



the president's message

Transformative Teaching: From the Classroom to the Culture

By Rachel Moran

This column culminates my year of writing on the theme of “transformative law,” described in my Presidential Address as using legal tools to challenge and reconfigure social institutions. I began by promoting a “citizen-lawyer” ethos within our profession, honoring Robert Gordon’s admonitions that lawyers take responsibility for the integrity of our society’s legal framework rather than becoming mere captives of clients’ interests. I planned to address three areas of transformative law that were specific to academic lawyers: transformative professional training, transformative scholarship, and transformative classroom teaching.

Continued on page 2

[in this issue]

- 10 Remarks of Rachel F. Moran made to the Council of the ABA Section on Legal Education
- 13 2010 AALS Annual Meeting Workshop on Pro Bono and Public Services
- 14 AALS Conference on Clinical Legal Education
- 15 Award Winner and Luncheon Speaker, The Honorable Guido Calabresi
- 15 Programs that issued Calls for Papers at the 2010 Annual Meeting
- 17 OAS Secretary General to Speak at Committee on International Cooperation Luncheon at the 2010 AALS Annual Meeting
- 18 2010 AALS Mid-Year Meeting Workshops
- 19 2010 Annual Meeting Presidential Programs
- 25 New Law Teachers Workshops

Michael A. Olivas Nominated for AALS President-Elect; Dorothy Andrea Brown, Ann C. Shalleck, as Executive Committee Members

Thanks to the nominations received from faculty members and deans at AALS member schools, a rich and accomplished field of admirable nominees made the Committee on Nominations’ task a challenging one.

At the meeting of the AALS House of Representatives on Saturday, January 9, 2010, the committee will place the following names in nomination: Michael A. Olivas, University of Houston Law Center for the position of President-Elect; and Dorothy Andrea Brown, Emory University School of Law and Ann C. Shalleck, American University Washington College of Law for three-year term positions on the Executive Committee.

The Committee on Nominations is especially proud to recommend these individuals, whose long careers exemplify excellence in teaching and in scholarship, and at the same time reflect high levels of superb service to their Universities and to legal education more broadly.

The Committee on Nominations was chaired by Martha L. Minow, Harvard Law School.

See page 8 for biographies of the nominees.

2010 Annual Meeting

January 6-10, 2010

New Orleans, Louisiana

View the full program and register today at:

www.aals.org/am2010/

- The Honorable Judge Guido Calabresi: Luncheon speaker and recipient of AALS Award for Lifetime Service to Legal Education and to the Law
- Order of the Coif Book Award Presentation
- Secretary General of the Organization of American States, José Miguel Insulza, to Speak at the AALS Committee on International Cooperation Luncheon
- Three Presidential Sessions focusing on the meeting’s theme: Transformative Law
- AALS Presidential Program, Film Screening of *Trouble the Water*
- A full-day AALS Workshop on Pro Bono and Public Service
- AALS Gala Reception
- New Orleans Solidarity Tour
- Over 500 speakers and 100 AALS Section and Committee Programs
- Many networking opportunities

Association of American Law Schools

President

Rachel Moran
University of California, Berkeley

President-Elect

H. Reese Hansen
Brigham Young University

Immediate Past President

John H. Garvey
Boston College

Serving through 2009

W. H. "Joe" Knight, Jr.
Seattle University

Lauren K. Robel

Indiana University, Maurer

Serving through 2010

R. Lawrence Dessem
University of Missouri

Leo P. Martinez

University of California, Hastings

Serving through 2011

Katharine T. Bartlett
Duke University

Daniel B. Rodriguez

The University of Texas

Executive Director Chief Executive Officer

Susan Westerberg Prager

Deputy Director

Elizabeth Hayes Patterson

Managing Director

Jane M. La Barbera

aalsnews

Published in March, May,
August and November by

Association of
American Law Schools
1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-2717

Issues are available online at:
www.aals.org/newsletter/

©2009 Association of American Law Schools.
All rights reserved. ISSN 0519-1025
Printing courtesy of West Academic
Publishing.

President's Message

Continued from page 1

In writing about transformative training, I cautioned against sacrificing the politically challenging nature of the clinical legal education movement because of increasing demands for quantifiable outcome measures. In writing about transformative scholarship, I noted tensions between the impetus to reform advocacy and the need to maintain academic respectability. Now, in discussing transformative teaching, I return to some of my initial themes, for teaching is the primary means by which we will – or will not – shape the ethos of new generations of practitioners, who may or may not consider themselves “citizen-lawyers.”

This year, the term “wise Latina” became a catchphrase in debating the appointment of the nation’s first Hispanic, and only third female, Supreme Court Justice. Having known Sonia Sotomayor when we were both students at Yale, I followed the confirmation process with an extra measure of interest. By the hearings’ end, I was struck by the parallels between determining what characteristics are desirable in our finest jurists and determining what characteristics are critical to our finest teachers of law.

Here, I will draw insights from three prominent public controversies over the Sotomayor nomination: whether she stood by her

“wise Latina” remark; whether she associated herself with President Obama’s remarks about the importance of empathy in judicial decision-making; and whether her disagreement with her mentor, Judge Jose Cabranes, over a controversial case involving affirmative action was significant. These disputed issues illuminate each aspect of transformative education that I will discuss: who enters the classroom, what happens in the classroom, and what is taken from the classroom.

(I) What we bring to the classroom: the argument for diversity

To refresh our recollections of Justice Sotomayor’s statement about being a “wise Latina,” here is the key passage that proved deeply contentious:

Justice O’Connor has often been cited as saying that a wise old man and wise old woman will reach the same conclusion in deciding cases. ... I am [] not so sure that I agree with the statement. First, as Professor Martha Minow has noted, there can never be a universal definition of wise. Second, I would hope that a wise Latina woman with the richness of her experiences would more often than not reach a better conclusion than a white male who hasn’t lived that life.¹

Continued on page 3

¹ Sonia Sotomayor, “A Latina Judge’s Voice,” Remarks to Berkeley La Raza Law Journal’s Twelfth Annual Symposium (Oct. 26, 2001), available at <http://www.law.berkeley.edu/4982.htm>.

President's message

Continued from page 2

Professor Ben Bratman has noted that Sotomayor's statement, from which she ultimately distanced herself, was entirely defensible as originally constructed.² The very decision that would raise controversy over her nomination, *Ricci v. DeStefano*,³ was in part a case about how much an employer may value the benefit of the differing perspectives that accompany workplace diversity. We know that workplace diversity fosters broader understanding.⁴ Both the predominantly white plaintiffs in *Ricci* and the black firefighters whose professed interests they opposed sought justice from the courts (which are themselves a workplace); beyond that, they sought understanding. Having Justices from a limited range of experiences impedes, even if it does not preclude, that understanding. Having Justices from a diversity of experiences fosters such understanding. Diversity on the bench is therefore crucial.

What is true for judges is also true for law students and for professors. This was the rationale for affirmative action presented in *Regents of the University of California v. Bakke*⁵ and *Grutter v. Bollinger*,⁶ the two critical cases that respectively expressed and endorsed the diversity rationale for affirmative action. Truncating the range of experiences among either students or faculty – based on race, gender, sexual orientation, class, disability, national origin, and many

other characteristics – threatens the capacity of law schools to generate a professional class that can cope with an increasingly diverse world. Then-Judge Sotomayor might be faulted only for leaving out some context: on a court where almost every Justice was Latina, an additional “wise Latina” might well be *less* likely to help the full Court reach a better conclusion than a white male who could offer what would, in that counterfactual world, be a unique perspective. Of course, Justice Sotomayor can hardly be faulted for leaving out that bit of context; our country was and is far from being overrun by Latina judges.

Diversity remains a core value of the AALS – one that it strives to promote through its site visits, conferences, reports, and a committee specifically dedicated to these issues. We should certainly redouble our efforts on that front. Justice Sotomayor was herself the product of a time of great access for people who, like herself, were of modest means. She was the first member of her family ever to attend law school. This diversity of socioeconomic experience was a function of such initiatives as the G.I. Bill and the once-revolutionary and much-admired California Master Plan for public education, which ensured that people from all walks of life would, to a substantial extent, be able to reach their highest level of educational achievement based on ability and energy rather than economic resources.

Professor Conrad Johnson of Columbia Law School has noted a decline in enrollment among Black and Mexican-origin students who ought to have a chance to become a future generation's Sotomayors.⁷ Over a recent fourteen-year span, while such students have applied to law school in constant numbers, improved their scores on standardized tests, and competed for places in entering classes with 4000 more seats, their numbers declined both in relative and absolute terms, Johnson reports. Among the many reasons for this is a lack of access to resources. One large obstacle to maintaining a diverse legal academy, then, is that what we win in the courts we may lose at the bursar's office. Diversity depends, increasingly, on the ability and willingness of law schools to value students from all backgrounds enough to ensure that students' financial straits do not render their admission and enrollment impossible.

Achieving diversity in legal academia is not simply an obligation, but an opportunity. Professor Susan Sturm, who will participate in a panel on “transformative teaching” at the upcoming 2010 Annual Meeting, has long collaborated with Professor Lani Guinier in reflecting on legal education. They have written, for example, on their experiences with creating “multiracial learning communities” in law school classrooms, in which students attend to internal

Continued on page 4

2 Ben Bratman, “A Defense of Sotomayor's ‘Wise Latina’ Remark – with No Rewording Required,” FindLaw (July 17, 2009), available at http://writ.news.findlaw.com/commentary/20090717_bratman.html.

3 530 F. 3d 87 (2d Cir. 2008), rehearing en banc denied, 520 F.3d 88, rev'd and remanded, 129 S. Ct. 2658 (2009).

4 See, e.g., CYNTHIA ESTLUND, WORKING TOGETHER: HOW WORKPLACE BONDS STRENGTHEN A DIVERSE DEMOCRACY (2003).

5 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

6 539 U.S. 306 (2003).

7 See <http://www2.law.columbia.edu/civilrights/> and subordinate pages within that site (site last visited Oct. 7, 2009).

President's message

Continued from page 3

and external sources of power (including racial identity, gender, and social class) in shaping the group's membership, the dynamics of group interaction, and the content of the inquiry.⁸ They report that confronting racial difference and its effect on power and perspectives galvanizes students, teaches them to speak before critical audiences, and sharpens their problem-solving skills. Students learn to "experiment, not just dominate,"⁹ in discussion. In the process, these groups build cooperative and close relationships between students and their work, their professors, and – most unusually in law school classrooms – each other.

Part of the benefit of diversity, then, is that it forces confrontation with and understanding of differing perspectives and assumptions. This, too, played its role in the Sotomayor saga.

(2) What we do in the classroom: the role of empathy

Professor Michael Hunter Schwartz has created a website devoted to documenting what legal educators are doing right.¹⁰ He has collected the names of exemplary American law professors, nominated by peers, former students, and other admirers, as preparation for an extensive qualitative analysis of powerful teaching methodologies. Schwartz will speak on the

"transformative teaching" panel at the upcoming 2010 Annual Meeting, sharing some early observations from his research. His work suggests that another signal term in the Sotomayor saga – "empathy" – is also critical to transformative teaching, insofar as it means identifying with one's students to better understand their hopes and needs.

President Obama initially inserted the term "empathy" into the Supreme Court confirmation debate, stating:

I will seek somebody with a sharp and independent mind and a record of excellence and integrity. I will seek someone who understands that justice isn't about some abstract legal theory or footnote in a case book; it is also about how our laws affect the daily realities of people's lives – whether they can make a living and care for their families; whether they feel safe in their homes and welcome in their own nation.

I view that quality of empathy, of understanding and identifying with people's hopes and struggles, as an essential ingredient for arriving at just decisions and outcomes. I will seek somebody who is dedicated to the rule of law, who honors our constitutional traditions, who respects the integrity of the judicial pro-

cess and the appropriate limits of the judicial role. I will seek somebody who shares my respect for constitutional values on which this nation was founded and who brings a thoughtful understanding of how to apply them in our time.¹¹

When Judge Sotomayor was nominated, the highlighted portion of the President's announcement quickly became the basis for concerns that her empathy would extend only to Latinos or the poor, and that such selective concern would undermine the rigorous and objective approach required of judges.

In analyzing Aristotle's writings on compassion, Martha Nussbaum has noted concern over emotions rooted in empathy within in our judicial system. Compassion could complicate the administration of justice, as "people's sympathies are unpredictable and inconstant; they may have antecedent biases against certain types of defendants and in favor of others that will influence the way in which they hear the defendant's story."¹² She concludes, though, that empathy and compassion (the latter of which adds to empathic understanding a level of identification with other people's plights) are critical tools to help decision-makers appreciate how others see the world from distinct perspectives.¹³

⁸ Susan Sturm and Lani Guinier, *Learning From Conflict: Reflections On Teaching About Race and Gender*, 53 J. LEGAL EDUC. 515 (2003).

⁹ *Id.* at 547.

¹⁰ See <http://www.washburnlaw.edu/bestlawteachers/michaelschwartz/index.php> and subordinate pages within that site (site last visited Oct. 7, 2009).

¹¹ Transcript available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Press-Briefing-By-Press-Secretary-Robert-Gibbs-5-1-09/ (emphasis added).

¹² Martha C. Nussbaum, *Hiding From Humanity: Dignity, Shame, And The Law* 49 (2004).

¹³ Martha Nussbaum, *Reply to Amnon Reichman*, 56 J. LEGAL EDUC. 320, 320-23 (2006).

President's message

Continued from page 4

This is especially critical, Nussbaum argues, in legal education, where emphasis on rational analysis may impede comprehension of others' motivations.¹⁴ While, as with the judiciary, cultivation of empathy has raised concerns about weakening analytical rigor, empathy has increasingly been celebrated as a necessary component of classroom teaching. In part, it is fundamental to courses on negotiation, mediation, and deal-making in both litigation and transactional practice. Beyond that, proponents of empathy argue that it makes law students into better lawyers.

In 1993, Professors Angela Harris and Marjorie Shultz offered an important defense of emotion's role in law school classrooms. They recognized that law teachers generally treat rationality and feeling as opposites and assume that "rationality is appropriate in legal reasoning whereas feeling is not."¹⁵ Drawing on Nussbaum's work, Harris and Shultz have contended that "idealized justice ... embodies wisdom and compassion. Supreme Court justices who are publicly revered are not simply cold calculating machines of 'smartness' but deeply humane people who struggle to do the right thing. ... Our society extols justice as blind, but also celebrates it when it is deeply seeing."¹⁶

Cultivating empathy and compassion may benefit students, but for teachers it requires accepting some loss of control and superior status. Harris and Shultz argue that the cost is worth the gain in teaching quality, concluding that "the risk of injury (although it certainly exists) is outweighed by the potential benefits of truly engaged, passionate, and rich intellectual debate."¹⁷

A strong teacher should be able to identify with her students and to empathize with their perspectives of the world – both outside of the classroom and within. Empathy for one's students requires a sense of humility not always valued by the legal academy. It is one thing for teachers to "hide the ball" in positions of power; it is quite another to recognize that the "ball" – what students are successfully learning during a semester – is also hidden from us. Empathy both requires and fosters authentic concern for the well-being of one's students.

Transformative teaching involves the ability to see and to feel what our students are experiencing.

This is not easy work. It is a far cry from reading off lecture notes; it is incompatible with stereotypes of self-indulgent and preening legal pedagogy of any stripe. To actually see and feel our students' perspectives may be arduous and frustrating and can leave us emotionally vulnerable – but I think it is what distinguishes the best teachers from the rest.

(3) What we take from the classroom – transforming legal culture

The third attack on Justice Sotomayor's nomination regarded the unpublished opinion she endorsed in *Ricci*, the "New Haven Firefighters Case." The opinion dismissed white firefighters' claims of reverse discrimination in a brief paragraph. The Supreme Court later overturned the decision by a 5-4 vote. Obviously, raising the issue of affirmative action in the nomination of the first Latina Justice was intrinsically fraught, but critics gave the issue extra prominence by identifying a Latino colleague on the Second Circuit whose view opposed Sotomayor's – a contrast made especially powerful because this Judge, Jose Cabranes, was Sotomayor's self-acknowledged mentor. Cabranes had hired Sotomayor as a research assistant at Yale and urged her to work for Robert Morgenthau, the Manhattan district attorney. A fellow student recalled Cabranes as "an entirely different species of cat"¹⁸ given his open-door policy and habit of introducing students as his friends. By the time Sotomayor joined Cabranes on the federal bench, he realized that "[t]he mentee was all grown up" and their jurisprudential philosophies had diverged. Despite their differences, Cabranes recalled that "I wanted to put her on the right path, and I don't think I was wrong."¹⁹

As this account suggests, the best professors have the capacity to be influential mentors. They take an interest in their students' careers and aspirations. These teachers hope, by instruction and example, to interest students in important problems, in innovative intellectual approaches to addressing them, and in persistent effort

¹⁴ Id. at 323-25.

¹⁵ Angela P. Harris and Marjorie M. Shultz, "A(nother) Critique of Pure Reason": Toward Civic Virtue in Legal Education, 45 STAN. L. REV. 1773, 1775 (1993).

¹⁶ Id. at 1787.

¹⁷ Id. at 1804.

¹⁸ David D. Kirkpatrick, Judge's Mentor: Part Guide, Part Foil, N.Y. TIMES, June 22, 2009, at A1.

¹⁹ Id.

President's message

Continued from page 5

to resolve them. What they do *not* do is try to generate carbon copies of themselves. Mentorship does not and should not lead to a lockstep recapitulation of the professor's ideas, but to an exchange and evolution of ideas, a process that at its best may last for decades.

The third member of our upcoming panel on transformative teaching, Elizabeth Schneider of Brooklyn Law School, exemplifies mentorship as a transformative enterprise. Schneider has been a leading light in applying feminist theory to the legal interests of women. As detailed in her 2000 book on domestic violence,²⁰ she has focused on changing how courts, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and other actors view the role and the rights of victims of domestic violence. She has mentored students who have made their own marks in the profession, such as Professor Cheryl Hanna of Vermont Law School, who has since become her collaborator, along with two other professors, on a casebook on Domestic Violence and the Law.²¹ Professor Hanna will be joining Professor Schneider on the panel to discuss the role and importance of mentoring in academic lives.

Even in the face of transformative change, the importance of one-on-one mentoring persists. Every faculty member can enhance a student's prospects with support and guidance. Sometimes this involves conveying information, but often it also requires being a good listener who can understand the student's own hopes and concerns. Students sometimes lose sight of their reasons for becoming lawyers in the crush of reading casebooks, briefing and outlining, writing assignments and taking exams. The impact of the current economic crisis on the legal market only exacerbates the tendency to focus on short-term needs and obligations while discounting long-term goals and aspirations.

Schneider's work highlights the importance not merely of changing her students by sparking their interest in an underdeveloped field of inquiry, but of changing the environment in which they will operate professionally. Her work enables judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys to perceive fully the interests of women, particularly victims of violence. This contribution is critical not only for its value to education, but for helping to transform legal culture.

This focus is critical beyond the academy itself. In this and my previous columns – on fostering “citizen-lawyers,” on defending the engaged status of our clinics, and on celebrating the power of applied scholarship – I have focused on how we may transcend tendencies towards academic insularity and focus our talents on changing our society and our profession.

We pursue this aim not merely for its own sake, but because such transformation is what cements our successes as legal educators. We can create the best-educated, most empathic students possible even without a transformative emphasis. But if they then enter a legal profession that does not value – indeed, that stultifies – their perspectives, abilities, values, and goals, our victory as educators is Pyrrhic. Studying law is then only a temporary haven from the difficulties of professional life rather than a springboard into changing the practice of law.

Even the best seeds require good soil to thrive. By producing students who desire systemic change and civic obligation, and who put those beliefs into practice, we foster an environment where the students we send into the world can reach their highest potential. This does not happen automatically; many students complain that for them it does not happen at all. But consciously adopting transformation of our profession as an affirmative goal – consciously inculcating in our students that they leave school aiming not to become others' passive tools but to remain their own moral agents – best serves this end. So conceived, transformative teaching is an enormous enterprise that goes well beyond the classroom – an enterprise of enormous worth.

Society demands a lot from its lawyers. We should demand a lot from ourselves.

So ends a year of thinking about transformations. Despite the hardships today's economy imposes on our students and many graduates, American law schools have much to celebrate. We have continued to transform ourselves in response to changing needs. We are innovating in every facet of legal education; we are privileged to make a difference in people's lives. As we help students to find their best selves, we find our own.

Continued on page 7

²⁰ ELIZABETH SCHNEIDER, *BATTERED WOMEN & FEMINIST LAWMAKING* (2002).

²¹ ELIZABETH SCHNEIDER, CHERYL HANNA, JUDITH G. GREENBERG, AND CLARE DALTON, *DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE LAW* (2d ed. 2007).

President's message

Continued from page 6

I began my first column with thanks and want to close this final column in the same spirit. I express my sincere gratitude to all of those who made this a transformative year for me. First, of course, there are the wonderful people at the Association, who make it possible for each President to acquire the sense of continuity and breadth of perspective necessary to succeed. I especially want to single out Susan Prager, Jane La Barbera, Elizabeth Patterson, and David Brennan, all of whom provided me with wise advice and unflagging support. I also am extremely grateful to my fellow members of the Executive Committee, who have been wonderful colleagues and outstanding leaders as we navigate the complex challenges facing legal education today. In addition, I want to acknowledge the efforts of every faculty member and dean who has volunteered to provide service to the Association during my Presidential year. These individuals are the lifeblood of the organization, and their generosity and good fellowship make it a joy to be a part of this effort.

Finally, I must make special mention of Gregory Diamond, who ably assisted me in thinking through our profession's transformative potential. Greg is a former academic social scientist who came to law as a second career and left his practice in the summer of 2006 to devote himself to political change (including two years of unpaid work in state and national electoral politics). Greg began working with me shortly after the 2008 election, ready to recommit himself to his profession as a citizen-lawyer – and finding that early-career lawyers were being ejected from law firms like ballast. He, and I vicariously, had to grapple with what maintaining an orientation towards social transformation means in troubled economic times. (His story has a happy ending; he landed a satisfying job with transformative potential and decent compensation. Many others, we know, have been less fortunate this year.) His experiences and perspectives from outside the academy have enriched and given immediacy to our discussions and explorations of what it means to become a lawyer today.

AALS Seeks Deputy Director

Service to Begin Mid- to Late-Summer 2010

Candidates must hold tenure-track position at AALS member school.

Position announcement to be e-mailed to faculty of member schools.

Executive Committee Nominations

Continued from page 1



Michael A. Olivas
President-Elect

Michael A. Olivas holds the William B. Bates Distinguished Chair in Law and is Director of the Institute for Higher Education Law and Governance at the University of Houston Law Center. He received his B.A. from the Pontifical College Josephinum, magna cum laude (1972), his M.A. (English) and his Ph.D. (Higher Education, Organizational Theory) from the Ohio State University (1977). Attending law school at night, Professor Olivas worked as Assistant Director for Research at the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy at Howard University, and then as Director of Research for LULAC National Educational Service Centers, while earning his J.D. from Georgetown University (1981). He joined the University of Houston law faculty in 1982. Professor Olivas teaches courses and seminars on Immigration Law and Policy, and on Higher Education and has served as Associate Dean for Research and as Associate Dean for Student Life. He was special counsel to the President of the University of Wisconsin and served for four years as General Counsel to the AAUP. In 1997 he held the Mason Ladd Distinguished Visiting Chair at the University of Iowa College of Law.

Over the course of his long career, Professor Olivas has authored, coauthored or edited 10 books, as well as written numerous book chapters and articles.

Professor Olivas' service to the AALS has been extensive and highly valuable. A past member of the Executive Committee (2005-07), he currently serves on the Membership Review Committee. He has chaired the Committee on Sections and the Annual Meeting, the Planning Committee for the New Law Teachers Workshop (2000) and two AALS Sections: Education Law (three times) and Immigration Law (twice). He has also served on numerous other AALS Committees: Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Nominating Committee, Government Relations, and the Special Committee on Recruitment of Minorities, and chaired the Planning Committee for a Joint ABA/AALS/LSAC Conference on Action and Accountability.

Dorothy Andrea Brown
For a 3-year Term on the Executive Committee



Dorothy Andrea Brown is Professor of Law at Emory University. Professor Brown earned her degrees from Fordham University (BA, 1980), the Georgetown University Law Center (JD, 1983) and The New York University School of Law (LLM (Tax) 1984). She served as attorney advisor to the Honorable Stephen J. Swift of the U.S. Tax Court, as an associate at Haynes & Miller in Washington, D.C. and as an investment banker at New York's Drexel, Burnham & Lambert. Brown subsequently served as Associate Deputy General Counsel at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development where she supervised 79 attorneys in the areas of Housing, Finance and Litigation.

Professor Brown is a distinguished law teacher who has served on the faculty of four AALS member schools and earned accolades at each one.

Professor Brown has been a highly positive force in the AALS for many years. She has Chaired two AALS Sections: State and Local Government Law (1998) and Minority Groups (1997), bringing to that work the quick intelligence, discipline, and warm energy that makes serving with her such a pleasure. She has chaired the Committee on Sections and Annual Meeting, where she has worked persistently to encourage section leadership to plan effective programs and to include younger scholars in the work of the Sections. Her service on the Committee on Professional Development has been characterized by excellent judgment, rigor and keen insight. Her service on planning committees reflects her willingness to give generously of her time to bring about the best possible programs. She served on the Planning Committee for the 2009 AALS Conference on Business Associations and the Planning Committee for the AALS Conference on "New Ideas for Law School Teachers: Teaching Intentionally." Since her entry into teaching, 18 years ago, Professor Brown has been asked to speak at AALS sponsored programs, including at the Annual Meeting, on more than 20 occasions, testimony to the respect awarded her as teacher and scholar.

Continued on page 9

Executive Committee Nominations

Continued from page 8



Ann C. Shalleck
For a 3-year Term on the Executive Committee

Professor Ann Shalleck is the Carrington Shields Scholar and Director of the Women and the Law Program at American University Washington College of Law. She graduated from Bryn Mawr College, summa cum laude with honors in history (1971) and Harvard Law School, cum laude (JD, 1978). During her undergraduate and law school years, she evidenced the dual interests that have shaped her career, the promotion of social justice and the study of women and gender. Following law school she served for six years at Community Legal Services in Philadelphia.

Professor Shalleck is widely regarded as a longstanding thoughtful leader and innovator in clinical legal education. Professor Shalleck's capacity for innovative insight has been evident throughout her career. It was formally recognized with the American University Award for Outstanding Contributions to Curricular Development (1992) and with the law school's Emalee C. Godsey Scholar Award (1996).

Professor Shalleck has been an extraordinarily thoughtful contributor to the planning of AALS Programs. She has chaired the Professional Development Committee, chaired the Planning Committee for the 1999 Workshop for Law Clinic Directors, served on the Planning Committees for five of the annual Workshops on Clinical Legal Education (chairing two of them), served on the Planning Committee for the 2009 Workshop on "Progress: The Academy, Profession, Race and Gender: Empirical Findings, Research Issues, Potential Projects and Funding Opportunities" and on the Planning Committee for the Plenary session for the 2001 Annual Meeting: "Teaching, Scholarship and Service in the Pursuit of Justice." She chaired the Litigation Section (1995), served on the AALS Committee on Curriculum and Research, and the Committee for Open Source Programs at the Annual Meeting (2007 and 2008). Over 24 years, she has been a presenter on 23 occasions at AALS workshops and programs.

Continuing Members of the Executive Committee
Members of the Executive Committee continuing on the committee in 2010 are:

Term expiring 2010

R. Lawrence Dessem, University of Missouri-Columbia School of Law
 Leo P. Martinez, University of California, Hastings College of the Law
 Rachel F. Moran, University of California, Berkeley School of Law (2009 President)

Term expiring 2011

Katharine T. Bartlett, Duke University School of Law
 H. Reese Hansen, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School (2010 President)
 Daniel B. Rodriguez, The University of Texas School of Law

Retiring Members of the Executive Committee

With the conclusion of the Association's House of Representatives meeting on Saturday, January 9, 2010, John H. Garvey, Boston College Law School (2008 President); W. H. Knight, Jr., Seattle University School of Law and Lauren K. Robel, Indiana University Maurer School of Law will conclude their terms on the Executive Committee.

~Committee on Nominations

William Hines, University of Iowa College of Law
 Herma H. Kay, University of California, Berkeley School of Law
 Antoinette Sedillo Lopez, University of New Mexico School of Law
 Martha L. Minow, Harvard Law School, **Chair**
 Blake D. Morant, Wake Forest University School of Law
 Ruth L. Okediji, University of Minnesota Law School
 Edward L. Rubin, Vanderbilt University Law School

2010 Annual Meeting Theme: *Transformative Law*

In 2010, we will be meeting in New Orleans for the first time since Hurricane Katrina forced the relocation of our 2006 Annual Meeting. During my Presidential year, I am adopting the theme of "Transformative Law," mindful of the symbolic significance of our return there as well as of the successes and failures of the legal profession in addressing this perilous past decade. Our meeting this year takes place at a time of crisis in our economy, our ecology, and our international standing as the leader of the free world. Many lawyers (including our President, Vice-President, and many Cabinet officials and congressional leaders) must tackle these challenges. Media coverage of their efforts, however, portrays these public servants as people who happen to be lawyers, not as lawyers whose leadership grows out of their mastery of law and whose accomplishments represent the pinnacle of their professional pursuits. To a significant degree, the news accounts reflect the fact that these leaders have not pursued a traditional law firm practice but instead have devoted themselves to government and public service. The image of the citizen-lawyer, whose training can be used to advance the common good, has so thoroughly disappeared from the popular imagination that those who pursue this path are no longer centrally defined as lawyers.

*Contrast today's portrayals to those of fifty years ago, when the word "lawyer" might conjure up images of crusaders in the civil rights movement. Or, compare these images to those of an even earlier era, when attorneys entered public life as architects of the New Deal. When citizen-lawyers embarked on these campaigns for change, the result was transformative law. By this, I mean that law became a powerful tool to challenge and reconfigure social institutions. Transformative law can take place at the national, state, or local level. Challenges can come through landmark Supreme Court decisions like *Brown v. Board of Education*, which forced the nation to reconsider the meaning of racial equality. Or, change can be the product of ground-breaking statutes and administrative action, as the battle for the New Deal that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt waged with a reluctant Supreme Court reminds us.*

Whatever the forum, citizen-lawyers have produced transformative law because they understood their professional role as integral to achieving the American dream.

Today, when lawyers receive attention as lawyers, they are more likely to be defending the notorious than building the nation. Is there no greater role for lawyers as professionals in our contemporary public life? Is the citizen-lawyer now largely relegated to some lost golden age of reform? I believe that law still has a vital role to play at moments of national crisis like this one, but we must once again recognize that lawyers can be powerful agents of change and not merely advocates for agendas set by someone else. We, as members of a learned society, can play a critical role in resurrecting the citizen-lawyer and the possibilities for transformative law. In fact, the current crisis of confidence in our country provides an unparalleled opportunity for lawyers to answer the call of service and restore a sense of integrity and trust.

-Rachel F. Moran
University of California, Berkeley and AALS President

Remarks of Rachel F. Moran made to the Council of the ABA Section On Legal Education

Chicago, Illinois

July 31, 2009

On behalf of the AALS, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today about legal education. The AALS and the ABA Section have always had important common ground. We have a shared history and a common mission: to enhance the quality of legal education for the benefit of the profession and the society. As a result of this long and productive partnership, we each have encouraged and helped law schools around the country to develop the kinds of programs that are seen as the gold standard for legal education around the world. Indeed, in an era of globalization, countries look to the U.S. for leadership as they consider how to improve their own law schools. We are proud of this success, but like the ABA Section we know that we can not rest on our laurels. Without question, leadership in the field of law inherently depends on responding to changing conditions. That said, in evaluating proposed reforms, we must always keep in sharp focus the core values that guide us. These core values are commitments that define us as a discipline and as a profession. They lend coherence to our vision for the future, while they respect institutional pluralism and encourage innovation.

Even under exigent circumstances we should think hard before compromising those values. The true mark of judgment in a crisis is knowing what counts. What are the hallmarks of American legal education that have earned it the exceptional regard it enjoys around the world? American law schools have constantly innovated in the areas of scholarship, teaching and service. The world of legal education has adapted to a changing society by diversifying its faculty, its student body, and even its notions of what counts as knowledge. As a result, in *Grutter v. Bollinger*, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized the unique role of law schools in developing inclusive and democratic pathways to leadership. None of this would have happened without faculty who have devoted themselves over a lifetime to conceptualizing the law, designing curricula and courses, experimenting with teaching methods, mentoring students, and engaging in critiques that lead to law reform, large and small. Teacher-scholars and their students often experience the synergies among the three roles expected of law teachers: teaching, scholarship and service. In the process, students learn that they too have the power to reform the law through their work as lawyers. All of this may seem a bit abstract, so let me share some specific examples with you. Catherine MacKinnon's groundbreaking work on equality for women created a whole new cause of action for sexual harassment. These abusive practices previously had been largely ignored, even tolerated, and certainly not spoken about. The law and economics movement, led by professors like Richard Posner from one vantage point and Guido Calabresi from another, persuasively argued that regulation needs to be based on economic realities. In so doing, fields like torts and contracts came to be seen in a whole new light. What once seemed radical now seems almost conventional. In fact, both Professor Posner and Dean Calabresi eventually ascended to the federal bench. Much of the work of linking scholarship to law reform has come through partnerships between professors and practicing lawyers. For example, after doing his foundational work on the public trust doctrine, Professor Joseph Sax collaborated with legislators and practitioners to develop what has now become the field of environmental law. More recently, Professor Neal Katyal, working closely with military lawyers, challenged the legality of detention practices in the wake of September 11th. These brave efforts convinced the United States Supreme Court that fundamental principles of fairness had been violated and showed that law professors and lawyers can be heroes. What professors can not accomplish alone, they sometimes achieve through the dedication and ingenuity of those whom they have mentored. Important consumer law reforms have been driven by students who, as lawyers, remembered some of the critiques they evaluated in their law school classroom. They took those ideas, not yet embodied in the law, and pursued class actions that changed the legal landscape.

Remarks of Rachel F. Moran made to the Council of the ABA Section On Legal Education

Continued from page 11

Often, visionary law reform and teaching innovations have gone hand in hand. For example, Professor Tony Amsterdam not only created path breaking and enduring experiments in the first wave of clinical teaching, but he and his students also had a dramatic impact on the use of the death penalty. As we contemplate proposed reforms, it is important to bear in mind the level of excellence that already has been achieved, even as we acknowledge that there is room for improvement. The *Carnegie Report*, for instance, makes clear that there is much to celebrate in the law school's signature pedagogy, the Socratic method, which inculcates a deep capacity for critical thinking. The report argues that this pedagogy must be fully integrated with skills training and increased instruction on the professional obligations of lawyers. Intelligent regulation supports rather than suppresses innovation; it does this by insuring that the basic conditions essential to high quality legal education are present so that thoughtful planning and responsible experimentation can take place. A set of core values ensures a shared commitment to excellence without predetermining outcomes or squelching institutional pluralism. The simple truth is that a lawyer must be able to adapt to a volatile marketplace and a dynamic world. An undue emphasis on a narrow set of competencies can leave law school graduates ill-prepared to reinvent themselves as the nature of law and legal practice changes. The perception that American law is more fluid, more flexible, and more dynamic than other legal systems in responding to changing conditions is not an accident. Law schools and the bar have empowered faculty, students, and attorneys alike by giving them the freedom to question and to challenge the conventional wisdom, to advance fields of law, and to remain in the vanguard of ideas. It is this capacity to solve problems creatively and responsibly over long careers that has made the American legal profession a model for the world. Precisely because these tasks are complex and require discretion, they do not lend themselves to bright lines and ready metrics. Freedom is not an outcome but a process, and it is this aspect of American legal culture that has helped to define our country as a place of possibility. That promise has steadily expanded to encompass an ever growing circle of people from all walks of life. Women, people of color, and students from around the globe have vied for the right to study at America's law schools because of this great tradition. These hopes can not be reduced to rote measures, nor can they be nurtured as an after-thought by the occasional lecturer. At the end of the day, crisis or not, we must recommit ourselves to our core values not simply as law schools or even as lawyers but as a nation.

Annual Meeting Workshop: Pro Bono and Public Service

January 7, 2010

New Orleans, Louisiana

As the country faces record-high unemployment and an economic recession, there is a critical and most urgent need for lawyers to be engaged in promoting access to justice. Throughout our law schools, programs have sought to inspire students to engage in pro bono and public interest work through a variety of program models. While this activity and emphasis has been on the rise, educators, the bar and the bench grapple with best practices to engender a lifelong commitment to pro bono.

The Workshop on Pro Bono and Public Service will raise critical questions regarding the ways in which we approach pro bono in legal education and will provide participants with specific models and approaches to making pro bono a central part of the campus culture. Attendees will have the opportunity to explore how to develop realistic pro bono practices, evaluating different program models and goals. In addition, participants will hear from faculty who have made pro bono a central part of their curriculum in doctrinal courses, seminars and workshops, going beyond the traditional model of pro bono through clinical and externships only.

The workshop will also explore the ways to leverage the relationships between the administration, faculty, students and alumni to encourage pro bono engagement. Registration for the Workshop is included in the Annual Meeting registration fee.

Visit www.aals.org/am2010/ for an up-to-date program of events and to register online.

Topics

- Exploring the Role of Pro Bono
- Developing Best Realistic Practices in Pro Bono Programs
- Engaging Faculty: Using Pro Bono to Teach Doctrine and Skills
- Transforming Campus Culture: Enriching the Law School Experience for Students and Faculty Through Pro Bono Programs

Planning Committee for 2010 Annual Meeting Workshop on Pro Bono and Public Service

Arlene R. Finkelstein, University of Pennsylvania
Marni B. Lennon, University of Miami
Jack McMahan, University of Idaho
Deborah Schmedemann, William Mitchell College
of Law
William M. Treanor, Fordham University, **Chair**

Speakers

- Cynthia F. Adcock, Charlotte School of Law
- Linda L. Ammons, Widener University
- Anita Bernstein, Brooklyn Law School
- Arlene R. Finkelstein, University of Pennsylvania
- Victor B. Flatt, University of North Carolina
- Bryant G. Garth, Southwestern Law School
- Charlene E. Gomes, Senior Program Manager, Law School Advocacy and Outreach, Equal Justice Works, Washington, D.C.
- Eve Biskind Klothen, Rutgers, The State University of N.J., Camden
- Karen A. Lash, Legal Consultant for Nonprofits and Law Schools, Washington, D.C.
- Susan Maze-Rothstein, Northeastern University
- Jack McMahan, University of Idaho
- Hari Michele Osofsky, Washington and Lee University
- Deborah L. Rhode, Stanford Law School
- Pamela D. Robinson, University of South Carolina
- Deborah A. Schmedemann, William Mitchell
- Thomas J. Schoenherr, Fordham University
- William M. Treanor, Fordham University
- Patricia D. White, University of Miami

2010 Conference on Clinical Legal Education:

Answering the Call for Reform: Using Outcomes Assessment, Critical Theory and Strategic Thinking to Implement Change

May 4-8, 2010

Baltimore, Maryland

Why Attend?

The *Carnegie Report*, *Educating Lawyers*, and *Best Practices For Legal Education* have stimulated a conversation about change in many law schools, including about how and whether to educate lawyers for practice. As professors who have played a central role in educating graduates for practice and in pushing reform in legal education, clinicians have been and will be an important voice in these conversations. The conference will provide clinical educators with knowledge and skills needed for improving their own programs and participating meaningfully in institutional change. The conference's goal is to empower clinicians and other faculty whether their school is deeply engaged in discussions about *Carnegie* and *Best Practices* or whether the conversation has not even begun.

Both *Carnegie* and *Best Practices*, as well as the ABA, have called for law schools to identify with greater precision what our students should learn and be able to do after graduation. Thus, the conference will begin with a focus on outcomes and assessment, identifying how to frame outcomes that shape the student's education and how to measure our effectiveness as teachers.

Next, as we think about changing legal education and our own clinical courses, we must ensure that change is not limited to creating greater technical competence but includes educating students about professional values and norms, especially commitments to social justice. *Carnegie* criticizes an approach to teaching law that eliminates a justice dimension and both reports identify professional commitments to justice and equality as important professional values to teach. The conference will address these concerns by exploring the contributions that critical race and other critical theories about law, practice and legal education can add to the discussions about what students need to learn and how best to teach them.

Finally we will explore how change occurs by engaging theories of institutional change and applying them to legal education, our law schools and our clinical courses. We will look at a variety of issues such as content, sequencing and design of clinical programs, integration of clinical courses and methodologies within the entire curriculum, and status.

Through a range of plenary and mini-plenary sessions, focused concurrent sessions, and small working group meetings, clinicians will examine these issues by drawing on expertise both within and outside of legal education. The emphasis, as in all clinical conferences, will be on the interaction among participants and between participants and presenters.

Who Should Attend?

This conference will be of interest to both veteran and novice clinicians as well as other faculty who are interested in addressing issues surrounding preparation of students for practice.

Registration information will be sent and will also be posted online at: www.aals.org/clinical/.

Topics

- Outcome and Assessments – Learning Theory Professions
- Mini-Plenary Sessions:
 - Designing Learning to Meet Objectives in Professional Identity
 - Measuring Competence
 - Setting Institutional Outcomes Across Three Years
 - Legal Education Focused Assessment
- Using Critical Perspectives to Inform Change
- Mini-Plenary Sessions (Using Critical Theory to Inform Practice and Pedagogy)
- Building Consensus for Change
- Works-in-Progress
- New Ideas
- Bellow Award Presentation

Planning Committee for 2010 Conference on Clinical Legal Education

Alicia Alvarez, The University of Michigan

C. Elizabeth Belmont, Washington and Lee University

Susan J. Bryant, The City University of New York, **Chair**

Kristin Henning, Georgetown University

Charles D. Weisselberg, University of California, Berkeley

The Honorable Guido Calabresi Announced as AALS Luncheon Speaker

Judge Calabresi also to be Presented with AALS Award for Lifetime Service to Legal Education and to the Law

The Honorable Guido Calabresi, Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and Sterling Professor and Professorial Lecturer, Yale Law School, will be the keynote speaker during the AALS luncheon at the 2010 Annual Meeting in New Orleans. Additionally, prior to Judge Calabresi's speech, President Rachel Moran will present him with the AALS Award for Lifetime Service to Legal Education and to the Law — a Triennial Award established in 2006 to formally recognize lifetime contributions to service, to legal education and to the law made by a faculty member or retired faculty member at an AALS member school.



Judge Calabresi received his B.S. degree, *summa cum laude*, from Yale College in 1953, a B.A. degree with First Class Honors from Magdalene College, Oxford University, in 1955, an LL.B. degree, *magna cum laude*, in 1958 from Yale Law School, and an M.A. in Politics, Philosophy and Economics from Oxford University in 1959. A Rhodes Scholar and member of Phi Beta Kappa and Order of the Coif, Judge Calabresi served as the Note Editor of *The Yale Law Journal*, 1957-58, while graduating first in his law school class. He began his teaching career at Yale Law School in 1959 and served as Dean from 1985-1994. On February 9, 1994, President Bill Clinton nominated Calabresi as circuit judge to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and he was confirmed by the United States Senate on July 18.

Professor, Dean and Judge Calabresi's service "to the law" is best exemplified in the body of his scholarship which transformed our profession's thinking about tort law. Two of his four books earned recognition from the American Bar Association, and one received the Order of the Coif's Triennial Book Award. The American Bar Foundation honored him with its Award for Outstanding Research in Law and Government. He has received the Morton A. Brody Distinguished Judicial Service Award and continues his active judicial service after fifteen years as a Judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. Judge Calabresi's service "to legal education" is multi-faceted. It includes nine years as Dean of the Yale Law School, membership during the late 1980s on the AALS Executive Committee, an exceptionally high degree of informal mentoring of law students and graduates over the generations, continued law school teaching despite the demands and satisfactions of his judicial role, willingness to participate in furthering the transition of individuals into law teaching through, for example, his frequent participation in the AALS's Workshop for New Law School Teachers, and his service to law schools other than his own exemplified in over 70 named lectures and service on advisory boards.

The Order of the Coif Book Award Winner will also be honored during the AALS Luncheon.

2010 AALS Annual Meeting Section Programs that held Calls for Papers

Please see the online program for speakers and descriptions. There will be a special Call for Papers printed program distributed at the Annual Meeting.

Thursday, January 7, 2010

2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

[4260] Joint Program of Sections on Legal Writing, Reasoning and Research and Teaching Methods

Topic: Teaching Law to Students from Other Countries

2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

[4280] Section on New Law Professors

Topic: Call for Papers in Transformational Law

2:00 - 5:00 p.m.

[4290] Section on Real Estate Transactions, Co-Sponsored by Section on Property Law

Topic: Law as Transformative Agent: Thinking and Doing Property in New Categories

Friday, January 8, 2010

8:30 - 10:15 a.m.

[5130] Section on Creditors' and Debtors' Rights

Topic: The Future of Debtor - Creditor Scholarship

8:30 - 10:15 a.m.

[5180] Section on Nonprofit and Philanthropy Law

Topic: Rebuilding New Orleans, Transforming America: The Role of Nonprofit Organizations in New Orleans and National Recovery

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5210] Section on Art Law

Topic: Mapping Art Spaces I: University and Nonprofit Art

Section Programs that held Calls for Papers

Continued from page 15

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5220] Section on Civil Procedure, Co-Sponsored by Section on Litigation
Topic: Revisiting Discovery

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5230] Section on Contracts
Topic: New Approaches to Teaching Contracts: A Teach - In

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5240] Section on Criminal Justice
Topic: Neuroscience, Cognitive Psychology and the Criminal Justice System

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5250] Section on Education Law
Topic: Five Years After Katrina: Access to Education

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5260] Section on Family and Juvenile Law, Co-Sponsored by Sections on Children and the Law, Poverty Law, Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues, Women in Legal Education
Topic: Money, Intimacy, Law and the Contours of Inequality

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5270] Section on Financial Institutions and Consumer Financial Services
Topic: Reforming the Institutional Structure of Financial Regulation

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5300] Section on Law, Medicine and Health Care, Co-Sponsored by Section on Constitutional Law
Topic: Constitutional Health Law: Pharmaceutical Regulation and Commercial Speech

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5310] Section on National Security Law
Topic: Barbarians at the Gate (or Within?): New Developments in the Detention and Prosecution of Terrorist Suspects

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[5330] Section on Professional Responsibility
Topic: The Transformative Effect of International Initiatives on Lawyer Practice and Regulation: A Case Study Focusing on FATF and Its 2008 Lawyer Guidance

4:00 - 5:45 p.m.

[5460] Section on Poverty Law
Topic: The New Anti - Poverty Advocacy: Constructs, Strategies, and Tactics

Saturday, January 9, 2010

8:30 - 10:15 a.m.

[6120] Section on Agency, Partnership, LLC's, and Unincorporated Associations
Topic: Vicarious, Individual, and Limited Liability: Responsibility for Wrongful Conduct and Unincorporated Firms

8:30 - 10:15 a.m.

[6170] Section on International Human Rights
Topic: New Voices in Human Rights

8:30 - 10:15 a.m.

[6210] Section on Women in Legal Education, Co-Sponsored by Section on Defamation and Privacy
Topic: The First Amendment Meets Cyber - Stalking Meets Character and Fitness

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[6220] Section on Commercial and Related Consumer Law
Topic: The Principles of the Law of Software Contracts: A Phoenix Rising from the Ashes of Article 2B and UCITA?

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[6230] Section on Constitutional Law
Topic: The Interpretation - Construction Distinction in Constitutional Law

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[6240] Section on Disability Law
Topic: Disability Discrimination After the ADA Amendments Act of 2008

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[6270] Section on Litigation, Co-Sponsored by Section on Civil Procedure
Topic: The Future of Summary Judgment

Continued on page 16

Section Programs that held Calls for Papers

Continued from page 16

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[6300] Section on Securities Regulations

Topic: Responding to the Financial Crisis: Change is in the Air

10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.

[6310] Section on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Issues

Topic: On the Cutting Edge: Charting the Future of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Scholarship

1:30 - 3:15 p.m.

[6390] Section on Law and Computers

Topic: Law and Wikis

1:30 - 3:15 p.m.

[6430] Section on Trusts and Estates

Topic: Changing Times, Changing Law: Evaluating Legal Trends in Trusts and Estates Law

Sunday, January 10, 2010

9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

[7100] Section on Business Associations

Topic: The Financial Collapse and Recovery Effort: What Does It Mean For Corporate Governance?

9:00 - 10:45 a.m.

[7170] Section on National Security Law, Co-Sponsored by Sections on International Human Rights and International Law

Topic: Cross - Currents in International Law, Human Rights Law and National Security Law

9:00 - 10:45 a.m.

[7190] Section on Property Law

Topic: Junior Property Scholars Works - in - Progress

Organization of American States Secretary General José Miguel Insulza Announced as Speaker for 2010 AALS Committee on International Cooperation Luncheon

Thursday, January 7, 2010

12:15 - 1:45 p.m.

Hilton New Orleans Riverside Hotel



José Miguel Insulza was elected OAS Secretary General in 2005, pledging to strengthen the

Organization's "political relevance and its capacity for action."

Insulza served as Chilean Ambassador for International Cooperation, Director of Multilateral Economic Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Vice President of the International Cooperation Agency. Under the administration of President Eduardo Frei, Insulza served as Under-Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister Secretary General of the Presidency, and President Ricardo Lagos's Minister of the Interior and Vice President of the Republic. After leaving his last post in May 2005, he had served as a government minister for more than a decade, the longest continuous tenure for a minister in Chilean history.

Photo courtesy of Organization of American States

Get Up-to-Date Annual Meeting Information at www.aals.org/am2010/

The complete 2010 Annual Meeting program with section and committee programs, speakers, and descriptions can be found at www.aals.org/am2010/.

The final program has been printed and copies were sent to the Deans' offices and will be given to each registrant at the Annual Meeting in January.

The program on the web site is continually updated and will be more up-to-date than the printed program, including late scheduled programs and new speakers.

2010 Mid Year Meeting

June 8-12, 2010

New York, New York

The Mid Year Meeting consists of the following professional development programs:

- The Workshop on Post Racial Civil Rights, held June 8-10, 2010
- The Workshop on Property Law and the Workshop on Civil Procedure, will be held concurrently from June 10-12, 2010

You can register for just the Workshop on Post Racial Civil Rights, or the simultaneous Workshops on Property Law and Civil Procedure, or register for the entire Mid Year Meeting which includes access to all programs (Post Racial Civil Rights and the concurrent Property Law and Civil Procedure Workshops) held from June 8-12. Registering for the entire Mid Year Meeting results in approximately a 50% discount off one of the workshop registration fees.

Type of Registration	Received by May 21	Received After May 21
Workshop on Post Racial Civil Rights		
June 8-10, 2010		
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$495	\$545
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$585	\$645
Workshops on Property Law AND/OR Workshop on Civil Procedure		
June 10-12, 2010		
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$495	\$545
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$585	\$645
All Three Workshops		
June 8-12, 2010		
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$750	\$835
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$835	\$930

2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Post Racial Civil Rights Law, Politics and Legal Education: New and Old Colorlines in the Age Of Obama

June 8 – 10, 2010

New York, New York

When Du Bois wrote in 1903 that “the problem of the Twentieth Century is the problem of the color line,” he was reflecting on momentous changes over the previous decades. For Du Bois, the turn of the century offered an opportunity to take stock of race, to gauge its recent past and predict its immediate future. The turn of the millennium offers us a similar backward- and forward-looking opportunity. Thus this AALS workshop on race and the law.

Entitled “Post Racial Civil Rights law, Politics and Legal Education: New and Old Colorlines in the Age of Obama” (hereafter “Post Racial Civil Rights”), the aim of this workshop, broadly framed, is to mark three significant post civil rights changes to the American racial landscape and to explore the implications of those changes for the future of racial justice advocacy, organization, litigation and legal education. As will become clear, while the three developments we have in mind are not exhaustive of the shifts in U.S. racial dynamics post *Brown v. Board of Education* and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, each raises profound questions about the direction and substantive content of civil rights reform in the decades to come.

Planning Committee for 2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Race & Law

Devon Wayne Carbado, University of California, Los Angeles, **Chair**
 Ian F. Haney Lopez, University of California, Berkeley
 Audrey McFarlane, University of Baltimore
 Robert O. Porter, Syracuse University
 Reva B. Siegel, Yale Law School
 Stephanie M. Wildman, Santa Clara University

2010 Annual Meeting Presidential Programs

Presidential Program I Transformative Scholarship

Moderator: Robert C. Post, Yale Law School

Speakers:

Dana Berliner, Senior Attorney, Institute for Justice,
Arlington, Virginia

Richard A. Epstein, The University of Chicago Law School

Charles Swift, Esquire, Swift & McDonald, P.S., Seattle,
Washington

Catharine A. Mac Kinnon, The University of Michigan
Law School

Maria T. Vullo, Esquire, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton &
Garrison LLP, New York, New York

Professors enjoy remarkable opportunities to capitalize on their research and expertise to forge partnerships to transform law and policy. The faculty on this panel will share the podium with practicing attorneys who collaborated on important reform efforts in a wide range of areas. These initiatives all required creativity, commitment, and courage to pursue change both in the United States and abroad. In each instance, a theory of rights whether related to real property, the criminal process, or international law was tested in the crucible of real world cases.

Presidential Program II Transformative Teaching and Institution- Building

Moderator: Devon Wayne Carbado, University of California,
Los Angeles, School of Law

Speakers:

Cheryl Hanna, Vermont Law School

Elizabeth M. Schneider, Brooklyn Law School School of Law

Michael H. Schwartz, Washburn University School of Law
(With audience as his partner)

Kyle Homstead, Chief Technology Officer, Chronicle
Technologies, Florence, Massachusetts

Susan P. Sturm, Columbia University School of Law

Presidential Program II, Continued

Professors enjoy the great privilege of shaping a future generation of legal thinkers through teaching and institution-building. The faculty on this panel will describe how they reach students in the classroom, how they form mentoring relationships that transcend a particular course, and how they work on curricular change to improve what law schools have to offer. The participants will be paired with partners, whether a former student, a talented professional from another field, or even the audience itself to explore how innovation can begin at our home institutions.

Presidential Program III Transformative Advocacy

Moderator: Elliott S. Milstein, American University
Washington College of Law

Speakers:

Lael R. Echo-Hawk, Reservation Attorney, The Tulalip
Tribes of Washington, Tulalip, Washington

Ron J. Whitener, University of Washington School of Law

Robert R. Kuehn, Washington University School of Law
Marylee Orr, Executive Director, Louisiana
Environmental Action Network, Baton Rouge,
Louisiana

Raul Pinto, Law Student, City University of New York
School of Law, Flushing, New York

Jenny Rivera, City University of New York School of Law

Professors enjoy an increasing number of ways to combine teaching and advocacy through clinics and centers devoted to research, policy, and practice. These programs represent a profound and continuing transformation in legal education, and they are reaching an increasingly broad cross-section of the communities they serve. The professors on this panel will share the experience of partnering with students, organizers, and activists to address controversial issues of pressing concern. This transformative advocacy often has given a voice to those in need of legal assistance, whose concerns about injustice might otherwise go unheard.

2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Post Racial Civil Rights

Continued from page 18

Change I: The installation of colorblindness as both the normative backdrop against which race is publicly discussed and a formal legal technique to adjudicate civil rights cases. This installation produces racial denials (of racism), racial prohibitions (of racial consciousness) and racial elisions (of existing racial inequalities). Colorblindness has simultaneously undermined the emancipatory potential of civil rights law and made conversations about racial justice in civic and political arenas virtually impossible. At the same time, colorblindness has enabled and legitimized a discourse of cultural difference and social responsibility that now serves as the principal explanation of and justification for existing racial hierarchies.

Change II: The shift in America's racial demographics from a majority white nation to a majority-minority nation. There are two significant features of this shift. First, no single racially-defined group represents a majority of the population; and, second, Latinos constitute the new majority-minority. By the year 2000, these patterns were firmly established in California; they now exist in numerous other states, and many of the nation's major cities, as well.

Change III: The momentous election of Barack Obama as the first Black President of the United States. When Obama announced his decision to run for the United States presidency, few people thought he would win the democratic nomination, let alone the

White House. But win the White House is precisely what he did, changing the face of American politics in the process and facilitating the introduction of a new term in our ever-shifting racial vocabulary: Post racialism. Exactly what this term will come to mean is anybody's guess. What is clear is that post racialism has already begun to operate as "replacement labor" for the ideological work that colorblindness has traditionally performed.

Organized over three days, Post Racial Civil Rights will examine what the foregoing developments portend for civil rights legal practice, education and political reform. An informal reception opens the workshop on the evening of Tuesday, June 8. The substantive sessions will begin on Wednesday, June 9, with a plenary focused the role law plays in reproducing inequality, even and perhaps especially when no formal "racial classifications" are involved. Entitled "The Legal (Re) production of Inequality," the plenary will demonstrate some of the distinctive mechanisms through which law reproduces racial inequality in areas including: criminal justice, healthcare, housing, education, employment, immigration, and constitutional law. Small group informal breakout sessions will follow the plenary. There will be no room change. Rather, the plenary attendees will simply form small groups based on where they are seated and engage the members of their group for 30 minutes around the themes the plenary

presented. Group participants will then have the opportunity to draw on their group discussions to direct questions at the plenary speakers.

Lunch then follows and will feature a keynote presentation. A second plenary will launch the afternoon sessions, this one devoted to "New Paradigms of Racialization." As mentioned above, the United States has shifted from a majority white nation to a nation within which (1) no single racial group constitutes a racial majority, (2) people of color outnumber whites, and (3) Latinos are the new minority majority. This plenary panel will explore whether these demographic changes—and social response to them—reflect new paradigms of racialization. How should we now count race? What are the frames in which we now talk about race? And what are the intersectional implications of these shifts in demographics and discourse? How do they affect our conception of whiteness? Do they have implications for relations of intimacy—shaping perceptions about childbearing and child care, or the social expression of sexuality? How do these new forms of racialization shape claims about citizenship and security, immigration and sovereignty? Staying with this theme, the second afternoon session will feature a choice among several concurrent sessions, including sessions on the census, immigration and profiling, sovereignty, race and dependency and race, family and sexuality.

2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Post Racial Civil Rights

Continued from page 20

The second day of the workshop, Thursday, June 9, will open with the plenary, "Race Across the Curriculum and Law School: Race Law 101 and Beyond." This plenary will focus on race, legal education and law school environment. Senior, mid-level and junior professors will discuss not only the substantive content on the basic race law course, but also how if, at all, that course does or should differ from a course in Critical Race Theory. The panelists will also consider whether identity specific courses, such as Latinos and the Law and Asian American Jurisprudence, enhance or diminish a multiracial approach to civil rights reform. Finally, because race is endogenous (and not just exogenous) to legal environments, the plenary will consider some of the ways in which—outside of the classroom—race shapes and is itself shaped by the institutional culture and life of law schools. To permit further discussion of these issues, the plenary will be followed by small group breakout sessions that, in addition to continuing the discussion of law school environment and race-specific courses, will examine how to incorporate race into non-traditional race law classes, such as tax and the basic first year curriculum.

Lunch then follows with a keynote presentation on the Obama Administration and Civil Rights. The afternoon sessions will turn to solutions. The discussion will begin with the plenary, "Interventions: The Possibilities and Limitations of Law." As the title suggests, this plenary will examine whether law remains a productive vehicle with which to achieve racial reform. From antidiscrimination law to immigration law to human rights to housing and criminal justice reforms, the panelists will explore the possibilities and limitations of law—working alongside large and small scale political organizing—to effectuate progressive racial change.

The day ends with another plenary, this one structured in the form of a roundtable to maximize audience participation. Entitled, "The Future of Race, Law and Civil Rights: Asking and Answering the Hard Questions," this plenary will press the panelists to engage some of the most difficult and controversial questions about the future of race, law and civil rights? Some of the questions will explicitly draw from, though they will not be exhausted by, the themes around which the

preceding plenaries are organized. Is Obama's presidency likely to be more symbolic than substantive? Are there progressive terms upon which assimilationist projects can be articulated? Should whiteness be more explicitly engaged in our public and political discourses about race? How we should we theorize the notion of a black/white binary? Has civil rights advocacy failed meaningfully to engage class? How, if at all, should arguments based on hierarchies of oppression figure in civil rights advocacy? To what extent should our racial engagements be more globally-centered? What is role of international law in domestic civil rights reform? These are some of the questions this plenary will take up.

Who Should Attend?

This workshop has been planned for (1) anyone interested in post civil rights changes to the American racial landscape and the implications of those changes for the future of racial justice advocacy, organization, litigation and legal education, (2) scholars and teachers in the field of race and the law and anti-discrimination law, including but not limited to, those who write about or teach courses in constitutional law, employment discrimination, women and the law, sexual orientation and the law and feminist jurisprudence, and (3) law professors who teach courses that are not explicitly marked in terms of race and are interested in developing new and exciting ways to incorporate race into their courses.

When is this Workshop?

The workshop will be held at the Sheraton New York Hotel and Towers located at 811 7th Avenue at 53rd Street in New York. The workshop will begin on Tuesday, June 8, with an opening reception from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m., followed by two days (June 9 and 10) of plenary and concurrent sessions. Both June 9 and 10 will feature luncheons with keynote speakers.

Registration information will be sent and will also be posted online at www.aals.org/midyear/.

2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Civil Procedure: Charting Your Course in a Shifting Field

June 10-12, 2010

New York, New York

Civil Procedure is a shifting field, requiring mastery of a rapidly changing subject. A new approach to pleading, elaborate litigation financing mechanisms, expanding frontiers in preclusion law, and an increasingly detailed awareness of the landscape of civil litigation all present difficult challenges to teacher and scholar alike.

This workshop will address these important issues. It will also focus on three central pedagogical challenges: teaching the hardest cases, incorporating innovative and varied classroom methodologies, and constructing a successful course in fewer credit hours.

Our speakers will include established scholars and newer voices. The program is designed to benefit civil procedure teachers and scholars at all levels of experience.

Registration information will be sent and will also be posted online at: www.aals.org/midyear/.

Topics

- The Return of Pleading: *Twombly* and *Iqbal* in Federal and State Courts
- Teaching the Three Hardest Cases
- Emerging Methods: Three Ideas
- The Demography of Civil Litigation: What We Know
- Big Topics, Shrinking Credits
- Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign-Country Judgments: Domestic and Comparative Perspectives
- Brave New World of Litigation Finance

Speakers

- Tom Baker, University of Pennsylvania
- Marilyn J. Berger, Seattle University
- Frederic M. Bloom, Brooklyn Law School
- Robert G. Bone, Boston University
- Hannah L. Buxbaum, Indiana University, Bloomington
- Paul D. Carrington, Duke University
- Joe S. Cecil, Ph.D., Project Director in the Division of Research, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C.
- Kevin M. Clermont, Cornell Law School
- Edward H. Cooper, The University of Michigan
- Theodore Eisenberg, Cornell Law School
- Howard M. Erichson, Fordham University
- Christopher Fairman, The Ohio State University
- Martha A. Field, Harvard Law School
- Susan M. Gilles, Capital University
- Alex Glashausser, Washburn University
- Samuel Issacharoff, New York University
- Laura Hines, University of Kansas
- John P. Lenich, University of Nebraska
- Ashley S. Lipson, University of La Verne
- Benjamin V. Madison, III, Regent University
- David W. Marcus, The University of Arizona
- Linda S. Mullenix, University of Texas
- Michael B. Mushlin, Pace University
- Richard A. Nagareda, Vanderbilt University
- Timothy D. Scramton, President, Juridica Capital Management (US), Inc., New York, New York
- Anthony Sebok, Yeshiva University
- Linda J. Silberman, New York University
- Lisa Margaret Smith, United States Magistrate, Judge, Southern District of New York, New York, New York
- Angela Upchurch, Capital University
- Howard M. Wasserman, Florida International University
- Patrick Woolley, University of Texas at Austin
- Stephen C. Yeazell, University of California, Los Angeles

Planning Committee for 2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Civil Procedure

Frederic M. Bloom, Brooklyn Law School

Laura Hines, University of Kansas

Richard A. Nagareda, Vanderbilt University

Patrick Woolley, University of Texas at Austin, **Chair**

Stephen C. Yeazell, University of California, Los Angeles

2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Property

June 10-12, 2010

New York, New York

Two major crises in the last few years have exposed deep tensions and pressures on our understanding of Property Law. The foreclosure of more than 2 million homes, and the anticipated default of another 6 million mortgages has shaken common notions about the ability of consumers to understand real estate transactions and the terms of their mortgage contracts, posed stark questions about the failure of the law to limit the ability of the market to produce property transactions that created significant principal/agent costs, moral hazards, and externalities, and presented challenging questions about racial disparities in access to prime credit and in the underwriting of troublesome new mortgage products. Similarly, vigorous debates over the responsibility of industrialized countries to control global warming, the need to protect future generations from the effects of global warming, and the fair allocation of the burdens of reducing greenhouse gases similarly have posed challenging questions about the regulation of risk from activities on private property, the nature of property owners' obligations to future generations, and the failure of regulation to control externalities from the use of property. Both crises raise serious theoretical and practical challenges to traditional notions about the comparative advantages of the free market, our ability to craft property laws that limit systematic risk without unduly discouraging innovation, and the continuing inability of the law to prevent racial discrimination, exclusion and exploitation.

The crises also have shown that property conundrums are hardest when they fall at the intersections of state and federal law; constitutional, statutory, regulatory and common law; and substantive environmental, international, financial instruments and risk regulation fields. Property law professors increasingly must come to terms with these intersections as they struggle to distinguish property from other subjects. At the same time, property law professors must master and incorporate into their scholarship and teaching the considerable insights normative theory, theories about race, gender and inequality, and scholarship on law and economics (especially behavioral law and economics) and political economy provide about property.

To address these issues, the workshop will begin substantively on Friday, June 11 with an opening plenary focused on identifying the core of property that must be taught in the introductory property course. As the credits allotted to introductory property courses shrink in schools across the country, but as the crises of the last few years show just how fundamental property law is to our legal and financial systems, senior, mid-level, and junior professors will debate what is critical to include in the basic property course. A second plenary will launch sessions on the mortgage and housing crises, focusing first on "Property in Dangerous Packages: Subprime and Skin in the Game." The luncheon keynote will feature a discussion of federal efforts to address the need for reform in the regulation of the financial and mortgage sectors.

The afternoon sessions will then feature breakout sessions on what behavioral law and economics tells us about the mortgage crisis; what norms underpin the mortgage crisis; what the crisis tells us about the regulation of risk; and what we can learn about and from the political economy of homeownership. We will then reconvene in a third plenary session to talk about inequality and the subprime market.

The morning of Saturday, June 12th will feature breakout sessions organized around works in progress selected through a request for proposals. A fourth plenary session will then focus on what the global warming crisis tells us about property law. Breakout sessions will follow, again to allow examination of the global warming crisis through the perspective of various normative theories and theories of equality and fairness, as well as from a political economy and risk regulation vantage point. The day will end with very early works in progress roundtables, at which scholars with very preliminary ideas will be given just ten minutes to outline their ideas and get feedback on the viability of the topic.

Registration information will be sent and will also be posted online at www.aals.org/midyear/.

See page 24 for a list of topics and speakers.

Speakers and Topics at the 2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Property

Topics

- Plenary Sessions:
 - The Core of Property: What is Essential in the First Year
 - Property in Dangerous Packages: Subprime and Skin in the Game
 - Inequality and the Subprime Mortgage Crisis
 - The Global Warming Crisis: Property Law
- Breakouts:
 - What Does Behavioral Law and Economics Tell Us About the Mortgage Crisis
 - What Are the Norms Underlying the Mortgage Crisis
 - What Does the Mortgage Crisis Teach Us About Regulating Risk
 - What Does the Mortgage Crisis Teach Us About the Political Economy of Home Ownership
 - Works-in-Progress
 - Behavioral Law and Economics
 - Normative Approaches
 - Regulating Risk
 - Political Economy
 - Global Warming Crisis: Thinking Holistically
 - The Global Warming Crisis: Fairness
 - The Global Warming Crisis: Regulating Risk
 - The Global Warming Crisis: Political Economy

Confirmed Speakers include:

- Jonathan H. Adler, Case Western Reserve University
- Adam Ashcraft, Assistant Vice President Financial Intermediation Function, Federal Reserve Bank of New York, New York
- D. Benjamin Barros, Widener University
- Alfred L. Brophy, University of North Carolina
- Lee Anne Fennell, The University of Chicago
- William A. Fischel, Professor of Economics, Dartmouth College Department of Economics, Hanover, New Hampshire
- Sheila R. Foster, Fordham University
- Eric T. Freyfogle, University of Illinois
- Tim Iglesias, University of San Francisco
- Martha Mahoney, University of Miami
- Patricia A. Mc Coy, University of Connecticut
- Hari Michele Osofsky, Washington and Lee University
- Jedediah S. Purdy, Duke University
- Mark Sagoff, Senior Research Scholar, University of Maryland School of Public Policy
- Maria Savasta-Kennedy, University of North Carolina
- Henry E. Smith, Harvard Law School
- Stewart E. Sterk, Yeshiva University
- Stephanie M. Stern, Loyola University, Chicago
- Laura S. Underkuffler, Cornell Law School
- Molly Van Houwelling, University of California, Berkeley

Planning Committee for 2010 Mid Year Meeting Workshop on Property

Vicki L. Been, New York University, **Chair**
 Carol N. Brown, University of North Carolina
 Eduardo Moises M. Penalver, Cornell Law School
 Joseph W. Singer, Harvard Law School
 Alfred Chueh-Chin Yen, Boston College

Informal Networking at the 2010 Annual Meeting New Orleans, Louisiana

AALS provides an opportunity for informal networking sessions at the Annual Meeting. Do you have an interesting topic outside of the area of interest of an AALS Section you want to discuss? Colleagues with similar interests or dilemmas you want to meet? If so, take charge and organize an informal networking gathering that could meet any time on Saturday, January 9th for one hour and forty five minutes. Simply post a notice on the bulletin board directly outside the Hilton Exhibition Center located on the 2nd Floor, Hilton New Orleans Riverside. Indicate the topic/interest you want to discuss and select a time to meet at a designated table assigned to a designated meeting room. Sign your name as Moderator and see who joins you!

The Informal Networking Sessions will take place in the Grand Ballroom D, First Floor, Hilton New Orleans Riverside from 8:30 a.m. — 5:15 p.m.

New Law School Teachers Workshops

June 16-20, 2010

Washington, D.C.

Planning Committee for the AALS Workshop for Pretenured Minority Law School Teachers, Workshop for New Law School Teachers; Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers:

Randy E. Barnett, Georgetown University Law Center
A. Mechele. Dickerson, The University of Texas
Robert D. Dinerstein, American University
Tanya Kateri Hernandez, Fordham University
Kellye Y. Testy, University of Washington, Chair
Ronald F. Wright, Wake Forest University

Type of Registration	Received by May 19	Received After May 19	Amount
Workshop for Pretenured Minority Law School Teachers			
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$255	\$305	
Faculty of Non Fee-paid Law Schools	\$330	\$380	
Workshop for New Law School Teachers			
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$550	\$600	
Faculty of Non Fee-paid Law Schools	\$600	\$650	
Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers			
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$255	\$305	
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$330	\$380	
Combined Workshops: New Law School Teachers and Pretenured Minority Law School Teachers or New Law School Clinical Teachers (discounted fee)			
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$660	\$710	
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$710	\$760	
All Three Workshops (discounted fee)			
Faculty of Member and Fee-paid Schools	\$770	\$820	
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$820	\$870	

Workshop for Pretenured Minority Law School Teachers

June 16-17, 2010

Washington, DC

This program is supported in part by a grant from the Law School Admission Council

Why Attend?

From their first day of teaching until tenure, minority law teachers face special challenges in the legal academy. At this workshop, diverse panels of experienced and successful law professors will focus on these issues as they arise in the context of scholarship, teaching, service and the tenure process. The workshop dovetails with the AALS Workshop for New Law School Teachers by providing sustained emphasis on the distinctive situations of pretenured minority law school teachers.

Who Should Attend?

The Workshop will be of interest to newly appointed minority law teachers as well as junior professors who are navigating the tenure process and looking for guidance and support.

Plenary Session Topics:

- Promotion and Tenure: Getting to Yes
- Teaching: Strategies to Success
- Service: Strategies to Success
- Scholarship: Strategies to Success
- You Can Do This

Speakers:

- Thomas W. Joo, University of California, Davis
- Camille A. Nelson, Saint Louis University
- Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Southern Methodist University
- Michael A. Olivas, University of Houston
- Jennifer L. Rosato, Northern Illinois University

Workshop for New Law School Teachers

June 17-19, 2010

Washington, DC

Why Attend?

At the 28th annual Workshop for New Law School Teachers, new law teachers will share their excitement, experiences and concerns with each other and with a roster of senior and junior faculty chosen for their track record of success and their diversity of scholarly and teaching approaches. These professors will pass along invaluable advice about teaching and testing techniques and tips for developing, placing and promoting one's scholarship. Speakers will also address how to manage the demands of institutional service, as well as the expectations of students and colleagues, along with special challenges that arise when confronting controversial topics.

Who Should Attend?

The Workshop will benefit newly appointed faculty members, including teachers with up to two years of teaching experience, and those with appointments as visiting assistant professors.

Topics:

- Scholarship: Choosing Subject Matter; Publication Process; and Promotion/Readership Techniques
- Preparing for Your First Semester of Teaching
- Biggest Triumphs and Mistakes: Junior Faculty Perspectives
- Teaching to the Whole Class
- Challenging Moments in the Classroom
- Exam Preparation, Reading, Grading, Review and Course Evaluation
- Institutional Citizenship and Politics

Speakers:

- The Honorable Guido Calabresi, U.S. Court of Appeals, New Haven, Connecticut
- G. Marcus Cole, Stanford Law School
- William Nichol Eskridge, Jr., Yale Law School
- Howard Katz, Elon University
- Paula Lustbader, Seattle University
- Solangel Maldonado, Seton Hall University
- Shuyi Oei, Tulane University
- Jennifer L. Rosato, Northern Illinois University
- Omari S. Simmons, Wake Forest University
- Lawrence B. Solum, University of Illinois
- Francisco X. Valdes, University of Miami
- Laurie B. Zimet, University of California, Hastings

Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers

June 19-20, 2010

Washington, DC

Why Attend?

The Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers is designed to offer new law faculty an introduction to clinical teaching, and to the challenges of balancing the various roles that clinical teachers are expected to perform. The Workshop will address the basic tasks of the clinical teacher—setting goals for clinical courses, teaching professional skills and values, supervising students and producing scholarship—and will provide the perspective of clinicians who were recently new teachers themselves. Concurrent sessions will focus on important questions of evaluation and collaboration in a clinical context. At lunch, registrants will be able to gather with colleagues teaching in similar subject-matter areas.

Who Should Attend?

The Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers should be of interest to new teachers of in-house and externship clinical courses and to all new teachers interested in clinical teaching methodology.

Topics:

- Goals and Future of Clinical Legal Education
- Skills and Values
- Scholarship
- New Clinicians (Things I Wish Someone Had Told Me When I Started)
- Evaluation
- Collaboration

Speakers:

- Phyllis Goldfarb, The George Washington University
- Margaret E. Johnson, The University of Baltimore
- Catherine F. Klein, The Catholic University of America
- Katherine R. Kruse, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- Ascanio Piomelli, The University of California, Hastings
- Jayesh Rathod, American University
- Ann C. Shalleck, American University

aalscalendar

2010 Annual Meeting

January 6-10, 2010

New Orleans, Louisiana

2010 Conference on Clinical Legal Education: *Answering the Call for Reform: Using Outcomes Assessment, Critical Theory and Strategic Thinking to Implement Change*

May 4-8, 2010

Baltimore, Maryland

2010 Mid-Year Meeting

June 8-12, 2010

New York, New York

Workshop for Pretenured Minority Law School Teachers

June 16-17, 2010

Washington, DC

Workshop for New Law School Teachers

June 17-19, 2010

Washington, DC

Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers

June 19-20, 2010

Washington, DC

- **Workshop on "Post Racial" Civil Rights
Law, Politics and Legal Education:
*New and Old Colorlines in the Age Of Obama***

June 8 – 10, 2010

- **Workshop on Property**

June 10-12, 2010

- **Workshop on Civil Procedure:
*Charting Your Course in a Shifting Field***

June 10-12, 2010

Future Annual Meeting Dates and Locations

- January 4-8, 2011, San Francisco
- January 4-8, 2012, Washington, D.C.
- January 4-8, 2013, New Orleans

Future Faculty Recruitment Conference Dates

Washington, D.C.

- October 28-30, 2010
- October 13-15, 2011
- October 11-13, 2012
- October 17-19, 2013
- October 16-18, 2014



Association of American
Law Schools

AALS

1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Suite 800

Washington, D.C. 20036-2717

phone 202.296.8851

fax 202.296.8869

web site www.aals.org