

Section on Legal Writing, Reasoning, and Research

Spring 2015 Edition

Inside this issue:

From the Chair	1
AALS Section Award Winner	2
Podia & Pens	3
Know Thy Student	6
Tips for a Successful Student Conference	10
How to Have a Great Conference	11
How to Have a Great Conference	11
The Key to an Effective Student Conference	12
How to Make the Most Effective Use of a One-On-One Student Conference	12
Announcements	13
LWRR Section Committees	22
Section Leadership	23

From the Chair

On April 27, 2015, Professor Greg Lastowka of Rutgers-Camden passed away. He was a husband and father, and also an IP scholar and author of publications such as *Virtual Justice: The New Law of Online Worlds*. I met him at the 2014 Annual Meeting of AALS. Greg is the starting point for this column because he was a wonderful person and professor who deserves remembrance as well as emulation. His colleagues at Rutgers such as Ruth Anne Robbins have shared their great sadness at his loss, alongside so many stories of his generosity.

Meeting Greg at an AALS Annual Meeting is emblematic, for me, of one of the special strengths of AALS involvement. Greg spoke on a panel, “Legal Scholarship Beyond the Law Review: Books, Briefs, Letters, and Other Avenues of Influence.” I went to that panel out of interest in the topic and to support my colleague Mary Dudziak, a historian and legal scholar. (The opportunity to learn from and support your own colleagues from various parts of the law school is another special strength of AALS.)

Afterwards I congratulated my colleague on a job well done. And then, like the proverbial law-school gunner I never was, I approached Greg for a sidebar conversation about some ideas for legal-writing hypotheticals about bitcoin. Greg thoughtfully shared some ideas, also instantly categorizing

them into beginner and advanced, and connecting them to other areas of law. He was later kind enough to take part in a follow-up conversation by e-mail as well. By all accounts, Greg was a pretty special guy. Not everyone is so gifted at creating a sense of collegiality, nor so willing to share and translate expertise with an amateur in the doctrinal area of interest. The conditions that made that conversation possible were primarily Greg’s generosity. But I’m really not sure what other professional context could have made that conversation possible, other than the AALS Annual Meeting.

That year and every year, the Annual Meeting offers numerous opportunities to learn from, enlighten, and generally mingle with professors from across the spectrum of legal education such as Greg Lastowka, and including a hearty contingent of legal writing professors. Intertwined with the meeting’s strength is the fact it is huge and can be unwieldy. Luckily this Section’s Outreach Committee and Committee on Committees are focused on making the Annual Meeting as accessible and rewarding as it can be for our Section members able to attend. Friendly faces can be seen and collegial conversations experienced at every program and meeting of the Legal Writing, Reasoning and Research section, as many observers of the Section have noted. As Daisy Gatsby once pointed out, “Large parties are so much more intimate.” (Thanks to Ruth Ann Robbins for pointing out that connection.)

This year marks some new directions in the way AALS Annual Meetings are planned. The deadlines for organizing the program have been extended to June of the preceding year, Also the opportunities for each section to offer a variety of programs have been expanded. Seizing these new



Jennifer Murphy Romig
Instructor, Legal Writing, Research and Advocacy Program
Emory University School of Law

From the Chair, continued



**Jennifer Romig (Chair)
&
Kimberly Holst (Past
Chair)**

options, our Section is planning to offer three programs at the 2016 Annual Meeting in New York City: a program on scholarly writing, a program on curricular reform, and a program designed for new law teachers. We will likely have a separate business meeting to discuss the ongoing role and activities of the Section. And the Outreach Committee will continue the tradition of organizing a series of informal events on site at the meeting as well as off-site. We will announce more details of the program in a Special Edition of the AALS Section Newsletter in June.

Although the AALS deadline schedule has changed, the crucial importance of the Section committees has not. The work of the Section is made possible by the various committees and their members. Full committees are listed on page 22 of the newsletter, and I want to specially acknowledge the committee chairs: Awards Co-Chairs Lurene Contento and Lyn Entriakin, Committee on Committees Chair Suzanne Rowe, Diversity and Inclusion Chair Ann Mallatt Killenbeck, Nominations Chair Lou Sirico, Outreach Co-chairs Howard Bromberg and Cathren Page, and Program Chair Robin Boyle Laisure.

Also I must thank the wonderful members of the Section Executive Committee: Bob Brain, Chair-Elect; Sabrina DeFabritiis, Secretary; Kim Holst, Immediate Past Chair; and Executive Committee members Mary Garvey Algero, Grace Hum, Lucy Jewel, and Wendy Adele Humphrey.

I will close by encouraging Section members to consider becoming (or staying) involved next year through Section committees as well as pursuing leadership roles in the Executive Committee. These roles are a way to make a meaningful contribution to the legal writing community and beyond. Within the Section and beyond, in the wide-open sea of the AALS Annual Meeting, there are many opportunities for learning and friendship through committee work, presentations, Q&A sessions, and perhaps best of all through conversation—such as the one I was lucky enough to have with Greg Lastowka.

Jennifer Romig

Mark Wojcik Bestowed the 2015 AALS Section Award



**Mark Wojcik, this
year's AALS Section
Award Winner**

***“He is an innovator, a mentor,
and a leader in the Legal Writing
field.”***

Professor Mark Wojcik of The John Marshall Law School in Chicago received the 2015 Legal Writing, Reasoning, and Research Section Award at the AALS Meeting in January. John Thornton, a Clinical Assistant Professor of Law at Northwestern Law School, introduced Mark at the award presentation ceremony.

This Award honors Mark for his outstanding contributions to the field of legal writing, reasoning, and research. The criteria for the Section Award are service, scholarship, and

legal writing program design or other activity valuable to the advancement of the field of legal writing. Below are some highlights from the nominations recognizing Mark's tireless work on behalf of the legal writing community and legal education in general.

Mark has taught in the field for over twenty years. He has brought his unrelenting energy and intellect to classroom instruction, pioneered innovative techniques like live grading critiques and spearheaded initiatives to bring a global perspective to the subject matter. He helped create and launch the Legal Writing Institute “One Day Workshops” now held around the country for legal writing professors, adjunct professors, and others who seek to enter the profession. Hundreds of persons have now participated in those workshops.

Mark Wojcik Bestowed the 2015 AALS Section Award, continued

Mark is the founder of the Global Legal Skills Conference, an international event that has attracted hundreds of presenters and participants and which will meet for its tenth year in Chicago in May 2015. Through his work, Mark has raised awareness throughout the global legal community of the importance and the value of what we do as legal writing professors who teach in U.S. law schools. By so doing, he has helped to break down stereotypes about legal writing professors and our role within legal academia.

Mark has published extensively in our field. He authored the first US coursebook on Legal English. He is the author of a state-specific research guide, *Illinois Legal Research*. He authored a research guide for Legal Writing professors that is distributed annually at the LWI One Day Workshops. He is a contributing author to the *ABA Sourcebook on Legal Writing Programs*, focusing on “Law Students Who Speak English as a Second Language.” Mark is also the co-editor of the Legal Writing Prof Blog. This blog was named to the ABA Journal Blawg Hall of Fame and named as the “Reader Favorite” in the Legal Research and Writing category.

Mark has served actively and with distinction in a leadership position in virtually every legal writing organization, including three separate, four-year terms on the Legal Writing Institute Board. He is also a Board Member and Treasurer of Scribes, the American Society of Legal Writers. In the Association of American Law Schools he has chaired the Section on Legal Writing, Reasoning, and Research, the Section on International Law, the Section on International Exchange, the Section on North American Cooperation, the Section on Graduate Programs

for Non-U.S. Lawyers, and the Section on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues.

Mark has been a strong advocate of diversity within the Legal Writing community. He was an early promoter of “Pink Ink,” the LGBT caucus of the Legal Writing Institute, and has repeatedly helped others to view attention to diversity as a legal skill and an effective teaching tool. Mark also acts as an advocate through his participation in many local, state, national, and international organizations. He has twice been elected to the Board of Governors of the Illinois State Bar Association and served on the Board of Managers of the Chicago Bar Association.

Simply put, Mark is always there to lend a hand to his colleagues, and to both cheerlead and educate about our profession. He is an innovator, a mentor, and a leader in the Legal Writing field.

In his remarks accepting the award, Mark thanked the previous winners of the award who inspired him to become active in the field of legal writing, reasoning, and research.



Dean Corkery proudly displaying Mark's award.

“Simply put, Mark is always there to lend a hand to his colleagues...”

LRWW-Sponsored Presentations at AALS

[Editor's Note: The LWRR Section sponsored two programs at the AALS Annual Meeting in January. The presenters have summarized their talks in the following two articles.]

Podia and Pens: Dismantling the Two-Track System for Legal Research and Writing Faculty

Professors Kristen Tiscione, Lisa McElroy and Amy Vorenberg organized a panel presentation entitled, *Podia and Pens: Dismantling the Two-Track System for Legal Research and Writing Faculty*, that confronted the unequal status often faced by LRW professors. Other panelists included The Honorable Ketanji Jackson, of the United States District Court for the District of



Kristen Tiscione
Professor of Legal
Research and Writing,
Georgetown Law

Podia & Pens, Continued

Columbia; Professor Lyrrisa Lidsky, Stephen C. O'Connell Professor and Associate Dean for International Programs, University of Florida College of Law; and Professor Orin Kerr, Fred C. Stevenson Research Professor of Law, George Washington University Law School. To stimulate a robust discussion on the topic, panelists were selected to provide a cross-section of perspectives –the federal bench, tenured faculty, contract faculty and hybrid (405c) status.


Panelists discussed whether the status of LRW faculty makes a difference to students, whether separate tracks and lower status for legal research and writing faculty make sense given the current demand for legal educators to better train students for practice, what obstacles exist for changing the system, and what solutions could be offered.

There was little disagreement that LRW status matters to students. Secure status leads to stable programs with invested faculty. Panelists agreed that, given the need for better skills training, the two-track system likely does not make sense anymore but acknowledged that addressing the obstacles is challenging. Obstacles identified included economic constraints due to lower class sizes, ingrained gender bias, and simple institutional inertia. Ideas for solutions centered on recognizing that LRW faculty typically have the same credentials as doctrinal faculty and therefore there is no real basis for the unequal status and salary. Scholarship expectations should also be similar, panelists argued, but the type of scholarship required should be flexible and more encompassing of topics outside the theoretical topics typically embraced by the legal academy.


Panelists discussed how the two-track system results in significant gender and pay disparities. Kristen Tiscione had prepared a series of charts to demonstrate this inequality.




Lisa McElroy
Associate Professor of
Law, Drexel



Amy Vorenberg
Professor of Law
Director of JD Legal
Writing, UNH



Podia & Pens, Continued



These disparities represent a major problem that law schools must address. In addition, panelists noted that current economic pressures to attract law students prompt law schools to market their “practice ready” programs. Legal research and writing, as well as other skills programs, are typically featured in these marketing materials and on websites. However, even as they are prominently represented in marketing efforts, LRW faculty continue to be underrepresented as full faculty members and suffer as a result, in terms of job status and salary.

Panelists discussed the ABA’s current Rule 405, which essentially codifies the disparate treatment. The ABA accreditation rules permit law schools to maintain the unequal status quo. While legal research and writing is one of only two specific courses required for ABA accreditation, and law schools must also provide “at least one additional writing experience after the first year,” the rules regarding faculty provide no incentive for law schools to provide better security of position for faculty teaching those courses. This is largely a function of ABA Standard 405 that directs law schools to establish a faculty policy “with respect to academic freedom and tenure,” but exempts LRW faculty. LRW faculty are covered under a different rule, 405(d), which states that law schools need only provide “such security of position and other rights and privileges of faculty membership as may be necessary to (1) attract and retain a faculty that is well qualified . . . and (2) safeguard academic freedom.”

In conjunction with this panel, the authors and Professor McElroy were invited to and did make a statement at the Crosscutting Program at the same annual meeting, entitled *The More Things Change...: Exploring Solutions to Persisting Discrimination in Legal Academia*. This program along with the panel formed the basis of an article by Tiscione and Vorenberg for a forthcoming symposium issue of the Columbia Journal of Gender and Law.



Amy Vorenberg moderated Podia & Pens at the AALS Conference in January 2015



Pens & Podia Panel: (l to r) The Honorable Ketanji Brown Jackson, Kristen Tiscione, Orin Kerr, Lyrrisa Lidsky, Lisa McElroy, Amy Vorenberg & Jennifer Romig

Know Thy Student, by Juli Campagna

Know thy student. Do you know where your students come from and what their reasonable expectations of legal education might be? International students in American law schools – and in your class!



Juli Campagna
Associate Professor of
Legal Writing and
Assistant Faculty Di-
rector of International
Programs

**“What do law
schools know
about these
students?”**

Introduction

The theme of the 2015 AALS Annual Meeting was *Legal Education at a Crossroads*. One indisputable feature of this theme is decline in law school enrollment all over the country. It is unlikely that student enrollment will pick up substantially any time soon, if ever, for reasons of which we are all keenly aware. In an effort to meet payroll and budgets, law schools all over the country are increasing their enrollment of non-U.S. students. These students come from all over the globe, with all levels of expertise and experience in their own legal systems. International law students are a major growth industry for law schools at a time when domestic law students are in serious decline.

In 2000, non-JD enrollment in U.S. law schools was around 4 to 5%. Ten years later, in the academic year 2010-2011, 6.2% of law students were non-J.D. students. By the 2012-2013 academic year, 7.4% of law school enrollment in the U.S. was “non-J.D.” The vast majority of these students are international students. Most do LL.M.s. Some do SJD programs; others come here to spend a semester abroad. They rarely take “separate” courses. Instead, they take the same courses as the J.D.s, and almost certainly take legal writing.

International Law Students

What do law schools know about these students? What do American law professors know about their students’ legal education experience before they walk into their class? What are the classroom and assessment expectations of foreign students?

Unlike the “traditional” 1L J.D.s, international students are *not* blank slates in terms of law or legal education. Many or most are finishing, and not starting their legal education. Some have already finished their legal studies in their home country. Typically, they will have completed an undergraduate degree where they majored in law the way we major in sociology or accounting. The concept of law “school,” as separate and distinct from the university, is unknown in most countries. Law is a department, like the history department.

Some of the foreign law graduates in American law school classes have practiced law in their home countries; others have not. Some of these foreign law graduates have passed the bar or equivalent in their home countries; others come from countries that have no bar exam. Thus, while international law students are not similarly situated to American law students, they are not a monolith, either. Their skills and education vary widely, based on individual traits and worldwide trends. One thing is certain: these students come with experience of legal education, and expectations as to what a legal classroom and a legal final examination will be.

Many American law professors see the foreign law students as imperfect American law students. They tend to think that the international law students’ *problem* is weak English. Actually, the international students tend to see themselves in the same light: weak on English. While this assumption may appear reasonable, it is flawed and uninformed. While there will be students whose English language skills are not quite “up to par” for the rigors of reading and writing at the level required of a law school experience, there is so much more at play than “mere” English language skills when international students attempt to analyze a problem in an American law school setting.

Goals and Limitations

The goal of my presentation, whose materials are summarized below, is to provide my colleagues with an idea of the assessment experience and expectations of the international law students in their classes. I have been teaching international law students in the United

Know Thy Student, continued

States and abroad for almost ten years. Before that, I worked in international practice and spent a third or more of my time each year abroad, working with attorneys from many different countries. Before going to law school, I had worked in international corporate training, spending most of my time abroad. I got a master's degree in teaching English as a foreign/second language years before I ever thought I would go to law school. I practiced law for years before I ever thought I would teach it. Based on all these experiences, I thought I was well prepared to teach foreign law students. Like most faculty and students, I too believed that it was all about their English and knew that I could help them in that regard.

At Hofstra, we have two legal writing courses dedicated specifically to international law students. At John Marshall, where I first taught this audience, we had one. I designed all these courses, weaving together (second) law and (second) language and the so-called "standard" legal analysis. While I am certainly no scholar of the civil law legal system, I had studied it in my own LL.M. and had worked with a substantial number of lawyers whose countries' legal systems are based on some version of the Roman or Napoleonic code. I thought I had it down, and could take willing, dedicated students where they needed to go. What happened consistently, however, is that even the top students in my writing classes had modest or poor results on their substantive law exams – particularly at the end of the first semester. I was particularly amazed and dismayed to see seasoned attorneys, with excellent English language skills and significant international experience, getting modest grades on their substantive law exams at the end of the first semester. During the spring semester, these seasoned lawyers told me that they used their "lawyers' heads" and not their "law student heads" when taking their exams. With their "lawyers' heads," they greatly improved. This is what finally led me to inquire into law school examinations in my students' countries of origin.

These exam questions, and the anticipated analysis of the questions, are as analogous to an American law school exam as a fish is to a bicycle. After receiving samples from 20 countries on three continents, I could see why my international students, including "the best and the brightest," had so much difficulty with American law school exams. None of the international students had any experience with or the slightest expectation of "issue spotters" or other fact-centered legal analyses. This goes far beyond the notion of "code v. case" or other critical distinctions between the foreign students' legal *systems* and our own. It is not just the legal systems that are so different from each other. The legal education methods and assessment are vastly different, too.

My empirical research has shown me that few international students have ever taken a written examination in their own legal education system. Oral exams are the norm in many countries. The content of these exams, whether oral or written, tends to be quite similar from country to country, and continent to continent. All are strikingly different from American law school exams, however.

Let me be clear about the limitations on and scope of my research. First of all, this is a start, and not the end. What I have gathered thus far are examination questions from professors at universities where I either taught or had a contact. Most of the questions below are from Europe or Latin America. This is not due to any cultural bias. It is due to financial constraints. I have no budget for this study at all. I was a licensed translator for years, and thus refuse to ask people to translate "as a favor." I also know the importance of skill and training in translation, and refuse to obtain translations from people who do not have the substantive knowledge (here, law) necessary to translate the text. I was able to translate the questions from French, Italian and Spanish myself. Colleagues were able to get me reliable English-language translations from Norway, Moldova and Czech Republic. I paid to translate the questions from Chinese.

I have divided the questions into two sections: Oral and Written. Some countries give both types. Many give only oral questions. At this early stage I found the content the most interesting thing of all.



***“Oral exams
are the norm in
many
countries.”***

Know Thy Student, continued

Oral Questions

Italy

In Italy, law students take oral exams almost exclusively. Students have 15 minutes to answer a question, and are ordinarily given one to two questions per course. The student and the examiner interact during the process. The examiner may (and often does) give the student hints and tips to help the student keep going. The student receives her grade immediately, and can accept or reject it. If the student rejects the grade, the student will take the exam the next time it is offered. The student does not re-sit or re-take the course, however.

Following is an exam on *Statutes of Limitations*.

To pass (“sufficienza”), the student must be able to answer –

- What is a statute of limitations claim?
- What are the general criteria for determining the time period available to bring the suit?

To get a B (“voto intermedio”), the student must be able to answer the above questions, and also know –

- *that* the statutory time period may be interrupted or suspended; and
- the difference between *interruption* and *suspension*; and
- how the maximum time available – not to be extended even when interrupted – is determined in the first instance.

To get an A (“voto pieno”), the student must know everything included to pass, and to get a B, and must also be able to answer –

- How can various mitigating and aggravating circumstances affect the statute of limitations, both in the initial determination and in the fraction used to calculate the maximum length of time available?

France

French universities use a combination of oral and written questions to assess. Most questions are available (a sort of exam bank) for review in advance although the student will not know which question(s) the examiner will ask him at exam time. As in Italy, the student and examiner interact during the exam.

- Which of the following treaties is the last legally binding amendment to the founding treaties? Maastricht Treaty? Amsterdam Treaty? Treaty of Nice? Explain.
- Explain the jurisdiction doctrine and state at least three examples of how this doctrine influences arbitration proceedings.

Belgium

Belgian universities also use a combination of oral and written questions, with a preference for oral questions in the early years. Like the other European universities covered here, most questions are available in a sort of exam bank although the student will not know which question(s) the examiner will ask him at exam time. The student and examiner interact during the exam, which is so in all the European countries presented in this article.

- What is meant by the term “corporate nationality”? Describe in some depth.
- Define and describe what is meant by “free movement of goods” in EU law.

Norway

- How does international law define sovereign rights according to the Law of the Sea Treaty (1982)?
- A foreigner is stopped at the airport because the authenticity of his visa is challenged. Explain.



Know Thy Student, continued

The Norwegian law professor who provided me with these samples also told me that Norwegian law students' answers "must be objective." "Arguing for one side or the other," he added, is "neither appropriate nor appreciated." Instead, "the students must know the law."

Czech Republic

- What are the basic principles of civil procedure before national courts?
- What is meant by "direct effect" of the EC law? Provide examples.

Following is a "practical question" of the type asked in some, but not all Czech law schools, where "practical questions" are seen as lacking legal depth.

- A takings is sought, but not for the entire property. The government is only going to leave the owner a little strip of land that is of no use to him. What can you do? Theory on takings and arguments you can make.

Written Questions

People's Republic of China

Directions: Please finish all these questions within two hours. Your answer to each question should be no less than 400 words.

1. What are the types of punishment in the P.R.C.?
2. What are the theories of retribution adopted by the government?
3. Discuss and analyze the elements of self-defense and the circumstances when it is justified under P.R.C. criminal law.

Republic of China (Taiwan)

- What is the proper substantive law that governs proprietary questions relating to dispositions of securities of the Taiwan investor? Please elaborate your answer and reasoning

Moldova

1. Explain the importance of judicial practice as it relates to labor law.
2. Describe the process of how individual labor contracts are suspended.
 - (a) Explain from the employer's viewpoint;
 - (b) Explain from the employee's viewpoint.

Mexico

All three of the following questions are from one of the top law schools of Mexico, the *Facultad Libre de Derecho de Monterrey*, where the students must study law through the medium of Spanish, French and English.

- In 300 words, discuss and respond to the following idea of Harvard Law Professor Todd D. Rakoff: "(...) ordinarily legal problems admit of many solutions, which may be equally functional, and, in context, culturally appropriate. Accordingly, our students need to understand that the particular solution they are taught as applicable in their own legal system may well not be the solution which lies in the minds of the lawyers around the world with whom they will deal in the course of their working lives. Or, in other words, they will constantly need to – and therefore, we also need to – learn from each other."
- Do a comparative analysis of the legal structure required to finance a corporation in Spanish law and Mexican law. Evaluate each system, highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of each one.
- Decide what the dominating principal with regard to conflict of laws in the Civil Code of Nuevo León is. Give your opinion on this, in a complete and organized manner; half page minimum and full page maximum. Use exact and correct terminology. Write legibly, and do not make any spelling mistakes.



Know Thy Student, continued

Conclusion

**“One in ten seats
will be taken by an
international law
student...”**

As stated earlier, I have only started this study. Already it is clear to me that we need to do much more to support our international students' ability to do well on exams. Many or most come on scholarships from their countries, their bar associations or even law firms. Waiting to improve on second-semester exams, when they have only two semesters of study for the LL.M., is unacceptable.

In addition to offering them specialized legal writing courses, which they certainly need, law schools should give these students opportunities to take practice exams in their substantive law classes. For many or most, who are already accustomed to hard work and who study diligently, it is not the “knowledge” of the law that presents the challenge, but the way in which they are accustomed to demonstrating what they know.

One in ten seats will be taken by an international law student by the end of this decade - if not sooner. We owe our international students much more than we are currently delivering.

- Juli is an Associate Professor of Legal Writing at the Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University where she teaches “traditional” first-year law students and also teaches specially designed legal writing courses to international law students. She is also the Assistant Faculty Director of International Programs.

* * * * *

***Need Ideas for Effective Student Conferences?
Check out these Essays!***

Tips for a Successful Student Conference, by Erin A. Donelon



Erin A. Donelon
Director of Legal Research and Writing,
Tulane

(1) Adjust Your Expectations: If you are transitioning from a high-level practice to teaching, you may expect near-complete drafts, probing questions, and fully engaged students. The reality is that you can expect a wide variety of abilities and work product. Some will be far along. The majority will be in the early stages and will require several rewrites. In my experience, no matter how much we advise students to “start early,” the real heavy lifting may begin after that first individual conference. Be prepared to provide strategies and timelines for those students who are in the early stages of the writing process.

(2) Be Sure That Every Student Leaves with a To-do List: I conclude every conference by jotting down a to-do list on the back of the student's draft. Students leave with a tangible list of tasks, I've clearly identified the most pressing issues, and we both have documentation that the conference was productive. The to-do list also generates goodwill among students. No matter how

much they have struggled with a topic, they know where to turn to get started. This simple technique helps students break down even the most daunting assignment into manageable tasks and is essential to overcoming procrastination.

(3) Save Time to Check in: Legal writing professors are often the first (and sometimes only) faculty members to meet individually with first-year students during the first semester. We often are the only faculty members who have a sense of how students are adjusting to law school. Because of this, I usually begin or end every conference with a simple “how is everything going?” This opens the door for students to share, vent, or decompress about their experience in law school. If students share specific personal problems, I can direct them to the appropriate university resource. In light of the epidemic of stress and depression among law students, I now view “checking in” as a core component of my individual student conferences.

How to Have a Great Conference, by Joel Atlas & Estelle McKee

Without question, a professor's own conferencing skills can significantly impact the quality of conferences. But, students' performance at conference matters too. Indeed, the professor should treat the ability to conference effectively as a lawyering skill to be taught in the course.

Thus, early in the course, we introduce students to the role, goals, and values of conferences and to the importance of conferencing skills to students' success. We teach that, to conference effectively, students should do the following:

1.) Thoroughly prepare for conferences by, for example, reading the assignment, conducting background research, and, if helpful, outlining the analysis.

2.) Think independently – i.e., before a conference, carefully evaluate the matter and attempt to resolve any concerns without assistance.

3.) Create targeted questions – i.e., determine precise concerns and formulate specific questions to address them. If a professor agrees to review a portion of a student's draft, the student should understand that the professor will do so only to address a particular concern (e.g., whether the text is precise or concise) rather than to determine whether the draft is flawless.

4.) Devise a realistic number of questions, and prioritize them. If a professor doubts whether the student has properly prioritized the questions, the professor may wish to review all of the

questions before answering any of them and to help the student to prioritize them.

5.) Bring hard copies of any text about which the student has questions. If the professor allows students to bring laptops to a conference, students should expect that the text may be reviewed on the laptop. In this instance, students should disable email and other alerts and should ensure that their documents are open and in an easily legible font. Students should also highlight the text at issue to avoid the need to scroll through the document.

6.) Understand that, to encourage independent thinking and problem-solving, a professor may provide guidance rather than a direct answer.

How to Have a Great Conference, by Karin Mika

The core mission of any student conference is getting through to the student and seeing the proverbial light go on. Making the light go on, however, is often the challenge.

I believe the key to a great student conference is following the advice that we give to our students when they do writing assignments – know your audience!

We all relish in the student who arrives for a conference with revisions that are spot on as well as intelligent questions, but the students who most need our help are students who arrive either with no preparation, or are so lost that they do not know what to do with draft comments, or how to even begin

a redraft. It would be easy to write off these students as not worth our time, but in many situations, the students themselves need to be taught how best to use the comments on the draft for purposes of a rewrite and also, how best to make use of the conferencing time.

There are various ways to attempt to engage the unengaged student. Personally, I think the worst way to begin a dialogue is to remind or reprimand the student for (perhaps) not following directions in terms of preparing for the conference by reviewing your comments and/or formulating questions about their drafts. I think the best way to engage the student is to determine

what the student's level of understanding is about his/her writing issues and then figure out whether there is a way that the student can be made to understand what steps can be taken toward improvement that do not necessarily involve the comments made on the draft. In other words, sometimes the best thing to do is to start from scratch – for you, in terms of how content is communicated, and for the student, in terms of his/her understanding about how to grasp what is being taught. The most important concept, however, is to make sure you do your best to figure out how best to connect to each student, even if the student seems unwilling or unable to connect with you.



Joel Atlas
Director of Lawyering
Program and Clinical
Professor of Law,
Cornell



Estelle McKee
Clinical Professor of
Law, Cornell



Karin Mika
Legal Writing Profes-
sor, Cleveland-Marshall



Amy Stein
Professor of Legal
Writing and Program
Coordinator, Assistant
Dean for Adjunct In-
struction, Hofstra

The Key to an Effective Student Conference is...What Happens After the Conference!, by Amy Stein

In the 15 years I have taught legal Writing I have conducted well over 1,000 student conferences. While that is an enormous quantity of conferences, I want to ensure that the quality is also substantial. It is vital to find ways to assess that what the student and I are discussing is actually having a positive impact on their writing in the future, not just on the next paper.

Any individual conference includes a far-ranging discussion of techniques and strategies aimed at improving the student's writing. I have come up with an interesting way of assessing which ones are effective for a particular learner by encouraging them to continue the discussion beyond the con-

ference. For example, if I give a student three strategies for improving wordiness when we meet, I will ask them to write me a note at the end of their rewritten paper telling me which of the techniques they tried and how useful they found each to be and why. The explanation is vital- I am often surprised by what I read. I make it clear that I am interested in hearing about both the methods that work and the ones that do not. I also ask them to let me know if they have come up with different ideas on their own that are helpful. I do make it clear that this will not impact their grade, it is just an additional way for me to help them.

This has proven enormously popular with students for a

number of reasons. First, it means that they must think actively about their learning- they cannot just rewrite the paper, they have to think about the *process* of writing the paper. Second, they feel a sense of accountability because they know that I will be looking for their notes, which makes them more likely to apply my advice. Third, this technique makes students understand that I care about their progress and that we are engaged in a dialogue to improve their writing. I always take the time to write a response to their note, and will often bring it up in their subsequent meetings. Finally, I make it clear that the data helps me not only to help them but also to help others going forward, an idea which they find appealing.



Jennifer Rosa
Associate Clinical
Professor of Law, MSU

How To Make the Most Effective Use of a One-On-One Student Conference, by Jennifer Rosa

1.) Allow autonomy in scheduling: Although I require a conference early in the semester, I allow students to choose the day and time. Research shows that the more choices they have, the better.

2.) Establish rapport: Students want to know we care about them as individuals. Ask questions about how they are doing, what brought them to law school, and goals they have, before critiquing their writing.

3.) Require students to complete a thorough self-evaluation before the conference: I give my students a self-evaluation that takes 3-4 hours to complete. They highlight facts from

precedent cases and our case to visually see any deficiencies in their analogies or distinctions; they enter thesis sentences in boxes and read them together to see if the rule develops; they label the IRACs; they circle apostrophes to ensure they used them correctly and mark grammar or citation errors to get extra credit. The exercise forces them to become self-aware of their writing issues before I say anything. Students often apologize for a weak memo and they have many questions for me about how to improve it. I found that this exercise breaks down the barriers between us. They no longer look at me as a "grader," criticizing their writing and telling them the weaknesses. Ra-

ther, they recognize their own deficiencies and see me as a tool to help them achieve success.

4.) Allow students to lead the conference: Begin the conference by asking them how the self-evaluation went and if they have any questions. They detail the strengths and weaknesses and ask questions regarding how to improve the memo. They become empowered and take ownership of their learning process.

5.) Reinforce the positive, offering encouragement and support: By working as team, students feel we are vested in their success.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Awards

Deborah L. Borman (Northwestern), was an award recipient, LWI/ALWD LexisNexis Scholarship grant for forthcoming article: De-grading Assessment: Rejecting Rubrics in Favor of Authentic Analysis.

Charles Calleros (ASU), is the first awardee of an annual award named for him by the ASU Chicano/Latino Law Student Assoc., the "Charles R. Calleros Campeón de Justicia Award" (Feb. 22, 2015). Charles also received the 2014-15 Faculty Moot Court Coach of the Year Award (from the Exec. Moot Court Board) and the MLK Award for Education, Tempe City Council on Diversity (Jan. 20, 2014).

Stephanie Roberts Hartung (Suffolk,) was awarded the Clarence Darrow Award by the Massachusetts Citizens Against the Death Penalty.

Tamara Herrera (ASU), was awarded the Rocky Mountain Award for outstanding service to the region at the Fifteenth Annual Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference held at the University of New Mexico School of Law, March 6 -7, 2015.

Dana Hill (Northwestern), received the school's Student Bar Association Faculty Appreciation Award for 2014-2015.

Connie Krontz (Seattle), has been selected for the Black Law Students Association Faculty Award.

Joan Rocklin (Oregon), was awarded the 2015 Hollis Award for excellence in classroom teaching. The annual Hollis Award is based

on nominations from faculty and students and other indicia of teaching excellence.

Jennifer Rosa (Michigan State), received the MSU Service Learning and Civic Engagement Award.

Gail S. Stephenson (Southern), was named Distinguished Professor of the Year by the Louisiana Bar Foundation.

Paul Stokstad (Michigan State), received the Outstanding Skills-Based Professor Award from MSU Student Bar Association.

Publications

Debra Austin (Denver), *Drink Like a Lawyer: The Neuroscience of Substance Use and Its Impact on Cognitive Wellness*, 15 Nev. L.J. (2015).

Rita Barnett-Rose (Chapman), *Compulsory Water Fluoridation: Justifiable Public Health Benefit or Human Experimental Research without Informed Consent*, 39.1 Wm. & Mary Environmental Law & Policy Rev. 201 (2014).

Kevin Bennardo (Indiana-Indianapolis), *Testing the Geographical Proximity Hypothesis: An Empirical Study of Citations to Nonbinding Precedents by Indiana Appellate Courts*, 90 Notre Dame L. Rev. Online 125 (2015).

Deborah L. Borman (Northwestern), *Fast Track Your Mindset: Engineering Confidence and Streamlining Feedback for Full Steam Success in Legal Practice*, 49 U.S.F.L. REV. 40 (2015); *The Millennials Challenge: Equalizing the Values Triad in Professional Identity Formation*, THE LEARNING CURVE, Winter 2015.

Bob Brain (Loyola, Los Angeles), *Video Game Law: Cases, Commentaries, and Forms* (2d ed., Carolina Academic Publishing) (forthcoming, to be published in the fall semester) (with Professor Ashley Lipson); *"Multijurisdictional Practice: A Need for Care,"* (forthcoming in the May edition of the California Bar Journal).

Anne M Burr and **Howard Bromberg** (Michigan), *U.S. Legal Practice Skills for International Law Students* (Carolina Academic Press 2014).

Mary Nicol Bowman (Seattle), *Full Disclosure: Cognitive Science, Informants, and Search Warrant Scrutiny*, 47 Akron L. Rev. 431 (2014).

Charles Calleros (ASU), *LEGAL METHOD AND WRITING* (7th ed., Wolters Kluwer L. & Bus. 2014); *CONTRACTS: CASES, TEXT, AND PROBLEMS* (Carolina Acad. Press 2014) [Digital Book] [Chapters 13 & 14 primarily authored by co-author Stephen Gerst].

John Campbell (Denver), *Where Kafka Reigns: A Call for Metamorphosis of Unlawful Detainer Laws*, Univ. Mich. J. of Law Reform (forthcoming 2015); *Countering the Plaintiff's Anchor: Jury Simulations to Evaluate Damages Arguments*, (with Bernard Chao), Iowa L. Rev. (forthcoming 2015).

Sha-Shana Crichton (Howard), *The Incomplete Revolution: Women Journalists - 50 Years After Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, We've Come A Long Way Baby, But Are We There Yet?* Howard Law Journal, Volume 58 (2014).

David R. Cleveland (Valparaiso), published *Discrimination Law's Dirty Secret: The Equal Opportunity Sexual Harasser Loophole*, 58 How. L.J. 5 (2015); *Legal Writing: A History; Part I – From the Colonial Era to the End of the Civil War*, 19 Leg.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Publications, continued

Writing 191 (2015) (co-authored with Jeffrey D. Jackson (Washburn)).

Linda Edwards (UNLV), *The Trouble with Categories: What Theory Can Teach Us About the Doctrine/Skills Divide*, 64 J. Leg. Educ. 181 (2014); *Advocacy as an Exercise in Virtue: Lawyering, Bad Facts, and Furman's High-Stakes Dilemma*, 66 Mercer L. Rev. ____ (2015); Legal Writing and Analysis, 4th ed. (Wolters Kluwer, 2015).

Elizabeth Fajans (Brooklyn), **Mary Falk** (Brooklyn), **Helene Shapo** (Northwestern) co-authored Writing for Law Practice, 3rd ed. (Foundation Press 2015).

Olivia Farrar (Howard), Thorpe v. Lightfoot: A Mother's International Hague Petition for the Return of her Child [A Context & Practice Global Case File; Carolina Academic Press, 2015]; Hastings v. USATF, IAAF, and IOC: An Intersex Athlete's Constitutional Challenge [A Context & Practice Global Case File; Carolina Academic Press, 2014].

Liz Frost (Oregon), published an article in the Oregon State Bar Bulletin entitled *Mental Shrinkage: The Many Costs of Multitasking*.

Shailini J. George (Suffolk), blogged "Law Students Need Mindfulness Training" for the Best Practices in Legal Education blog, March 8, 2015.

Stephanie Roberts Hartung (Suffolk), *Habeas Corpus for the Innocent*, 19 U. Penn. J. of Law & Soc. Ch. (forthcoming 2016).

Michael J. Higdon (Tennessee), MARGINALIZED FATHERS AND DEMONIZED MOTHERS: A FEMINIST LOOK AT THE REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM OF UNMARRIED MEN, 66 Ala. L. Rev. 507 (2015)

Wendy Adele Humphrey (Texas Tech), "But I'm Brain-dead and Pregnant": Advance Directive Pregnancy Exclusions and End-of-Life Wishes, 21 Wm. & Mary J. Women & L. 669 (2015).

Regina Ramsey James (SULC-Baton Rouge), *How to Fulfill a Broken Promise: Revisiting and Reaffirming the Importance of Desegregated Equal Educational Access and Opportunity*, 68 ARK. L. REV. 159 (2015).

Faisal Kutty (Valparaiso), published *Review of Drone Warfare: Killing by Remote Control*, in 11 J. INT'L L. & INT'L REL. (University of Toronto) Volume 11, Issue 1 (2015); "Islamic Law" in US Courts: Judicial Jihad or Constitutional Imperative?, 41 Pepp. L. Rev. 1059 (2014); "Islamic law and Adoptions," in Robert L. Ballard, Naomi H. Goodno, Robert F. Cochran, Jr., and Jay A. Milbrandt, eds., The Intercountry Adoption Debate: Dialogues Across Disciplines. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Feb. 2015.

Ellie Margolis (Temple), *Is the Medium the Message? Unleashing the Power of E-Communication in the Twenty-First Century*, forthcoming, 12 Legal Communication and Rhetoric: JALWD (2015).

Ellie Margolis & Kristen Murray (Temple), *Mind the Gap*, forthcoming, 20 Legal Writing: The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute (2015); *Teaching Research Using an Information Literacy Paradigm*, 22 Perspectives: Teaching Legal Res. & Writing 101 (2014).

Megan McAlpin (Oregon), celebrated the release of her first publication, *Beyond the First Draft: Editing Strategies for Powerful Legal Writing*, with an official book launch celebration on January 29.

Sarah J. Morath (Akron), *A Park for Everyone: The National Park Service in Urban America*, Nat. Resources J. 56.1 (forthcoming 2016); *The 2014 Farm Bill: A Wicked Problem Seeking a Systematic Solution*, Duke Evntl. L. & Pol'l F. (forthcoming 2015); *The Farmer In Chief: Obama's Local Food Legacy*, 93 OR. L. REV. 91 (2014); *Training the Superstar Associate: Teaching Workplace Professionalism in Legal Writing Courses*, 23 Perspectives: Teaching Res. & Writing 53 (Fall 2014) (with Elizabeth Shaver); *They Know Their Colors: Using Color Coded Comments to Facilitate Revisions*, The Law Teacher 6 (Fall 2014).

Michael D. Murray (Valparaiso), *Visual Rhetoric: Topics of Invention and Arrangement and Tropes of Style*, 21 Leg. Writing ____ (forthcoming 2016); *Leaping Language and Cultural Barriers with Visual Legal Rhetoric*, ____ U.S.F.L. Rev. ____ (forthcoming 2015); *Post-Myriad Genetics Copyright of Synthetic Biology and Living Media*, 10 Okla. J.L. & Tech. 71 (2014); *Legal Research Methods* (2d ed. 2015) (with Christy H. DeSanctis of George Washington); *Legal Writing and Analysis* (2d ed. 2015) (with Christy H. DeSanctis of George Washington).

Robin Nilon (Temple), *A Better Way to Fail: Teaching Critical Thinking to Chinese Lawyers*, ____ TESOL Asia EFL Journal ____ (forthcoming 2016).

Ann Nowak (Touro Law Center), Author of "Tough Love: The Law School that Required Its Students to Learn Good Grammar," 28 Touro L. Rev. 1369, available at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2146252>.

Mark K. Osbeck (Michigan), *Using Data Analytics Tools to Supplement Traditional Research and Analysis in Forecasting Case Outcomes*, ____ Legal Writing ____ (2015) (forthcoming).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Publications, continued

Abigail A. Patthoff (Chapman), *This is Your Brain on Law School: The Impact of Fear-Based Narratives on Law Students*, 2015 Utah L. Rev. ____.

Sara Rankin (Seattle), "A Homeless Bill of Rights (Revolution)," 45 SETON HALL L. REV. 383 (Spring 2015). Available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2376488>; "Invidious Deliberation: The Problem of Congressional Bias in Federal Hate Crime Legislation," 66 RUTGERS L. REV. 563 (2014). Available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2350591>.

Sara Rankin, ED. (Seattle), "THE NEW 1L: TEACHING FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS TO BE LAWYERS THROUGH ACTUAL PRACTICE," (Carolina Academic Press, April 2015).

Jennifer Romig (Emory), *Legal Blogging and the Rhetorical Genre of Public Legal Writing*, 12 Legal Communication and Rhetoric: JALWD (2015); *Georgia Judges on iPads*, Georgia Bar Journal at 58 (April 2015); coverage of new legal blogging class at Zosha Millman, *Emory Law School Gets Students Blogging Early with Innovative New Class*, Real Law-

yers Have Blogs (February 12, 2015), <http://kevin.lexblog.com/2015/02/12/emory-law-blogging-class/>

Suzanne Rowe (Oregon), recently published five articles in the Oregon State Bar Bulletin, including *From the Mail Bag: Responses to Readers*, *Think Different: The End of the Ad-verb?*, *Difficult Conversations: Talking About Bad Writing*, "C" Change: *Compelling Compliments and Confrontations*, and *Brevity: A Challenge*.

Nantiya Ruan (Denver), *The New 1L: First-Year Lawyering With Clients* (with Eduardo R.C. Capulong, Michael A. Millemann, and Sara Rankin), Carolina Academic Press (2015); *Stabilizing Low-Wage Work: Legal Remedies for Unpredictable Work Hours & Income Stability* (with Charlotte Alexander & Dr. Anna Haley-Lock), 50 HARV. C.R. - C.L. L. REV. (2015).

Louis J. Sirico, Jr. (Villanova), published *A Proposal for Improving*

Argument Before the United States Supreme Court, 42 Pepperdine L. Rev. 195 (2015); Louis J. Sirico, Jr. & Nancy L. Schultz, *Persuasive Writing for Lawyers* (4th ed. 2015) (Wolters Kluwer/Aspen).

Gail Stephenson (Southern), *Sanctions for Frivolous Civil Appeals in Louisiana*, 75 La. L. Rev. 1125 (2015).

David Thomson (Denver), *Skills & Values: Discovery Practice* (2nd Edition, LexisNexis/Matthew Bender 2014); "Teaching" *Formation of Professional Identity*, 17 Regent University L. Rev. (2015).

Kathleen Elliott Vinson (Suffolk), *Problem Solved: How to Incorporate Problem Solving in Your Course to Prepare Students to Practice*, *The Learning Curve* 16 (Winter 2015).

Presentations

Debra Austin (Denver), *Wellness for 1Ls: the Neuroscience of Happy Hour and Alternatives to Self-Medication*, the Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference, UNM, March 2015; *The Law Student Brain: Cognition, Stress, Self-Medication, and Brain Health*, Legal Ethics and Professionalism: Business Law Issues and Law and Economics classes, University of Colorado, March 2015; *Comfort Food and Cocktails: Understanding the Power of Substances on Our Brain*, the DU Women's Conference, University of Denver March 2015.

Tanya Bartholomew (Denver), *Imbedding Cultural Sensitivity in the First-Year Writing Curriculum*, the Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference,

UNM, March 2015; *Back-to-School: A Legal Writing Update*, University of Denver Professional Mentorship Program, University of Denver, March 2015.

Kevin Bennardo (Indiana-Indianapolis), *Measuring the Value of Non-Binding Precedents through Empirical Methods*, The Capital Area Legal Writing Conference, William & Mary Law School, March 2015.

Deborah L. Borman (Northwestern), *Incorporating Teaching Professional Identity into the Legal Education Curriculum*, Moderator, American Association of

Law Schools (AALS) 2015 Annual Meeting, January 3, 2015, Washington, D.C.; *Instilling Confidence and Receiving Feedback: Creating Opportunities for Improved Satisfaction in Practice*, Society of American Law Teachers (SALT) Teaching Conference, Legal Education in a Time of Change: Challenges and Opportunities, October 11, 2014, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Boyd School of Law; *Instilling Confidence and Receiving Feedback: The Art and Science of Motivation*, Western Regional Conference Beyond Carrots and Sticks: *Motivating Students to Do Their Best Work* Stanford Law School, September 20, 2014; *Write Your*

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Presentations, continued

Way In: Legal Writing and Legal Research in Law School, 2014 Midwest Association of Pre-Law Advisors (MAPLA) Conference, Chicago, Illinois, September 12, 2014; Write Your Way In: Legal Writing and Legal Research in Law School, National Association of Pre-Law Advisors (NAPLA) Conference, University of Baltimore School of Law, Baltimore, Maryland, June 18, 2014; The Millennials Challenge: Equalizing the Values Triad in Professional Identity Formation, a paper prepared by invitation to the Discussion Group, Teaching Methods to Help Students Develop a Professional Identity, Southeast Association of Law Schools (SEALS), Amelia Island, FL, on August 7, 2014; American Bar Association Council on Legal Education Opportunity (CLEO), July 19-20, 2014; De-Grading Assessment: Rejecting Rubrics in Favor of Authentic Analysis, Legal Writing Institute Biennial Conference, Philadelphia, PA, on July 2, 2014.

Bob Brain (Loyola, Los Angeles), "Characters: Intellectual Property and Other Protection Issues," Annual California State Bar Meeting (with Cydney Tune, Esq., Pillsbury, Winston); "Making First Year Students Comfortable with the Idea of Uncertainty," (upcoming ALWD Biennial Conference, June 3, 2015).

Charles Calleros (ASU) "Teaching common law legal method to civil law students," Global Legal Skills Conference in Verona, Italy, May 23, 2014; "Introducing first-semester law students to legal uncertainty, synthesis, organization, and outlining," One-day Legal Writing Conference in San Diego, Dec. 5, 2014; presented a manuscript titled "Advocacy for Marriage Equality: The Power of a Broad Historical Narrative During a Transitional Period in Civil Rights," Symposium on Persuasive in Civil Rights Advocacy, Mich. State Univ., April 10, 2015.

John Campbell (Denver), Countering the Plaintiff's Anchor, (with Bernard Chao), Conference on Empirical Legal Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 2014.

Bruce Ching (Michigan State) planned, facilitated, hosted *Persuasion in Civil Rights Advocacy Symposium* with MSU Law Review, April 2015.

Jennifer Cooper (Seattle) presented her working paper, "Illusions of Competence: Using Empirical Research on Undergraduate Study Behaviors to Maximize Law Learning" to the faculty of the University of Missouri School of Law.

Linda Edwards (UNLV) presented Hearing Voices: Using Non-Party Narratives in Abortion and Gay Rights Litigation, Symposium: Persuasion in Civil Rights Advocacy, April 10-11, 2015, Mich. St. Univ. Col. of Law; The Myth of Redemptive Violence, Symposium: Justice & Injustice: The Consequences of Storytelling in the Courtroom, Univ. of California, Irvine, Jan. 23-24, 2015; Other Voices: The Use of Non-Party Stories in Appellate Writing, Marquette University Law School, Dec. 2, 2014; Advocacy as an Exercise in Virtue: Lawyering, Bad Facts, and Furman's High-Stakes Dilemma, Symposium on The Scholarship and Teaching of Jack Sammons, Mercer University School of Law, Oct. 3, 2014.

Joan Foley (Touro Law Center), Co-Presenter, Meeting the Needs of Today's Law Students: Integrating Distance Learning into the Legal Writing Classroom, Legal Writing Institute One-Day Workshop, U Conn School of Law, December 12, 2014; Aging in Place: At the Intersection of Healthcare, Finance, and Law, poster presentation at Touro College Research Day, April 28,

2015.

Shailini J. George (Suffolk) presented "Why Law Students Need Mindfulness Training", The Fourth Colonial Frontier Legal Writing Conference, "Teaching the Academically Underprepared Law Student," Duquesne Law School, December 2014.

Wendy Adele Humphrey and **Shery Kime-Goodwin** (Texas Tech), *The Art of Negotiating as an Inherent Principle in Successful Advocacy*, Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference, UNM (March 2015).

Faisal Kutty & David Cleveland (Valparaiso) presented Towards a Pedagogy of Legal Journalism, Legal Writing Institute Conference: The Modern Legal Writing Classroom, Univ. of Miami, December 6, 2014.

Faisal Kutty (Valparaiso) Deradicalization or Disengagement from Violence?, Keynote Address, University of Windsor, November 26, 2014; Deradicalization or Disengagement from Violence?, Keynote Address, Osgoode Hall Law School of York University, November 27, 2014.

Sammy M. Mansour (Michigan State) hosted 2 live webinars for LWI's Committee on Global Legal Writing Skills and created database of videocasts to assist U.S. law professors in teaching international graduate students. Available at www.lwa.msu.edu/glws.

Samantha A. Moppett (Suffolk) Teaching Tips for Advanced Research & Writing Courses, Legal Writing Institute One-Day Workshop, UNLV, December 2014 (with Jeanne Price & Melissa Bernstein); When the Novice Becomes Master, New England Consortium of Legal Writing Teachers Regional Conference, Vermont Law School September 2014 (with Kathleen Elliott Vinson).

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Presentations, continued

Samantha A. Moppett (Suffolk) Zooming in: A Prezi Primer, The Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference, UNM, March 2015.

Suzanna Moran (Denver), A New Course Model – Spend Your Time Doing What You Do Best, the Legal Writing Institute One-Day Workshop, University of Pennsylvania, December 2014; Teach Better, Do More, Have More Fun, Spend Less Time, the Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference, UNM, March 2015.

Sarah J. Morath (Akron) presented Food Waste: Beyond Recognition, Sabin Colloquium on Innovative Environmental Scholarship, Columbia School of Law (May 2015); Advocacy Applied: The E-Comment Exercise, Legal Writing and Leadership, University of Oregon School of Law (April 2015); The 2014 Farm Bill: A Wicked Problem Seeking a Systemic Solution, Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum's 25th Anniversary Symposium, Carrots & Sticks: Moving the U.S. National Food System Toward a Sustainable Future (January 2015). Also presented as part of the University of Toledo College of Law Faculty Exchange and Fifth Annual Colloquium of Environmental Scholarship, Vermont Law School (October 2014).

Michael D. Murray (Valparaiso) Stanford Law School, Western Regional Legal Writing Conference, Stanford, CA, Sep. 19, 2014; presented *Visual Legal Rhetoric for Cross-Cultural Communication*, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2496736>.

Daphne O'Regan (Michigan State) presented at the LWI Conference "The Modern Legal Writing Classroom" at Univ. of Miami: *Teaching Students Fundamental Skills: Proficiency, Engagement, and Framing the Task*, December 2014.

Mark K. Osbeck (Michigan) presented "Law 420: Cannabis and Legal Writing" at the Southeast Regional Writing Conference, University of Tennessee Law School, Knoxville, Tennessee, April 18, 2015; "Bringing Marijuana (Law) into the Legal Writing Classroom" at the Rocky Mountain Legal Writing Conference, University of New Mexico School of Law, Albuquerque, New Mexico, March 7, 2015.

Sara Rankin (Seattle) presented *National Strategy Session on the Criminalization of Homelessness*, Denver, CO (April 2015) (invited); *Innovations in Clinical Teaching*, Eugene, OR (April 2015) (invited); *Who Is At Risk For Homelessness?* Crosscut Public Media, Seattle, WA (January 2015) (invited); *Washington State Studies of Criminalizing Homelessness*, Antioch University, Seattle, WA (January 2015) (invited guest lecture); *The Crime of Homelessness*, Gonzaga Law School, Spokane, WA (November 2014) (presentation to faculty); *Creating the Political Will to End Homelessness*, Interfaith Community Task Force on Ending Homelessness, Seattle, WA (October 2014) (invited plenary panel presentation).

Jennifer Rosa (Michigan State) moderated panel for MSU Law Review/RWA Symposium: *Advocating Justice*, April 2015; moderated a panel for the 11th Annual Indigenous Law Conference at MSU, *Dismantling Barriers in American Indian Education*, November 2014; co-presented with Anne Alexander from Univ. of Missouri at Midwest Clinic Teachers Conference at MSU: "Flipping" the Lid off Old Ideas About Classroom Pedagogy, September 2014.

Nantiya Ruan (Denver), FLSA Collective Actions, the Colorado Bar Association Annual Meeting, Denver CO, April 2015; Leadership in Clinical and Experiential Learning, the Lead-

ership and Legal Writing 2015 Northwest Regional Conference, Eugene OR, April 2015.

David Thomson (Denver), Teaching Upper-Level Simulation Courses Through Carnegie Integration, Legal Writing Institute One-Day Workshop, Las Vegas, December 2014; Overview of Interactive Teaching Methods for Law, at Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia, December 2014; Teaching Law Through Simulations: The Discovery Practice Example, at Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia, December 2014.



ANNOUNCEMENTS

Promotions, Moves, Milestones & Other News

Mary Garvey Algero (Loyola – New Orleans), has been named Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at Loyola University New Orleans College of Law. She will begin serving as associate dean on August 1, 2015.

Angela Allen-Bell (Southern), was promoted to Associate Professor of Legal Analysis & Writing with presumptively renewable 5-year contracts.

Rita Barnett-Rose (Chapman), was promoted to Professor of Legal Writing with a presumptively renewable 5 year contract.

Rebecca Blemlberg (Marquette), was promoted to Professor of Legal Writing.

Jaime Bouvier (Case Western), was promoted to the position of Assistant Professor of Lawyering Skills.

Mary Bowman (Seattle), is co-chairing the new LWI Professional Status Committee. Mary presented the Scribes Law-Review Award at the Scribes Dinner during the National Conference of Law Reviews meetings in Louisville, Kentucky. She chairs the Scribes committee that honors the best student note or comment. Mary is reviewing a manuscript and writing a preface for an upcoming monograph dealing with police policies and integrity testing of confidential informants. The monograph, by Jon Shane of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, is part of an interdisciplinary monograph series on policing and is aimed at both academics and police practitioners.

Bob Brain (Loyola, Los Angeles), was appointed to the California Bar's Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct ("COPRAC"), which issues the State Bar's official ethics opinions; the Chair-Elect for the Legal Writing, Reasoning, and Research Section of the AALS; Co-Chair of the "Faces of LWI" Commit-

tee, the Committee that produces the "LWI Lives" newsletter; the Program and Site Committees for the 2016 LWI Conference in Portland; West Academic Publishing's "Inside Look" Panel, a group to advise West on the future of Legal Casebooks.

Charles Calleros (ASU), coached for 2 teams for the Vis Int'l Commercial Arbitration Moot, supervising 8 students in Spring 2014 and 9 students in Fall 2014 (with one team placing in second out of more than 100 in March 2015). Charles also taught a one-week course on Comparative Contract Law and Conflicts of Laws, Univ. of Paris Renee Descartes (June 2014).

Jake Carpenter (Marquette), was promoted to Associate Professor of Legal Writing.

Bruce Ching (Michigan State), was promoted to Associate Clinical Professor of Law.

David R. Cleveland (Valparaiso), was promoted to Professor of Law and awarded tenure.

Sabrina DeFabritiis (Suffolk), was elected Secretary for the Legal Writing, Reasoning, and Research Section of the AALS.

Joan Foley (Touro Law Center), was sworn in as Secretary- Officer of the Federal Bar Association - Eastern District of New York Chapter on October 6, 2014.

Gary Gulliver (Michigan State), retired in April 2015 after 11 years teaching at Michigan State University College of Law.

Rebekah Hanley (Oregon), is returning to the faculty after serving for four years as Assistant Dean of the Center for Career and Professional Development. She will be teaching courses in legal writing and legal profession.

Wendy Adele Humphrey (Texas Tech), has been appointed to a three-year term on the Negotiation Competition Subcommittee of the ABA Law Student Division's Competitions Committee; elected as Treasurer of Law-Focused Education, Inc., which is the non-profit that oversees the law-related education division of the State Bar of Texas; serves on the national program awards committee for the American Inns of Court. This prestigious committee evaluates programming submitted by Inns all over the nation; and was elected as a member-at-large on the Executive Committee of the AALS section on Legal Writing, Research and Reasoning.

Regina Ramsey James (SULC-Baton Rouge), was promoted to Associate Professor of Legal Analysis and Writing (presumptively renewable 5-year contract).

Lucy Jewel (Tennessee), was elected to the ALWD Board of Directors; she was also appointed to the LWI Professional Status Committee.

Diane Kraft (Kentucky), was promoted to Assistant Professor of Legal Research & Writing, was awarded a 5-year contract.

Faisal Kutty (Valparaiso), was promoted to Associate Professor and appointed Director, International LL.M. Program.

Lisa Mazzie (Marquette), was promoted to Professor of Legal Writing.

Megan McAlpin (Oregon), was elected to the Board of the Association of Legal writing Directors (ALWD).

Sarah J. Morath (Akron), was promoted to Associate Professor of Legal Writing with a preemptively renewable 5 year contract.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Promotions, Moves, Milestones & Other News, continued

Kristen Murray (Temple), was promoted to Professor of Law.

Michael D. Murray (Valparaiso), will join the faculty of Michigan Law School as a Visiting Professor in the Legal Practice Program (2015-16).

Mark Osbeck (Michigan), was promoted to Clinical Professor of Law (full professor rank), with clinical tenure, at the University of Michigan Law School.

Abigail Patthoff (Chapman), was promoted to Professor of Legal Research and Writing.

Sara Rankin (Seattle), with the support of Bob Chang and Lori Bannai, has launched the Homeless Rights Advocacy Project (HRAP) within the Korematsu Center. HRAP engages law students in effective legal and policy research, analysis, and advocacy work to advance the rights of homeless adults, youth, and children. HRAP builds partnerships across a broad range of disciplines with community members, advocates, academic institutions, and other stakeholders to advance the rights of homeless people. HRAP also develops strategic partnerships between SU students and other law school faculty. Sara was interviewed by Alyssa Figueroa of AlterNet media regarding the research and analysis she and her students are doing on the criminalization of homelessness.

Sara Rankin (Seattle), gave several press and media interviews: *Real Change*, <http://realchangenews.org/2015/04/01/seattle-university-students-build-resource-stop-laws-criminalize-homelessness>; *CrossCut Public Media*, <http://www.stitcher.com/podcast/httpwwwstitchercompod-castadryrain/crosscuts-the->

[crosscut-podcast/e/who-is-homeless-37085578](http://www.seattlespectator.com/2015/02/04/after-21-homelessness-increase-seattle-looks-for-solutions/); *Alternet*, <http://www.alternet.org/civil-liberties/guess-which-liberal-state-has-500-laws-aimed-oppressing-homeless>; *SU Spectator*, <http://www.seattlespectator.com/2015/02/04/after-21-homelessness-increase-seattle-looks-for-solutions/>. Sara had her homeless rights advocacy course mentioned in two articles: in *Alternet* and the *SU Spectator*. Week of February 23, 2015.

Joan Rocklin (Oregon), is serving as the Academic Achievement Specialist. She continues to teach in the Legal Research and Writing Program and to teach bar prep courses.

Suzanne Rowe (Oregon), has been named the Director of Externships, a role she will fill in addition to her current work teaching in and directing the Legal Research and Writing Program.

At the AALS Annual Meeting in Washington, DC, **Suzanne Rowe** (Oregon) organized gatherings for new directors and mid-level directors, along with members of ALWD's New Directors and Leadership Committees.

Seattle University School of Law's Legal Writing Program was ranked #1 in the country by U.S. News & World Report.

Wendy Shea (Southern), was promoted to Associate Professor of Legal Analysis & Writing with presumptively renewable 5-year contracts.

Paul Stokstad (Michigan State), was promoted to Associate Clinical Professor of Law with a 3 yr. rolling contract.

Mark Strickland (Howard), was featured in May's edition of LWI

Lives, <http://www.seattlespectator.com/2015/02/04/after-21-homelessness-increase-seattle-looks-for-solutions/>.

Suffolk University's Legal Writing Program was ranked among the top 10 in the country in U.S. News & World Report.

David Thomson (Denver), was elected to a three year term on the Board of Directors of the Center for Computer Assisted Legal Instruction (CALI) (at AALS in January). David was appointed the inaugural John C. Dwan Chair in Online Learning. The Dwan Chair is designed to provide support for online initiatives at the Sturm College of Law.

The University of Denver's Legal Writing Program was ranked 7th in the country by U.S. News and World Report.

Valparaiso Law School's Legal Journalism course was profiled by the Chicago Law Bulletin.

Kathleen Elliott Vinson (Suffolk), was appointed to the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court Standing Advisory Committee on Professionalism for a three year term. The Committee is charged with overseeing the implementation of a mandatory course on professionalism for lawyers newly admitted to the Massachusetts bar.

Jodi Wilson (Memphis), was promoted to Associate Professor and approved for tenure.

Tracie Woods (Southern), was promoted to Associate Professor of Legal Analysis & Writing with presumptively renewable 5-year contracts.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Conference Announcements

Michigan State University College of Law RWA Program and Law Review co-hosted *Persuasion in Civil Rights Advocacy Symposium*, April 2015.




Liz Frost (Oregon) organized the **Northwest Legal Writing Conference in Eugene, OR, April 24-25, 2015**. Entitled "Legal Writing and Leadership," the conference began with a plenary that included **Dean Darby Dickerson (Texas Tech)** and Dean **Susan Duncan (Louisville)** as well as current and former Associate Deans for Academic Affairs **Judy Stinson (ASU)** and **Carol Parker (Tennessee)**. Panels addressed LRW professors leading in student affairs, moot court, doctrinal courses, etc.

The University of Tennessee College of Law hosted the Southeastern Legal Writing Conference April 17-18 in Knoxville.



The University of Texas School of Law was pleased to host the Scribes annual board meeting in February, providing opportunities for students and faculty to meet with and learn from Scribes board members. Texas Law is also pleased to announce the hiring of an additional full-time writing lecturer. When hiring is completed sometime in early summer, it will bring to nine the number of full-time writing professionals working in the school's David J. Beck Center for Legal Research, Writing, and Appellate Advocacy. The Center held its third annual Beck Awards on April 30, recognizing student excellence in legal writing and oral advocacy. And two Beck Center faculty, Wayne Schiess and Elana Einhorn, recently gave a seminar on judicial-opinion writing for the Texas Center for the Judiciary's College for New Judges.



ANNOUNCEMENTS

Upcoming AALS Conferences & Events

AALS Balance Section and Mindfulness Affinity Group Topic Call May 18, 2015, 11 a.m. to 12 p.m. PST. Mindfulness in Law Schools – spectrum of programs: Glimpse into incorporating mindfulness in programs and curriculum of 2 law schools (20 minutes), followed by conversation (40 minutes) University of San Francisco School of Law: Prof. Rhonda Magee and University of Miami School of Law: Prof. Jan Jacobowitz will each take 10 minutes to (1) describe how they/their schools incorporate mindfulness into programs/curriculum, and (2) share observations/comments about benefits/challenges/opportunities with respect to incorporation of mindfulness into law school programs/curriculum. We'll then have Q&A and discussion. Call Instructions: Dial-In: 605-562-0020, Meeting ID: 605-442-206

AALS Mid-year Meeting June 22, 2015 through June, 26, 2015 in Orlando Florida. <http://www.aals.org/midyear2015/>. **Teri McMurtry-Chubb** (Mercer) has been invited to speak on at the Plenary Session on Legal Education at the AALS Mid-Year Meeting in Orlando. Professors and Deans on this Roundtable will engage in a lively discussion concerning the many forms of gender inequality in law schools. In so doing, they will draw upon empirical data and personal experience to address various forms of intersectional bias based on gender, race, sexual orientation, disability, age, and socioeconomic class. They also will consider strategies for tackling these systemic gender-related problems in law teaching. Date & Time: 06/25/2015, 9:00 AM.

AALS 2015 Workshop for New Law School Teachers Wednesday, June 3, 2015 through Friday, June 5, 2015 in Washington D.C. <http://www.aals.org/nlt2015/>. At this year's workshop, participants will be able to share their experiences, and concerns both with each other and with a roster of inspirational scholars and teachers chosen for their commitment to legal education, the distinction they have achieved in their own careers, and the diversity of their scholarly and pedagogical approaches. These speakers will pass along valuable advice about developing, placing, and promoting one's scholarship as well as tips and techniques for successful student engagement and assessment. They will also address the often competing demands of institutional service and the evolving expectations of law students and faculty colleagues. For new Legal Writing faculty, this Workshop offers additional specialized training opportunities, including sessions on: designing legal writing course materials, establishing learning outcomes, providing students with valuable feedback on their legal writing assignments, and producing scholarship in legal writing as well as other fields. The workshop will benefit those in their first few years of teaching in any program in the law school, including clinic and legal writing, tenure track and contract, and visiting assistant professors.



From the 2015 AALS Conference in New York:
(back row) Mark Wojcik, Bob Brain
(front row) Kimberly Holst, Judy Rosenbaum, Suzanne Rowe, Jennifer Romig

LWRR Section Committees

The Officers and Executive Committee Member of the Legal Writing, Reasoning and Research Section want to acknowledge our members who have agreed to serve on committees. The Section's business would not get done with their hard work. Thank You!

Awards Committee

Rita Barnett	Chapman
Lurene Contento	John Marshall
Janet Dickson	Seattle
Eric Easton	Baltimore
Lyn Entrikin Goering	Washburn

Committee on Committees

Jessica Clark	George Washington
Anne Mullins	North Dakota
Jennifer Rosa	Michigan
Suzanne Rowe	Oregon

Program Committee

Mary Beth Beazley	Ohio State
Robin Boyle Laisure	St. John's
Joe Mastro Simone	Washburn
Susan McMahon	Georgetown
Samantha Moppett	Suffolk
Nancy Soonpaa	Texas Tech

Nominations Committee

Suzanna Moran	Sturm
Lou Sirico	Villanova
Mark Wojcik	John Marshall
Kathleen Elliott Vinson	Suffolk

Diversity and Inclusion Committee*

Hillary Burgess	Charlotte
Rachel Croskery-Roberts	Michigan
Anne Mallatt Killenbeck	Arkansas
Shakira Pleasant	Savannah

Outreach Committee

Howard Bromberg	Michigan
Aimee Dudovitz	Loyola, Los Angeles
Joe Fore	Virginia
Rebekah Hanley	Oregon
Marueen Johnson	Loyola, Los Angeles
Cathren Koehlert	Barry
Katherine Lyons	Loyola, Los Angeles
Cathren Page	Barry
Susan Salmon	Arizona

***From the Diversity and Inclusion Committee:** To date, the committee has discussed developing a resource guide on issues of diversity and inclusion in teaching legal writing. We plan to solicit topics from the listserv membership that we will then research and published on the LWI website. The guide will include articles, video links, and any other relevant materials. Also, the Committee will explore whether to include a section in the resource guide, or separate product, focusing on curricular interventions designed to reduce implicit bias in law students. The committee is working in alignment with the LWI Diversity Committee and ALWD.

LWRR Section Leadership

Officers

Chair

Jennifer Murphy Romig
Emory University School of Law
jromig@emory.edu



Chair Elect

Bob Brain
Loyola Law School, Los Angeles
bob.brain@lls.edu



Secretary

Sabrina DeFabritiis
Suffolk University Law School
sdefabritiis@suffolk.edu



Past Chair

Kimberly Y.W. Holst
Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law, Arizona State University
kimberly.holst@asu.edu



Executive Committee Members

Mary Garvey Algero
College of Law, Loyola University New Orleans
algero@loyno.edu



Grace Hum
University of San Francisco
ghum@usfca.edu



Lucy Jewel
University of Tennessee
ljewel@utk.edu



Wendy Adele Humphrey
Texas Tech University School of Law
Wendy.humphrey@ttu.edu



Disclaimer

This newsletter and related website are forums for the exchange of point of view. Opinions expressed here or on the website are not necessarily those of the Section and do not necessarily represent the position of the Association of American Law Schools.



[https://connect.aals.org/
p/co/ly/gid=133](https://connect.aals.org/p/co/ly/gid=133)

Contribute to the Next Edition of Our Newsletter

Did you know we get most of our information for the newsletter from you?

If you have photos, articles, or news about publications, conferences, presentation, moves or promotions; please keep a record of them. Our Secretary will be seeking submissions for the next issue.