



# THE LAW TEACHER

Institute for Law School Teaching

Spring 1999

## Go forth and prosper *The 10 commandments of externship placement*

By Larry Krieger

*I. Thou shalt love the externship, thy Program, with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy might.*

**C**reate a program you can passionately believe in, and support/defend it without hesitation. Articulate and address directly any concerns that you have, including consultation with adult learning specialists if necessary. If you doubt your program, who won't?

*II. Thou shalt bear no false gods before thee, but shall prosper in the Truth in all thy ways.*

Be alert to recognize and address directly any biases and assumptions that suggest externships are not responsible programs generally. If your program is designed and administered well, you will not have (long-term) problems. Avoid accepting negative stereotypes, and don't fall into the trap of defending apparent imperfections in externships. The best scholars and teachers have classroom students daydreaming in the back rows, and no in-house clinic is perfect either. Why apply the (impossible) standard of perfection only to field placements?

*III. Yea, though thou walkest through the valley of the shadow of uncertainty, thou shalt not fear, for thy Program is with thee.*

It is crucial to create a clear and descriptive set of educational objectives and methods, and to have them approved by your Curriculum Committee or overall faculty. Live by them, and amend them as necessary to reflect the reality of your programs. The inevitable uncertainty of some field placements (and supervisors) is a reflection of the reality of law practice and real lawyers and will not undermine the program if you have considered realistic imperfections in your program design.

*IV. Thou shalt humbly render the regulators their due, but thou shalt not bow down before them. And through thy steadfast righteousness it shall come to pass that they also shall believe upon thee and upon thy program.*

---

*Create a program you can passionately believe in, and support/defend it without hesitation.*

---

Develop camaraderie with the faculty and work against any we-they attitudes. Generate an educationally responsible program that

complies, at least largely, with the accreditation standards. Be consistent and confident in the administration of the program, and avoid reacting to negativity. People come around with time.

*V. Let there be no wailing, nor gnashing of teeth, over thy status or thy rewards, for verily I say unto thee that thence shall be planted many dark seeds in thy heart, and they shall be as a blight upon thy Countenance and upon the Countenance of thy children.*

Complaining can make you miserable, and is likely to affect your home life as well as your job satisfaction. Avoid comparisons you'll always come out better or worse than someone else. Work for salary and status parity, but don't forget to appreciate the great job you have and your chance to shape skilled and decent lawyers. If that's not enough, try remembering how happy you were to leave the old job for this one; and if that doesn't restore a positive attitude, consider going back.

*Continued on page 2*

### Inside

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Legislative simulation as a teaching tool ..... | 3  |
| Fresh looks at teaching .....                   | 5  |
| The value of rules and illusions .....          | 10 |
| Teaching as an interdisciplinary team .....     | 12 |

# Externships

Continued from page 1

*VI. Neither shalt thou bow down before the God of the In-house Clinic, for She is a True God, but She is not the One True God, nor is She thy God.*

One of the particular assumptions that creates a defensive posture for externships is that the in-house clinic is the superior (or, perhaps, only legitimate) approach to clinical training of good and decent lawyers. It is clearly the more established and accepted approach, but look out for the unspoken standard that a good externship must necessarily model a good in-house clinic. That is a setup for guaranteed stress, as you try to ignore, deny, or cover up the obvious differences between the two. The legitimacy of your program will depend only on its design, objectives, and conduct of the program responsibly to meet its objectives.

*VII. Thou shalt teach Goodness, Self-Reflection, and all these Truths to thy students, so that they may go forth and prosper in the whimsical Land of Externship.*

Look realistically at the goals of your program, and the general level of reliability and expertise of your field supervisors; then decide how much preparation and relative autonomy your students will need to have a successful placement. Prepare them well with these factors in mind, and if you can't, amend the goals or structure of the program.

*VIII. In thy dark moments quaver not before the plight of thy students, nor the fancy of their supervisors, but in all ways be true to thy Scriptures.*

Inevitably, some students will have problems with their supervisors. They may learn well from the experience if properly prepared, and/or they may need to be transferred to a new supervisor or even a new office. Work to amend the supervisor's approach (if errant), by reference to your published objectives, methods, and supplementary materials. If that fails, make the necessary changes to maximize the student's semester, and consider suspending the placement or amending the relevant objectives and credit award.

*IX. Suffer not the little accreditors to come before thee, for theirs is the Kingdom of Power and Glory. Neither tremble nor prostrate thyself in fear before them, though their ways*

*be vexatious and strange, for verily shall they lift thee up in thy time of travail, and shall anoint thee in righteousness before thy dean and thy faculty.*

Theirs is, indeed, a position of relative power; and unfortunately, different teams will have different approaches and attitudes. Try to learn the identities of the members early, and hope for someone with externship experience, or at least a minimum of biases. But remember a few things: If your program makes sense and you are convinced and passionate about its worth, the team is likely to see things clearly. And if you need resources, the team is likely to note that in the report, thereby encouraging the administration to give more support to your program. Few programs indeed have been closed as the result of accreditation visits. Approach the visit openly as a learning (and teaching) opportunity, in your own thinking and when interacting with the team. And communicate with the assigned visitor well before she/he arrives, to arrange for a cooperative and time-effective visit.

*X. Go forth in Light, and joyfully sow the seeds of thy placements upon the fields. For though thou dwellest in toil with the doubtful and the weak of understanding, thou shalt be delivered mightily by the Light of thy Program, and thou shalt prosper in the Fields of Externship forever.*

This should be the natural result of creating an educationally responsible program, standing confidently behind it, and avoiding negative reactions to possible biases or negativity. The worth of your program will be well articulated and supported for you by your students, alumni, and at least some of your faculty. Additionally, quality clinical programs are increasingly demanded from outside the college both by hiring attorneys and more skills-oriented regulatory standards. Stand clear and firm, approach difficulties honestly, care about your students, appreciate your work, stay positive. . . and thrive.

---

Larry Krieger teaches at Florida State University College of Law, 425 W. Jefferson Street, Tallahassee, FL 32306-1601; (850) 644-7262; fax (850) 644-5487; lkrieger@law.fsu.edu.

## Submit articles on practical teaching skills to THE LAW TEACHER

**T**HE LAW TEACHER encourages readers to submit brief articles explaining interesting and practical ideas to help law teachers become better classroom teachers.

Articles should be 500 to 1,500 words long. Footnotes are neither necessary nor desired. The deadline for articles to be considered for the fall issue is Sept. 3, 1999.

You may submit an article on paper. If you have composed your manuscript on a word processor, please also include a copy of your work on floppy disk.

Submissions through electronic mail also are welcome. After review, all accepted manuscripts will become property of the Institute for Law School Teaching.

Manuscripts, comments, and letters should be sent to:  
Institute for Law School Teaching  
Gonzaga University School of Law  
P.O. Box 3528  
Spokane, WA 99220-3528

The e-mail address is: [ilst@lawschool.gonzaga.edu](mailto:ilst@lawschool.gonzaga.edu).  
For more information, call (509) 323-3740.

# Use legislative simulation as a teaching tool

By Ronald Benton Brown

After a hiatus of about ten years, I started teaching Legislation again in 1996. I chose Popkins MATERIALS ON LEGISLATION: POLITICAL LANGUAGE AND THE POLITICAL PROCESS because I liked its focus on statutory interpretation that I thought would interest students, even if they had no interest in becoming involved with a legislature. Of course, studying statutory interpretation would inevitably lead into the study of the legislative process. I was, however, concerned that they might find the readings too abstract and dry. My solution was to plan a legislative simulation. Consistent with the approach of the book, students would experience both roles, law making and law interpreting. Thus, I planned first to place them in a legislative setting where they would enact a statute, and later place them in the roles of advocate or judge involved in statutory interpretation. My plan was to have them engage in interpreting the very statute they had enacted so they could see the relationship, or lack thereof, between the legislative and the interpretation process.

Years ago, I had attended an AALS workshop in which Phil Schrag explained the extensive legislative simulation that he was then running at Georgetown. He gave an inspiring talk, but I remembered wondering if the simulation would work if run on a much smaller scale. Before I could deal with that question, I agreed to cede the course to another professor. Now I would need an answer. It was clear to me that I did not have the time or resources to simulate the Congress, or even a state legislature, in a credible manner. I also realized that an even bigger obstacle was subject matter. If the legislature were going to adopt a statute, what would it concern? Topics that I suggested, primarily in the real estate area, got collective groans from the class. I was amazed that they did not want to fix the rule against perpetuities, but forcing my interests on them would have undermined the simulation. I solicited their ideas, but every student's suggestion got a similar negative response. Even in areas in which they admitted having an interest, most students (primarily 2-Ls) felt they lacked sufficient background and could not possibly fix what they did not understand. Shifting the focus to the substantive law underlying a legislative proposal would have been time-consuming and distracting.

Then it occurred to me that our one common area of interest and expertise was the law school itself. I asked them what they would change if they were the law school's legislature, i.e., the faculty. They certainly had some ideas about that! Moreover, they liked taking over the law school, even if only in a simulation. After a hot debate, they decided to reform the grading and examination process. Like a real legislature, there was a time pressure. The session would end in the eighth week of the semester. I warned them that if they failed to adopt a statute, I would have to pick or write one for them to use in the second half of the simulation; no one wanted that to happen.

They attacked the task with gusto. With only a few organizational suggestions from me, they divided up into committees (and subcommittees) and went off to do research. Over the next four weeks, I allocated part of each two-hour class to legislative meetings. The committees exchanged reports and drafts. People lobbied for particular positions. We had a final legislative session in class. The presence of laptop computers greatly simplified keeping track of amendments and the production of a final act. Finally, they adopted a statute. I acted as the clerk of the legislature. They gave me disks with all the reports and the adopted statute so I could make copies for everyone and provide each student with a complete legislative history.

The next step was for me to examine the statute and devise the problems, i.e., fact patterns in which the application was uncertain. That was less difficult than I anticipated. Over the last three weeks of the semester, we devoted part of each class period to one of these problems. Students might be assigned the role of

advocate for one side or the judge challenged to use the tools of statutory interpretation they had learned in the course. Drafting and enactment proved to be lighter work than the application and interpretation process that forced them to look critically at their own earlier work.

This exercise was very effective at sensitizing them to how difficult it can be for a legislature to foresee problems, even when it is well informed about the subject matter; how difficult it can be to draft a statute; and just how uncertain language can be. Since they had participated in both the enactment and interpretation phases, they could see how the traditional methods might, or might not, lead a judge to what the legislature, or at least this one legislator, actually intended.

This simulation does not introduce students to the ins and outs of Congress or a particular state legislature. It involves a unicameral legislature without established rules or procedures. It does not deal with the threat of an executive veto. But it is not so very unlike many local legislatures such as city councils or county commissions. Moreover, it was an effective way to introduce them to the nature of the enactment and interpretation processes in a limited time and with minimal obstacles. My experience, including comments on student evaluations and conversations with students, convinced me to repeat the simulation this year. This year's simulation is already under way, although the class chooses an entirely different project: reforming the processes of registering for and adding/dropping courses.

---

*This exercise was very effective at sensitizing students to how difficult it can be for a legislature to foresee problems, even when it is well informed about the subject matter.*

---

---

Ronald Benton Brown teaches at Nova Southeastern University Shepard Broad Law Center, 3305 College Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314; (954) 262-6165; fax (954) 262-3835; brownr@nsu.law.nova.edu.

# The play s the thing

## *Learning Civil Procedure by breaking the routine*

By Robin Kundis Craig

It s late October or early November. The newness of law school has worn off for most first-year students, but most of them do not yet feel completely comfortable with the case method of learning the law. In addition, in Civil Procedure they have been learning rule after rule delineating who can and who must be part of a lawsuit and what claims and defenses those parties can or must present. Only a few students, however, have begun to move facilely from rule to rule, from issue to issue, with any general sense of how lawsuits come together overall. It s time to break the routine and play a game of hot potato.

Yes, play. As teachers and theorists of education at every level up until college recognize, play is one of the best ways of learning. The first year of law school need not be any different — indeed, it is perhaps the only time in the future lawyers careers when play is possible. Properly organized and presented, play allows students to grapple with the complexities of law in a non-threatening and non-stressful environment; to discover loopholes, gaps, contradictions, and other puzzlements in the law itself; and to grapple with that infamous bugaboo of first-year law-exam-taking skills: the relationship of facts to law.

In my approach to teaching Civil Procedure, I schedule a day to review the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governing joinder of claims and parties right after my students finish interpleader (FRCP 22) and intervention (FRCP 24). Because I cover the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure more or less in order, my students by that point have also covered notice pleading and Rule 8, special

pleading rules and Rule 9, Rule 12 motions, counterclaims and cross-claims under Rule 13, third-party practice under Rule 14, amended pleadings under Rule 15, joinder of claims and remedies under Rule 18, mandatory joinder under Rule 19, permissive joinder of parties under Rule 20, and misjoinder and nonjoinder of parties under Rule 21.

Rather than rely on a dry review of the rules or even my own hypotheticals, however, I use half of Review Day to play hot potato. The equipment required is simple: something to serve as the potato (a real potato, a small bean bag, a toy, etc.) and a timer. The rules are only slightly more complex:

1. The professor starts the game by constructing a *basic* scenario, such as a car accident, out of which a simple (one plaintiff, one defendant) lawsuit arises. The game works best if the professor keeps the facts to a minimum.

2. The goal for the *class* is to use up a list of available rules before time is up. My list of rules consists of FRCP 8(a), 8(c), 9(b), 12(a), 12(b), 12(c), 13(a), 13(b), 13(g), 13(h), 14(a), 14(b), 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 (or statutory interpleader), and 24. I give my students 30 to 40 minutes for the exercise and use the timer to prevent second-guessing about when the time is actually up.

3. The goal for the *student holding the hot potato* is to come up with something that a party in the lawsuit can do and to pass the hot potato on to another student. In order to get rid of the hot potato, the student must: (1) tell which

*Continued on page 11*

# Technology has both good and bad sides

By John Paul Jones

Last spring, I succumbed to the siren s call of increased technology in my Constitutional Law class by preparing slides for projection on a big screen. I used Presentation by Corel, a software program virtually identical to PowerPoint. Slides for each session were certainly easy enough to create using that software. Within a week or so, my students had persuaded me to distribute after each class the file itself over our network, so that they did not have to write such extensive notes in class, and could integrate my slides into their outlines.

I am ambivalent about this experiment. Its most profound influence has been on the orderliness of my class. In first-year classes like Civil Procedure or Constitutional Law, I used to prepare each class knowing that, once we got going, the class might take me in a very different direction. Now I am confident that the students and I are completely subordinated to the slides and the order in which they appear on the screen. In Civil Procedure or Constitutional Law, I often found myself in the past teaching Corporations,

Criminal Law, or Family Law because the facts of the case, or the substantive law entwined with the procedural issues, confused or distracted students. This is much less likely to happen now that our script is on the screen. I don t know that I like shooting from a script better than improv.

A colleague predicts that I will be discovered a much better teacher in this semester s student assessments because I have delivered the product visually and with greater internal structure (than, by the way, I think the law itself actually offers, legal realist that I am).

The more I use technology, the more I begin to feel like a corporate trainer. For a reason I cannot yet articulate, the image of a corporate trainer in my mind is at odds with the image of someone preparing lawyers.

---

*John Paul Jones teaches at the University of Richmond School of Law, Richmond, VA 23173; (804) 289-8211; fax (804) 289-8683; jones@uofrlaw.richmond.edu.*

# Fresh Looks at Teaching and Learning Law

*The Institute for Law School Teaching will present its sixth annual summer conference on June 11-12, 1999, at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington. The conference will feature thirty-six workshops on innovative methods and creative ideas related to the conference theme, "Fresh Looks at Teaching and Learning Law."*

## Structure of the Conference.

The conference will include eight workshop sessions. During each session, four or five workshops will run simultaneously. Participants will be able to tailor the conference to fit their individual interests by choosing which workshop to attend during each session. The workshops address many aspects of teaching and learning in legal education, including methods and ideas for first-year courses, upper-level courses, clinical courses, skills and writing courses, and academic support. The workshops deal with innovative materials, alternative teaching methods, new technology, ways to enhance student learning, and means of restructuring legal education to foster healthy lawyers. Each workshop will include materials that participants can use during the workshop and when they return to their campuses. The workshops will model effective teaching methods by actively engaging the participants.

## Benefits to Participants.

During the conference, participants can expect to encounter many new ideas about teaching and learning in law school. Participants will experience a variety of active teaching/learning methods. In addition, the conference is intended to facilitate informal interaction among creative teachers who love their work with students. Participants should leave the conference with the inspiration and information to apply the "fresh ideas" in the courses they teach next fall. In short, the ultimate goal of the conference is to help the participants improve their teaching and their students' learning.

## Registration and Deadlines.

Attendance will be limited to fifty participants (in addition to the forty-seven presenters) to facilitate small-group experiences. The roster will be filled in the order that the Institute receives the registration form and conference fee (\$350; checks only; payable to Gonzaga University). Refunds: Attendees must notify the Institute in writing to receive refunds. If notice is received on or before May 21, 1999, a full refund will be provided. No fees will be refunded if notice is received after May 21, 1999.

## Lodging and Transportation.

Cavanaugh's River Inn — adjacent to our campus — is offering rooms for attendees at a reduced rate. To take advantage of the rate, participants must make reservations before May 10, 1999. Rates: \$62 single; \$67 double. For reservations, call 1-800-325-4000 or (509) 326-5577 and mention the Institute for Law School Teaching. Shuttle service from the airport is available.

## Meals.

Breakfast, lunch, and dinner on Friday, June 11, and breakfast and lunch on Saturday, June 12, are included in the registration fee. The dinner will feature wine-tasting and a Pacific Northwest menu at Arbor Crest Wine Cellars, with a panoramic view of the Spokane River valley and surrounding mountains. Because of hazards at the site, minors will not be permitted.

## Conference Workshops

### Session 1 (9:00-10:50 a.m.) Friday, June 11

#### Competition and Learning (B. Fines, Missouri-Kansas City)

[A]

As a result of this workshop, participants should perceive the pervasiveness of competitive learning in law schools, understand the predominantly negative effects of teaching which promotes this competition, and develop concrete techniques to address these negative effects in constructive ways. Participants will play the Attitudes and Assumptions Card Game, an exercise designed to help participants discuss and discover their attitudes toward and assumptions about competition in law school teaching and learning. In addition, participants will develop two techniques they can implement in their own institutions and classes to mitigate the effects of competition.

#### Health, Satisfaction, and the Lawyering Process (L. Krieger, Florida State)

[B]

This workshop is designed (1) to sensitize participants to the problems in the profession and in legal education; (2) to present aspects of humanistic psychology and addiction theory which assist in understanding the potentially negative internal processes common to law students and lawyers; and (3) to provide materials and suggest methods for teaching health and satisfaction in the law school context. Participants will consider a variety of processes common to legal education and law practice which may directly inhibit the development of satisfaction, health, and well-being.

#### Multimedia is Now...For You (H. Gibbons, Franklin Pierce)

[C]

This workshop has two parts. The first demonstrates three computer programs developed for use in a Torts course. One is a role-playing simulation of an intake interview in which the student "interviews" a surviving spouse and three witnesses to a fatality to determine if there is a plausible cause of action. The second program is an expert system that interviews the lawyer, asking the user questions, to evaluate the strength of the lawyer's products liability case. Third is an interactive exploration for the foundation, if any, underlying the Tarasoff case. During the second part of the workshop, participants will create a multimedia program of their own, using Shell Drake, a desktop, non-programming tool capable of producing extremely sophisticated multimedia programs with minimal expertise.

#### Using Attorney Briefs and Judicial Opinions in Legal Writing (R. Hathaway, Georgia)

[D]

This workshop shows how a legal writing course can use the court papers from a recently litigated case to analyze the presentation and use of mandatory and persuasive authority. Participants will be supplied with selected sections of the appellate briefs in a Torts case. Participants will then discuss how students can use these briefs to dissect, paragraph by paragraph, the structure (including via "IRAC") of the parties' arguments and responses. Reflecting an actual class, workshop participants will then receive the appellate decision to explore the benefits of reading a judicial opinion after seeing the framework established by the parties' briefs.

## Session 2 (11:10 a.m.-12:00) Friday, June 11

### An Interactive, Whimsical, Musical Exploration (C. Calleros, Arizona State)

[A]

The goal of this presentation is to provide a rapid overview of a number of teaching techniques in an entertaining fashion, with the participants alternately experiencing the learning process, critiquing various techniques, sharing ideas, and, finally, leaving the workshop with a sense of excitement about exploring more ideas in other workshops and in other settings. Professor Calleros will employ audio and visual aids (music and computer projections) and live demonstrations including a hypothetical question revolving around several pieces of fruit and a learning exercise involving a flamenco rhythm.

### The Eyes of the Beholders (D. Schmedemann, William Mitchell)

[B]

Several years ago, William Mitchell revised its course evaluation form, with the assistance of consultants in measurement of performance. In the process, the faculty learned: (1) what the core dimensions of law school teaching are and how discrete features of a course relate to those dimensions; (2) how student opinions vary over time and as a function of the student's employment status; (3) how diverse student learning styles are (as documented by the Kolb Learning-Style Inventory); and (4) whether students differ in their evaluation of male versus female teachers. During the workshop, Professor Schmedemann will present what William Mitchell learned, share the revised form, and have participants take the Kolb inventory.

### The Interactive Citation Workstation (K. Holloway, C. Hurt, & T. McKinzie, Texas Tech)

[C]

This workshop will be a demonstration of the Interactive Citation Workstation (ICW), a Web-based series of exercises designed to teach legal citation. The ICW contains exercises for each type of legal authority (cases, statutes, administrative regulations, etc.) and tracks the progression of rules for each group in the Bluebook. One advantage of the workstation is that students receive immediate feedback.

### Skills Training in Large Classes (G. Myers, Mississippi)

[D]

This workshop describes and illustrates innovative ways to incorporate a skills-training component into large classes, such as first-year courses and high-enrollment upper-level classes. The workshop will provide specific examples (including sample written problems) from Torts, Contracts, Intellectual Property, and Corporations, but will also provide general guidance on how skills training can be introduced at almost no cost in any large (or small) class. Several types of skills exercises will be discussed, including trial arguments, witness examinations, appellate arguments, negotiation exercises, and factual investigation.

### Teaching as Lawmaking (G. Minda, Brooklyn)

[E]

This workshop will explore five models of teaching: (1) teacher as judge/lawmaker, (2) teacher as lawyer/advocate, (3) teacher as collaborator, (4) teacher as scholar, and (5) teacher as critic/activist. Each model will be assessed based on four learning principles: (1) classroom assessment (does the model provide students with explicit teaching objectives and allow for student feedback); (2) metacognition principles (does the model provide students with opportunities to understand how they learn as well as what they are learning); (3) collaborative venture (does the model allow refocusing the teaching/learning activities as the course progresses); and (4) developmental principles (does the model permit learning to develop in a sequential manner).

## Session 3 (1:30-3:20 p.m.) Friday, June 11

### Evoking the Moral Imagination (M. Weisberg, Queen's (Can.))

[A]

As James White suggests, "(s)ories are the most basic way we have of organizing our experience and claiming meaning for it." Stories can help us put ourselves in other people's shoes and can help us hold a mirror up to our own experience, both essential characteris-

tics of sound ethical judgment and of professional development. This workshop will model how reading, writing about, and discussing stories can generate a meaningful conversation about teaching, one that invites participants to explore who they are, what they care about, and how they can bring those dimensions into their teaching.

### The Next Generation of Electronic Casebooks (A. Johnson, California Western)

[B]

This workshop will demonstrate how to develop a workbook that integrates legal skills, creative problem solving, self-directed learning, and greater interaction among and between faculty and students. The workbook can be used in both text and on-line formats. The pedagogy has been tested in the United States and Southeast Asia.

### Teaching Advanced Negotiation Skills (S. Peppet, Harvard)

[C]

This workshop will focus on teaching advanced communication skills in the legal context, particularly on how lawyers can combine empathy and assertiveness when they work "behind the table" with clients and "across the table" with the other side. The workshop will combine a short presentation of a theoretical framework for thinking about communication skills in legal negotiations, exercises and role plays designed to engage participants in the experience of using these skills, and facilitated discussion about the pedagogy of teaching negotiation.

### Teaching by the Problem Method (S. Shapiro, Baltimore)

[D]

The workshop will be a two-part exploration of the benefits of the problem approach over the case method. Part One will involve teaching the same material, first using the case method and then using a problem method. Part Two will be a discussion of some preliminary results of Professor Shapiro's ongoing research into the effectiveness of the problem method in Civil Procedure and Evidence courses.

## Session 4 (3:40-4:30 p.m.) Friday, June 11

### Bringing the Practical into the Classroom (V. Flatt, Georgia State)

[A]

The workshop will present reasons and foster discussion on why it is beneficial to bring "real-life elements" (speakers, clients, videos, site visits, etc.) into the classroom and will offer practical steps to accomplish this goal. The presentation will include a group discussion on the value and role of so-called "real-life" legal training, then will detail steps to assist teachers in making this happen, and will conclude with a demonstration of a session in an Environmental Law class.

### Criminal Law, Literature, and the Virtual Classroom (C. Lassiter, Cincinnati)

[B]

This workshop will demonstrate the simultaneous use of Socratic, lecture, and the problem method, using hypothetical criminal problems drawn from literary themes. This combination of teaching methodologies and electronic and live technologies permits the creation of a virtual classroom.

### Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning (S. Apel, Vermont, & J. Stern, M.D., Dartmouth)

[C]

This workshop is based on the presenters' experience co-teaching a seminar entitled "Medical/Legal Issues and Our Changing Concepts of Reproduction and the Family" to a combination of medical and law students. Educating students in only the law — and paying little if any attention to related disciplines — prevents them from making the best choices as lawyers and policy makers, because they both lack the necessary information and, more importantly, don't always recognize that extra-legal information may be crucial to an effective resolution. An interdisciplinary approach begins to address this difficulty. In addition to relating their experience in interdisciplinary teaching, the presenters will have participants identify areas in which their own courses might profit from an interdisciplinary approach and construct suggestions for ways to accomplish that.

### Net Teaching: Docs and Taboos (W. Slomanson, Thomas Jefferson)

[D]

This will be a Web presentation about teaching a course on the Internet. The workshop will begin with a description of the

limitations and advantages of various Web options for teaching a Net course. Then, Professor Slomanson will briefly review his Web course. The heart of the workshop will be a discussion of “pedagogical do’s and taboos,” including setting pedagogical objectives, learning styles and the Web, distance learning (two campuses v. intraschool Web course), what he learned the hard way, things he would alter, e-mail, and grading.

### **The Skills Certificate (M. Young, Luton (U.K.))**

[E]

The University of Luton is to be the first in the United Kingdom to issue graduates with a “skills certificate,” which will describe the skills that the students have acquired during their studies. Participants will be asked prior to the workshop to draw up a list of target skills from the employers’, students’, and university’s perspectives. In the workshop, lists of the skills will be compared and a skills profile will be produced. At the end of the workshop participants should have a skills matrix which they can take to their own institutions and adapt to their own students’, employers’, and institution’s needs.

## **Session 5 (9:00-10:50 a.m.) Saturday, June 12**

### **Conversation, Curiosity, and Creativity (S. Friedland, Nova, & K. Magone, Montana)**

[A]

This workshop actively explores how the American legal educational process would change if teaching techniques other than the Socratic method were used. Specifically, what would result if legal education were built on pillars of conversation, curiosity, and creativity? Participants will experience new methods of learning by combining legal education with the arts. Each participant will design one assignment for use in their individual courses which combines legal education and the arts. In addition, participants will observe assignments designed by others.

### **Eloquence May Set Fire to Reason (C. Wasson & A. Hemingway, Widener)**

[B]

This workshop will demonstrate the use of interactive, collaborative classroom exercises and course work in legal writing, oral advocacy, trial skills, negotiation, mediation, and client counseling. Both presenters, in addition to being licensed attorneys, have education and experience in other disciplines. Professor Wasson has a B.A. in Theatre/English and a M.A. in Speech/Communications. Professor Hemingway holds a B.S. in Psychology/Sociology and a M.A. in Clinical Psychology. Techniques and insights drawn from these disciplines can be easily and effectively incorporated into the law school curriculum to give students the skills they need to become confident speakers.

### **Injecting Legal Technology into the Curriculum (L. Cumbie, Campbell)**

[C]

This workshop will demonstrate two different approaches to the integration of modern law office computer technology into the law school curriculum. One approach is a separate course devoted to law office technology; the other approach integrates the technology throughout the curriculum. Both approaches provide students with practical, hands-on experience in basic networking concepts, file management, Internet browsing and downloading, case management, document assembly, document management, time and billing, electronic trial presentation techniques, litigation support, spreadsheets, desktop publishing, jury verdict assessment, and e-mail.

### **The Preparation and Use of Simulations (P. Ferber, Vermont)**

[D]

Simulations are a form of experiential learning. They lend themselves to a broad range of learning tasks, from learning “how to do” skills, to making complex concepts more understandable, to providing a context for understanding ethical and other professional issues. The participants will explore examples of issues which lend themselves to different kinds of simulations. The participants will go through each step in the simulation design process and then will run the simulation.

## **Session 6 (11:10 a.m.-12:00) Saturday, June 12**

### **Administrative Law Experiment from Down Under (R. Snell, Tasmania (Aust.))**

[A]

The Public Law Active Research Project aims to facilitate deep learning and student empowerment and to promote the learning of legal skills through active participation and hands-on experience in the area of Administrative Law. Students undertake a unique research project, singly or in pairs, that encourages them to interact with public officials and to apply a wide range of information sources to a current legal topic. The workshop will critically explore the methodology and theoretical justifications for this type of approach to teaching Administrative Law. The Public Law Active Research Project is an Australian teaching experiment which has achieved widespread recognition, now has a track record over six years, and has involved over 1,000 students.

### **Articulating a Theory of the Case (S. Herbert & J. Oreskovic, SUNY Buffalo)**

[B]

Using abbreviated legal and factual materials in class can help students understand the process of creating a theory of the case. This workshop is built around an exercise in which the participants will receive an abbreviated set of materials that contain some short statutory and/or case descriptions and some factual material (deposition or trial testimony, documents, or interview excerpts). The participants will formulate both the plaintiff’s and defendant’s theory of the case. The rest of the workshop will focus on how each theory of the case characterizes the underlying law and facts and on how the instructor can best use time for class discussion.

### **Sorry, Socrates! Thinking Like a Lawyer is Not Enough (L. Epstein & L. Cooney, Nova)**

[C]

The presenters will share their approaches for teaching litigation and transactional skills in upper-level courses. Workshop attendees will participate in exercises designed to foster communication by breaking down barriers and promoting cooperation and teamwork. The exercises will highlight cooperative versus competitive learning. After the exercise(s), the presenters will lead a discussion of teamwork, roles of team members, creativity, and competitiveness.

### **Using Clinical Methodology for At-Risk Students (R. Jones & L. Levine, McGeorge)**

[D]

The goal of the workshop is to introduce participants to ways to integrate clinical teaching methods into traditional classes to help at-risk students become more independent learners. One type of clinical method requires that students work with a faculty supervisor to assess their skill level and to design an individual program to improve existing skills to deal with the challenges of individual cases. This workshop will explore how similar methodology can be used to teach at-risk students the skills necessary for effective legal analysis and examination writing.

### **Using Web Sites for Teaching (D. Mandelker, Washington-St. Louis)**

[E]

The goal of this workshop is to show teachers how to develop and use a Web site in law teaching. The workshop will begin with a lecture and discussion of the following topics: (1) deciding whether to develop a Web site; (2) constructing a Web site (use of a law school home page, access issues, content, sources for content); (3) using a Web site (student assignments, class use). The second part of the workshop will be a demonstration of Professor Mandelker’s Web site for his Land Use Law course to show how to use it in class and for student assignments.

## **Session 7 (1:30-2:20 p.m.) Saturday, June 12**

### **Lucy Ricardo Wants a Divorce (S. Penn, Arkansas-Little Rock)**

[A]

Professor Penn will demonstrate teaching techniques through a simulation in which she will play the role of a walk-in divorce client seeking advice from attorneys. Workshop participants will play the role of the attorneys. The simulation provides: (1) creative, interactive, and fun learning of some areas of Family Law; (2) active analysis and application of statutes; (3) client interviewing and client counseling skill building in an interactive setting; (4) legal and ethical issue spotting in a pseudo-life situation; and (5) resolving ethical issues.

### **Putting Evidence to Work (L. Berend & T. Player, San Diego)**

[B]

The goal of this workshop is to demonstrate teaching the practical

application of the rules of evidence in a simulation course. The workshop is based on Professor Berend's Evidence course, in which students rotate through the roles of lawyer, witness, and judge during the semester. The workshop will include videos of selected classroom simulations to demonstrate the process of student presentations and peer as well as professor critiques. The videos will allow workshop attendees to contrast the students' beginning efforts with their more polished performances later in the semester and to participate themselves in the critiquing process.

**Service-Learning**  
**(M. Truthart, Gonzaga)**

[C]

This workshop has four objectives: (1) familiarize participants with service-learning; (2) explain the educational and personal benefits of service-learning; (3) identify and attempt to address teacher concerns about incorporating service-learning into law school courses; and (4) suggest possible means to evaluate the student's service-learning experience. In addition to discussion of the issues inherent in the four goals, the workshop will include videotaped, audiotaped, or written testimonials from students who have participated in service-learning courses. Participants will receive resource materials, including a sample Web site suitable for use by faculty, students, and community partners.

**Use the Internet to Create a Supplemental Classroom**  
**(J. Friedman, Tulane)**

[D]

This workshop will demonstrate how a teacher uses TWEN to create a supplemental, virtual classroom. This classroom creates rich connections among people to allow all participants to share documents and other information created by the teacher or student or located on the Internet or within the databases of Westlaw. Most professors who have used TWEN at Tulane for the past three years have noticed a demonstrable improvement in the quantity and quality of classroom performance, as well as an increase in their own ability to perceive the extent to which students are understanding what occurs in the classroom.

**Why Can't Jane Close the Deal**  
**(D. Long & D. Stark, John Marshall)**

[E]

The presenters define transactional skills as effective client communications (client interviewing, fact gathering, and counseling), negotiating, drafting, problem spotting, and problem solving. This workshop will contain a live demonstration of methods to integrate transactional skills used by the presenters in such diverse courses as Copyright, Trademark, Unfair Competition, Contracts, Property, Real Estate Transactions, Real Estate Finance, Commercial Real Estate, and International Business Transactions. These methods include negotiation and drafting exercises, incorporating transactional skills training issues in classroom hypotheticals, and creating unique in-class formats which dovetail with the transactional skills being developed.

**Session 8 (2:40-4:30 p.m.) Saturday, June 12**

**Context, Lawyering Skills, and Passion**

**(D. Maranville, Washington)**

[A]

This workshop is designed to stimulate participants to think about (1) the role of the students' passions in motivating them to learn and (2) the importance of context in learning. The presenter will link those considerations to decisions on how to structure law school clinics. How do simulation experiences and client representation compare to traditional classroom methodologies in generating passion and providing context for students, and how do simulation experiences and client representation compare with each other?

**Experiential Learning in the Traditional Classroom**

**(S. Taylor, New Mexico)**

[B]

Each attendee, working in a group of three to six other attendees and led by a facilitator, will design an experiential learning component for a class that he or she already teaches or plans on teaching within the year. Experiential learning takes place when a student observes behavior in the context of a legal process, participates in some phase of the process, reflects about what he or she has learned from the observation and participation, and then generalizes from these experiences to contextualize the theory and to see its effect (or non-effect) in practice.

**Teaching Civility and Professionalism**

**(L. Sirico, Villanova, & N. Schultz, Chapman)**

[C]

Professor Schultz will discuss her approach to using learning contracts in place of syllabi and how that practice encourages professionalism among students. It has been her experience that giving students a voice in how the classroom will be run increases both attention and commitment to the "rules" of the classroom and also gives students a chance to focus on argumentation, negotiation, and drafting skills in a context that has some personal meaning for them. Professor Sirico will discuss a program he presents entitled, "How to Excel This Summer: How to Succeed and Not Blow It." The program reviews how to write a legal memo and, more importantly, gives advice on succeeding in the legal culture.

**Teaching Law as Right Livelihood**

**(L. Morin, District of Columbia)**

[D]

Participants will engage in a mock class which includes exercises to encourage critical introspection and moral dialog. The Buddhist philosophy of "right livelihood" provides a paradigm for cultivating students' higher purpose in pursuing a legal career. While law schools can help students develop their right livelihoods in many ways, this presentation proposes four pathways: (1) Do no harm. Reconnect students with their own goals and values by fostering critical introspection. (2) Deepen the well. Cultivate professional ethics and values through moral dialogue. (3) Practice compassion. Cultivate collaboration, civility, and respect for diversity. (4) Do well by doing good. Foster a sense of public service in law school and beyond by integrating students' personal and vocational values.

**'Fresh Looks at Teaching and Learning Law'**

**Institute for Law School Teaching Summer Conference: June 11-12, 1999**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ Fax: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Courses you teach: \_\_\_\_\_

City/State/Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Check the boxes for the workshops you wish to attend (only one per session):

**Session 1:**  A  B  C  D

**Session 5:**  A  B  C  D

**Session 2:**  A  B  C  D  E

**Session 6:**  A  B  C  D  E

**Session 3:**  A  B  C  D

**Session 7:**  A  B  C  D  E

**Session 4:**  A  B  C  D  E

**Session 8:**  A  B  C  D

Enclosed is a check for \$350. (Includes all meals on Friday, June 11, and 2 meals on Saturday, June 12.)

Return this form and your check (payable to Gonzaga University) to:

Institute for Law School Teaching, Attn: P. Prather, Box 3528, Spokane, WA 99220-3528

# Teaching resources from Great Britain

By Gerry Hess

Readers who enjoy THE LAW TEACHER and who utilize other Institute programs to improve teaching and learning in law school should check out the National Centre for Legal Education (NCLE) in Great Britain. The NCLE was established in 1997 at the University of Warwick to encourage and support the pursuit of innovative teaching and learning methodologies in law. The NCLE has programs and resources useful to North American law teachers: the Learning in Law Initiative, a Web site, and a newsletter.

**Learning in Law Initiative (LILI):** The National Centre created the LILI to facilitate the dissemination of good practices and new materials in legal education. The LILI has begun a network of teachers at law schools in Great Britain. Each school identifies a teacher with primary responsibility for distributing information on teaching and learning. In addition to creating the network, the LILI will conduct annual conferences on legal education. The first conference, held in January 1999, addressed assessment of learning, teaching and learning methods, maintaining quality, and managing change.

**NCLE Web Site ([www.law.warwick.ac.uk/ncle](http://www.law.warwick.ac.uk/ncle)):** The NCLE Web site has several areas of interest for law teachers.

It describes the NCLE's background, objectives, and current activities. The Resource Bank contains teaching materials and ideas. The Directory provides links to academic and government organizations in the UK, e-mail addresses for legal academics, and a list of law journals available on the World Wide Web. In the future, the Directory will include a bibliography of publications in the area of legal education, book reviews, articles on teaching law, and government reports of interest to legal educators.

**Newsletter:** The NCLE publishes a newsletter twice each year. It is available in hard copy or on the NCLE Web site. The NCLE newsletter contains information about the NCLE's programs and short articles on teaching and learning law. The story in the box below appeared in the Autumn 1998 edition and illustrates the type of interesting and helpful ideas available from the NCLE.

---

*Gerry Hess directs the Institute for Law School Teaching, and teaches at Gonzaga University School of Law, Box 3528, Spokane, WA 99220-3528; (509) 323-5779; fax (509) 323-5840; [gness@lawschool.gonzaga.edu](mailto:gness@lawschool.gonzaga.edu).*

## Steps to learning

In general, students will learn more, and more deeply, when they . . .

1. Engage actively intellectually and emotionally in their academic work.
2. Set and maintain high, personally meaningful expectations and goals.
3. Provide, receive, and make use of regular, timely, specific feedback.
4. Become explicitly aware of their values, beliefs, preconceptions, and prior learning and are willing to *unlearn* when necessary.
5. Are instructed in ways that recognize and stretch their present learning styles/preferences and levels of development.
6. Seek and find connections to, and real-world

applications of, what they are learning.

7. Understand and value the criteria, standards, and methods by which they are assessed and evaluated.
8. Work regularly and productively with academic staff.
9. Work regularly and productively with other students.
10. Invest as much engaged time and high-quality effort as possible in their academic work.

*[This was extracted from a paper titled Ten Levers for Higher Learning presented by Thomas A. Angelo, The School for New Learning, DePaul University, Chicago, to the 6th Improving Student Learning Symposium, 7-9 September 1998, University of Brighton.]*

## Book on legal education available soon

A new monograph on teaching and learning will be published this spring. *Techniques for Teaching Law*, by Gerald Hess (Gonzaga) and Steven Friedland (Nova Southeastern), blends pedagogical theory with practical ideas for law teachers.

Professors Hess and Friedland intend their book to be a resource to help legal educators create challenging and interesting learning experiences for their students. This book contains two types of material. First, it summarizes foundational principles of teaching and learning from the

higher education literature. Second, it contains 137 specific teaching ideas, described by experienced legal educators who used them successfully with their students. The principles and ideas cover course planning, questioning, discussion, visual tools, experiential learning, collaborative learning, computers, simulations, writing exercises, feedback to students and teachers, evaluation of students, and the teaching and learning environment.

*Techniques for Teaching Law* is forthcoming from Carolina Academic Press, (919) 489-7486.

# Monday/Wednesday, Tuesday/Thursday

## *Teaching Torts, Successions, Jurisprudence rules and illusions*

By Steve Wexler

This semester I am teaching Successions on Mondays and Wednesdays. The law of successions is very formal and there are a lot of little rules, so on Mondays and Wednesdays I wind up saying things to my students like the following:

*In order to be valid, a will must be signed or acknowledged by the testator in the joint presence of two witnesses. Joint presence means the witnesses must be present together at the same time.*

*If a beneficiary under a will or the spouse of a beneficiary acts as a witness to the will, the will is valid, but the gift to that beneficiary is void, unless there are at least two other witnesses.*

At the end of each chapter I give a non-credit short-answer, multiple-choice quiz as a review. One of the questions on one of the quizzes is:

If it is proven beyond question that there is a mistake in a will, a court of probate may:

- a. Add words to the will.
- b. Change words in the will.
- c. Strike out words in the will.
- d. Do whatever is necessary to make the will reflect the intention of the testator.

**Circle any correct answer.**

On Tuesday and Thursday mornings I teach Torts. I teach it from the perspective of an event that occurred when I was 16 years old. My parents made a birthday party for me. I was dating a girl named Judy and I succeeded in getting her off alone in the darkroom.

My mom came down to look in on the party, noticed I wasn't there, and ran around the basement looking for me.

Stevie, you come out of there! she yelled when she discovered I was in the darkroom. Come out of there at once!

Judy and I came out, embarrassed and crestfallen. After the party my mother said to me, Stevie, you are **never** to take Judy in the darkroom again. Do you understand me?! You are **never** to take Judy in the darkroom again.

Soon after that I stopped dating Judy and started to date Susan. If you find yourself laughing, if you know the punch line of this story, it is because you understand law. You understand that if I had taken Susan in the darkroom and my mother had caught me and accused me, not just of being in there with Susan but of disobeying her express order, if she had said angrily, I told you never to do that again, I could have responded, in true lawyerly fashion, Oh no, Mom. You

said I was never to take **Judy** in the darkroom again.

My mother would never have fallen for that argument, and learning to be a lawyer means learning to make arguments just like that, arguments that no sensible person would take seriously for a moment. Law sometimes means taking seriously what common sense does not take seriously. Not always, of course. Some legal arguments are just a matter of common sense, but some are not, and the fact that an argument makes no sense does not disqualify it as a legal argument.

On Mondays and Wednesdays, I take seriously what the law requires me to take seriously and ignore the fact that it does not make sense. On Tuesdays and Thursdays, I do not.

Most of the rules in Torts do not have to be taught to the students. They already know them; everybody knows them. If without excuse you punch somebody and they get hurt, you have to pay them for that. If you take someone's shirt, you have to give it back. If you make a product to sell and there's a danger in it, you have to tell people who buy the product about the danger.

But nobody has to tell anybody these rules, and after you get past them when you get to a question such as whether a city has committed a trespass when it takes certain property by eminent domain and eight years later, the Supreme Court of Canada decides that the taking was void *ab initio* because one of the owners of the property was given only 18 days' notice of the hearing at which the by-law taking the property was passed instead of the 21 days required by statute there are virtually no rules. There are arguments to be made on both sides and terms that must be used by both sides in their arguments, but there are no rules.

Monday and Wednesday mornings in Successions, I lecture, from written notes to make sure that I don't miss a rule or get it wrong. Tuesday and Thursday mornings in Torts, I make sure my students learn the terms and how to argue, and I teach them the few rules they do need to learn, e.g., that in Canada there is a \$100,000 cap (in 1978 dollars) on non-pecuniary losses (i.e., pain and suffering). But on Tuesdays and Thursdays I refuse to pretend that the law is anything more than that. This means that in Torts I phumph around a lot, answering questions about whether the law says X by saying something like, Well, yeah, you can see it that way.

Occasionally, I do have to say as when a student (speaking with what she described as her socialist bent) argued that the court should find the defendant liable because the plaintiff was poor and the defendant could afford

*Continued on page 11*

# Monday/Wednesday

---

*Continued from page 10*

to pay the damages that certain arguments may not be used in law. The legal rule is *restitutio in integrum*, not from each according to his means, to each according to his needs. I am grateful for the occasions on which I can say such-and-such is not a legal way of thinking, because most of the time in Torts I feel like I am talking about the law in a fog and too often I have to say, I don't know what the law is.

On Tuesday and Thursday afternoons I teach Jurisprudence. I talk with my students about what the consequences of the law being the way it is are for morals and rationality. Here, there is even less to teach than in Torts. Indeed, teaching Jurisprudence is to teaching Torts as teaching Torts is to teaching Successions. I do want anybody who says they have studied jurisprudence with me to know a few names and words: Aquinas, Blackstone, Austin, Bentham, Llewellyn, Ross, Natural Law, Positivism, Realism, idealism, realism, romanticism, etc.

But other than that, there is nothing for me to teach my students. There is plenty for me to talk about with them and it's very interesting, but my students' ideas about morality and

rationality and things like that, their ideas, for instance, about whether human beings are naturally good or naturally bad, are every bit as valid or true as my ideas. I have been thinking about these matters for a long time and I have read a fair amount of what other people think about them so it's okay for me to be the teacher, but by the end of Thursday afternoon, I am nuts. Luckily, I don't have to teach on Fridays.

Incidentally, my Tuesday/Thursday position suggests that my Monday/Wednesday position, namely that the law of successions is very formal and there are a lot of little rules, is an illusion. I am convinced this is so, but I cannot escape the illusion.

---

*Steve Wexler teaches at the University of British Columbia Faculty of Law, 1822 East Mall, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z1; (604) 882-2194; fax (604) 882-8108; wexler@law.ubc.ca.*

# Civil Procedure

---

*Continued from page 4*

party (2) is doing what action (3) under which Rule, (4) making up appropriate facts as necessary to explain the new claim or the new party. The student cannot get rid of the hot potato until he or she has legitimately expanded the lawsuit.

4. Once the student has appropriately used a Rule (or more than one Rule), the student must *walk* the hot potato to another student.

5. Other students can volunteer to take the hot potato, if they want, but the decision as to who gets it next is entirely the prior student's.

6. Students can work in groups.

7. If the *class* uses up all of the listed Rules within the available time, they earn some prize. Prizes don't have to be elaborate. For example, I have allowed class to end at the same time the game does (generally five to ten minutes early) and made participation in the next class entirely voluntary instead of relying on my normal quasi-Socratic method of calling on students.

8. If the timer goes off before the class finishes the list, the student left holding the hot potato is it for the next class — i.e., the first person to answer questions.

9. During the game, the professor keeps track of how the lawsuit has expanded and what Rules the students have used. An initial list of Rules written on the blackboard, with the professor crossing off Rules as students use them, works well. In addition, the professor needs to ensure that each student has met all aspects of the Rule in question — including checking for jurisdiction problems.

The benefits of playing build-a-lawsuit hot potato are several. Academically, the game inspires close reading of the Rules and forces students to identify fact patterns that will allow them to apply specific Rules, an exercise that seems to help them apply the law to facts throughout the rest of the

course. The game also gives students a sense of how the Rules can work together — particularly when a student figures out how to use two or three Rules in conjunction, a feat generally cheered by the rest of the class.

Finally, in playing the game, students discover which Rules are easy to use up — because they apply in several situations and/or have tests or requirements that are easy to meet, like permissive counterclaims — and which are hard, because they apply to only particular types of claims and/or particular types of parties. In the auto accident scenario, for example, my students can dream up numerous persons to join as parties but struggle to create an indispensable party under FRCP 19.

The hot potato game has benefits beyond teaching details of Civil Procedure, however. First, it provides a welcome change of pace at a point in the semester when students' energy is beginning to wane. Second, the game shows students how to create their own practice problems, a study device that I encourage. Third, because I encourage collaboration, the game allows students to meet their classmates and to experience a sense of community effort toward a common goal. Fourth, when the class wins, as it usually does, students have shown themselves that they can, in fact, master Civil Procedure.

And finally, perhaps most important, the facts students create inevitably get us all laughing — something that everyone in law school can use!

---

*Robin Kundis Craig teaches at Lewis & Clark School of Law, 10015 S.W. Terwilliger Boulevard, Portland, OR 97219; (503) 768-6846; fax (503) 768-6671; rcraig@lclark.edu.*

# Interdisciplinary teaching and learning

By Susan B. Apel

Learning the law can be a narrowing experience. While many of us exhort our students to bring various experiences and other kinds of knowledge to their legal education, that exhortation stands to one side, rather than forming the core of our pedagogy. Nowhere is this more evident than in our curriculum. Law schools offer the occasional interdisciplinary course in, for example, psychology and the law, or law and economics, but most of our curricular offerings are the standard law-only courses.

Three years ago, my own cumulative experience in teaching family law led me finally to say out loud what I had long suspected. It is difficult, if not impossible, to train students to be good family law lawyers without some instruction in child development, or rudimentary commercial practices such as mortgages and insurance. We tend to think that somehow, somewhere, students have learned these things, maybe in undergraduate courses or in life. Often they haven't. This lack of knowledge and its negative effects were evident as I watched my students trying to negotiate settlements in a simulated divorce.

My observations led, in circuitous fashion, to my putting together an interdisciplinary seminar titled Medical-Legal Issues and Our Changing Concepts of Reproduction and the Family. The course has now been taught twice by myself and my new colleague, Dr. Judy E. Stern of the Dartmouth Medical School. The class is composed of both law and medical students. The readings are from medical and law journals, empirical biological and psychological studies, and popular media. We discuss issues such as egg and sperm donation, the cryopreservation of human embryos, cloning, and genetic diagnosis.

The seminar has been a hit, loved by students (both kinds) and, perhaps not altogether impartially, adjudged by its professors to possess great pedagogical vitality. And so, the logical direction of this article would be to further explain the considerable benefits of such a course to the students who learn from it. While that article is in the near future, the point of *this* article is to discuss something more unexpected, and that is the benefits of *teaching* such an interdisciplinary course. The benefits have been too numerous to recount; what follows are but some of them.

Even for an experienced teacher (and this is thought by some to be the unnerving part), teaching in an interdisciplinary setting is a new experience. Aside from content, the teaching methodology changes. Not only does one share the podium, one becomes aware that teachers in different disciplines may teach differently to students who are accustomed to learning differently. For example, extensive reading, I have learned, is more reflective of demands placed upon law rather than medical students. My colleague is an adept lecturer and uses visual technology such as slides and charts. Ever the law professor, I tend to

ask open-ended questions. This naturally leads not only to a mix of teaching activities in each class but, more important, has allowed me a regular and close-up look at an effective professor who employs methods different from my own.

Second, apart from the process of teaching, one gets to learn something new; for me, medical science was heretofore unknown, and unknowable. The learning curve is dizzyingly exciting. As the professor, one gets to integrate new information into one's own understanding of the subject matter, and the results are profoundly satisfying. Not only

does one learn for learning's sake (never underestimate the power of *that*), but that integration of knowledge reflects the student's own experience. The professor, therefore, gets to occupy two places at the seminar table — that of teacher *and* student. What better way to learn and teach than to do them

simultaneously?

Finally, it is rejuvenating to venture outside the legal academic world. Especially because I teach at a free-standing law school without benefit of a larger university community, the participation in another setting — a medical school — brings contact with different students, different colleagues, even a different physical environment. Symbolic of and testament to the otherworldliness of this experience is the human skeleton that hangs outside my seminar classroom at the medical school. Perhaps over time it will become as so much wallpaper, but for now, it reminds me each time that I have left the comforts of my professional home behind. It remains a little spooky, but I have the thrill of exploring new space.

---

*Susan Apel teaches at Vermont Law School, P.O. Box 96, Chelsea Street, South Royalton, VT 05068; (802) 763-8303; fax (802) 763-7159; [sapel@vermontlaw.edu](mailto:sapel@vermontlaw.edu).*

## THE LAW TEACHER

Volume VI, Number 2

THE LAW TEACHER is published twice a year by the Institute for Law School Teaching. It provides a forum for ideas for improving teaching in law schools and informs law teachers of the activities of the Institute.

Opinions expressed in THE LAW TEACHER are those of the individual authors. They are not necessarily the opinions of the editors or of the Institute.

Co-editors: Gerald Hess and Dan Webster

Program coordinator: Paula Prather

' 1999 Institute for Law School Teaching

Gonzaga University School of Law

P.O. Box 3528, Spokane, WA 99220-3528

E-mail: [ilst@lawschool.gonzaga.edu](mailto:ilst@lawschool.gonzaga.edu)

All rights reserved

ISSN No. 1072-0499