

NEWSLETTER

Volume 2000 No. 1
Teaching Methods Section
Executive Committee: 2000-2001

Chair: Terri LeClerq
University of Texas
Chair Elect: Vernellia Randall
University of Dayton

Secretary: Deborah Maranville
University of Washington
At Large: Paula Lustbader
Seattle University

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

by Terri LeClercq
University of Texas

TEACHING MAGIC

Saturday morning at 8:30 a.m.- who could possibly get your attention and keep it? This year's Teaching Methods section meeting in San Francisco, January 2, 2001, will highlight five master teachers who promise not only to keep us awake but also excite us again about the possibilities of good teaching:

Master Teaching Presentations

Allison Grey Anderson, UCLA
Darby Dickerson, Stetson
Paula Franeze, Seton Hall
Alan Michaels, Ohio State
David Sokolow, Texas

Each master teacher will present a 5-6 minute vignette of a typical class in front of a group of students sitting on a stage. After the short introduction to the individual's teaching style, the teacher will change roles and deconstruct his/her attitude, techniques, emphases and classroom goals.

Audience Will Peak Behind the Curtain

When the five vignettes and deconstructions are concluded, the audience will break into small groups led by teachers who have won Outstanding Professor of the Year. Each group will create a list of ingredients they believe form the "magic" potion of great teachers. Most of us know how to define a "bad" teacher; what, though, distinguishes a "good" teacher from a "great" one? Is it personality traits? Teaching methods? Tricks?

Full Section Membership to Be Polled, Included

Not every member of the AALS section on Teaching Methods can attend the national meeting in San Francisco this year (approximately 200 attend the presentation each year). Undoubtedly other section members will want to contribute to the national definition (s) of great teaching. After the session we will publish the lists generated by the attending members and encourage a discussion within the full membership. So begin thinking about great teachers you have known, or about great teaching moments you have experienced from the student's desk or the teacher's podium. And jump into the debate!

Specific Experiences Welcome

Collecting abstract concepts like "receptive," "interesting," and "challenging" might help us define better teachers. For the concepts to apply to our own teaching we need to understand the terms and have some general agreement about the definitions. As you know, definitions develop from concrete examples. During the January session and the open, published debate to follow, we encourage you to share specific great teaching experiences- this is an open invitation to memorialize a positive teaching moment in your past that might influence someone's future teaching methods.

TEACHING TIPS

From Kim Diana Connolly, University of Southern California:

"While not strictly "innovative" in the world of professors at other schools, I have used "Blackboard" software to deliver the course content over the past two semesters. Although repeated problems with the software and server made this a challenging (and time-draining) undertaking, overall I am committed to web-based teaching as an integral part of how I am coming to define effective teaching for me. In addition to (at least when the software was working) making content available 24/7, a web-based discussion can encourage written discourse, providing experience in what students will eventually be asked to produce on many exams (and actual practice) Shy students are also more likely to open up in this format. I would recommend that more instructors invest the time and energy into integrating some web-based content and discourse into their pedagogy.

I also use PowerPoint to teach each class, I have found it works well with my teaching style, and once I got comfortable with it, that it allows students to relax into the subject and really think in class. Note: it takes a while to get students comfortable with me flipping ahead a dozen slides to address an issue or question that they bring up in discussion.... the first time it happens they tend to think they are "interrupting" my lecture preparation. Once they see I am fine with jumping around somewhat, as long as we cover the material, they become more comfortable truly participating in class."

From Andrea Curcio, Georgia State:

“ To help students to better understand how the Rules of Evidence apply in practice, I supplement the casebook reading with a case file which contains pleadings, deposition transcripts, documents and jury instructions on the relevant law. Throughout the semester, we do problems based on the case file. This allows students to think about how a rule of evidence may or may not apply given a particular theory of the case and the law that governs the action. It also allows students to begin to think about how the Rules fit together. For example, early in the semester, students identify information that may be relevant. Later, we return to the same information and discuss how it may be excluded because it is character evidence. As the semester goes on, we do problems from the file that pull all of the concepts we have learned together. For example, we are using a sexual harassment file this semester. In that file, the alleged harasser received a series of extremely positive workplace evaluations. In one class we discussed introducing the evaluations. Through those documents we reviewed authentication, best evidence, hearsay and relevancy. When students realized they might have a character evidence problem if they wanted to admit evaluations to show the employer was a good worker and thus not the type to harass co-workers, they tended to think about another theory of admissibility. Thinking about alternative theories was easier because they had the problem in context of the entire case. In essence, having the case file allows students to think about evidentiary problems in the same way they will be thinking about them when they practice.

At the end of the semester, students must use a particular transcript from the case file, identify a motion in limine they would make, and then write a five-page brief in support of the motion. This exercise is 25% of their final grade. It is a good review of the material and forces students to think globally and tactically about the material they have learned. It also helps them to begin to hone their legal writing skills and to understand that not all briefs will be appellate briefs they may have written for their legal research and writing class.

Students have responded positively to the use of the case file. They like having a “real life” context for the legal principles they are learning. They also think the final motion in limine brief is a good thing because it forces them to review the material and to work on their legal writing skills.

I strongly recommend using a case file to supplement your Evidence text. It is not that much more work for the students because, instead of doing the casebook problems, they do problems from the case file. Also, a couple of case files exist which already have problems (and a teacher’s manual with answers) so it is not much work to incorporate the new material into your course.”

From Kristin B. Gerdy, Temple University Beasley School of Law:

“This year I focused on further implementing the principles of learning cycle theory into my legal research and writing teaching. A full description of what I have done is included in my ‘Making the Connection’ article.”

From Myron Moskovitz, Golden Gate:

Recommends the “problem method”. Very successful. Others should consider using it.”

From William Slomanson, Thomas Jefferson Law School:

“I incorporated the problem method in my class (Fed Civ Pro) and placed the problems on my personal Web site. Thus, students had additional access to the Web technology they will have to understand/employ in law practice. I do not believe that it is someone else’s job to prepare our students for the technological aspects of law practice.”

From Debra Pogrund Stark, John Marshall:

I have begun supplementing classes with pro bono opportunities for my students in connection with the topics covered in class. For example, two of my students in my real estate transactions class are working with me to review the documents Habitat for Humanity uses with prospective home purchasers for purposes of federal laws and the ability to assign the loans and take advantage of the secondary mortgage market. The students are reviewing the documents with me, researching the law and assisting in writing the opinion to be sent to the client. I also offer students who have completed the course the opportunity to assist an attorney representing low-income home purchasers on a pro bono basis under my supervision and the attorney’s supervision. These guided pro bono experiences give students a chance to put into practice what they have learned in class and to see how legal principles get applied to help clients. It also gives them a sense of the importance of and satisfaction you can derive from doing pro bono work.”

From Nancy A. Wanderer, Maine:

“ I have tried to bring as many judges and lawyers to the class as possible. During the first eight weeks we work with an actual Maine Supreme Judicial Court case that is on appeal. I teach the students to write a bench memo on the case using the actual parties’ briefs. Then I invite the lawyers from both sides to come to class and talk about the case with the students. Finally, the entire class (80 or so students) attends the actual oral argument. After the argument, right in the courtroom, the lawyers talk with the students again and process their impression of how the argument went. A few weeks ago, the court issued an opinion and we were able to dissect it and determine the probable impact the opinion will have on future cases.

I have also brought in a lawyer each year who has argued in the United States Supreme Court to talk about their experience; three panels of lawyers to explain discovery, motion practice, and ethical duties; the chief justice of the Maine Supreme Judicial Court to talk about what makes for a good brief or oral argument; and a senior circuit judge from the First Circuit to talk about federal practice, brief writing, and oral argument. Although these visitors say basically the same thing I have been saying the students really perk up and listen when they speak.

I have taught the student to use a form of IRAC using the colors of the rainbow. Here is my system:

I= Issue (Pink)

R= Rule of Law (Orange)

A= Analogous cases (or facts from rule cases) (Yellow)

A= Application (or arguments of parties in an objective memo) (Blue)

C= Conclusion (Green)

I emphasize that the order of the IRAAC is as important as having each of the “letters” represented. Students are required to “IRAAC” all their drafts up until their final draft by using highlighters (or computerized coloring) to show the various sections of their analysis. The students love the system; it’s easy to remember once they understand the logic involved. I find the papers much easier to comment on because of the colors. They allow me to get inside my students’ minds. We find ourselves speaking the same language. For example, I can tell the students that all cases should be introduced and cited in the orange and yellow sections or that they shouldn’t include any citation in the blue or green sections.”

INNOVATIVE TEACHING ACTIVITIES

From Charles Calleros, Arizona State University College of Law:

(See the description of his video teaching tool under ‘Presentations’ in this newsletter).

“Entering students have responded very well to it (videotape) because the non-legal context permits them to focus narrowly on facets of legal method without being distracted by new legal rules. The demonstrations and simulations set in non-legal contexts take advantage of universal student schemata, or shared foundations of knowledge, that students bring with them to class. By setting examples of ‘law-making’ in family settings, students tend to more quickly grasp the principles of legal method (such as indeterminacy or uncertainty in the law; the doctrine of stare decisions; and techniques of the case analysis, case synthesis, reorganization in an outline; and application of rules to new facts in the exam).”

From Kim Diana Connolly, University of South Carolina:

“ Following out-of-class simulations or role-play assignments, instead of ‘discussion’ among the entire class, I ask students to get together in groups of about six to eight. These small groups spend 10-15 minutes focused on particular issues in the simulation. I ask for reports back to the

page 5

full class, having asked each group to name a spokesperson that doesn’t tend to volunteer a lot in

the full class. These small groups give students a “safe” place to discuss their ideas, allowing participation by many students in the learning process and fostering deeper understanding by sharing insights with their colleagues.

The group-chosen spokespeople also help decrease domination of class discussions by a vocal minority, ensuring that more voices are heard on various topics (without me always being forced to ‘call’ on folks to get those voices heard).”

From Andrea Curcio, Georgia State College of Law:

“In the second semester of civil procedure, I teach the Rules of Civil Procedure. Along with the traditional casebook, I use “A Documentary Companion to Civil Action” by Lewis Grossman and Robert Vaughn. We use the pleadings, motions and briefs, and discovery documents in that book to re-enforce the Rules. Students really like working from an actual case. However, they often feel overwhelmed by the amount of material they have to read- the cases in the casebook, the rules and the materials in the Documentary Companion. This year, I will cut out a few of the cases we read. However, I have not found a good solution to this “overload” dilemma.”

From Jane Kent Gionfriddo, Boston College Law School:

“In my Legal Reasoning, Research & Writing class in the fall, students analyze legal problems and then write up that analysis in memos to a supervisor objectively analyzing the law and making a prediction of a result (s) for a client. During sequences of classes where I’m helping students learn analytical skills as they analyze the legal problem that is the foundation for the memo that they will ultimately write, I have incorporated classes where, instead of a Socratic discussion, I teach the analysis through a role-play with students.

I ask two students to come to the front of the class. They are a team of associates in a law firm (or other place of employment) and I discuss the analysis with them as if I were the supervising attorney. Throughout the role-play, I try to get them not only to understand the analytical skills they are struggling to use as well as the analysis they need to come up with, but also why, in the context, the depth and precision and accuracy of that analysis is so critical.

For instance, I might ask the students, “ well, is this just a general factor the court ‘considers’ or is it a ‘requirement’? How do you know? I was really embarrassed last year when I went into court thinking that something was requirement but wasn’t because the associate working with me didn’t know how to figure that out from a group of cases.” Asking two students to work together helps them feel more comfortable, and I’m careful, especially in the first few weeks of school, to be quite supportive, including turning to the rest of the class when I see that the two are really stumped and getting nervous. But this teaching methodology really helps students understand just what they are learning is so important in the real life context of law practice.

In addition, I've been using in-class writing exercises to make students get in touch with the human side of the problem they are analyzing. This works especially well because I tend to use tort problems. For instance, I use a problem based on a bystander's cause of action for negligent infliction of emotional distress.

Part of the analysis depends upon a bystander's understanding through his or her senses how the negligent act has injured the direct victim or a loved one of the bystander. If the bystander, through this connection to the negligent act, confronts the horror of what the defendant did, then the court feels secure the bystander's resulting emotional distress is truly severe.

In struggling with the court's explicit and implicit reasoning in the line of relevant cases, students tend to shy away from confronting on an emotional sense just why this "understanding"-or not-makes the court feel more secure or less secure that the bystander's ultimate emotional distress is the type that should be compensated. In working with the general principles, the abstractions that explain the analysis, students lose the sense of why these principles actually make sense based on the human tragedy went on. To get students back in touch with that, I make them write in class on a hypothetical problem as if they were a bystander at an accident scene confronting, through their senses, the injuries of the direct victim. Several students will read what they wrote- with a little prodding. When we then return to discussing the abstractions, students have a much better integrated sense of what those general ideas mean- and therefore a much better sense of how to develop and communicate the analysis of the line of cases."

From Terri LeClerq, University of Texas:

" This year I have added either a short music piece or outside (no legal) writings to each class, paralleling the class theme. Students love it, and so do I (although it is time consuming). If others want to try this addition, I suggest spending the summer thinking about and organizing the outside materials."

From James Levy, University of Colorado School of Law:

" I developed a legal research exercise that emulates tape recorded, self-guided museum tours by providing students written instructions for using library tools that they can refer to as they engage in their research projects. My technique is the subject of two pending articles-referred to below in the New York Law School Law Review and the Journal of the Legal Writing Institute.

Based on the student feedback, this technique is very successful in delivering library instruction to students at the moment they need it most, when they begin their research projects."

From Tracy McGaugh, Texas School of Law:

Along with Christine Hurt (Director of Legal Writing, University of Houston Law Center) and

Kay Holloway (Legal Practice Professor of Law, Texas Tech School of Law). I developed interactive web-based exercises to teach citation form to first-year law students. We beta tested the software at fifteen law schools during 1999-2000 academic years before making them available through a publisher during the 1999-2000 academic years. The overwhelming response was that using web-based software was more effective for teaching citation than in-class instruction combined with manually corrected exercises. Student citation form improved dramatically.

We believe that one of the reasons this was helpful is because the method spoke to the current generation of law students, which is accustomed to learning through interactive computer programs.”

From Cornelia “ Nina” Piliard, Georgetown University Law Center:

“I teach in a rather conventional, modified Socratic manner. I do seek to increase students’ engagement by doing class-wide oral arguments, and by getting students to break into groups to discuss a hypo before we discuss it in the full class setting, and similar techniques to increase students’ opportunities to talk and to “warm up” in subgroups before speaking to the entire class.”

From William Slomanson, Thomas Jefferson Law School:

“ Give (first year) students about one minute to refresh their recollection of each case assigned for class, in class. Before doing that, I select at least two playing cards (each with a students’ name on it, which they will fill out on the first day of class) to represent P & D (sometimes, judge, appellant etc.) This helps them to buy into a case that otherwise is not theirs. Thus, the two whom I will probe in their capacities as P & D are not as uptight about participating and there is much more student ‘buy in’ to case analysis during class. The advantage of the playing cards is that ‘lady luck’ calls on them, rather than the professor. As a result, no student can think that I intentionally or unwittingly call on the select groups of students. While my students occasionally complain that they now have to be more prepared than in other classes, they like the gaming aspect of determining who is going to be ‘called on’ for class discussion.”

From Lea B. Vaughn, University of Washington School of Law:

“As an experiment at our school, I have been working with a group of eight law students who are acting as “teaching assistants” in our civil procedure program. There are three faculty members who teach Civ Pro and their attitude to these programs differs widely. I am encouraging the students to write up their experiences so that we could get something published about this.

I plan to try out the domestic violence curriculum I’ve worked out in my employment law course during winter quarter, 2001. Basically, I’m going to introduce a client who loses her job and has other work problems arising out of the domestic violence she is experiencing in her home.

By the end of the course, students should conclude that employment law provides no real solutions for victims of domestic violence even though we know that holding a job is a correlate for successfully escaping from a violent household. This class will end in a mock legislative session in which we address this problem. My hope is that students will come away with at least three things: a heightened awareness of domestic violence, substantive mastery of employment law doctrines, and an open-minded hands-on willingness to engage in legal reform.”

From Richard S. Wirtz, Tennessee:

“ In Contracts I, over the past several years:

- 1) Eight Monday morning quizzes, counting together for 5% of the grade. The students are enthusiastic about this. Successful. I got the idea from Howard Bill at Arkansas/Fayetteville. I’d be happy to share the details.
- 2) This year I took the handouts I use and all the hard questions I ask in class and packaged them in a supplement to the published casebook. A lot of the handouts are easy problems. Very successful: best high-grade class interaction ever. Like writing your own materials only much easier.
- 3) To make the final exam more of a learning experience, and also to make it fairer and feel fairer, I will pinpoint on each question the area I want the students to discuss. Lowers the premium placed on issue spotting under pressure. Haven’t tried it yet.”

PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST BY SECTION MEMBERS

Brown, Ronal Benton. “Problem Solving and Advocacy: Two Separate Skills,” *The Law Teacher*, (Fall 2000). “Use Legislative Simulation as a Teaching Tool,” *The Law Teacher*, (Spring 1999).

Calleros, Charles. “ In the Spirit of Regina Austin’s Contextual Analysis: Exploring Racial Context in Legal Method and Writing Assignments and Scholarship,” *John Marshall Law School Review*, (forthcoming 2001). “Reading, Writing, and Rhythm: A Whimsical, Musical Way of Thinking about Teaching Legal Method and Writing,” *5 Legal Writing 1*, (1999). Note: “Since 1998, presented to nine audiences as a teaching workshop, including in summer 2000 to the LEXIS-NEXIS conference on Teaching Research in American Law Libraries.”

Connolly, Kim Diana. Environmental Law Clinic Design: An Exercise in Ecosystem Management,” at the Southeastern Conference of the Association of American Law Schools (SEAALS) Young Scholars Workshop, (July 2000).

Curcio, Andrea. “Court Room Visits as a Way to Learn Evidence,” *The Law Teacher*, (Fall 2000); available online at <http://www.law.gonzaga.edu/ILST/Newsletters/Fall00/brown.htm>

Delgado, Juan F., Perea, Richard, Harris, Angela P., and Wildman, Stephanie M. "Cases and Resources for a Diverse America (with accompanying Teacher's Manual)," West (2000).

Frank, Judith. "Lessons and Ideas: Skills Instructions in Large Law School Classes," 3 T.M. Cooley J. Practical & Clinical Law, 307 (August 2000).

Gerdy, Kristin B. "Making the Connection: Learning Style Theory and the Legal Research Curriculum," Legal Reference Services Quarterly, (forthcoming Summer 2000). "National Legal Research Teach-In," West (2000).

Gionfriddo, Jane Kent. "Reading Critically is the Foundation for Legal Analysis," The Second Draft: Bulletin of the Legal Writing Institute 14, 2-3 (May 2000).

Goldman, Pearl. "Beyond Core Skills and Values: Integrating Therapeutic Jurisprudence and Preventive Law into the Law School Curriculum," 5 PSYCHOL., PUB. POL'Y & L. (1999) (co-authored with Leslie Cooney).

Hess, Gerry. "Good Practice Encourages Active Learning," 49 J. Legal Education, 401 (1999). "Monographs on Teaching and Learning for Legal Educators," Special Edition, Gonz.L.Rev. 63 (2000). "Seven Principles of Good Practice for Legal Education: History and Overview," 49 J. Legal Educ. 367 (1999).

Jacobson, M.H. Sam, "Teaching to Every Student: A Primer on Learning Styles" (2000) (submitted to the J. Legal Educ.). "How Students Absorb Information: Determining Modality," 8 J. of Legal Writing (2001).

Joy, Peter A. "Clinical Legal Education for This Millennium: The Third Wave," 7 CLIN. L. REV. (Forthcoming November 2000).

LeClercq, Terri. "Good Practice Gives Prompt Feedback," 49 J. Legal Educ. 418 "Failure to Teach: Due Process and Law School Plagiarism," 49 J. Legal Educ.

Levy, James B. "Better Research Instruction Through 'Point of Need' Library Exercises," 9 J. Legal Writing, (forthcoming Spring 2001). "Escape to Alcatraz: What Self-Guided Museum Tours Can Show Us About Teaching Legal Research," 44 N.Y.L. Sch. L. Rev., (forthcoming Fall 2000). "50,000,000 Elvis Fans Can't Be Wrong: The Socratic Method Works," 14 Second Draft 5 (May 2000). "Legal Research and Writing Pedagogy-What Every Teacher Needs to Know," 8 Perspectives: Teaching Legal Research and Writing 103 (Spring 2000).

Liemer, Sue. "Memo Structure for the Right and Left Brain," 8 Perspectives 95 (Winter 2000).

Lustbader, Paula. "Principle 7: Good Practice Respects Diverse Talents and Ways of Learning," and "Conclusion: Adapting the Seven Principles to Legal Education," 49 J. Legal Educ., 448, 459 (1999). "Pedagogical Implications of Instructional Technology," on-line paper

from the 15th Annual BILETA Conference, (April 2000).

McGaugh, Tracy L. “The Application Process, The Second Draft,” Legal Writing Inst., Seattle, WA. At 12, (May 2000). “Interactive Citation Workbook,” (2000). Online citation exercises to accompany the workbook can be found at <http://lawschool.lexis.com/icw>. “The Synthesis Chart: Swiss Army Knife on Legal Writing,” Perspectives, (forthcoming Winter 2000).

Moskovitz, Myron, (Golden Gate). “On Writing a Casebook,” Seattle Law Review, (forthcoming).

Rowe, Suzanne, (University of Oregon School of Law). “From the Grocery to the Courthouse: Teaching Legal Analysis to First-Year Law Students,” 14 The Second Draft 14 (May 2000) (with J. Varn). “The Gordian Knot: Uniting Skills and Substance in Employment Discrimination and Federal Taxation Courses,” 33 J. Marshall L. Rev. 303 (2000) (with B. Busharis). “Legal Research, Legal Writing, and Legal Analysis: Putting Law School into Practice,” 29 Stetson L. Rev. 1193(2000).

Stark, Debra Pogrund. “See Jane Graduate. Why Can’t Jane Negotiate a Business Transaction?” 73 St. John’s Law Reviews 477 (Spring 1999).

PRESENTATIONS AND SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS ON TEACHING METHODS

Brown, Ronald Benton, (Nova Southeastern University Shepard Broad Law Center). Discussed implementing teaching goals as part of a teaching forum for his law school’s Faculty Development Committee.

Calleros, Charles, (Arizona State University of College of Law). “Using Demonstrations in Familiar Nonlegal Contexts to Teach Unfamiliar Concepts of Legal Method to New Students (forthcoming in Legal Writing, Journal of Legal Writing Institute). “I presented this to the Legal Writing Institute Summer Conference 2000, Seattle, WA. Accompanying it is a videotape, which is a teaching tool for class presentation. A description for the LWI newsletter follows:

“At the LWI Conference 2000, Charles Calleros demonstrated a class presentation that provides students with an overview of case analysis, case synthesis, outlining, and exam taking, all in the non-legal context of a mother developing rules for her teenage daughter. To illustrate the ‘cases’ addressed by the mother, Charles screened a video that he shot and edited himself, a video that betrayed modest equipment and limited editing skills. Since then he has received a grant from the Institute for Law School Teaching to hire a professional to reshoot and edit the video. He expects the new video to be available in November 2000, perhaps in time to provide some last-minute guidance and reassurance to students who are outlining course material and gearing up for exams.

Because the Institute is funding the project, Charles should be able to distribute the video to interested faculty for the minor cost of making copies and mailing them (he estimates about \$10 each). He can also e-mail lecture notes to users of the video. Watch the legal writing e-mail list-serve for details.”

Gerdy, Kristin B., (Temple University Beasley School of Law). “Teaching Research in Academic Law Libraries,” (July 2000). “I was one of four members of the faculty and advisory council for TRIALL, which was sponsored by Lexis Publishing. The Curriculum for the institute, which involved thirty selected academic law librarians from around the country, was an extension of my Making the Connection article on incorporating learning theory in legal research instruction. I prepared materials for and presented two sessions during the institute. The first focused on adult learning theory and the Kolb experimental learning cycle. The second addressed evaluation and assessment of student learning. “Creating Legal Research Problems and Assignments that Work,” (July 2000). Presented during the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries.

Gionfriddo, Jane Kent, (Boston College Law School), with Professor Steven Johansen, (Lewis & Clark at Northeastern). “Effective Classroom Teaching Strategies,” at the Legal Writing Institute 2000 Conference, Seattle University School of Law, Seattle, WA. (July 2000). “This presentation, designed for new teachers, focused on setting objectives for a class and using a range of teaching methodologies to reach students with different learning styles.”

Hess, Gerry, (Gonzaga University School of Law). “Active Learning,” Dickinson School of Law, (January 2000). “Faculty Development Workshop,” The National Judicial College, (April 2000). “Teaching Effectiveness,” Michigan State University, Detroit College of Law, (December 2000).

Jacobson, Sam M.H. “Using Learning Styles to Help Students Maximize Their Potential,” Biennial Conference of the Legal Writing Institute, Seattle University School of Law, Seattle, (July 2000).

Joy, Peter A. “Clinical Legal Education for This Millennium: The Third Wave,” Clinical Theory Workshop, New York, (January 2000) (co-authored with Margaret Martin Barry and Jon Dubin). “Withstanding Political Attack,” Rutgers Law School-Newark, (April 2000). “Nuts and Bolts of Evaluation and Feedback of Students,” AALS Conference on Clinical Legal Education, Albuquerque, New Mexico (May 2000) Moderator of the session, “Practicing Justice” 15th Annual Midwest Clinical Conference, “Teaching Justice, Practicing Justice, and Delivering Justice in the New Millenium: The Role of Law School Clinical Programs,” in St. Louis, MO. (October 2000).

LeClercq, Terri, (University of Texas). Evaluation of writing program, Texas Tech, (1999). “Incorporating Writing Throughout the Curriculum,” Catholic Law School, Alabama University School of Law. Importance of careful writing, pre-law program, University of Texas at El Paso.

Levy, James B., (University of Colorado School of Law). Presented seminar on “teaching legal research” at the biennial conference of the Legal Writing Institute, (July 2000).

Liemer, Sue, (Southern Illinois University). “The Future of Legal Citation: The ALWD Citation Manual,” with Darby Dickerson of Stetson University and Richard Neuman of Hofstra University, Legal Writing Institute biennial conference, Seattle University School of Law, (July 22, 2000). “Conferencing and Critiquing: A Legal Writing Teachers Workshop,” Louisiana State University Law Center, (October 15, 1999). “Teaching Conference, Washington, D.C., (July 2000). “Pedagogical Implications of Instructional Technology,” 15th Annual BILETA Conference, Coventry, England, (April 2000).

Mahon, George Herman, (Texas Tech University School of Law). Spoke on “Integrating Domestic Violence Issues into a Basic Criminal Law Course” at the Symposium, Integrating Responses to Domestic Violence sponsored by Loyola University New Orleans School of Law and the Women’s Center, Co-Sponsored by the American Bar Association Commission on Domestic Violence, (October 26-28, 2000). Remarks will be published in a forthcoming issue of Loyola Law Review.

McGaugh, Tracy L., (Texas Tech School of Law). “The Agony & The Ecstasy: Using Portfolios for Writing Assessment,” (2000). “Because I Can’t Isn’t the Answer: Using a Web Course Management System in Skills & Writing Courses,” CALI Conference, (2000). “Integrating Technology into the Curriculum,” Wakonse-South Conference, (2000).

Moskovitz, Myron, (Golden Gate). Spoke to Japanese Bar Association regarding teaching methods in American law schools.

Rowe, Suzanne, (University of Oregon School of Law). “Having It All or Doing It All: Teaching “Substantive” Law and Writing in the Upper Level Curriculum, Legal Writing Institute Conference,” (July 2000 panel presentation).

Stark, Debra Pogrund, (The John Marshall Law School). “Why Can’t Jane Close the Deal?” at the Gonzaga University Institute for Law School Teaching, (June 11, 1999).

Vaughn, Lea B., (University of Washington School of Law). “Victimized Twice: Integrating Domestic Violence into the Teaching of Employment Law,” Loyola-New Orleans, (October 27, 2000). “This was a conference specifically addressing ways in which domestic violence could be addressed in substantive and clinical classes.”

Wanderer, Nancy, Workshop on “Writing Better Opinions” for all Maine state court law clerks, (September 2000)

TEACHING METHODS NEWSLETTER

Clinical Legal Education Newsletter Vol. 2000 No.1 December 2000
Editor: Deborah Maranville 206-534-3434 Fax: 206-685-2388
maran@u.washington.edu