

Conference Program

Wednesday, June 26

- 1:00-5:00 p.m. Innovative Teaching Workshop – Room 357 (main room) with breakout sessions in rooms 304 and 355 (third floor)
- 3:30-5:30 p.m. ALWD Board Meeting – Room 433A (fourth floor)
- 5:30-9:00 p.m. Registration (first-floor lobby)
- 6:00-9:00 p.m. Opening Reception – Zilber Forum (first floor)

Thursday, June 27

- 7:30 a.m.-noon Registration (first-floor lobby)
- 7:30-8:10 a.m. Continental Breakfast – Zilber Forum (first floor)
New Directors’ Breakfast – Room 155 (first floor)
Presenters’ Technology Session – Room 267 (second floor)
- 8:20-8:50 a.m. Welcome – Appellate Courtroom (first floor)

Session 1 9:00-9:50 a.m.	Presenters	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Eric Easton, John Lynch, Amy Sloan & Nancy Modesitt	Greater Than the Sum of its Parts: Integrating LRW & Doctrinal Instruction in a First Semester Course	A panel presentation on the University of Baltimore’s Introduction to Lawyering Skills (ILS) Program, which integrates first-semester legal analysis, research and writing with doctrinal instruction in torts, contracts, criminal law, or civil procedure. The course has been required for all first-semester students since fall 2008, so we now have five years of experience with the full program. Associate Dean John A. Lynch, Jr., will cover staffing issues for an integrated approach to legal writing from an administrative perspective. Professor Amy E. Sloan will discuss various uses of adjunct professors, teaching assistants, and law librarians by different professors teaching in the program. Professor Eric B. Easton will discuss a three-week, legal method-like introduction to the integrated course that combines legal analysis, torts doctrine, and study skills. Associate Professor Nancy Modesitt will present an outline of a class on rule synthesis using cases from the torts casebook and writing the rule and explanation components of a CREAC.

Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Mary Algero, JoAnne Sweeney	Balancing Collaboration and Independence	Finding the right balance between collaboration and independence with your LR&W faculty can exponentially improve what everyone does in the program. Collaboration among individuals means a sharing of ideas and often results in brainstorming, which can lead to even better ways of doing things. On the other hand, forced collaboration can lead to negative feelings, less initiative and less ownership of tasks. Similarly, working independently puts responsibility on an individual that may cause the individual to work even harder at a task but, free from the ideas and experiences of others, the individual may not come up with the best way to do something and may not generate new, fresh ideas. This session will focus on ways to strike the right balance between collaboration and independence for LR&W faculty.
	Julia Glencer, Tara Willke	Avoiding the “Ping Pong Effect”: Techniques and Tips for Balancing the Needs of the 1L LRW Curriculum when Teaching Other Courses	Would you like to teach an upper-level course but do not know how to manage it while teaching your 1L LRW course? Do you already teach an upper-level course (or courses) in addition to your 1L LRW course, but are having trouble figuring out how to balance the workload in the courses? If you answered “yes” to either of these questions, this presentation is for you. The simple reality is that, despite the demands of a typical 1L LRW course, a number of LRW professors also teach doctrinal or upper-level legal writing courses. Teaching another course (or courses, as may be the case) while juggling the demands of a traditional 1L LRW course may be desirable for a number of reasons, but the reality of managing the demands of both courses can be difficult, particularly when both courses are writing intensive, and especially when simultaneously critiquing and conferencing with 1L students on their drafts. In this interactive presentation, we will discuss the techniques we have developed to avoid feeling like a ping pong ball bouncing from class to class with little idea of where we are going to land once we get there.
Room 246 (second floor)	Terrill Pollman, Judy Stinson, Linda Edwards	What Makes a Program a Program?	Legal writing programs are increasingly becoming “autonomous” or “coordinated.” In addition, many programs are becoming less coordinated or standardized. What are we gaining and what are we losing in this process? Is a program more than a curriculum? Is it more than the aggregate of its members? Is it standardization or meetings that make us part of a program? This session will offer attendees the opportunity to discuss these issues. We will begin the session by offering a few

			of our own observations and by posing questions to generate discussion. Most of the session will be spent exploring these issues through group discussion.
Room 267 (second floor)	Suzanne Rowe, Tenielle Fordyce- Ruff	New Directors Roundtable: Teaching, Scholarship, Service, and Administration	This informal, roundtable session is targeted to colleagues who have been directing a legal writing program for just a few years (or anyone who is about to embark on this adventure). We will discuss building relationships with your administration, hiring and mentoring faculty, designing and updating the curriculum, changing programmatic models, directing v. coordinating, including alumni in your plan, making time for scholarship, and how to keep administrative work from taking over your life. The facilitators are an experienced director (Suzanne) and a new director (Tenielle). Everyone is welcomed.
Session 2 10:00-10:50 a.m.	Presenters	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Susan Bay, Rebecca Blemborg, Jacob Carpenter, Melissa Greipp, Alison Julien & Lisa Mazzie	Directorless But Not Without Direction: The Workings of Marquette Law School's Director- and Coordinator- Free Legal Writing Program	Twelve years ago, Marquette Law School's legal writing program shifted from a directed, adjunct-taught program to a directorless program taught by a full-time legal writing faculty. The six current professors independently design their courses, formally coordinating only on major course objectives to promote smooth transitions as students switch from one professor to another between their first and second semesters of law school. They enjoy this academic freedom, but they also sense the detriments of duplicating one another's work and lacking a unified voice. Each of the six professors has a unique perspective on the program, as each has been here a different amount of time and has come from different teaching and practice experiences. On this panel, we would like to explore these perspectives, particularly discussing how the 1L and upper level curricula work, how we teach legal research, how we work together, and how we don't. We also look forward to comparing and contrasting this model with the experiences of audience members. In this interactive panel, our goal is to give direction to and gain direction from other programs that are navigating between various models of coordination.

Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Sherri Lee Keene, Susan Hankin	A Successful Marriage of Theory and Practice: Our Experiences Teaching Legal Analysis and Writing in Conjunction with a Casebook Course	In this presentation, we will describe a model for integrating analysis and writing with doctrine and theory in our law school's first year curriculum, and will recommend ways to include such integration into your courses. At University of Maryland Carey School of Law, the first semester Legal Analysis & Writing ("LAW") course is paired with a required casebook course, and both courses are taught by the same professor. Our law school's approach is also unique because our fall 1L legal writing course is taught primarily by casebook and other non-legal writing faculty. We will discuss why such integration is a good idea, and will include observations and examples of what makes this particular model work so well. We will also discuss some of the benefits and challenges of both the program and staffing models. The discussion will address the substance of these courses, including our experiences coordinating the content of these courses, creating and selecting legal writing assignments, and planning the syllabus. In addition, we will address the more technical aspects of this model, including our experiences working with doctrinal faculty and managing this type of program.
	Diane B. Kraft, Melissa N. Henke	We Are Family: Effective Ways to Integrate the Legal Research & Legal Writing Components of a First-Year LRW Course Even When Taught Separately	The UK College of Law's legal research and writing curriculum has undergone significant enhancements in recent years, including an increase in credit hours for the first-year LRW Course and the creation of three full-time legal writing faculty positions, including a full-time Director. One of the Director's responsibilities has been to integrate the legal research and writing components of the Course, which had traditionally been taught by different faculty (law librarians and primarily legal writing adjuncts) who reported to different directors and created separate, unrelated course documents. The Director worked with the library faculty (who teach the legal research classes) and new full-time legal writing faculty (who teach the legal writing classes) to implement measures that take advantage of the faculty's collective areas of expertise, and to message how interrelated legal research and writing skills are in the practice of law. So far, integration progress has included: developing a liaison program that pairs one legal research professor with one legal writing professor; creating a joint Course syllabus that includes all research and writing classes, assigned reading, and assignments, and does so by introducing topics in a logical and complementary

			way; creating one set of Course policies and procedures that introduces all Course goals; and creating research assignments that are tied to writing assignments.
Room 246 (second floor)	Jan Levine, Sue Liemer	Change from Within: Leadership for Law School Reforms	Legal writing professors have become more involved with, and central to, law school curriculum reform efforts as we have attained status as tenured faculty members. Many schools have been appointing writing professors and program directors to leadership roles in curriculum reform efforts and related activities, such as ABA Self-Study Committees preparing for a sabbatical site visit. Such roles have probably been based upon our expertise and experience in several areas: 1) knowing more about legal education than many of our non-LRW colleagues and publishing scholarly works about legal education, 2) our work on skills training and understanding of experiential learning, which have suddenly become fashionable, 3) the administrative experience and political acumen of many writing program directors, 4) the national reputations of our programs, 5) our organizational and leadership skills, and 6) our growing power within our law schools as a newly-enfranchised and important group of faculty members. The presenters will share their experiences leading and participating in such major multi-year committee projects at their schools; we will offer hard-won advice and suggestions for others who may find themselves in such positions.
Room 267 (second floor)	Cynthia M. Adams	Nuts and Bolts of Administrating a Contract Drafting Program	Everything you ought to know about designing and administrating a successful contract drafting program—well, as much as can be discussed in 25 minutes! For the past several years I have been administrating 4-5 sections of a basic contract course, taught by adjunct professors and myself each fall and spring semester. The course is one of the most popular electives at the law school with waiting lists in most sections each semester. Topics covered during this presentation: finding appropriate adjuncts; communicating with adjuncts, including use of collaborative websites to stay in touch and share information; designing course policies and syllabi (including balancing consistency among the sections with academic freedom); assisting adjuncts with developing drafting assignments and evaluating papers; and evaluating adjuncts.
	Emily Grant	Analogical Exercises for Transactional	Effective lawyers are comfortable anticipating contingencies and structuring their clients' affairs to provide a balance of flexibility for, and

		Drafting	protection against, the predictably unexpected. By developing accessible classroom exercises that incorporate everyday contingencies, teachers can hone students' abilities to anticipate and adapt to factual and legal contingencies, and accordingly, to be effective planners and drafters. In this session, the presenter will model an analogical exercise by guiding participants through an exercise in which they will brainstorm contingencies that might arise in coordinating a simple social function. The exercise culminates by incorporating the anticipated contingencies into contract format. Participants will then work in groups to identify other analogies that incorporate the use of familiar contingencies to teach students how to anticipate legal contingencies and draft client documents accordingly.
10:50-11:00 a.m.	Morning Break – Refreshments will be served on the second floor near the vendor display area.		
Session 3 11:00-11:50 a.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Wanda M. Temm, J. Lyn Entrikin, Teri McMurtry-Chub, Lisa Cannon	The Triumphs and Pitfalls of Going Director-less	As legal writing faculty acquire rights equivalent to casebook faculty, they desire more flexibility in how they teach their own courses. To meet this goal, several schools have chosen to adopt a director-less model as an alternative program design. Director-less models can be that utopia we desire where legal writing faculty are treated no differently than casebook faculty. But “going director-less” also has downfalls in the loss of a designated political spokesperson, loss of reputation, and loss of administrative functions. The panelists have taught at five different law schools that have either transitioned to director-less programs or are currently director-less. Each panel member will discuss the issues that arose to benefit other programs that are considering moving to a director-less model.
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Karen Mika, Ralph Brill, Catherine Wasson	Love Me Now or Thank Me Later? Programmatic Issues that Develop Because of Student Evaluations and a Consumer-Driven Mentality in Legal Education	Most law schools now regard law students as consumers, and with it often comes the underlying belief that law students should be kept happy, sometimes even at the expense of a rigorous curriculum. This panel discussion will focus on a variety of issues related to student evaluations including the nature of student evaluations themselves, the credibility that administrations often give student evaluations, and how sometimes long term programmatic goals might be compromised in order to appease conflicting constituencies for short term goals. The panel will discuss emerging trends in administration that often base promotion and raises on student

			<p>satisfaction, and the difficulties of upsetting students, especially given the current economic climate and downturn in law school applications and attendance. The panel will discuss with the audience the tension between a happy classroom and the need to train students for the real world of the practice of law. As part of this discussion, the panel will brainstorm with the audience about whether there are any solutions to ensure that long term goals might still be achieved when the goal seems contradictory to what is the here and now of the classroom.</p>
<p>Room 246 (second floor)</p>	<p>Richard Strong, Sarah Morath, Elizabeth Shaver</p>	<p>Motions in Motion: Incorporating the Carnegie Apprenticeships into a Legal Drafting Course</p>	<p>This workshop will present a collaborative approach to teaching three upper-level litigation writing courses that emphasize the apprenticeships identified in the Carnegie Report: legal analysis, practical skill and professional identity. We linked our separate writing classes into an integrated design that requires students to interact with one another within a professional context. Our classes place students in the role of plaintiff's counsel, defense counsel, or judge and simulate the three stages of motion practice: motion, opposition, and ruling. Because the students are asked to draft motions that will be opposed and later ruled on and orders that will be analyzed by classmates, students use and refine the legal analysis skills they acquired in their first year of law school. Furthermore, the integrated nature of the course gives students a better understanding of the complexities of working with judges and opposing counsel. Because students are enacting a particular role, they begin to develop a professional identity as they communicate with co-counsel and opposing counsel or interact with the court. Participants will actively review and discuss the course materials, including brainstorming ideas for appropriate course hypotheticals, and will leave the session with several useful tools for designing a course that will help students transition from the classroom to the courtroom.</p>
<p>Room 267 (fourth floor)</p>	<p>Craig T. Smith</p>	<p>Cooperative Hybrid Teaching: Collaboration Within and Beyond the Traditional Course</p>	<p>This interactive session will explore a cooperative hybrid teaching strategy. Such a strategy is cooperative in that it relies on teamwork among professors. The strategy is hybrid in that it extends beyond the framework of traditional courses, particularly through online resources. The strategy informs much of the work of the nine professors who teach in UNC's Writing and Learning Resources Center. For example, we: blend online instruction with in-class learning and optional individual meetings; partner with librarians and</p>

			with vendors of electronic legal-research services to teach research and related problem-solving; and coordinate with one another and with our school's information-technology experts to enhance the timeliness and attractiveness of educational counseling for relevant students. Such efforts present interesting challenges—and also promising results.
	Tracy Turner	Giving Students a Choice in Their First-Year Legal Skills Course	The traditional first-year appellate advocacy course and moot court competition provide students with a challenging, rich experience in writing and oral advocacy. To a large extent, these lessons are valuable regardless of the type of practice students enter after graduation. However, the Carnegie Report's call for coverage of a wider range of skills should prompt a reexamination of the appellate advocacy model. Is it really the best match for the average law student? While trial and transactional attorneys certainly need good writing and oral advocacy skills, the manner in which they use these skills differs significantly from the traditional appellate advocacy model. Why not tweak the first-year legal skills course to more closely parallel these alternative practice types? At Southwestern, we decided to allow our students to select between the traditional appellate advocacy first-year LRW course and two alternative tracks: trial practice and negotiation. We also now run three parallel 1L intramural competitions and three upper-division intermural teams to match the three tracks. I will discuss the challenges we encountered along the way including, for example, staffing, selection process, cultural resistance, intramural logistics, and problem design.
12:00-1:30 p.m.	ALWD Membership Meeting, ABA Standards Update & Scholarship Grant Awards - Appellate Courtroom (first floor). Pick up a boxed lunch in the Zilber forum to take with you to the membership meeting.		
Session 4 1:40-2:30 p.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Joseph Mastrosimone, Emily Grant, Jeffrey Jackson, Tonya Kowlaski	Meow! Meow!: Ways to Herd Cats and Coordinate in a Directorless Program	There are many models for successful legal research and writing programs. One of those is a so-called directorless program. Like the label implies, in a directorless program there is no one person setting the agenda, the goals, the structure, etc. of the legal writing program. Washburn University School of Law has successfully run such a program. While the program has no formal director there are many ways in which the faculty coordinate – both formal and informal – to ensure cohesion within the program. This panel presentation will feature a discussion of the ways that the Washburn faculty have coordinated with

			<p>the hope of sparking a wider conversation with the attendees about other avenues of coordination. The goal of the presentation is to (1) provide assistance to other programs contemplating moving to a directorless model and (2) provide information sharing for those programs already operating without a formal director.</p>
	Christine Rollins	How to successfully lead a “Closely Supervised” department model	<p>Much like herding cats, leading a writing department as described by the ABA Sourcebook as “Closely Supervised,” has its challenges. However, there are infinitely more rewards that come from training and mentoring eager and caring individuals into master level teachers. In this interactive session, participants will receive structured outlines for mentoring and professional development for faculty from their first year as teachers through their fifth year.</p>
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Anne Kringel, Sarah Ricks, Jessica Simon	A Realistic Simulation to Integrate Interviewing, Counseling, Negotiation, and Drafting into the First-Year Course	<p>This year we launched a new 6-credit Legal Writing course at Penn, designed to introduce client interviewing and counseling, negotiation, and contract drafting while also enhancing our teaching of analysis, writing, research, and oral presentation. We did it by designing a series of course modules—classes, exercises, and assignments—built around a realistic franchise relationship. The simulation used a real company in a real location with real documents. It allowed the students to play the role of transactional lawyers as they worked with their clients and opposing counsel to finalize the franchise agreement, and as litigators when a conflict eventually arose between the parties. Along the way, they composed interview questions, conducted research on the company involved, counseled their clients in email communications, summarized research findings to a supervising attorney, negotiated a term of the contract, drafted the contract provision, and argued a motion for a preliminary injunction. We will share the teaching methods and materials we used so you can replicate all or part of the simulation.</p>
Room 246 (second floor)	Mary T. Nagel, Jamie A. Kleppetsch	Planting the Seed – Showing the Doctrinal Faculty How Easy (and Effective) It Is to Incorporate Legal Writing and Academic Achievement into Their Courses	<p>We’ve all heard the benefits of assessment and practical exercises for our students from such respected sources as “Best Practices,” “The MacCrate Report,” “The Carnegie Report,” and the proposed amendments to the American Bar Association accreditation standards. These sea changes are inevitable. Our focus will show doctrinal faculty how adding such assessments and practical writing elements to their teaching will actually improve student understanding of the material. We will demonstrate how doctrinal classes can easily incorporate legal writing and</p>

			drafting as well as academic achievement with minimal upheaval and limited additional preparation time.
	Ruth Vance, Susan Stuart	The Academically Underprepared Law Student: How Legal Writing Professors Gained Street Cred and Influenced a Faculty to Overhaul the Law School Curriculum	First, we will briefly describe our findings from research we did to figure out why, for the last few years, the students coming to our law school were not performing as well as they had in the past. Both legal writing and doctrinal faculty observed this phenomenon and were puzzled. We found from three different studies of American students in or recently graduated from college that proficiency in core learning outcomes espoused by higher education – critical thinking, analytical reasoning, problem-solving, and writing – has declined significantly. We can no longer assume our law students bring these skills to law school. Additionally, we discovered that neuroscientists are reaching new conclusions about the brain’s development in our twenty-something students. The record number of students in higher education and the current economic conditions have contributed to creating a new life stage – emerging adulthood. On top of this, the profession is asking law schools to graduate “practice ready” lawyers. Traditional legal education, alone, is largely unsuccessful with our underprepared emerging adult students. We reported our findings to the faculty and got buy-in to overhaul the law school’s curriculum in response. The result is that legal writing professors are leading curricular reform that is being embraced by the majority of the faculty.
Room 267 (second floor)	Olympia Duhart	Best of Both Worlds: Using LRW Teaching Methods in the Doctrinal Classroom	As law schools scramble to develop better formative assessment tools and self-regulated learners, the legal research and writing instructor can provide special guidance. This session will address the multiple ways legal research and writing experience can positively impact the larger law school curriculum. Specifically, this presentation will highlight teaching strategies and assessment tools that can be imported from the LRW classroom into traditional doctrinal courses. It was also offer advice for LRW instructors moving into or interested in moving into doctrinal courses. This interactive workshop will feature discussions led by the presenter and practice by participants.
	Tonya Kowalski	Mind the Gap: Preparing Students for Experiential Learning with a Legal Writing Intersession Course	At most law schools, Legal Writing is a two-semester course covering primarily motions and briefs. Most students will not have either the drive or opportunity to take intensive, upper-division legal writing courses. Yet they need to continue to build their repertoire of skills and portfolio of work

			product in order to survive in the workplace. Increasingly, the workplace no longer consists of summer clerkships, but of live-client clinics, a wide spectrum of externship types, and part-time work at local firms during the semester. One way to expose more students to an array of common litigation practice documents and their related skill sets is an intensive, 4-5 day intersession course during winter and spring. This short presentation will review Washburn's new 4-day intersession course, "Legal Writing for Clerkships and Externships," in which students worked on a single problem that generated the following documents for a final portfolio: research memo, motion, motion brief, affidavit with exhibits, client letter, transmission letter, proposed order, e-memo, and a new cause of action for an amended complaint.
2:30-2:40 p.m.	Afternoon Break – Refreshments will be served on the second floor near the vendor display area		
Session 5 2:40-3:30 p.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Gary M. Bishop	A Delicate Balance: Harmonizing Program Consistency with Teaching Autonomy in an All-Adjunct Legal Research & Writing Program	The legal research & writing program at New England Law Boston is comprised of 41 adjunct professors, 25 of whom teach the first year LR&W I course and 16 of whom teach the second year LR&W II course. A program of this size challenges the director in a number of ways. The students expect consistency and uniformity throughout the program, and they want to be assured that they are learning the same material, bearing the same workload, and being judged by the same standards as their classmates in other sections. The adjuncts expect guidance and detailed teaching instruction from the director, but they also demand a level of independence in the classroom. This program will discuss techniques and strategies for managing an all-adjunct legal research & writing program and for assuring that the program achieves its goal each year of imparting to the students the necessary writing, research, and analytical skills. It also will include a discussion of methods for recruiting, training, supervising, and evaluating members of the LR&W faculty, as well as the overall administration and management of the program.
	Elizabeth Carrol, Julie Ryan	Teaching Teachers: How to Address the Challenges of Training and Overseeing Adjuncts in a Joint JD-LL.M. Legal	This presentation will explore the challenges of running a large adjunct-taught legal writing program and provide some strategies for addressing those challenges. Specific issues we will address include: ensuring teacher quality; maintaining a uniform curriculum and consistent instruction while encouraging instructors to bring

		Writing Program	their individual experiences into the classroom; and retaining gifted adjuncts. In addition, we will examine the specific challenges of administering a program that encompasses both first-year JD and international LL.M. legal writing, such as training LL.M. instructors to effectively convey concepts to students with varied cultural perspectives and legal experience. We will discuss a variety of practical techniques, from developing an intensive adjunct training program to creating in-class exercises and other materials that promote active learning and ensure that all students are learning the fundamental concepts for effective legal writing and advocacy. We will then open up the discussion to the audience using a series of hypotheticals to illustrate some of these concepts.
Room 433AB	Ian Gallacher, David Thomson	Planning Each Charted Course, Each Careful Step Along the Byway: Two Approaches to Teaching the Formation of Professional Identity to Contemporary Law Students	Two experienced legal writing directors present different, but complementary, curricular responses -- one in the first year and one in the upper level curriculum -- to the Carnegie Report's challenge that law schools should do more to help law students form their professional identities while in law school. You'll laugh, you'll cry, you'll swear a man can fly.
Room 246 (second floor)	George Mader, Marcia A. Rosenthal	The ALWD/LWI Survey: Trends, Insights, and the Future	The presenters are co-chairs of the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee. Our goal is to allow those who attend to better understand and use the data that has been so assiduously collected over the years. To that end, we will offer a look at the survey, both its past and its future, to those interested in (1) extracting information from the survey at a level beyond the raw results offered in the tables and (2) understanding future directions in the implementation of the survey and fashioning of the report. We will offer some statistical analysis, consider some correlations and look for some causal links in the results. We anticipate there being many questions and comments, so we plan to allocate roughly half the time for presentation and half the time for those questions and comments.
Room 267 (second floor)	Martha Pagliari, Susan Thrower	Practice Ready? Teaching Ready!	Drafting courses have become a standard part of the curriculum at many law schools with the goal of better preparing students for the practice of law. These courses often incorporate practice experience with the drafting of documents. Although the drafting courses may be based on a particular practice area such as civil litigation, transactions, patents, etc., the most effective course will focus on developing the students' effective

			writing skills through the use of substantive documents. When designing drafting courses, legal writing faculty should develop clear curriculum goals, sufficient academic rigor, and a means of communication with the law school. This presentation will help legal writing faculty to develop the tools to formulate an effective course that meets everyone’s wishes and needs.
Session 6 3:40-4:30 p.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444	Kristen K. Tiscione, Amy Vorenberg	Reflections on the “Yale Letter” and Moving Forward Together	We will discuss the impetus for the letter sent in August 2012 to Yale Law’s Admissions Committee regarding Dean Rangappa’s blog post, advising transfer applicants not to submit recommendations from legal writing faculty. The letter, signed by roughly 450 faculty nationwide, drew both praise and criticism. In reflecting on the letter’s successes and failures, we hope to unite LRW faculty to advance our reputation and respect in the legal academy. Our purpose is not to foment continued disagreement over the letter but to use our collective energy as a catalyst for further change. We would like to discuss ways to move forward together to create an infrastructure – that might incorporate both LWI and ALWD – to accomplish articulated goals. Examples include creating a Committee for the Advancement of Legal Writing comprised of LWI and ALWD board members and all interested legal writing faculty. The committee could focus on public relations, letter writing campaigns, creating a blog for students to highlight the importance of legal writing, mentorship programs for new legal research and writing professors, etc. If there can be a Talk Like a Pirate Day, why not a National Legal Writing Day?
Room 433 AB (fourth floor)	Tom Holm	Cracking the Case Method: Using Lawyering Skills Teaching Methodology in Orientation Courses	While many doctrinal professors use the Case Method to teach students, some professors may never explain how the Case Method teaches legal analysis or how to make the analytical leap from learning cases in isolation to analyzing complicated exam hypotheticals. To help students thrive in these situations, my colleagues and I developed a week-long legal methods course designed to provide our incoming first-year students with an immersive introduction to principles of sound legal analysis. Students learn analytical frameworks for analyzing and briefing cases, pulling rules from cases, identifying relationships between rules, outlining, analyzing hypotheticals, and crafting written arguments relating to those hypotheticals. Using the clinical method, we have students apply

			each of these analytical skills multiple times. By externalizing the analytical process, we provide students with a foundation for understanding the analytical skills they will continue to develop and apply in their doctrinal courses.
Room 246 (second floor)	Suzanne Rabe	Adjunct is Not a Dirty Word: Creating a Dynamic Hybrid Legal Writing Program that Supports and Celebrates both Students and Professors	Over the years, adjunct-taught legal writing programs have been criticized on many grounds. But these concerns do not play out in all hybrid programs, even those in which adjunct professors teach a majority of the class sections. Some law schools have found dynamic ways to incorporate talented and experienced adjuncts into successful and popular hybrid legal writing programs. This can result in significantly lower class size program-wide, as well as deeper and measureable student satisfaction. This presentation will discuss ways to structure and administer such a hybrid legal writing program. There will be time for questions, answers, and discussion.
Room 267 (second floor)	Amy Flanary-Smith	Integrating an MPT into the Fall, First Year Legal Writing Curriculum	Although North Carolina does not employ the Multistate Performance Test (MPT) as part of its bar exam, Campbell Law began including an MPT question in the fall of 2010 in its legal writing program. The use of an MPT has evolved, and I will share our results of the original formulation (a final exam) as well as the way we utilize the MPT today (a recurring theme throughout the semester). The MPT allows our program to put many of the principles explained in the 2010 book by Susan Ambrose et. al., <i>How Learning Works: 7 Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching</i> , in place in an almost entirely adjunct-taught legal writing program. The presentation will explain how we use the MPT and will also include a simulation of an in-class exercise. The exercise requires movement around the classroom and group work, both of which will be expected of session participants.

4:15 p.m. Shuttles will begin transporting people from the law school to the Doubletree, Hilton, and Straz Tower. Shuttles will run on a continuous loop until 5:30 p.m.

6:00 p.m. Gala dinner & brewery tour at Lakefront Brewery – Shuttles will depart for Lakefront Brewery beginning at 5:45 p.m. We would like to get all guests to the brewery as promptly as possible, so please be ready to board a shuttle between 5:45 and 6 p.m. (although you may need to wait for the next shuttle with available seats).

Friday, June 28

8:00-8:50 a.m. Continental Breakfast – Zilber Forum (first floor)

8:00-9:00 a.m. LWI Journal meeting – Room 304

Session 1 9:00-9:50	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444	Kirsten Dauphinais	Doing it our Way in the Law School Curriculum: 'It Was You All Along'	This interactive discussion will explore how legal writing professors can increase the status of their program and improve their position by leveraging our knowledge and expertise about curricular matters now being emphasized by the ABA, encouraged by the economy and other imperatives, and lacking in many of our casebook colleagues. In particular, as assessment is being mandated and as legal employers are demanding now more than ever before practice-ready attorneys, we can proffer our expertise in formative assessment, integration of skills, doctrine, and ethics, and writing across the curriculum to aid our colleagues in meeting the new imperatives of legal education and hopefully, in return, increase our perceived value in our individual schools.
	Terry Jean Seligmann	Get Right Back to Me on This: Fostering Efficient Research and Communication Within an Integrated LRW Curriculum	LawMeets is an interactive, web-based learning platform developed by Professor Karl Okamoto of Drexel. Students watch a client video posing a problem, research the problem, and upload their video advising the client. They watch a series of peer videos, comment on and rate them, and then debrief with an expert. Excited by the opportunities this platform offers for an integrated LRW program, I developed and piloted legal research units using LawMeets at Drexel and UNLV. The presentation will explain and demonstrate LawMeets, and equip LRW professionals to use it freely and to develop additional content.
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Jessica Clark	LRW Grades: Using Data to Drive Change in Legal Education	Using data from George Washington University Law School's 2011 graduating class, I will demonstrate the correlation between student performance in LRW and performance in non-LRW courses during the first year and throughout a student's law school career. In particular, A-range grades in LRW strongly correlate to A-range grades in non-LRW first-year courses and to A-range graduation cumulative GPAs. Similarly, at the low end, B-

			or below grades in LRW strongly correlate to B- or below grades in non-LRW first-year courses and to low graduation cumulative GPAs. This data highlights the critical role legal writing courses play in a student’s legal education and suggests legal writing courses should play a larger role within the law school curriculum. The data also indicates a mechanism for identifying students in need of academic support. Through a series of slides illustrating the data results, the presentation will be an interactive discussion aimed at thinking about what the data means to legal writing and legal education more broadly, as well as identifying other areas for research.
Room 246 (second floor)	Kirsten Davis, Charles Calleros, Ellie Margolis, Kristen Tiscione	Everything Old is New Again, Maybe: How Should Programs Teach the Interoffice Predictive Memo?	This panel presentation takes up the tough question of whether and how the office memo should be taught in an age where practitioners report that the “traditional” memo is infrequently written and where on-screen reading of legal documents is dramatically increasing. It considers how technology should (or shouldn’t) affect what is taught in the first-year course. The panelists will offer a variety of viewpoints on the topic, encouraging a lively conversation between panelists and audience.
Room 267 (second floor)	Thomas Cobb, Anthony Niedwiecki	Legal Writing Faculty and the Crisis in Legal Education: First Responders?	Whether and how much should LRW faculty be at the forefront of responses to the current crisis in legal education? We explore three potential efforts: 3+3 (combining the last year of undergraduate education and the first year of law school), MOOCs (Massive On-line Open Courses), law faculty teaching courses outside the law school, and expanding experiential learning opportunities for all students.
Session 2 10:00-10:50 a.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Kimberly Holst, Andrew Carter, Susan Chesler, Janet Dickson	Old Faces, New Places: Assimilating Lateral Hires into Successful Legal Writing Programs	As Legal Writing continues its growth as an area of professional scholarship and as a place where professors may spend their entire career, the number of professors hired by legal writing programs as laterals (as opposed to new professors) also increases. While the experience of a lateral hire is a positive benefit for a legal writing program, lateral hiring presents a unique challenge for programs, directors, and the lateral hires themselves in determining how to best transition those laterals into programs that are fully developed and staffed by experienced professors. This panel discussion will present perspectives on the challenges of integrating lateral hires into

			existing programs and on transitioning into new positions as laterals. The panel will suggest ideas for best practices and will invite attendees to contribute to this list of best practices.
	Judy Rosenbaum	Letting Go, Wrapping Up, Moving On: A Director's Transition	Many LRW Directors have been working as program directors for a long time, often as much as 20 or 25 years, and many may be thinking about life after being a Director. In this presentation I would like to share some of my experiences in making the transition from serving as Director to taking on new roles on the faculty, with a focus on how that transition can provide benefits to the school, the director's successor, and the director herself.
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Cindy Archer, Robert Brain, Aimee Dudovitz	Lights, Camera, Action! Using Professional Actors for Simulations to Support a Client-Focused Lawyering Skills Curriculum	Legal writing and other skills courses need role players -- a client to counsel; a witness to depose; a person to interview. At some schools, the professor or a teaching assistant acts as the client; at others, the professor is able to cajole friends or colleagues to fill the roles. But at Loyola Los Angeles we have long tradition of using professional actors in simulated exercises for a variety of skills courses. Our presentation will set forth our experiences -- both good and bad -- in hiring actors to play these parts and will discuss the different considerations involved in deciding whether actors are a good idea for particular classes and how to control their involvement. The director of our program will also address some of the issues involved in advocating for such a program despite the budgetary constraints all schools are facing, and the logistics involved with hiring and paying actors. We will also provide a checklist of do's and don'ts. Between now and the conference, we also plan to poll the legal writing community to get a sense of what other schools are doing to fill the client and witness roles, and so we hope to have an empirical component as part of our presentation as well.
	Tracy Turner	Teaching a Flexible IRAC	IRAC is a great tool but is not always the best organizational choice for every type of analysis. Based on an extensive review of textbooks and sample briefs, this presentation will provide some examples of alternative organizational models that can be introduced to students to provide some flexibility and strategy without sacrificing the benefits of organizational paradigms. In the presentation, I will discuss the method of teaching alternative structures that I developed based upon my research. The alternative structures offer several benefits over

			a rigid IRAC: (1) the ability to select the right organization for the right type of analysis; (2) the ability to include narratives to make the analysis more engaging; and (3) the flexibility to use an abbreviated form of proof for uncontested points of law. I do not intend to present my method as definitive but rather merely as an illustration of the feasibility and importance of teaching greater flexibility to our students without abandoning the pedagogical benefits of blueprints.
Room 246 (second floor)	Nicole Chong	Blueprint for Doing More with Less in the First-Year Legal Research and Writing Curriculum	We are all aware of the growing crisis facing law schools across the country regarding significant decreases in applications and admissions. Law schools are implementing strategies that may include making changes to the curriculum and cutting costs. These changes can affect first year writing programs in at least two ways: (1) reduced staffing because of cuts or (2) reduced staffing in the first year program so that writing faculty can be used elsewhere in the curriculum. For example, over the past few years, our program has experienced some of the referenced changes, and we have had to adapt the legal writing program accordingly. This presentation will focus on handling changes in staffing, namely a reduction in long-term contract legal writing professors and an expectation of having first year writing faculty become involved in other areas of the curriculum. A “blueprint” will be presented for ways in which to “do more with less” in the first-year legal writing curriculum. This presentation will explain our school’s adaptations to staffing reduction, while still providing students with thorough and quality research and writing instruction in the first year.
	Christine Rollins	No Pink Slips Here: Adapting What Is Being Taught to Survive Downsizing	Program description: Like law schools across the country, our incoming class has declined over the past couple of years. Many schools are scrambling with discussions about restructuring or firing teachers. Because writing faculty have less protections at some schools, they may be first on the chopping block. We are likewise facing this challenge; moving from a class size of 320 down to a projected 180 this next fall. Re-imagining curriculum and retooling what we teach has allowed for flexibility and positions to be saved. Let’s share what is going on around the country and learn from each other.

Room 267 (second floor)	Anthony Niedwiecki	Expanding Opportunities to Teach Additional Lawyering Skills in the LRW Classroom	The current state of law practice requires that legal research and writing professors cover more material than ever in their courses, including the teaching of more lawyering skills and the increasing number of ways to research the law. This presentation will discuss the skills required of a law school graduate (based on surveys of employers) and the innovative ways to incorporate more skills and research training into the legal writing classroom.
10:50-11:00 a.m.	Morning Break – Refreshments will be served on the second floor near the vendor display area.		
Session 3 11:00-11:50 a.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	J. Lyn Entrikin, Mary Beth Beazley, Richard Neumann	Bullying in Academia: Life on the Power Grid	Bullies target those who are vulnerable. Because many legal writing teachers have lesser forms of job security or none at all, they can become targets of bullying. This session will address research about bullying in the workplace, particularly in academia, and the harm it causes, both emotionally and professionally. Presenters will discuss how to identify workplace bullying and distinguish it from other adversities, such as thoughtlessness. Presenters and participants will strategize about effective methods for handling bullying.
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Cindy Archer, Robert Brain, Aimee Dudovitz	Fully Integrated and Fully Engaged: The Synergistic Effect of Combining the Teaching of Legal Ethics and Lawyering Skills	At Loyola Law School Los Angeles, our LRW faculty teach a required second-year class called “Ethical Lawyering.” In “EL” we teach the substantive ethics rules, but we combine them with client interviewing and counseling, along with various research and writing assignments. Interviewing and counseling brings ethics alive and makes the abstract rules seem more real. It also allows clinical faculty to teach a doctrinal subject. In our presentation we will share our experiences, including preparation of problems, staffing for the smaller class sizes required to teach these skills, and finding “clients” to be counseled. We will have checklists on what to do and what to watch out for and will share ideas, assignments, and practical student handouts, including a sample syllabus. The presentation should be interesting for those who are considering expanding a two semester writing program into three semesters, those who are looking to better integrate doctrinal and clinical faculty, and those who are looking for different ways to get additional memo, letter and email writing into the curriculum.
	Joseph Mastrosimone	Towards Implementing Carnegie: Introducing	How to transform law students into professional lawyers is not a new concern. The American Bar Association has issued at least three reports on how law schools can improve teaching professional skills

		Legal Ethics and Professionalism Through Legal Writing	and instilling fundamental values. More than 20 years after the ABA's initial 1986 report, the issue of integrating ethics and professionalism in the law school curriculum was revived by the Carnegie Foundation's report on educating lawyers and its recommendation to integrate "Lawyering, Professionalism and Legal Analysis" into the curriculum. I propose legal writing programs can help meet this goal without losing the focus of the already burdened writing program. I offer four "low cost" but high impact ways that I have done so: through selection of problems for writing assignments, selection of topics for in-class review exercises, focus on the ethical duties of an advocate, and an introduction to ethical billing practices.
Room 246 (second floor)	Mary Trevor	Coordinating Assignments with an Undergraduate Legal Studies Class: A Different Perspective and Audience	Professor Trevor will describe an initiative at Hamline University School of Law that involves coordinating some LRW assignments with assignments for the undergraduate Legal Studies Program at the University. The first collaborative effort involved coordinating work on a client letter assignment this spring: the undergrads played the role of client for letters that the law students wrote. Each undergrad read a couple of law-student-written client letters and provided rubric-based written feedback to the law students. Faculty in both programs found that working on this collaboration provided new perspectives on their teaching. The collaboration also created an interesting opportunity for the law students to have a "client" audience for their work that may be more realistic than an audience composed of their peers or instructors, and it helped the undergrads prepare for their own client letter assignment, which followed their role-playing for the law student assignment. Professor Trevor's presentation will address practical aspects of working out the coordination as well as noting observations about what worked well, what will probably be done differently next time, and what other collaborations might be pursued in the future.
	Tamara Fischer, Stephen Tollafield	Thinking Like a Lawyer: Integrating the Legal Writing Curriculum Beyond the J.D.	UC Hastings is a leader in offering graduate degrees beyond the traditional Juris Doctor to students interested in incorporating a legal education into their disciplines or practices. The college offers a Master of Studies in Law, or MSL, degree to medical doctors, scientists, and other professionals. UC Hastings also runs a well-established LL.M. program for foreign attorneys who wish to specialize in U.S. legal studies. Both of these distinctive graduate programs attract professionals from all over the globe interested in learning how to think like a lawyer and become more conversant with the U.S. legal system. A core feature

			of both programs is the robust legal research, writing, and reasoning curriculum offered to MSL and LL.M. students. Presenters Stephen Tollafield and Tami Fisher will discuss their experiences crafting writing courses for these non-traditional law school populations and their thoughts about how a legal writing curriculum can be designed to appeal to, and draw upon the strengths of, the highly trained students of these valuable graduate programs. The presentation will also address how to retool existing legal writing classes for non-J.D. students, and encourage discussion about how other programs meet this growing need in law school communities.
Room 267 (second floor)	Emily Grant	Students at the Front of the Classroom	French author Joseph Joubert wisely noted that “To teach is to learn twice,” and we can employ this maxim in our classrooms in a variety of ways. This session will focus on ideas for how to use students to teach concepts to their classmates, thereby solidifying their own grasp of the subject matter. And it will provide ideas for ways to manage and direct students at the front of the classroom to maximize their effectiveness for all students in the room.
	Susie Salmon	Training Future Bosses: Easy Ways Your Teaching Assistant Program Can Help Law Students to Become More Effective, Professional, and Humane Supervisors in Practice	Many different types of LRW programs use upper-level law students to assist – or sometimes teach – in the legal writing classroom. Teaching assistants or writing fellows provide written or in-person feedback on student writing, present lessons in class, or sometimes even teach entire writing or research courses under the supervision of faculty. These same teaching assistants will one day be supervising law clerks, junior attorneys, paralegals, and support staff, but lawyers are notoriously ineffective (ok, BAD) supervisors. Is there a way to create a “teaching assistant” or “writing fellow” program that not only benefits your writing program and your students, but also effectively trains upper-level students to become more effective, professional, and humane supervisors as they progress in their legal careers? In this presentation, I will discuss some ways that a “teaching assistant” or “writing fellow” seminar or training program can foster the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will help participating students become better supervisors once they enter practice.
12:00-1:50 p.m.	Plenary Presentation – Dean Kent D. Syverud, Dean & Ethan A.H. Shepley Distinguished University Professor, Washington University Law School – Zilber Forum (first floor) A lunch buffet will be served in the forum during the plenary presentation.		
Session 4 2:00-2:50 p.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Jan Levine, Julia Glencer, Tara Willke	Designing Spaces: Planning the Physical Space	The physical location of an LRW program affects many things, from the relationships between the individuals working within the program, to the perceptions of other faculty members within the law

		for a LRW Program	school, to the daily experience of the students who enter and use the space. All of these items must be taken into consideration when finding, designing, or remodeling a space. It must also reflect the relationships among these individuals and their statuses within the law school, the interaction between LRW teachers and students, and the relationship of the program to the rest of the law school, faculty and staff. The space must provide the technology employed by all of the individuals teaching within the program, including those LRW teachers who offer courses beyond the first-year course. It must also encourage interaction and learning. There are various models of LRW program space, such as faculty offices interspersed among those for other faculty, offices located together, and offices in separate buildings. This presentation will be an interactive session identifying the factors involved in planning a space for a program, illustrated by our experiences and those of others, and the lessons learned in designing and then living and teaching within a new program environment.
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Robin Wellford Slocum	Interpersonal Dynamics: Managing Emotional Reactivity	Legal writing faculty engage in group collaboration and problem-solving perhaps more than any other group of law school faculty. Some group collaboration is creative and fun, such as brainstorming new fact patterns and exchanging teaching ideas. However, other kinds of curricular, pedagogical, and political issues can create interpersonal challenges. This is particularly true for legal writing directors, who must artfully facilitate collaborative discussions and problem-solving among people and constituencies who have different points of view while also managing their own emotional reactivity. In this presentation, I will introduce participants to recent research from neuroscience and neurocardiology documenting the adverse impact of stress and emotional reactivity on collaborative problem-solving, creativity, mental clarity, and resiliency. I will then lead participants through several exercises designed to help them better understand and manage emotional reactivity as well as optimize their resiliency and the ability to collaborate and problem-solve with others. These exercises will include use of technology (an emWave® monitor) so that participants can see in “real time” how heart rhythms actually move from incoherent patterns (when we are irritated or under stress) to harmony and coherency with the nervous system when we actively shift our thoughts and breathing as suggested by the exercises.

Room 246 (second floor)	Amy Flanary-Smith	Teaching the Teachers: Mentoring and Empowering Adjuncts to Participate in Problem Development	Campbell Law's Legal Writing Program includes one full time, tenure-track professor and nine adjuncts. Each fall, with guidance and feedback from me (the full timer!), each adjunct writes a semester-long problem for his or her spring class. This way, the adjuncts are invested in their individual scenarios, they are empowered to solve problems within the prompts, and they enjoy the semester exploring an area of their interest rather than mine. Particularly as compared to past years when I provided them with a prompt I prepared, they are happier (which of course leads to better retention). That's crazy, you say! That can never work, you say! It can work and it does work, but it takes work. This session will explore what to teach adjunct instructors about problem development and how to teach it to them. The format will be an interactive lecture with significant Q & A. Participants will leave with checklists for timing and content.
	Amy Langenfield	Beyond 1L Oral Arguments: Oral Communication Pedagogy Across the Curriculum	Oral communication is a lawyering skill highly valued by employers and required by the ABA for programs of legal education. Whether the standard requires "substantial instruction in . . . oral communication" or "competency as an entry-level practitioner in . . . oral communication in a legal context," most law schools probably meet it. Or so we assume. How often do our students have the opportunity to sound like lawyers? First-year legal writing courses typically include simulation exercises. Upper-level courses may require seminar presentations, negotiations, and trial advocacy skills. Extra-curricular activities like moot court offer additional opportunities to practice oral communication skills. And there's always Socratic method, perhaps modified. However, what if our students had to pass an oral examination in order to be licensed? How confident are we that they would pass? All faculty (whether "casebook" or "skills" or both) can share the task of teaching students how to communicate their legal analyses orally. We all should be (and perhaps are) explicitly teaching legal method. We all should be (and perhaps are) explicitly teaching students oral communication skills. This presentation's goal is to reflect on how law schools handle oral communication skills and how we can handle them better.
Room 267 (second floor)	Sharon A. Pocock	The Case for a Course on Visual Persuasion as Part of an Upper-Level	In light of the growing use of videos by lawyers in and outside of court, the understanding and persuasive use of images, moving or static, has become another important skill in the modern lawyer's arsenal. Normal surveillance videos, as well as videos and other visual material created for a

		Legal Writing Program	specific purpose, are making more frequent appearances in courtrooms. Legal professionals are also creating videos for public interest and informational purposes. An upper-level course on visual persuasion can develop a visual literacy on the part of law students and help them to deal with video material (a) in litigation as a proponent of it or as opposing counsel, and (b) for informational purposes in a legal but non-litigation context. A growing number of law schools offer courses in this area. This presentation will discuss the reasons for such an elective course, what some schools are doing, and why legal writing professors are in an excellent position to develop and teach such courses.
Session 5 3:00-3:50 p.m.	Presenter	Title	Description
Room 444 (fourth floor)	Adam Todd	Doing It the American Way: Comparing American and Civil Law Countries' Legal Writing Pedagogy	With a few exceptions, American legal writing pedagogy has garnered little more than academic interest by continental and other civil law academics and has not been adopted in any meaningful way in the law schools of most foreign countries. My presentation will examine why American legal writing pedagogy (or "our way") has not been readily transplanted or borrowed by other legal education systems outside of the United States. American law schools and the law schools in other countries share the same basic pedagogical goal which is to train skilled lawyers and legal professionals. As a consequence, the teaching of skills such as legal writing should be a high priority in both education systems. The structural differences in the legal systems, particular their educational systems, however, help explain why American legal writing programs remain rather uniquely American. The presentation also reflects on how methods of teaching legal writing used in other countries might be considered in the United States particularly as a way to enhance the third year of law school and possibly lower the costs of legal education.
	Diane B. Kraft, Melissa N. Henke	The Sun Shines Brightly on Our New Kentucky Law LRW Program	In the past two years the University of Kentucky College of Law's First-Year Legal Research and Writing Program has changed dramatically. During the 2010-11 academic year, the three-credit first-year writing classes were taught primarily by adjunct instructors, with no full-time faculty devoted exclusively or even primarily to the Legal Writing Program. First-year research was not integrated with the first-year writing classes. Fast forward to the 2012-13 academic year: We have the Program's first full-time Director, and the first-year writing classes are four credits and are taught primarily by full-time writing professors. Research classes are more fully

			integrated with the writing classes. In our presentation we will offer insights to those contemplating or in the midst of similar changes at their own law schools by discussing how this evolution came about: who the central players were, the steps we took to advocate for LRW and to educate the faculty about its importance, why we chose the program model we did, the challenges in shifting from an adjunct-based model to a full-time-faculty model, the curricular enhancements we made to support the increased credit hour, and the challenges that still remain for us as we advocate for an ever-improving LRW Program.
Room 433AB (fourth floor)	Jo Ellen Lewis	Promoting Faculty and Your Program through Faculty Evaluations	Evaluations can be very stress inducing for legal writing faculty, even if faculty are evaluated by a legal writing director with whom they work closely. However, if evaluations can be seen by legal writing faculty as a means to advance such faculty and the legal writing program, this can reduce the stress. In this presentation, information and ideas will be shared on how to structure an evaluation to be the least stressful and most beneficial for the legal practice faculty member being evaluated while promoting the overall program. A format for evaluating faculty that is designed to show all of the wonderful accomplishments of the faculty being reviewed will be discussed. The intended result of such an evaluation is that the ultimate reviewer, the Dean, gains an appreciation of the legal writing faculty member's work as well as the merits of the entire legal writing program.
	Michael W. Loudenslager	How to Explain What We Do and How We Do It: Talking to Your School's Administration about Programmatic Improvements (or Resisting Detrimental Programmatic Changes)	Whether in response to a suggestion from an uninformed doctrinal faculty member or in an effort to make a positive change in the legal research and writing program, directors of writing programs often have to explain the content of the legal research and writing curriculum and how we teach that content. This presentation would discuss some of the resources and strategies available to help explain the best practices for legal writing instruction and to deal with misconceptions about what is taught, or ought to be taught, in legal research and writing classes. After discussing resources available to directors to aid in this type of communication and some strategies that the presenter has used, the presenter hopes to foster an interactive discussion of approaches that attendees have used to deal either with uninformed suggestions that could damage the writing program or to argue for positive changes in their legal writing program.

Room 246 (second floor)	Deborah McGregor, Joel Schumm	Why Can't We (and Should We) Just Get Along? An Interactive Overview and Exercise to Consider Differences in and Enforcement of Course Policies	What is an appropriate penalty for a student's arrival late to class, a paper that is late or too long, or other policy violations? Should these rules be grounded in real world practice or be guided by another standard? Should all writing faculty at the same school apply the same rules? This presentation will include the results of an informal survey of writing faculty throughout the country and policies collected from several law schools. Participants will explore the validity and consistency of these policies by responding to hypothetical situations through the use of audience responders. We hope to allow sufficient time for discussion.
Room 267 (second floor)	Kim Peterson, Trina Tinglum	Trading Spaces: Benefiting from Our Colleagues' Strengths	Teaching a colleague's class while he or she observes might seem awkward and stressful for both the observer and the teacher, but it can be a valuable learning and bonding experience. Most Legal Research and Writing programs include instructors from a variety of backgrounds and experiences with teaching legal writing and research. We realized we could capitalize on this diversity from watching each other teach to our strengths. Our presentation will first discuss how we planned for and executed this cross-teaching experience. Specifically, we will cover how we chose our topics, how we prepared for each class, and how the observation was conducted. Next we will discuss how this activity benefited both the teachers and the classes. Finally, we will offer advice about how to effectively implement an exercise like this. This presentation will use a discussion and Q & A format.
	Nancy Soonpaa, Pamela Armstrong	Doing It Our Way: Dealing with Dissension Within the Ranks	What happens when there is no "doing it our way" within a program or writing legal faculty, but only several "doing it my ways"? Is that a problematic challenge or a desirable sign of a maturing program? This presentation will analyze the group versus the individual mindsight and invite discussion as to whether one is preferable over the other.

4:00-5:00 p.m. Ice Cream Social & Closing – Zilber Forum (first floor). Join us in the forum to try Kopp's frozen custard. We'll be serving seven flavors, so you're sure to find at least one that you like!

4:30 p.m. Shuttles will begin transporting people from the law school to the Doubletree, the Hilton, and Straz Tower. Shuttles will run on a continuous loop until 6 p.m.

6:00 Summerfest – Shuttles will begin transporting people from the Doubletree, the Hilton, and Straz Tower to Summerfest at 6 p.m. Shuttles will run on a continuous loop until 7 p.m. Shuttles will begin the return trips from Summerfest to the Doubletree, the Hilton, and Straz Tower at 9 p.m. Shuttles will make continuous loops until 10:30 p.m. Please see the Summerfest handout in your conference program for more details about transportation to and from the festival.