of National Security Law and Policy*)

**Section on Nonprofit and Philanthropy Law, Co-Sponsored by Section on Taxation**
Topic: IRS Oversight of Charitable and Other Exempt Organizations – Broken? Fixable?
(Papers to be published in *Pittsburgh Tax Review*)

1:30-3:15 PM

**Section on Academic Support**
Topic: ASP a Roadmap at the Crossroad: How Academic Support Will Meet Today’s Varied Challenges

**Section on Contracts**
Topic: Mind the Gap: Contracts, Technology, and Legal Gaps

**Section on International Human Rights**
Topic: Global Perspectives on Human Rights

**Section on Law and the Social Sciences**
Topic: Extreme Empirical Methods
Section on Transactional Law and Skills
  Topic: Agency Costs of Capitalism: The Governance Story of Public Companies vs. Private Companies

3:30-5:15 PM

Section on Immigration Law and Minority Groups Joint Program
  Topic: The 1965 Immigration Act: Fifty Years of Race-Neutral (?) Immigration?

Section on Securities Regulation
  Topic: The Future of Rule 10B-5

Section on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues
  Topic: Transgender Equality: Prisons, Workplace, and Academic Institutions

Sunday, January 4, 2015

8:30-10:15 a.m.

Section on Business Associations
  Topic: The Future of the Corporate Board

Section on Clinical Legal Education, Co-Sponsored by Section on Teaching Methods
  Topic: Integrating Clinical Pedagogy Across the Curriculum: Making It Work

Section on Property Law
  Topic: The Place and Scope of Economic Analysis within Competing Conceptions of Property

10:30 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

Section on Agency, Partnership, LLC’s and Unincorporated Associations
  Topic: Bringing Numbers into Basic and Advanced Business Associations Courses: How and Why to Teach Accounting, Finance, and Tax

Section on Commercial and Related Consumer Law
  Topic: Emerging Scholars in Commercial and Consumer Law

Section on Education Law
  Topic: The Higher Education Act at 50
  (Papers to be published in *Kentucky Law Journal*)

Section on Family and Juvenile Law
  Topic: The Future of Marriage

Section on Insurance Law
  Topic: The Relationship between Insurance and Legal Regulation

Section on International Law
  Topic: The Influence of International Law on Government Decisionmaking
2:00–3:45 p.m.
Section on Children and the Law
   Topic: Dead Upon Birth: The Inter-Generational Cycle of Thwarted Lives in America's Poorest Neighborhoods

Section on Economic Globalization and Governance
   Topic: Theorizing Global Administrative Law

Section on Law and the Humanities
   Topic: Law and the Hero

Section on Remedies
   Topic: Structural Reform Litigation at 60

---

Monday, January 5, 2015

10:30 a.m.–12:15 p.m.
Section on Labor Relations and Employment Law, Co-Sponsored by Sections on Socio-Economics and Women in Legal Education
   Topic: Emotions at Work: The Employment Relationship During An Age of Anxiety
   (Papers to be published in Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal)
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS
STATEMENT OF GOOD PRACTICES BY LAW PROFESSORS IN THE
DISCHARGE OF THEIR ETHICAL AND PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

American law professors typically are members of two professions and thus should comply with the requirements and standards of each. Law professors who are lawyers are subject to the law of professional ethics in force in the relevant jurisdictions. Non-lawyers, in turn, should be guided by the norms associated with their disciplines. In addition, as members of the teaching profession, all law faculty members are subject to the regulations of the institutions at which they teach and to guidelines that are more generally applicable, such as the Statement of Professional Ethics of the American Association of University Professors.

This statement does not diminish the commands of other sources of ethical and professional conduct. Instead, it is intended to provide general guidance to law professors concerning ethical and professional standards both because of the intrinsic importance of those standards and because law professors serve as important role models for law students. In the words of the American Bar Association’s Commission on Professionalism, since “the law school experience provides the student’s first exposure to the profession and . . . professors inevitably serve as important role models for students, . . . the highest standards of ethics and professionalism should be adhered to within law schools.”

Law professors’ responsibilities extend beyond the classroom to include out of class associations with students and other professional activities. Members of the law teaching profession should have a strong sense of the special obligations that attach to their calling. They should recognize their responsibility to serve others and not be limited to pursuit of self interest. This general aspiration cannot be achieved by edict, for moral integrity and dedication to the welfare of others cannot be legislated. Nevertheless, a public statement of good practices concerning ethical and professional responsibility can enlighten newcomers and remind experienced teachers about the basic ethical and professional tenets the ethos-of their profession.

Although the norms of conduct set forth in this Statement may be relevant when questions concerning propriety of conduct arise in a particular institutional context, the statement is not promulgated as a disciplinary code. Rather, the primary purpose of the Statement—couched for the most part in general aspirational terms—is to provide guidance to law professors concerning their responsibilities (1) to students, (2) as scholars, (3) to colleagues, (4) to the law school and university at which they teach, and (5) to the bar and the general public.

I. RESPONSIBILITIES TO STUDENTS

As teachers, scholars, counselors, mentors, and friends, law professors can profoundly influence students’ attitudes concerning professional competence and responsibility. Professors should assist students to recognize the responsibility of lawyers to advance individual and social justice.

Because of their inevitable function as role models, professors should be guided by the most sensitive ethical and professional standards.

1 “. . . .In the spirit of Public Service”: A Blueprint for the Rekindling of Lawyer Professionalism 19 (1986).
Law professors should aspire to excellence in teaching and to mastery of the doctrines and theories of their subjects. They should prepare conscientiously for class and employ teaching methods appropriate for the subject matters and objectives of their courses. The objectives and requirements of their courses, including applicable attendance and grading rules, should be clearly stated. Classes should be met as scheduled or, when this is impracticable, classes should be rescheduled at a time reasonably convenient for students, or alternative means of instruction should be provided.

Law professors have an obligation to treat students with civility and respect and to foster a stimulating and productive learning environment in which the pros and cons of debatable issues are fairly acknowledged. Teachers should nurture and protect intellectual freedom for their students and colleagues. If a professor expresses views in class that were espoused in representing a client or in consulting, the professor should make appropriate disclosure.

Evaluation of student work is one of the fundamental obligations of law professors. Examinations and assignments should be conscientiously designed and all student work should be evaluated with impartiality. Grading should be done in a timely fashion and should be consistent with standards recognized as legitimate within the university and the profession. A student who so requests should be given an explanation of the grade assigned.

Law professors should be reasonably available to counsel students about academic matters, career choices, and professional interests. In performing this function, professors should make every reasonable effort to ensure that the information they transmit is timely and accurate. When in the course of counseling a law professor receives information that the student may reasonably expect to be confidential, the professor should not disclose that information unless required to do so by university rule or applicable law. Professors should inform students concerning the possibility of such disclosure.

Professors should be as fair and complete as possible when communicating evaluative recommendations for students and should not permit invidious or irrelevant considerations to infect these recommendations. If information disclosed in confidence by the student to the professor makes it impossible for the professor to write a fair and complete recommendation without revealing the information, the professor should so inform the student and refuse to provide the recommendation unless the student consents to full disclosure.

Discriminatory conduct based on such factors as race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, disability or handicap, age, or political beliefs is unacceptable in the law school community. Law professors should seek to make the law school a hospitable community for all students and should be sensitive to the harmful consequences of professorial or student conduct or comments in classroom discussions or elsewhere that perpetuate stereotypes or prejudices involving such factors. Law professors should not sexually harass students and should not use their role or position to induce a student to enter into a sexual relationship, or to subject a student to a hostile academic environment based on any form of sexual harassment.

Sexual relationships between a professor and a student who are not married to each other or who do not have a preexisting analogous relationship are inappropriate whenever the professor has a professional responsibility for the student in such matters as teaching a course or in otherwise evaluating, supervising, or advising a student as part of a school program. Even when a professor has no professional responsibility for a student, the professor should be sensitive to the perceptions of other students that a student who has a sexual relationship with a professor may receive preferential treatment from the professor or the professor’s colleagues. A professor who is closely related to a student by blood or marriage, or who has a preexisting analogous relationship with a student, normally should eschew roles involving a professional responsibility for the student.
II. RESPONSIBILITIES AS SCHOLARS

A basic responsibility of the community of higher education in the United States is to refine, extend, and transmit knowledge. As members of that community, law professors share with their colleagues in the other disciplines the obligation to discharge that responsibility. Law schools are required by accreditation standards to limit the burden of teaching so that professors will have the time to do research and to share its results with others. Law schools also have a responsibility to maintain an atmosphere of freedom and tolerance in which knowledge can be sought and shared without hindrance. Law professors are obligated, in turn, to make the best and fullest use of that freedom to fulfill their scholarly responsibilities.

In teaching, as well as in research, writing, and publication, the scholarship of others is indispensable to one's own. A law professor thus has a responsibility to be informed concerning the relevant scholarship of others in the fields in which the professor writes and teaches. To keep current in any field of law requires continuing study. To this extent the professor, as a scholar, must remain a student. As a corollary, law professors have a responsibility to engage in their own research and publish their conclusions. In this way, law professors participate in an intellectual exchange that tests and improves their knowledge of the field, to the ultimate benefit of their students, the profession, and society.

The scholar's commitment to truth requires intellectual honesty and open-mindedness. Although a law professor should feel free to criticize another's work, distortion or misrepresentation is always unacceptable. Relevant evidence and arguments should be addressed. Conclusions should be frankly stated, even if unpopular.

When another's scholarship is used—whether that of another professor or that of a student—it should be fairly summarized and candidly acknowledged. Significant contributions require acknowledgement in every context in which ideas are exchanged. Publication permits at least three ways of doing this: shared authorship, attribution by footnote or endnote, and discussion of another's contribution within the main text. Which of these will suffice to acknowledge scholarly contributions by others will, of course, depend on the extent of the contribution.

A law professor shall disclose the material facts relating to receipt of direct or indirect payment for, or any personal economic interest in, any covered activity that the professor undertakes in a professorial capacity. A professor is deemed to possess an economic interest if the professor or an immediate family member may receive a financial benefit from participation in the covered activity. Disclosure is not required for normal academic compensation, such as salary, internal research grants, and honoraria and compensation for travel expenses from academic institutions, or for book royalties. Disclosure is not required for funding or an economic interest that is sufficiently modest or remote in time that a reasonable person would not expect it to be disclosed. Disclosure of material facts should include: (1) the conditions imposed or expected by the funding source on views expressed in any future covered activity; and (2) the identity of any funding source, except where the professor has provided legal representation to a client in a matter external to legal scholarship under circumstances that require the identity to remain privileged under applicable law. If such a privilege prohibits disclosure the professor shall generally describe the interest represented.

A law professor shall also disclose the fact that views or analysis expressed in any covered activity were espoused or developed in the course of either paid or unpaid representation of or consultation with a client when a reasonable person would be likely to see that fact as having influenced the position taken by the professor. Disclosure is not required for representation or consultation that is sufficiently remote in time that a reasonable person would not expect it to be disclosed. Disclosure should include the identity of any client, where practicable and where not
prohibited by the governing Code or Rules of Professional Conduct. If such Code or the Rules prohibit a professor from revealing the identity of the client, then the professor shall generally describe the client or interest represented or both.

Covered activities include any published work, oral or written presentation to conferences, drafting committees, legislatures, law reform bodies and the like, and any expert testimony submitted in legal proceedings. A law professor should make, to the extent possible, all disclosures discussed in this policy at the earliest possible time. The earliest possible time should be when the professor is invited to produce the written work for publication or to make a presentation or when the professor submits the written work for publication or delivers the presentation.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES TO COLLEAGUES

Law professors should treat colleagues and staff members with civility and respect. Senior law professors should be particularly sensitive to the terms of any debate involving their junior colleagues and should so conduct themselves that junior colleagues will understand that no adverse professional consequences would follow from expression of, or action based upon, beliefs or opinions contrary to those held by the senior professor.

Matters of law school governance deserve the exercise of independent judgment by each voting member of the faculty. It is therefore inappropriate for a law professor to apply any sort of pressure other than persuasion on the merits in an effort to influence the vote of another member of the faculty.

Law professors should comply with institutional rules or policies requiring confidentiality concerning oral or written communications. Such rules or policies frequently will exist with respect to personnel matters and evaluations of student performance. If there is doubt whether such a rule or policy is in effect, a law professor should seek clarification.

An evaluation made of any colleague for purposes of promotion or tenure should be based exclusively upon appropriate academic and service criteria fairly weighted in accordance with standards understood by the faculty and communicated to the subject of the evaluation.

Law professors should make themselves reasonably available to colleagues for purposes of discussing teaching methods, content of courses, possible topics of scholarship, scholarly work in progress, and related matters. Except in rare cases and for compelling reasons, professors should always honor requests from their own law schools for evaluation of scholarship in connection with promotion or tenure decisions. Law professors should also give sympathetic consideration to similar requests from other law schools.

As is the case with respect to students (Part I), sexual harassment, or discriminatory conduct involving colleagues or staff members on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, disability or handicap, age, or political beliefs is unacceptable.
IV. RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE LAW SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY

Law professors have a responsibility to participate in the governance of their university and particularly the law school itself. Although many duties within modern universities are assumed by professional administrators, the faculty retains substantial collective responsibility to provide institutional leadership. Individual professors have a responsibility to assume a fair share of that leadership, including the duty to serve on faculty committees and to participate in faculty deliberations.

Law professors are frequently in demand to participate in activities outside the law school. Such involvement may help bring fresh insights to the professor’s classes and writing. Excessive involvement in outside activities, however, tends to reduce the time that the professor has to meet obligations to students, colleagues, and the law school. A professor thus has a responsibility both to adhere to a university’s specific limitations on outside activity and to assure that outside activities do not significantly diminish the professor’s availability to meet institutional obligations. Professors should comply with applicable laws and university regulations and policies concerning the use of university funds, personnel, and property in connection with such activities.

When a law professor resigns from the university to assume another position, or seeks a leave of absence to teach at another institution, or assumes a temporary position in practice or government, the professor should provide reasonable advance notice. Absent unusual circumstances, a professor should adhere to the dates established in the Statement of Good Practices for the Recruitment of and Resignation by Full-Time Faculty Members of the Association of American Law Schools.

Although all law professors have the right as citizens to take positions on public questions, each professor has a duty not to imply that he or she speaks on behalf of the law school or university. Thus, a professor should take steps to assure that any designation of the professor’s institution in connection with the professor’s name is for identification only.

V. RESPONSIBILITIES TO THE BAR AND GENERAL PUBLIC

A law professor occupies a unique role as a bridge between the bar and students preparing to become members of the bar. It is important that professors accept the responsibilities of professional status. At a minimum, a law professor should adhere to the Code or Rules of Professional Conduct of the state bars to which the law professor may belong. A law professor may responsibly test the limits of professional rules in an effort to determine their constitutionality or proper application. Other conduct warranting discipline as a lawyer should be a matter of serious concern to the professor’s law school and university.

One of the traditional obligations of members of the bar is to engage in uncompensated public service or pro bono legal activities. As role models for students and as members of the legal profession, law professors share this responsibility. This responsibility can be met in a variety of ways, including direct client contact through legal aid or public defender offices (whether or not through the law school), participating in the legal work of public interest organizations, lecturing in continuing legal education programs, educating public school pupils or other groups concerning the legal system, advising local, state and national government officials on legal issues, engaging in legislative drafting, or other law reform activities.
The fact that a law professor’s income does not depend on serving the interests of private clients permits a law professor to take positions on issues as to which practicing lawyers may be more inhibited. With that freedom from economic pressure goes an enhanced obligation to pursue individual and social justice.

Adopted by the Executive Committee,
November 17, 1989

Amended May 2003
REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TENURE AND THE TENURING PROCESS FOR THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS

Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

Recent developments in and affecting legal education have ripened issues of tenure processes and practices in law schools for inquiry, analysis and evaluation. A number of “tension points” that were non-existent a generation or so ago contribute strongly to the problems of administering tenure today and to the need for studying them. These points include diversity of both the subject matter and instructional techniques of legal education; the rising level of faculty quality; disputes over openness versus confidentiality in appraising faculty performance; a trend toward closer university scrutiny of law school recommendations on tenure; and the experiences and perceptions of minority men and all women surrounding the formulation and administration of law school tenure standards and procedures.

The creation of a Special Committee on Tenure and the Tenuring Process was authorized by the Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools in November 1988 in response to a proposal by then President-Elect Herma Hill Kay. Professor Kay focused on the responsibilities, needs, and problems associated with evaluating law faculty and called for a special committee that would gather and evaluate data on law schools’ procedures and practices regarding tenure and would make appropriate recommendations to the AALS Executive Committee. The members of the Committee included: Professor Charles R. Lawrence, Stanford University; Professor Martha L. Minow, Harvard University; Professor Karen Nelson Moore, Case Western Reserve University; President Robert M. O’Neil, University of Virginia; Dean Susan Westerberg Prager, University of California at Los Angeles; Professor Theodore J. St. Antoine, University of Michigan; and Professor Victor G. Rosenblum, Northwestern University, CHAIR.

ENDEAVORS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE: THE 1989 QUESTIONNAIRE

The Committee sought to present a snapshot in its report on tenure standards in law schools and of the ways in which law school tenure criteria, procedures, and practices are formulated, disseminated, and applied. To develop a reliable empirical base for analysis, the Special Committee asked all 175 ABA-approved law schools to answer a 10-page Tenure Practices Questionnaire and to submit copies of any written statements of their procedures and criteria for the award of tenure. The questionnaire was designed both to obtain explicit quantitative data and to raise pertinent demographic and qualitative issues related to faculty retention.

A total of 141 law schools responded to the Special Committee’s questionnaire. Where feasible, the responses were compared to responses to equivalent questions on a similar survey undertaken by the AALS a decade earlier. The responses shed additional light upon such matters as:

- Revision of Procedures or Criteria for the Award of Tenure -- Over two-thirds of the schools responding have changed their procedures or criteria since 1979; of those that made changes, close to 50% have done so only in the last five years. Changes typically have placed heightened emphasis on scholarly productivity and increased the length of the probationary period.
• The Year in Which a Person is Normally Considered for the Award of Tenure -- The average is the fifth year, although the highest percentage (almost 40%) of those responding award tenure in the sixth year.

• Procedures Used to Assess the Teaching Competence of Untenured Faculty -- Of the 141 schools responding, 92% use both of these methods: classroom observations by faculty colleagues and anonymous student questionnaires.

• Procedures Used to Assess Scholarship of Untenured Faculty -- In addition to making their own assessments, nearly 70% of responding schools seek evaluations regularly from faculty at other law schools, and another 10% do so in “exceptional cases.” This compares with 40% using outside evaluations regularly, and another 20% using them in exceptional cases, in the 1979 survey.

• A Trend Toward Closer University Review of Law School Tenure Recommendations -- Almost half of the respondents perceived a trend.

• Percent of Those Eligible for Tenure Who Receive It -- Overall, tenure was granted to 70% of those eligible for consideration during the decade from 1979 to 1989. More than one-half of those not receiving tenure resigned before being considered. Of women who were eligible, 65% received tenure compared to 71% for men during 1979-1989. With regard to race, 72% of the whites, 65% of the blacks, and 53% of other minorities who were eligible received tenure during 1979-1989.

• Percent of those Resigning Before Consideration for Tenure -- A higher percentage of women and minorities eligible for tenure resigned before being considered. Approximately 21% of the women who were eligible for tenure resigned before being considered, compared to 16% of the men. Over 29% of blacks and 40% of the non-black minorities (Hispanic, Native American, and Asian American) who were eligible for tenure resigned before being considered, while the percentage of eligible whites (male and female) resigning was only 16%. The differences in resignation rates, both between women and men and between minorities and whites, are statistically significant.

• Percent of those Considered for Tenure Who Were Denied -- The difference in the rates at which women and men are granted or denied tenure is statistically insignificant. Similarly, although there are significant differences in the resignation rates before being considered, the differences in the rates at which whites and all minorities (also whites and blacks) are denied tenure is statistically insignificant.

STATEMENTS OF TENURE POLICY

Virtually every law school’s statement of tenure policy professes allegiance to criteria of teaching, scholarship, and public service; the relative importance of each, however, has not typically been made explicit. Although few schools’ statements proclaim it officially, there are frequent indicia of the primacy of scholarship in awarding tenure. While some schools set forth neither explicit qualitative nor quantitative requirements, a few schools identify traditional law review scholarship as essential for recognition of substantial scholarly achievement and specify a minimum number of published articles as a prerequisite to tenure. Typically, however, expectations regarding scholarship are stated in general terms. A prototype of such formulation is: Scholarship should be sufficient to demonstrate a devotion to intellectual inquiry and scholarly production that indicates a promise of scholarly productivity throughout the person’s professional life.

Evaluation of teaching performance focuses typically on classroom visits by peers and assessments of student observations and comments. Whether classroom visits should be announced or spontaneous remains unsettled. Although utilized in virtually all schools, the anonymous student evaluations are often regarded with caution or skepticism.
Most schools accord public service minor status as a criterion of tenure evaluation.

Practices on confidentiality of tenure files vary considerably among responding schools. Whether accessibility of files to tenure candidates undermines or impairs frankness of assessments is and will no doubt continue as a major theme of debate for some time to come. The Supreme Court’s decision in *University of Pennsylvania v. EEOC*, 100 S.Ct. 577 (1990), may well affect confidentiality policies in the tenure process, but the data submitted to the Committee predate the Supreme Court’s ruling.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Committee urges each law school to engage in self study, discussion, and debate about tenure requirements and practices. The mission and needs of each school should be addressed together with the wide ranging issues raised by an increasing variety of forms of scholarship, types of teaching, and diversity of people who are now candidates for tenure.

Each school should articulate its norms and standards for tenure as fully and as concretely as possible. This should be accompanied by programs to assist and guide faculty development for untenured professors. Among other priorities, attention should focus on support for research, mentoring, and also on assuring that the membership of internal review committees and outside review panels is and will be perceived to be balanced and fair. With regard to confidentiality, the Committee recommends full and timely disclosure to tenure candidates of the substance of serious criticism in their respective tenure files. Fair procedure should include meaningful opportunity for candidates to respond to serious criticism prior to the reaching of decisions about them.

Section 6-5(c) of the AALS bylaws should inform law school and university approaches to tenure decisions:

> "A faculty’s competence shall be . . . determined in the aggregate with emphasis upon the following criteria: (i) quality of teaching and attention given to law students both as individuals and as a group; (ii) breadth, depth and variety of the faculty’s training and experience; (iii) scholarly interests and performance; and (iv) responsible participation in the group deliberative process of law faculty."

Where university-wide tenure committees review law school recommendations about tenure, inclusion of at least one member of the law faculty on the university’s committee would help to inform other committee members concerning special characteristics of legal scholarship, teaching, and service.
Section Chairs, Chair-elects, and Mentor Coordinators for 2014

Section on Academic Support
Chair: Amy L. Jarmon, Texas Tech University School of Law
Email: amy.jarmon@ttu.edu, Phone: (806) 834-6385
Chair-Elect: Lisa Young, Seattle University School of Law
Email: youngl@seattleu.edu, Phone: (206) 398-4000
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Email: ktobin3@utk.edu, Phone: (865) 974-2521
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Section on Commercial and Related Consumer Law
Chair: Eboni S. Nelson, University of South Carolina School of Law
Email: nelsones@law.sc.edu, Phone: (803) 777-5011
Chair-Elect: James Hawkins, University of Houston Law Center
Email: jrhawkins@uh.edu, Phone: (713) 743-2200

Section on Comparative Law
Chair: Intisar Rabb, Harvard Law School
Email: irabb@law.harvard.edu, Phone: (617) 552-3358
Chair-Elect: Sudha N. Setty, Western New England University School of Law
Email: ssetty@law.wne.edu, Phone: (413) 782-1431
Mentor Coordinator: Richard Albert, Boston College Law School
Email: richard.albert@bc.edu, Phone: (617) 552-3930
Section on Conflict of Laws

Chair: Symeon Symeonides, Willamette University College of Law
Email: symeon@willamette.edu, Phone: (503) 370-6402

Chair-Elect: Patrick J. Borchers, Creighton University School of Law
Email: borchers@creighton.edu, Phone: (402) 280-4076

Mentor Coordinator: Patrick Woolley, The University of Texas School of Law
Email: pwoolley@law.utexas.edu, Phone: (512) 232-1323

Section on Constitutional Law

Co-Chair: M. Isabel Medina, Loyola University New Orleans College of Law
Email: medina@loyno.edu, Phone: (504) 861-5655

Co-Chair: Derek T. Muller, Pepperdine University School of Law
Email: derek.muller@pepperdine.edu, Phone: (310) 506-7058

Chair-Elect: Laura A. Cisneros, Golden Gate University School of Law
Email: lcisneros@ggu.edu, Phone: (415) 369-5358

Section on Continuing Legal Education

Chair: Jennifer Dabson, American University, Washington College of Law
Email: jdabson@wcl.american.edu, Phone: (202) 274-4077

Chair-Elect: Dennis Greene, University of Dayton School of Law
Email: dennis.greene@notes.udayton.edu, Phone: (937) 229-2362

Section on Contracts

Chair: Nancy S. Kim, California Western School of Law
Email: nkim@cwsl.edu, Phone: (619) 525-1693

Chair-Elect: Curtis Bridgeman, Willamette University College of Law
Email: cbridgem@willamette.edu, Phone: (503) 370-6402

Section on Creditors' and Debtors' Rights

Chair: Michelle A. Cecil, University of Missouri School of Law
Email: cecilm@missouri.edu, Phone: (573) 882-7765

Chair-Elect: Michelle M. Harner, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law
Email: mharner@law.umd.edu, Phone: (402) 472-3158

Section on Criminal Justice

Chair: Carolyn B. Ramsey, University of Colorado School of Law
Email: carolyn.ramsey@colorado.edu, Phone: (303) 735-5028

Chair-Elect: Shima Baradaran, University of Utah, S. J. Quinney College of Law
E-mail: shima.baradaran@law.utah.edu; Phone: (801) 422-4934
Section for the Law School Dean
Co-Chair: Joyce E. McConnell, West Virginia University College of Law
Email: joyce.mcconnell@mail.wvu.edu, Phone: (304) 293-6502
Co-Chair: Camille A. Nelson, Suffolk University Law School
Email: cnelson@suffolk.edu, Phone: (617) 573-8157
Co-Chair Elect: David A. Brennen, University of Kentucky College of Law
Email: david.brennen@uky.edu, Phone: (859) 257-1678
Co-Chair Elect: Martin J. Katz, University of Denver Sturm College of Law
Email: mkatz@law.du.edu, Phone: (303) 871-6103

Section on Defamation and Privacy
Chair: Woodrow Hartzog, Samford University, Cumberland School of Law
Email: whartzog@samford.edu, Phone: (205) 726-4327
Chair-Elect: Jacqueline D. Lipton, University of Houston Law Center
Email: jdlipton@central.uh.edu, Phone: (216) 368-3303

Section on Disability Law
Chair: Arlene S. Kanter, Syracuse University College of Law
Email: kantera@law.syr.edu, Phone: (315) 443-9551
Chair-Elect: Cheryl L. Anderson, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Email: cheryla@siu.edu, Phone: (618) 453-5634

Section on Economic Globalization and Governance
Co-Chair: Gregory C. Shaffer, University of Minnesota Law School
Email: shaffer@umn.edu, Phone: (612) 625-2630
Co-Chair: Faith Stevelman, New York Law School, Email: stevelmn@uw.edu
Chair-Elect: Geoffrey P. Miller, New York University School of Law
Email: geoffrey.miller@nyu.edu, Phone: (212) 998-6329

Section on Education Law
Chair: Scott Robert Bauries, University of Kentucky College of Law
Email: scott.bauries@uky.edu, Phone: (904) 200-1352
Chair-Elect: Tiffani N. Darden, Michigan State University College of Law
Email: dardent@law.msu.edu, Phone: (517) 432-6800

Section on Employee Benefits and Executive Compensation
Chair: Norman P. Stein, Drexel University School of Law
Email: nps32@drexel.edu, Phone: (215) 571-4710
Chair-Elect: Maria O’Brien Hylton, Boston University School of Law
Email: mhylton@bu.edu, Phone: (617) 353-6679
Section on Employment Discrimination Law
Chair: Angela I. Onwuachi-Willig, University of Iowa College of Law
Email: angela.onwuachi-willig@yale.edu, Phone: (319) 335-9043
Chair-Elect: Bradley A. Areheart, University of Tennessee College of Law
Email: brad.areheart@tennessee.edu, Phone: (865) 974-6808

Section on Environmental Law
Chair: Alice Kaswan, University of San Francisco School of Law
Email: kaswan@usfca.edu, Phone: (415) 422-5053
Chair-Elect: LeRoy Paddock, The George Washington University Law School
E-mail: lpaddock@law.gwu.edu, Phone: (202) 994-0417

Mentor Coordinator: Peter L. Lindseth, University of Connecticut School of Law
Email: peter.lindseth@law.uconn.edu, Phone: (860) 570-5392

Section on European Law
Chair: Francesca Bignami, The George Washington University Law School
Email: fbignami@law.gwu.edu, Phone: (919) 613-7006
Chair-Elect: Daniela Caruso, Boston University School of Law
Email: danielac@bu.edu, Phone: (617) 353-7024

Section on Evidence
Chair: David S. Caudill, Villanova University School of Law
E-mail: caudill@law.villanova.edu, Phone: (610) 519-7085
Chair-Elect: John J. Capowski, Widener University School of Law
E-mail: jjcapowski@widener.edu, Phone: (717) 645-4158

Section on Family and Juvenile Law
Chair: Ann Laquer Estin, University of Iowa College of Law
Email: ann-estin@uiowa.edu, Phone: (319) 335-6850
Chair-Elect: Melanie B. Jacobs, Michigan State University College of Law
Email: mjacobs@law.msu.edu, Phone: (517) 432-6944

Section on Federal Courts
Chair: Tara Leigh Grove, William & Mary Law School
Email: tlgrove@wm.edu, Phone: (757) 221-2482
Chair-Elect: Amanda L. Tyler, University of California, Berkeley School of Law
Email: atyler@law.berkeley.edu, Phone: (510) 664-4986
Section on Financial Institutions and Consumer Financial Services
Chair: Robert C. Hockett, Cornell Law School
Email: rch37@cornell.edu, Phone: (607) 255-4539
Chair-Elect: Daniel Schwarcz, University of Minnesota Law School
Email: schwarcz@umn.edu, Phone: (612) 625-4272
Mentor Coordinator: Michael N. Simkovic, Seton Hall University School of Law
Email: msimkovic@gmail.com, Phone: (516) 423-9187 (5164239187)

Section on Graduate Programs for Foreign Lawyers
Chair: George E. Edwards, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law
Email: gedwards@indiana.edu, Phone: (317) 278-2359
Chair-Elect: Mark E. Wojcik, The John Marshall Law School
Email: 7wojcik@jmls.edu, Phone: (312) 987-2391

Section on Immigration Law
Chair: David B. Thronson, Michigan State University College of Law
Email: david.thronson@law.msu.edu, Phone: (517) 432-6916
Chair-Elect: Pham T. Huyen, Texas A&M University School of Law
Email: hpham@law.tamu.edu, Phone: (817) 212-3953

Section on Indian Nations and Indigenous Peoples
Chair: Alexander Pearl, Florida International University College of Law
Email: mipear@fiu.edu
Chair-Elect: Ann E. Tweedy, Hamline University School of Law
Email: atweedy01@hamline.edu, Phone: (651) 523-2076

Section on Institutional Advancement
Chair: Darby Dickerson, Texas Tech University School of Law
Email: darby.dickerson@ttu.edu, Phone: (806) 742-3793
Co-Chair Elect: Lisa O’Rourke, Loyola Law School
Email: lisa.orourke@lls.edu, Phone: (213) 505-3924
Co-Chair Elect: Leslie R. Steinberg, Southwestern Law School
Email: lsteinberg@swlaw.edu, Phone: (213) 738-6731

Section on Insurance Law
Chair: Ronen Avraham, The University of Texas School of Law
Email: ravraham@law.utexas.edu, Phone: (312) 503-4469
Chair-Elect: Kyle D. Logue, The University of Michigan Law School
Email: klogue@umich.edu, Phone: (734) 936-2207
Section on Intellectual Property
Chair: William Mc Geveran, University of Minnesota Law School
Email: billmcg@umn.edu, Phone: (612) 625-6047
Chair-Elect: Zahr Said, University of Washington School of Law
Email: zahr@uw.edu

Section on International Human Rights
Chair: Stuart Ford, The John Marshall Law School
Email: sford@jmls.edu, Phone: (312) 659-2393
Chair-Elect: Jonathan Todres, Georgia State University College of Law
Email: jtodres@gsu.edu, Phone: (404) 413-9165

Section on International Law
Chair: Cindy Galway Buys, Southern Illinois University School of Law
Email: cbuys@siu.edu, Phone: (618) 453-8743
Chair-Elect: Matthew H. Charity, Western New England University School of Law
Email: mcharity@law.wne.edu, Phone: (413) 782-1439

Section on International Legal Exchange
Chair: Theresa K. Kaiser, American University, Washington College of Law
Email: tkaiser@wcl.american.edu, Phone: (202) 274-4000
Chair-Elect: George E. Edwards, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law
Email: gedwards@indiana.edu, Phone: (317) 278-2359

Section on Internet and Computer Law
Chair: Annemarie Bridy, University of Idaho College of Law
Email: abridy@uidaho.edu, Phone: (208) 885-7056
Chair-Elect: Robert Heverly, Albany Law School
Email: rheve@albanylaw.edu, Phone: (518) 445-2379

Section on Islamic Law
Chair: Haider Ala Hamoudi, University of Pittsburgh School of Law
Email: hamoudi@pitt.edu, Phone: (412) 624-1055
Chair-Elect: Sahar Aziz, Texas A&M University School of Law
Email: saziz@law.tamu.edu, Phone: (817) 212-3830

Section on Jewish Law
Chair: Adam S. Chodorow, Arizona State University Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law
Email: adam.chodorow@asu.edu, Phone: (480) 727-8574
Chair-Elect: Mark D. Rosen, Chicago-Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology
Email: mrosen1@kentlaw.iit.edu, Phone: (312) 906-5132
Section on Jurisprudence
Chair: Ekow Yankah, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law
E-mail: yankah@yu.edu, Phone: (217) 333-0931
Chair-Elect: Michelle Dempsey, Villanova University School of Law
E-mail: dempsey@law.villanova.edu, Phone: (610) 519-8011

Section on Labor Relations and Employment Law
Chair: Rebecca K. Lee, Thomas Jefferson School of Law
Email: rlee@tjsl.edu, Phone: (619) 961-4268
Chair-Elect: Jason R. Bent, Stetson University College of Law
Email: jbent@law.stetson.edu, Phone: (814) 865-4285

Section on Law and Anthropology
Chair: Addie Rolnick, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law
Email: addie.rolnick@unlv.edu, Phone: (310) 825-4841

Section on Law and Economics
Chair: Keith Norman Hylton, Boston University School of Law
Email: knhylton@bu.edu, Phone: (617) 353-8959
Chair-Elect: David S. Abrams, University of Pennsylvania Law School
Email: dabrams@law.upenn.edu, Phone: (215) 898-7497

Section on Law and Interpretation
Chair: Brett Gilbert Scharffs, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School
Email: scharffsb@law.byu.edu, Phone: (801) 422-9025
Chair-Elect: Emily M.S. Houh, University of Cincinnati College of Law
Email: emily.houh@uc.edu, Phone: (513) 556-0108

Section on Law and Mental Disability
Chair: Richard M. Peterson, Pepperdine University School of Law
Email: richard.peterson@pepperdine.edu, Phone: (949) 212-2211
Chair-Elect: Barry Kozak, The John Marshall Law School
Email: 6kozak@jmls.edu, Phone: (312) 427-2737

Section on Law and Religion
Chair: John Inazu, Washington University in St. Louis School of Law
Email: jinazu@wulaw.wustl.edu, Phone: (314) 935-6273
Chair-Elect: Marc O. De Girolami, St. John’s University School of Law
Email: degirolm@stjohns.edu, Phone: (718) 990-6760
Section on Law and South Asian Studies
Chair: Anil Kalhan, Drexel University School of Law
Email: akalhan@drexel.edu, Phone: (215) 571-4775
Chair-Elect: Deepa Badrinarayana, Chapman University Dale E. Fowler School of Law
Email: badrinar@chapman.edu, Phone: (714) 628-2673

Section on Law and Sports
Chair: Dionne L. Koller, University of Baltimore School of Law
Email: dkoller@ubalt.edu, Phone: (410) 837-5761
Chair-Elect: Matthew J. Parlow, Marquette University Law School
Email: matthew.parlow@marquette.edu, Phone: (414) 288-7842

Section on Law and the Humanities
Chair: Charlton C. Copeland, University of Miami School of Law
Email: ccopeland@law.miami.edu, Phone: (305) 284-2376
Chair-Elect: Tamara F. Lawson, St. Thomas University School of Law
Email: tlawson@stu.edu, Phone: (305) 474-2418

Section on Law and the Social Sciences
Chair: Shima Baradaran, University of Utah, S. J. Quinney College of Law
Email: shima.baradaran@law.utah.edu, Phone: (801) 422-4934
Chair-Elect: Tom Tyler, Yale Law School
Email: tom.tyler@yale.edu, Phone: (203) 432-7432

Section on Law Libraries and Legal Information
Chair: Darin K. Fox, University of Oklahoma College of Law
Email: darinfox@ou.edu, Phone: (405) 325-4311
Chair-Elect: Steven D. Hinckley, Pennsylvania State University The Dickinson School of Law
Email: sdh14@psu.edu, Phone: (814) 867-0390

Section on Law School Administration and Finance
Chair: Michael S Dean, Mercer University School of Law
Email: dean_ms@law.mercer.edu, Phone: (478) 301-2607
Chair-Elect: José Bahamonde-González, University of Maryland Francis King Carey School of Law
Email: jbahamonde-gonzalez@law.umaryland.edu, Phone: (410) 706-1524

Section on Law, Medicine and Health Care
Chair: Ani B. Satz, Emory University School of Law
Email: asatz@emory.edu, Phone: (404) 712-9505
Chair-Elect: Thaddeus Mason Pope, Hamline University School of Law
Email: tpope01@hamline.edu, Phone: (651) 523-2519
Section on Legal History
Chair: James W. Fox, Jr., Stetson University College of Law
E-mail: fox@law.stetson.edu, Phone: (727) 562-7890
Chair-Elect: Danaya C. Wright, University of Florida Fredric G. Levin College of Law
E-mail: wrightdc@law.ufl.edu, Phone: (352) 273-0946

Section on Legal Writing, Reasoning and Research
Chair: Kimberly Holst, Arizona State University Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law
Email: Kimberly.holst@asu.edu, Phone: (480) 965-1144
Chair-Elect: Jennifer Murphy Romig, Emory University School of Law
Email: jromig@law.emory.edu, Phone: (404) 712-9364

Section on Legislation & Law of the Political Process
Chair: James J. Brudney, Fordham University School of Law
Email: jbrudney@law.fordham.edu, Phone: (212) 636-7387
Chair-Elect: Abbe Gluck, Yale Law School
Email: abbe.gluck@yale.edu, Phone: (203) 432-6703

Section on Litigation
Chair: Bernadette Bollas Genetin, University of Akron, C. Blake McDowell Law Center
Email: genetin@uakron.edu, Phone: (330) 972-6939
Chair-Elect: Paul Radvany, Fordham University School of Law
Email: radvany@law.fordham.edu, Phone: (212) 636-6943

Section on Mass Communication Law
Chair: David Ardia, University of North Carolina School of Law
Email: ardia@email.unc.edu, Phone: (919) 962-8955
Chair-Elect: Sonja R. West, University of Georgia School of Law
Email: srwest@uga.edu, Phone: (706) 542-5145

Section on Minority Groups
Chair: Eloisa C. Rodriguez-Dod, Florida International University College of Law
Email: elrodrig@fiu.edu, Phone: (305) 348-3245
Chair-Elect: Kristin N. Johnson, Seton Hall University School of Law
Email: kristin.johnson@shu.edu, Phone: (973) 642-8198
Mentor Coordinator: Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law
Email: xnguyen@smu.edu, Phone: (214) 768-4037

Section on National Security Law
Chair: Peter Margulies, Roger Williams University School of Law
Email: pmargulies@rwu.edu, Phone: (401) 254-4564
Chair-Elect: Deborah Pearlstein, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law
Email: dpearlstein@post.harvard.edu, Phone: (609) 924-4535
Section on Natural Resources and Energy Law
Chair: K.K. DuVivier, University of Denver Sturm College of Law
Email: kkduvivier@law.du.edu, Phone: (303) 871-6281
Chair-Elect: Kalyani Robbins, University of Akron, C. Blake McDowell Law Center
Email: kalyani@uakron.edu, Phone: (330) 972-6815

Section on New Law Professors
Chair: Tiffani N. Darden, Michigan State University College of Law
Email: dardent@law.msu.edu, Phone: (517) 432-6800
Chair-Elect: Bradley A. Areheart, University of Tennessee College of Law
Email: brad.areheart@tennessee.edu, Phone: (865) 974-6808

Section on Nonprofit and Philanthropy Law
Chair: Lloyd Hitoshi Mayer, Notre Dame Law School
Email: lmayer@nd.edu, Phone: (574) 631-8057
Chair-Elect: Miranda Perry Fleischer, University of San Diego School of Law
Email: mirandafleischer@sandiego.edu, Phone: (303) 492-6278

Section on North American Cooperation
Chair: Betsy Baker, Vermont Law School
Email: bbaker@vermontlaw.edu, Phone: (802) 831-1270
Chair-Elect: William V. Dunlap, Quinnipiac University School of Law
Email: william.dunlap@quinnipiac.edu, Phone: (203) 582-3265

Section on Part-Time Division Programs
Chair: Julie A. Davies, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law
Email: jdavies@pacific.edu, Phone: (916) 739-7194
Chair-Elect: Sondra R. Tennessee, University of Houston Law Center
Email: stennessee@uh.edu, Phone: (713) 743-2079

Section on Post-Graduate Legal Education
Chair: Yvette Gutierrez, St. John's University School of Law
Email: gutiery1@stjohns.edu, Phone: (718) 990-1923
Chair-Elect: John N. Riccardi, Boston University School of Law
Email: jriccard@bu.edu, Phone: (617) 353-5323

Section on Poverty Law
Chair: Emily Suski, Georgia State University College of Law
Email: esuski@gsu.edu, Phone: (404) 413-9000
Chair-Elect: Annie Smith, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
Email: abs006@uark.edu, Phone: (479) 575-5601
Section on PreLegal Education and Admission to Law School
Chair: R. Jay Shively, Wake Forest University School of Law
Email: shivelrj@wfu.edu, Phone: (336) 758-5705
Chair-Elect: Tracy L. Simmons, University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law
Email: tsimmons@pacific.edu, Phone: (916) 549-7117

Section on Pro-Bono & Public Service Opportunities
Chair: Susan B. Schechter, University of California, Berkeley School of Law
Email: sschechter@law.berkeley.edu, Phone: (510) 643-7387
Chair-Elect: Carolyn Goodwin, Boston University School of Law
Email: cgoodwin@bu.edu

Section on Professional Responsibility
Chair: Andrew M. Perlman, Suffolk University Law School
Email: aperlman@suffolk.edu, Phone: (617) 573-8777
Chair-Elect: Samuel J. Levine, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center
Email: slevine@tourolaw.edu, Phone: (631) 761-7138
Mentor Coordinator: Barbara A. Glesner Fines, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law
Email: glesnerb@umkc.edu, Phone: (816) 235-2380

Section on Property Law
Chair: Timothy Mulvaney, Texas A&M University School of Law
Email: tmulvaney@law.tamu.edu, Phone: (817) 212-3968
Chair-Elect: G. Kristen Barnes, University of Akron, C. Blake McDowell Law Center
Email: barnes6@uakron.edu, Phone: (330) 972-7331

Section on Real Estate Transactions
Chair: David J. Reiss, Brooklyn Law School
Email: david.reiss@brooklaw.edu, Phone: (718) 780-0636
Chair-Elect: Julie P. Forrester, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law
Email: jforrest@smu.edu, Phone: (214) 768-2574

Section on Remedies
Chair: Margo Schlanger, The University of Michigan Law School
Email: mschlan@umich.edu, Phone: (734) 615-2618
Chair-Elect: Anthony J. Sebok, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law
Email: sebok@yu.edu, Phone: (212) 790-0418
Section on Scholarship
Chair: Michelle Dempsey, Villanova University School of Law
Email: dempsey@law.villanova.edu, Phone: (610) 519-8011
Chair-Elect: Dan Markel, Florida State University College of Law
Email: markel@law.fsu.edu, Phone: (850) 644-3831

Section on Securities Regulation
Chair: Lisa M. Fairfax, George Washington University Law School
Email: lfairfax@law.gwu.edu, Phone: (202) 994-4630
Chair-Elect: Christine Hurt, University of Illinois College of Law
Email: achurt@illinois.edu, Phone: (217) 244-8293

Section on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues
Chair: Ellen S. Podgor, Stetson University College of Law
Email: epodgor@law.stetson.edu, Phone: (727) 562-7348
Chair-Elect: James D. Wilets, Nova Southeastern University, Shepard Broad Law Center
Email: wiletsj@nsu.law.nova.edu, Phone: (954) 262-6017

Section on Socio-Economics
Chair: Thomas Ulen, University of Illinois College of Law
Email: tulen@law.illinois.edu, Phone: (217) 333-4953
Chair-Elect: I. Richard Gershon, University of Mississippi School of Law
Email: igershon@olemiss.edu, Phone: (662) 915-6901

Section on State and Local Government Law
Chair: Michelle W. Anderson, University of California, Berkeley School of Law
Email: manderson@law.berkeley.edu, Phone: (510) 643-3144
Chair-Elect: Cynthia A. Baker, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law
Email: cabaker@iupui.edu, Phone: (317) 278-2357

Section on Student Services
Chair: Emily Scivoletto, University of San Diego School of Law
Email: escivoletto@sandiego.edu, Phone: (619) 260-6851
Chair-Elect: Lisa Ferreira, Thomas Jefferson School of Law
Email: lisaf@tjsl.edu, Phone: (619) 961-4202

Section on Taxation
Chair: Miranda Perry Fleischer, University of San Diego School of Law
Email: mirandafleischer@sandiego.edu, Phone: (303) 492-6278
Chair-Elect: Diane M. Ring, Boston College Law School
Email: ringdi@bc.edu, Phone: (617) 552-0640
Mentor Coordinator: Tracy A. Kaye, Seton Hall University School of Law
Email: tracy.kaye@shu.edu, Phone: (973) 642-8455
Section on Teaching Methods
Chair: Lisa A. Mazzie, Marquette University Law School
Email: lisa.mazzie@marquette.edu, Phone: (414) 288-5367
Chair-Elect: Kris Franklin, New York Law School
Email: kris.franklin@nyls.edu, Phone: (212) 431-2353

Section on Torts and Compensation Systems
Chair: Andrew R. Klein, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law
Email: anrklein@iupui.edu, Phone: (317) 274-2099
Chair-Elect: Anthony J. Sebok, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law
Email: sebok@yu.edu, Phone: (212) 790-0418

Section on Transactional Law and Skills
Chair: Therese H. Maynard, Loyola Law School
Email: therese.maynard@lls.edu, Phone: (213) 736-1155
Chair-Elect: Afra Afsharipour, University of California at Davis School of Law
Email: aafsharipour@ucdavis.edu, Phone: (530) 754-0111

Section on Trusts and Estates
Chair: Alfred L. Brophy, University of North Carolina School of Law
Email: abrophy@email.unc.edu, Phone: (919) 962-4128
Chair-Elect: Iris J. Goodwin, University of Tennessee College of Law
Email: igoodwin@utk.edu, Phone: (865) 974-6813
Mentor Coordinator: Stewart E. Sterk, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law
Email: sterk@yu.edu, Phone: (212) 790-0230

Section on Women in Legal Education
Chair: Kirsten K. Davis, Stetson University College of Law
Email: kkdavis@law.stetson.edu, Phone: (727) 562-7877
Chair-Elect: Wendy Greene, Samford University, Cumberland School of Law
Email: degreene@samford.edu, Phone: (205) 726-2419
Mentor Coordinator: Naomi R. Cahn, The George Washington University Law School
Email: ncahn@law.gwu.edu, Phone: (202) 994-6025
Mentor Coordinator: Rebecca E. Zietlow, University of Toledo College of Law
Email: rebecca.zietlow@utoledo.edu, Phone: (419) 530-2872
TO: New Law Professor
FROM: The Officers of the AALS Section for New Law Professors

Congratulations on becoming a law professor! We write merely to inform you that support for new law professors does not end at the conclusion of this Workshop. The AALS Section for New Law Professors exists to provide advice, guidance, and support to professors in their first seven years of law teaching. We offer informative panels, networking opportunities, teaching assistance, and scholarship opportunities for our members. We would love to have you join the Section.

Before you can join the Section and access the resources it provides, you must first ask your law school dean's office to have you added to the law school roster with your position, whether it is a tenure track, contract, visiting, fellow or adjunct. Once added to the law school's roster, you will need to log into the AALS Website. Passwords are not automatically assigned, therefore, you will need to select "forgot your password" and follow the appropriate steps to have a temporary password sent to you. Only your dean's office can add you to the Law School's AALS roster.

You can use the following procedure to check and see if your school has already added you the law school's AALS Roster:

- Go to www.aals.org/login/
- Click the 'forgot password' link on the bottom of the page
- Type your e-mail address and click the 'go' button
  - If you get the message 'E-mail address not found in database.' Then you have not been added by your school to your law school's roster.
  - If your e-mail address was found, then you have already been added by your school's roster. Your password will be e-mailed to you, which will allow you to log in. After logging in, you can change your password under the 'My Information' link.
  - If you need assistance, contact dltsupport@aals.org

To Join a Section:

- Log in by using your username (e-mail address) and password at www.aals.org/login/
- Click the 'Online Store' link on the left of the page
- Click 'Section Membership' on the top of the page
- Browse the Sections by scrolling down, and click the 'select item' button on the Sections you want to join
- Follow the on-screen prompts to complete the shopping cart process. Please note, even though joining AALS Sections uses a standard shopping cart process, all AALS Sections are free to join for those identified by the Dean as being on the faculty, except for the Clinical Legal Education Section, which has annual dues of $15.00.

To Join the New Law Professors Discussion List-Serv:

- Go to www.aals.org/sections/
- Find and click the 'New Law Professors' link
- Click the web site address at the top of the page
- Log in
- You will now be at the New Law Professors home page
- On the top right of the page, go to the 'My Options' then click 'My Subscriptions'
- On the 'Select Category' drop down, select 'Section', then select 'New Law Professors Discussion List-Serv'
- Click the 'add' button.
To Update your Biography in the AALS Directory of Law Teachers:
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Phone: (517) 432-6800, E-mail: dardent@law.msu.edu
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Phone: (865) 974-6808, E-mail: brad.areheart@tennessee.edu

Secretary: Jennifer Carter-Johnson, Michigan State University College of Law  
Phone: (314) 566-8885, E-mail: jcj@law.msu.edu

Treasurer: Eugene Mazo, Wake Forest University School of Law  
Phone: (336) 758-3944, E-mail: mazoed@wfu.edu
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James Nelson, Columbia University School of Law  
Phone: (212) 854-2640, E-mail: james.nelson@law.columbia.edu

Dov Waisman, Southwestern Law School  
Phone: (213) 738-5733, E-mail: dwaisman@swlaw.edu

Congratulations again!
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This bibliography was compiled by several law librarians at the University of Texas School of Law Tarlton Law Library. It surveys the literature for law professors across five topics: (1) being a new faculty member, (2) scholarship, (3) teaching, (4) evaluation and assessment of law students, and (5) service.

Bibliography entries are listed in chronological order within each topic, with the most recent items listed first. This is intentional; it helps the user identify the newest ideas and discussions, and shows the development in these areas over time. The bibliography ends in Section VI with a compilation of online sources such as blogs and newsletters that law professors may find useful throughout their careers.

Altogether, the resources noted here represent many different viewpoints, some of which may conflict. Including this broad swath of approaches and opinions was done in an effort to provide a wide selection of resources that new law professors can review according to their own needs and interests. Nevertheless, this is by no means a comprehensive bibliography, but rather a snapshot of notable and primarily recent resources on these topics. The goal throughout the bibliography is to highlight pieces that will provide a basic knowledge of these areas and the corresponding range of opinions to assist new law professors in developing their own views and practices.
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I. Being a New Faculty Member
   Stephen Wolfson & Joseph Noel

Entering legal academia offers unique challenges for which prior experience might not fully prepare new law professors. Accordingly, this section provides resources that can help new law faculty members better manage this transition into legal academia. It contains articles and books in four topics: general resources, getting started, work-life balance, and evaluation and assessment of faculty and tenure. Most of the resources in this section are relatively recent. However, it also includes older works that still offer relevant advice for new faculty members today. Several of the resources in this section provide practical advice based on the authors' personal experiences. Moreover, while most of what is included here was written by and for law professors specifically, this section also contains works from academics in other fields to provide broader insight into being a new faculty member.

A. General

---

1 The authors would like to thank Professor Barbara A. Bintliff and the AALS Planning Committee for Workshop for New Law School Teachers for the opportunity to compile this bibliography for the annual workshop. The authors also wish to extend a special thanks to Professor Bintliff for her insightful comments and feedback on the substance of the bibliography. Nevertheless, any mistakes are ours alone.

Three experienced law professors have written this book based on case studies of some of the best teachers at law schools throughout the country. This book is meant to provide a concrete picture of excellent classroom teaching and a guide to how to best help students learn.


Professor Bird attempts to address what he perceives as a gap in the literature that offers advice to new academics by giving a short but broad introduction to life as a legal academic. Since he believes that a new faculty member must be proficient at research, teaching, service and networking, Professor Bird divides his article into four parts, one addressing each area. He then offers his observations and suggestions to excel in the legal academy. While the author admits that not all of the advice in the article may be universal, he hopes that any new professor will find his insights helpful.

McKay Cunningham, Freshman Professor: The First Year; The First Semester; The First Day, 3 PHOENIX LAW REVIEW 389 (2010).

Professor Cunningham discusses what he learned from his experiences as a new law professor and passes on suggestions and advice for new professors on how to prepare for teaching legal classes on your first day, first semester, and first year.


This book offers an idea of what legal education could be if law schools consider new ideas for how to effectively prepare students for practice. It is designed to offer a good roadmap for new law professors in designing their classes, presenting information, and assessing students. In this, the authors give “best practices” for various aspects of legal education.


This book starts with the proposition that simply because someone is highly skilled in the law, does not mean that he/she is skilled at teaching the law. Accordingly, it sets out to help new faculty members transition from legal practitioner to law professor. It addresses many important areas for new professors, from deciding to enter academia to course design through teaching and evaluating students. In this, it can be a valuable resource for any new legal faculty member.


This article presents an annotated bibliography of 209 articles about teaching law. It is organized by subject area, offering articles across a wide variety of law school classes.


This article provides thoughtful advice from an experienced, outstanding law professor. Professor Syverud offers thoughts about teaching and managing your classroom like: respect your students, how to create the right atmosphere in class, remind your students that you know what they are going through, and take your student seriously. Further, he addresses topics like office hours, other contacts with students, how to handle students who are under stress, examinations, and helping students find jobs. All in all, this article provides many helpful thoughts about being a successful law professor.


This article follows up Professor Douglas Whaley’s famous 1982 article, listed below, on legal academia with additional observations and thoughts from the author’s own experiences in teaching.

Gail Levin Richmond, Advice to the Untenured, 13 NOVA LAW REVIEW 79 (1988).

This article offers practical advice for new and aspiring law professors about teaching, course selection, scholarship, service, and other general tips for success in legal academia.

Professor McGough shares some insights she gained from keeping journals of her experience in her first year in legal academia. In doing this, she offers twenty-six rules new faculty should try to follow. A few examples of these rules are: “Bluffing an assertion is bravado better left to poker players”; “Trust your instincts”; “The Trap of Traps is agenda-obssessing: setting a goal of coverage is one thing; losing a class in the process is too high a price”; “If available time for preparation still leaves you feeling incompetent to teach some material, ask a colleague or practitioner to do a guest spot”; and “Take every opportunity to watch other teachers at work.”


Professor Newell offers ten “Survival Suggestions” for new law professors. His goal with this article is not to provide a guide for excellence in teaching, but rather to make any new professor better at education. It includes suggestions like “enjoy yourself,” “personalize the class discussion,” and “set an example” for your students.


In this famous paper for new law professors, Professor Whaley draws from his own experience and success in legal academia to offer some great suggestions and insights for young faculty. He gives advice about preparing for your first class, how to learn a subject, selecting a casebook, how to teach, and provides several classroom tricks he has learned.

B. Getting Started


This article argues that some authority and decisions for creating law school classes should be made in collaboration with students. It points out that recent research suggests that building law school classes through collaborative design can improve students’ performance and motivation. In its final section, it describes results from shared design efforts in ten classes.


Here, Professor Muller looks more closely at the issue of casebook selection than many of the other articles that address this topic. From his own experience, he offers some thoughts on how to choose a text book. He believes that there are more considerations than a new professor might first realize in making this decision, and he gives advice from his own experiences.

C. Work-Life Balance


The authors of this book set out to refute what they see as a false dichotomy among young female academics: either to have a career or a family. They designed it as a guide for young women to being both parents and professors, from graduate school through full professorship. They argue that, while having a family and a career in academia is not easy, it is not impossible, and, in fact, is worth the effort.


This book is a collection of essays by male professors who reflect on what being a father in academia means today. It is organized into three sections—“Fathers in Theory, Fathers in Praxis”; “Family Made”; and “Forging New Fatherhoods” — covering topics including the challenges of working and parenting, nontraditional fatherhood and academia, and how to balance fatherhood with professional ambition.

Similar to Papa, PhD, this book collects essays from women in academia about their experiences balancing their careers and their families. It discusses the gender inequality in higher education and makes suggestions for how universities could be more family-friendly.


This study looks at paid family leave in American law schools. The author’s findings are that (i) many schools provide a more generous wage replacement program than required by law, (ii) there is a positive relationship between teaching at top tier and private law schools and receiving paid family leave, and (iii) most paid family leave is granted on a case-by-case basis. The author then discusses her findings, including what explains these results, how the profession stacks up against other employers, and whether this explains the underrepresentation of women among top law teaching positions.


This article looks at the difficulties that women have had in balancing parenthood and academia, and argues that the solution is to redefine what an ideal worker in academia should be and offer a half-time tenure track model for parent-professors. In this plan, any tenure-track faculty member who is also a caregiver would have half-time status for one to twelve years, during which he/she would have a reduced workload as well as a tenure clock moving at half-speed as well. The authors describe what they see as the strengths of this approach, while also addressing a few possible objections/concerns that would arise from it.

D. Evaluation/Assessment of Faculty and Tenure issues


The authors examine what law professors think of the tenure process. Their study consists of two phases. First, they conducted a national survey of tenured law faculty. Then, they follow up those results with in-depth interviews.


The author reviews previous scholarly output measuring systems by Brian Leiter and the Roger Williams University School of Law, and proposes his own system that takes into account a wider range of scholarly output. The author’s system—which he calls “the Protocol”—is meant to be used as a measure for promotion and tenure.


The authors break down the role that service plays in the tenure process as a screening method for “good citizenship,” and how this creates problematic outcomes for minorities. The authors’ goal in highlighting some of the informal rules of the tenure process is to help non-tenured professors to understand and navigate this informal system. The authors direct this advice to minority professors, though there is no reason that it would not also be helpful for non-minorities.

II. Scholarship

Casey Dwight Duncan

The process of researching, writing, and ultimately publishing legal scholarship is one of the most central and potentially daunting aspects of being a new law professor. The following selection of books and articles offers a range of pertinent advice on this subject. While preference was given to more recent examples better reflecting the current nature of legal scholarship, selections were made to provide a wide range of advice and insight that is both informative and applicable. Several articles offer very specific advice on such topics as working with co-authors or seeking support and advice from colleagues, while others were adapted from prior conferences held for new and emerging law faculty. Yet others offer techniques that will be useful to anyone wishing to become a better writer or which can assist even accomplished authors in the planning of a research agenda capable of extending throughout an academic career.

In this recently published essay, professor Schlueter offers a number of insights and suggestions about working with co-authors based on nearly three decades of personal experience as a co-author. Covered topics included deciding whether to form a co-author partnership and with how many co-authors, the different roles necessary within a co-author partnership, difficult issues that can arise between co-authors, and suggestions for a preliminary agreement between co-authors, including a sample “prenup.”

Samuel W. Buell, Becoming A Legal Scholar, 110 MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW 1175 (2012).

Professor Buell addresses an issue that he believes has not received enough attention in the literature: The literature tells aspiring and new professors that they must write articles, but it does not explain how to become a good legal scholar. In this article, he reflects on the weaknesses he perceives in the current literature, and suggests several ideas for how the literature in this area can improve and be more valuable to new professors.


While this book is largely devoted to the process of successfully becoming a law professor, Appendix B summarizes the entire submission process including timing and strategy, SSRN drafts, and expedited review. Also covered are various submission mechanics and options such as LexOpus and ExpressO.


The article includes an essay by Professor Edwards as well as a collection of shorter essays by nearly twenty legal writing professors offering their individual advice on legal writing and scholarship. As the title suggests, the shared theme of every essay is the development of a career-long commitment and mastery of legal writing. A short bibliography of articles and books on legal scholarship is also included.


Now in its fourth edition, Eugene Volokh’s Academic Legal Writing is the definitive work on scholarly legal writing. In addition to chapters on research, topic selection, and well-crafted thesis statements, this book also offers keen insight into drafting an abstract, setting timelines and schedules, and working with law journal editors. The work also includes deep yet concise sections on writing style and editing.


This article seeks to assist new scholars to comply with traditional tenure guidelines while still taking full advantage of the opportunities and resources presented by new and emerging forms of scholarly communication. The article is arranged as a series of categorical topics covering everything from understanding institutional tenure evaluation standards to topic selection to successfully placing completed works.


This article sets forth Professor Marlow’s idea of a “scholarship buddy,” which she describes as sharing many of the same functions as an exercise or fitness regimen. As envisioned by the author, ideal scholarship buddies will have different personal skill sets and strengths but will share similar publication goals and experience levels.

Symposium, Bloggership: How Blogs Are Transforming Legal Scholarship, 84 WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW 1025 (2006).

Issue 5 of volume 84 of the Washington University Law Review contains a symposium featuring more than twenty entries devoted to the emergence and role of legal blogs in the legal academy. The first section of the symposium is highly recommended and features twelve contributions specifically on the topic of legal blogging as scholarly endeavor by notable academic legal bloggers including Lawrence Solum, Eugene Volokh, and Orin Kerr. Other segments of the symposium cover topics including free speech, privacy, and tenure-related concerns.
III. Teaching

Stacy E. Hays

There is an abundance of materials created to help new professors attain success in the classroom. The below books and articles focus on teaching the law and can be utilized by new law professors to design their courses and teach law school students. Preference was given to the most recent and significant scholarship that would also provide numerous perspectives. Some of the resources below are essentially practical “handbooks” that will help law professors successfully craft courses from conception to fruition. In addition, there are several materials that provide guidance and theory on a variety of effective teaching techniques that law professors can use to achieve a productive classroom environment.


Three experienced law professors have written this book based on case studies of some of the best teachers at law schools throughout the country. This book is meant to provide a concrete picture of excellent classroom teaching and a guide to how to best help students learn.


This book is for legal research and writing professors and covers every step of the teaching process including teaching techniques, evaluating students, and professional development.


This book includes material on legal education pedagogy from education research. The research results are used to support 160 specific ideas on how to implement effective teaching techniques gathered from teaching professionals.


This article addresses how technology is affecting the learning processes of law students. It includes writing exercises that can be implemented in the classroom to make use of the new ways students are learning information.

Professor Randall utilizes this workbook to encourage professors to evaluate their own goals as well as those of their law school and guides them through designing their courses based on these objectives. The book helps scholars reflect on the decisions they make when planning courses to improve their teaching effectiveness.

David M. Becker, Teaching Teachers about Teaching Students, 87 WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW 1105 (2010).

Professor Becker addresses the complicated issue of how professors can help each other to improve their teaching techniques. The text analyzes whether “do as I do” is the best approach and suggests some ways to improve teaching in the legal classroom.


This article analyzes the difficulties in teaching counter-analysis to law school students and proposes a way to combat them in the classroom by applying cognitive learning with graphic organizers.


The authors, one a law professor and the other a psychology professor, take recent findings from psychology about implicit bias and apply them to the law. They argue that the profession should take a “behavioral realist” approach to these issues, including making efforts to “debias” law school classrooms.

Guy A. Boysen & David L. Vogel, Bias in the Classroom: Types, Frequencies, and Responses, 36 TEACHING OF PSYCHOLOGY 12 (2009).

This article provides data about different biases in college classrooms, including the often-overlooked concept of implicit bias. The authors explain these biases, and provide examples and data collected from anonymous surveys of professors.


This book walks legal professors through the steps involved in planning a legal course, including deciding on the goals of the class, mastering the course topic, and teaching strategies.


This article addresses the issue of declining enthusiasm in law school students by analyzing the problem, developing “the enthusiasm paradigm,” and giving suggestions to reignite their interest.


This bibliography includes a plethora of valuable resources on a variety of topics including: learning styles, grading, academic support, classroom participation, and pedagogy.


This book applies the results of teaching and learning research to teaching the law. The text covers the process of planning coursework and looks at learning from the student's perspective.

MICHAEL HUNTER SCHWARTZ, EXPERT LEARNING FOR LAW STUDENTS (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2008).

This book draws on the teaching and learning research of recent decades to provide advice to students on how to become expert learners, and get the most out of their law school courses.

Professor Levy performed a survey asking law students which traits make a professor effective. This article utilizes the results and suggests that the socio-emotional component of teaching is as important as the instructional element when evaluating a professor’s performance.


This book is a resource for professors of specific legal subjects. Each chapter covers a different course topic and guides professors through course planning. Topics that are covered include: exercises that can be used in the classroom, the professor's approach to teaching, and the best ways to evaluate students.


This publication offers a good discussion of how the notion of “thinking like a lawyer” relates to the expert-novice and cognitive apprenticeship concepts fundamental in modern teaching and learning theory.


In this article, Professor Caron discusses how to infuse the classic case method of legal education with newer educational techniques or narrative and storytelling. He discusses both the pedagogical ideas behind the Law Stories series from Thomson West’s Foundation Press and then explores the lessons that we can learn from this method of instruction.


This article argues that integrating matters of racial justice into legal education is worth the difficulty. It also serves as an excellent starting point for further discussion which has followed.


This article introduces some highly relevant cognitive theory developed in the last quarter century and how it relates to legal pedagogy. Professor Mitchell starts by discussing several different learning theories and then shows how they might apply to legal education.


This article is a discussion written for first year students about the operation of the case system in the law school pedagogy and the importance of storytelling to the legal profession. It can be used to help new law professors frame what they are doing for students and to understand the system broadly themselves.


This article proposes a more formal role for problem solving in law school classes, and provides sample contracts and civil rights legislation problems.

**IV. Evaluation/Assessment of Law Students**

Kasia Solon Cristobal

On the one hand, this topic of student evaluation is in many ways a subset of the preceding portion on teaching. On the other hand, given the critical role that grades play in the lives of students along with the many different schools of thought on grading, law student assessment could easily inspire a whole bibliography in and of itself. In fact, a whole book has been written on the topic, as the Munro title noted below demonstrates. Given the nature of the beast, most of these works are extremely practical in nature and often zero in on recurring debates such as mandatory curves and essay exams. Perspectives from other disciplines may also be more evident in this literature as the legal academy strives to achieve balance and uniformity in grading. Hopefully all these works will aid a new law professor in deciding how best to grade depending on the circumstances at an individual institution, type of class, or year of student.
This article discusses mandatory curves and defends them as the best option for assessment. Although curves are problematic, the author argues that grade variances due to differences in professor grading philosophy are unfair and distort students' course selection.

Emily Zimmerman, Do Grades Matter?, 35 SEATTLE UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW 305 (2012).
This article presents empirical research regarding law students' perspectives on grading. The author asserts that legal educators must take seriously the importance of grades to law students, but students' grades may be less salient in certain respects than many legal educators believe.

This revised edition of an earlier work has two chapters focused on assessing law students, divided into formative assessment—feedback to students during a course—and summative assessment—evaluating and grading students at the end of a semester. The chapters introduce basic concepts, followed by individual comments from experienced law professors.

This article reviews law school accreditation standards, which are traditionally based on inputs, rather than evidence demonstrating actual student learning. It goes on to summarize two embedded assessment projects conducted at Western State University College of Law.

NELSON MILLER, TEACHING LAW: A FRAMEWORK FOR INSTRUCTIONAL MASTERY (Getzville, NY: Bridge Publishing Group, 2010).
This practical book from Professor Miller offers multiple chapters on the topic of law student assessment, including a general overview of assessment, making meaningful multiple-choice questions, writing essay questions to match course objectives, and scoring rubrics and grade ranges. It ends with sample exam-format, grading checklists, and an accompanying CD-ROM.

This article offers an overview of what assessment is, its purpose, history, and current practices. It then makes recommendations for best practices, and offers specific examples as models.

In this article, Professor Curcio undertakes a scholarly exploration of how best to assess law students. The author proposes alternative assessment ideas and explains how to develop empirical studies to measure the validity and reliability of assessments.

Lynn M. Daggett, All of the Above: Computerized Exam Scoring of Multiple Choice Items Helps to: (a) Show How Exam Items Worked Technically, (b) Maximize Exam Fairness, (c) Justly Assign Letter Grades, and (d) Provide Feedback on Student Learning, 57 JOURNAL OF LEGAL EDUCATION 391 (2007).
This article by Professor Daggett, who also has a Ph.D. in education, provides a brief overview of psychometrics, the branch of psychology that deals with standardized testing. The author then describes the typical data available and the uses of this data for law faculty, closing with some concrete examples.

Otherwise known as the “Carnegie Report,” this influential study of legal education by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching provides an outside and comparative perspective. It includes a final chapter on assessment that focuses on conceptual knowledge during the first phase of law school and makes recommendations for improvements.

This article by Professor Hegland argues in favor of continued use of essay exams. After examining criticisms of essay exams, the author posits that such exams help law students become better writers.


This article describes what rubrics are: a set of detailed written criteria for student assessment. It then describes a method of developing them and offers samples for a variety of law school courses.

GREGORY S. MUNRO, OUTCOME ASSESSMENT FOR LAW SCHOOLS (Spokane: Institute for Law School Teaching, Gonzaga University School of Law, 2000).

This work was published by the Institute for Law Teaching and Learning that is co-sponsored by Washburn University School of Law as well as Gonzaga, and is devoted to the topic of law student assessment. Professor Munro has written chapters that include a discussion of what assessment is, why do it in law school, how to carry it out, and concludes with practical appendices of sample assessment tools.


This article provides an excellent discussion of the pedagogical implications of law schools' classic “Blue Book” exams.

V. Service

Joseph Noel

Service is an often overlooked area that can be used to supplement and even enhance one's scholarship and teaching. Unlike scholarship and teaching, however, service can take many different forms. The following selection of pieces shows just how widely service can vary, and how widely the opinions on it can as well. Some of the most recent pieces included hot topics like scholars' briefs and blogging, while some of the older pieces have stood the test of time for their perspectives on the proper role of law faculty in this realm. Together, they are meant to provide a basis to develop your own views and determine what role service will play in your career.


The author looks at the increasingly common occurrence of "scholars' briefs" and concludes that law professors have been compromising their integrity and signing on to far too many of them. He discusses the ethical obligations involved and proposes higher standards that faculty should consider before they sign on to such a brief.


In response to Richard Fallon's piece that criticized the increase in "scholars' briefs," the author argues that law professors should instead not have to meet a higher standard similar to the standard for legal scholarship. The author also makes an argument for the numerous benefits of these briefs.


The authors use data from a three-year study of recently tenured university professors to look at the claim that faculty service to one's institution increases after tenure. Perhaps most helpful for our purposes, the authors also look at what form this service takes and what the professors believe they gained developmentally from engaging in this service.


This study analyzes the perceived expectations for assistant professors. Data for the study was gathered by interviewing 22 professors from seven disciplines at two different universities. Though the focus of the article is on sociology, it will likely also be helpful to law professors who want to learn about the perceived service expectations across many different fields.

This article, a compilation of short papers and panel discussions, discusses the role of the law professor as a legal commentator in the news. The contributors include both journalists and law professors, including Linda Greenhouse and Erwin Chemerinsky. The contributors debate if and how professors should carry out this role, as well as how they should approach it before being granted tenure.

Erwin Chemerinsky, A Pro Bono Requirement for Faculty Members, 37 LOYOLA OF LOS ANGELES LAW REVIEW 1235 (2004).

Erwin Chemerinsky, now the Dean of the University of California, Irvine School of Law, makes the argument that law professors should be required to perform pro bono work. Though Chemerinsky admits at the outset that this suggestion is unlikely to be instituted, he nonetheless makes a very strong case for the benefits both for the profession itself and for the professors’ individual development, and he refutes many of the arguments against such a requirement.


The author breaks the issue of law professors doing public service down to (i) laws affecting the professors, (ii) precepts in the profession on the right and duty, and (iii) legal academy norms. The author covers each of these areas in fine detail, and concludes that despite legal norms and precepts pushing law professors to “speak out” and serve the public, professors are only doing a modest amount of this type of work. This article does an excellent job synthesizing the laws and other less visible forces and makes a credible argument for more public service by law professors.


This is a volume from the long running series of higher education reports from ASHE, the Association for the Study of Higher Education. If you only read one piece on faculty service, this would be the one to read. This book covers faculty service from its history and development to the different types of service to linking your service to your scholarship and thereby making it a part of your scholarly role instead of an additional burden to an already busy workload. This book also includes citations to much of the important research in this area.


The authors break down the role that service plays in the tenure process as a screening method for “good citizenship” and how this creates problematic outcomes for minorities. The authors’ goal in highlighting some of the informal rules of the tenure process is to help non-tenured professors to understand and navigate this informal system. The authors direct this advice to minority professors, though there is no reason that it would not also be helpful for non-minorities.


This short article from the Bench and Bar of Minnesota profiles how four law professors – David Weissbrodt, Eric Janus, Robin Magee, and Jerry Organ – make their efforts in scholarship, teaching, and community service a part of their quest for equal justice.


If Erwin Chemerinsky is leading the charge for more public service by law professors, then Jett Hanna is just making sure everyone buckles their seat belt and uses their turn signal along the way in this piece about the potential legal pitfalls involved. Hanna focuses on professors as lawyers and as experts, and identifies potential legal issues and ways to avoid them.
VI. Selected Additional Resources

Academic law blogs:
- BEST PRACTICES FOR LEGAL EDUCATION: http://bestpracticeslegaled.albanylawblogs.org/
- BRIAN LEITER’S LAW SCHOOL REPORTS: http://leiterlawschool.typepad.com/
- EDUCATING TOMORROW’S LAWYERS INITIATIVE:
  http://online.iaals.du.edu/category/educating-tomorrows-lawyers/
- FACULTY LOUNGE: http://www.thefacultylounge.org/
- JOTWELL: http://jotwell.com/
- LAW PROFESSOR BLOGS NETWORK: http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/
- LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP BLOG: http://legalscholarshipblog.com/
- LEGAL THEORY BLOG: http://lsolum.typepad.com/
- THE LEGAL WHITEBOARD: http://lawprofessors.typepad.com/legalwhiteboard/
- PRAWFSBLAWG: http://prawfsblawg.blogs.com/

Newsletters:
- THE LAW TEACHER, from the Institute for Law Teaching and Learning, Gonzaga University School of Law and Washburn University School of Law: http://lawteaching.org/lawteacher/
- SALT EQUALIZER, from the Society of American Law Teachers: http://www.saltlaw.org/contents/view/equalizer
- SYLLABUS, from the ABA Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar:
  http://www.americanbar.org/publications/syllabus_home.html

Law reviews and journals:
- CLINICAL LAW REVIEW, from the Association of American Law Schools, the Clinical Legal Education Association, and New York University School of Law: http://www.law.nyu.edu/journals/clinicallawreview/index.htm
- JOURNAL OF LEGAL EDUCATION, from the American Association of Law Schools: http://www.swlaw.edu/jle

Law review and journal submission guides:
- Allen Rostron & Nancy Levitt, INFORMATION FOR SUBMITTING ARTICLES TO LAW REVIEWS & JOURNALS:
- Catholic University of America Law Library, GUIDE TO SUBMITTING ARTICLES TO LAW REVIEWS:
- Columbia Law School, TIPS ON PUBLISHING: http://www.law.columbia.edu/careers/law Teaching/Publishing
- Georgetown Law Library, PUBLISHING ARTICLES IN LAW REVIEWS AND JOURNALS RESEARCH GUIDE:
  http://www.law.georgetown.edu/library/research/guides/Publishing.cfm
- Harvard Law School Library, PUBLISHING IN LAW REVIEWS AND JOURNALS:
  http://libguides.law.harvard.edu/gettingpublished
- Ken Strutin, LAW PERIODICAL PUBLISHING PRACTICES AND TRENDS,
  http://www.llrx.com/features/lawperiodicalpubpracttrends.htm
- University of Washington Law Library, WRITING FOR & PUBLISHING IN LAW REVIEWS series:
  o General Information, https://lib.law.washington.edu/content/guides/lawrevs
  o Finding and Developing Topics,
    https://lib.law.washington.edu/content/guides/writing-for-and-publishing-in-law-reviews-topics
  o Preemption Checking, https://lib.law.washington.edu/content/guides/lawrevs-preempt
  o Submitting Manuscripts, https://lib.law.washington.edu/content/guides/lawrevs-sub
  o Where to Publish, https://lib.law.washington.edu/content/guides/lawrevs-where
Websites:
- Barbara Glesner Fines, TEACHING AND LEARNING LAW, RESOURCES FOR LEGAL EDUCATION:
  http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/profiles/glesnerfines/bgf-edu.htm
- Georgetown Law Library, TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP GUIDE:
  http://www.law.georgetown.edu/library/research/guides/teachingscholarship.cfm
- Michigan State University, ADVANCING DIVERSITY THROUGH THE ALIGNMENT OF POLICIES AND PRACTICES (IMPLICIT BIAS RESOURCES): http://www.adapp-advance.msu.edu/implicit-bias-resources
- Gonzaga University School of Law and Washburn University School of Law, INSTITUTE FOR LAW TEACHING AND LEARNING: http://lawteaching.org/
Hotel Floor Plans
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Washington, D.C.