



## President's Message

### Hail, Hail, the Gang's All Here

Michael A. Olivas, University of Houston Law Center

Until you have actually put on a professional meeting, you have no idea how hard they are to coordinate. Over the years, I have put on perhaps fifteen or twenty academic conferences, where you assign a topic or theme, invite experts to a convenient venue, edit their work, raise money to pay their way there, spring for meals and lodging and publish the papers in a journal or book. Even doing this on a small scale is considerable work and I always prefer to be the invitee to these shindigs, not the inviter.

*Continued on page 5*

### [in this issue]

- 9 2011 AALS Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum
- 10 2011 AALS Conference on Clinical Legal Education
- 12 2011 AALS Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality
- 14 Call for Scholarly Papers
- 15 2012 AALS Annual Meeting Theme: Academic Freedom and Academic Duty
- 18 Nominations for AALS Executive Committee and President-Elect
- 19 Proposals for Professional Development Programs

## 2011 AALS Annual Meeting Keynote Luncheon Address, E. Gordon Gee, Ohio State University

*Extensive introductory and highly humorous observations have been omitted from President Gee's remarks. As he transitioned to his prepared remarks, President Gee noted the labor dispute affecting the convention hotel and observed:*

We find ourselves in a time when controversy and challenge are hardly infrequent visitors in our midst. One of the great things about being students of the law, one of the great things that we have... as an Association and as leaders in legal education, is the ability to contribute to civil discourse; not only with our words and our work, but, also with an enduring respect to the rights of those who give voice to dissent. [Managing this particular meeting] was a great, great challenge to the leadership and we acknowledge them for making all of this happen.

*President Gee then presented his luncheon address:*

Ladies and gentlemen, whether your institution is public or private, large or small, we are all experiencing unprecedented disruptions to what we have come to think of as the natural order of things. We face escalating costs and funding that dwindles. But, more than a crisis of dollars, we face a crisis of faith. The life of the typical lawyer may never have contained the theatrics and adrenaline coursing through an episode of "Law and Order."



Once, all of us could depend on an economy that provided some degree of welcome to our graduates. Today, that is not necessarily the case.

The National Association for Law Placement found that one-third of the class of 2009 is either unemployed or working in temporary positions. Meanwhile, the whole of the nation has misplaced its confidence. A recent Rasmussen poll found that half of all Americans believe the best days of this nation lie in the past. Americans are sharpening their pencils and preparing to jot down an obituary for a nation that—let me just note—has given the world the telegraph, the telephone, the Internet, and, of course, the iPad—I love the iPad, by the way—and now, our people live in fear and resignation.

...I ask all of the people in this room, in the face of the many burdens confronting universities, is that [national loss of confidence] a battle that we should confront? Well, ladies and gentlemen, I would submit to you that that is the battle

*Continued on page 2*

## Association of American Law Schools

*President*

**Michael A. Olivas**  
University of Houston

*President-Elect*

**Lauren K. Robel**  
Indiana University-  
Bloomington

*Immediate Past President*

**H. Reese Hansen**  
Brigham Young University

*Serving through 2011*

**Katharine T. Bartlett**  
Duke University

**Daniel B. Rodriguez**  
The University of Texas

*Serving through 2012*

**Dorothy Andrea Brown**  
Emory University

**Ann C. Shalleck**  
American University

*Serving through 2013*

**Pat K. Chew**  
University of Pittsburgh

**Paul Marcus**  
College of William and Mary

*Executive Director  
Chief Executive Officer*

**Susan Westerberg Prager**

*Managing Director*

**Jane M. La Barbera**

---

## aalsnews

*Published in February, April,  
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/](http://www.aals.org/newsletter/)

©2011 Association of American Law Schools.  
All rights reserved. ISSN 0519-1025  
Printing courtesy of West and  
Foundation Press.

## 2011 AALS Annual Meeting Keynote Luncheon Address

*Continued from page 1*

of the moment. Because for all of us in universities and law schools, we are in the future business. For America's law schools this cannot be a time of isolation or arrogance. The world is changing around us. Our universities are changing around us. We must change with them. Our obligation today is to re-invent ourselves to be a catalyzing force for a brighter future. Law schools must be vibrant, intellectual change agents, integrated fully into our universities. We must move from thinking vertically to thinking horizontally.

Now, having led universities for 30 years, I have some perspective on managing through difficulties. Indeed, I always joke about the fact that I changed jobs six times. We've gone into a recession, so I'm a leading economic indicator from that experience. I believe that, although these are indeed trying times, these times also present us with great opportunities to think differently, to collaborate more fully, to reconfigure ourselves to the long-term benefit of our students and our nation. As educators, we must invest wisely in the future and show that we can fight the darker angels that have gained purchase on our national psyche. The challenge before us is so great that our natural inclination is to lower our heads and wait this out—the foxhole mentality. But, our watches are not going to start clicking backwards. Our world has changed, and the old world is not coming back.

During the Civil War, General George McClellan became famous—infamous, actually, I think many people would say—for dithering. He refused to take action. He refused to implement changes, he refused to seize the opportunities presented his Army because he wondered if waiting—if waiting just a moment longer—might bring forth slightly more advantageous conditions. He nearly lost the war. Within his inaction lies, of course, a great lesson: The journey to oblivion starts by waiting just a single moment more. Indeed, war historians contend that McClellan's unyielding hesitancy undermined the value of the strategies he was attempting to support. One of his contemporaries, General Henry Halleck said of McClellan—I love this quote because I think it's of the time: "There is an immobility here that exceeds all that any man can conceive of. It requires the lever of Archimedes to move that inert mass."

Now, let me just say to all of you, all of us can go back to our institutions and wait for a slightly more advantageous time to take action. That may be prudent. I don't think so, but my central point is this: If it takes the lever of Archimedes to move us, we will have forfeited the value of this particular moment.

Right now, here, today, we need to question the old ways of doing things. We need to be more collaborative; in other words, we need to be more like our students. Let me just share a few facts that challenge our assumptions about this remarkable new generation of students we serve: According to the Pew Research Center surveys, current law students and their peers com-

*Continued on page 3*

## 2011 AALS Annual Meeting Keynote Luncheon Address

*Continued from page 2*

prise the most educated—the most educated—generation in American history. In an era when materialism is thought the norm, Pew found that this is a group that, far more than previous generations, favors family life and friendship over career and financial success. Think about that. And, yet, Millennials believe that previous generations have superior moral values to their own. Now, that is our burden and our blessing. These young people see something in us which we do not see in ourselves.

Now, admittedly, to a degree, most of us might find this unsettling. This generation is tattooed and pierced and spends an enormous amount of time broadcasting their whereabouts and every thought on social media sites—they're kind of a mess in that regard, aren't they? But, more than Twitter or tattoos or anything else, though, the contrast between our young people and older generations is a matter of faith. Younger Americans are not rebelling against institutions. They believe in government, unlike their parents... at their age or any age. They believe in schools; they believe in us; and they believe in the future. Unlike their elders, they see reasons for optimism in this nation today. We must honor their spirit, their future, their confidence in us, and their willingness to adapt to a world where the technology that is shaping their day might not have existed even a year ago. Think of that: Now, if my old self, the law school dean of some 30 years ago, were to hear about the need for change and collaboration and a more horizontal approach to life in the univer-

sity from my new self, the university president, I have a sense what would have happened—probably nothing—because the law school dean would have been suspicious of the motives of the university president. My own ego would have gotten in the way of listening to myself.

*Younger Americans are not rebelling against institutions. They believe in government, unlike their parents... at their age or any age. They believe in schools; they believe in us; and they believe in the future. Unlike their elders, they see reasons for optimism in this nation today. We must honor their spirit, their future, their confidence in us, and their willingness to adapt to a world where the technology that is shaping their day might not have existed even a year ago.*

But, I hope that now I'm able to reflect to you a dual perspective—a double-consciousness, if you will, out of my sometimes self-contradictory experiences as a university president, and as a former dean of a law school—on the role of professional schools within the contemporary large research university. One particularly harsh lesson I received as law school dean occurred when I learned that law schools are no more deserving of special privilege than any other interest at the university; and that came, I will tell you, as quite a shock to me. As a beginning law school dean, I wanted to win every concession I could from the university, as if I were negotiating the terms of an arms treaty with the Soviets. I thought of myself as the captain of a great ship, unmoored from the petty concerns

of the university. I was not thinking about the value of a rising tide to all of the boats on the sea. Law schools are important, yes. They are vital, absolutely; but, we could make them even more relevant.

One of the most important advantages that the Moritz College of Law at Ohio State University has is Ohio State University. It is moored within that great university, the nation's largest, most complex institution; but, that only does our law school any good if they take advantage of it. I have explained many times that Ohio State can be thought of as two dozen colleges connected by a heating plant, but that is not the best way to serve the future. With a well-integrated law school, not only can the university draw upon the law school's web of acquaintance and its specialized intellectual resources, but the law school can draw upon the limitless intellectual resources of the modern global university to serve its profession, and to do it a lot more creatively. As much as each party adds, so it is also benefited. Law schools can be graced with the auspicious chance to become participants in their university's full intellectual life, to lead shifts within the current of that life, and of their university's whole character and history. Now, if we can consider the institution to which we belong to be a true university, we must facilitate movement among the disciplines. Professional schools can share resources and faculty with graduate and undergraduate programs enhancing the quality of each program involved. Let me give you just a couple of examples:

*Continued on page 4*

## 2011 AALS Annual Meeting Keynote Luncheon Address

*Continued from page 3*

At Ohio State, Michelle Alexander holds a joint appointment in our law school and at our Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity. It is an intellectual platform, which feeds her scholarship on race and a justice system and gives more of the university the benefit of her talents. In my experience at Vanderbilt, re-integrating professional education with the intellectual life of the university led to some notable and unique combinations. We made a joint faculty appointment in Law and Mathematics, launched a Ph.D. program in Law and Economics, and offered students the rare opportunity to pursue a joint J.D. and Master's of Divinity. On a social level—this is very important. No good reason exists why a law school should not engage with ethical questions by way of a university's philosophy and religious studies departments. On a professional level, no reason exists why research in organizational theory, for example, should not be employed to address professional questions within the law.

Indeed, one of the great recent innovations at Ohio State's law school focuses on law and leadership. For three years, inside and outside the classroom, students can work with faculties and practitioners, not only from law, but from our business school and from our John Glenn School of Public Affairs. The program has attracted more than one-third—think about this, it's an important concept—one-third of our students, because it reflects the fundamental reality that lawyers lead. Let me just say that again: that lawyers lead. That is our calling. [Our students] should,

therefore, not only be students of the law, but students of decision making and management. The truth is that no area of a university is intellectually self-sufficient anymore. An insular legal education may have been appropriate in the past, but law has now unavoidably and inextricably entangled itself, or become entangled, with other disciplines through its own success and indispensability. Legal education must evolve to compensate for and encompass these changes. The potential benefit of the university curriculum to the law school curriculum is immeasurable, as it keeps the law curriculum relevant and progressive. Courses of study and degree programs can draw from Medicine and from Divinity and Business and Public Policy; whatever a university's resources are, they can be blended and integrated, and make a truly great legal education. Such adaptability allows creative change and intellectual activity in a school rather than imprisoning it as the passive recipient of over one hundred years of Langdellian method and habituation. And the alignment of schools with universities is not a rough fit.

The answers to the root questions, "What is law really about?" and "what are universities really about?" are the same. When we keep digging past all the definitions that we have learned, we come to the ideas of justice and to improving the quality of our human condition in organized communities. Our goal is the same—and must be the same—and each of us is able better to accomplish it in concert with the other. I do believe in the integrity of institutional and professional conditions. I understand that and

value it. I do think professions, as well as institutions, are right to be wary about too eagerly embracing trends and about too easily allowing themselves to be defined and dictated by single issues. But, it is a mistake—and I should know, by the way, because it numbers on the list of my own mistakes—for any institution to be imprisoned by its traditions, to serve history, even when a particular tradition has ceased to respond to the real tangible, changing needs of society or of the institutions or the professions it serves. Nothing is more traditional in many ways as the teaching of law, but at the same time, nothing is more frequently called into new territory—and that territory requires expertise to navigate and explore.

Sixty-some years ago, Robert Maynard Hutchins made the argument at the University of Chicago that sharp academic divisions do nothing but feed the intellectual development of people. He thought that the time for academic strict segregation had passed, and it surely has passed now. For three decades I have run great universities; and, before that, I was a law school dean—we all know—and I've come to understand one thing, and, that is: That the university is a narrative. It is a story of validating ambition and fostering creativity; it is a story unbounded by time or place; it is a story of progress; a story of forever. All of us at universities must, once again, fall in love with what makes our story unique—and that is, first and foremost, the power and ability of our schools to make a difference for the future.

*Continued on page 5*

## 2011 AALS Annual Meeting Keynote Luncheon Address

Continued from page 4

So, where does a law school fit into that story, into that narrative? Thorstein Veblen said there was no more need for a law school at a university than a school of dance. You know, I believe he was actually wrong on both counts. He chose, by the way, to overlook the extraordinary complication of both practices and their essentiality to the full cultural life of a civilization. Grace is never a mere highlight, and law, like dance, is an exceedingly graceful science. It balances the practical with the theoretical and the parochial with the commercial. A law school balances an experiential and participatory knowledge of the needs of the greater community with the most revolutionary new views that intellectual life is

capable of producing. Law is a true Renaissance degree. It is a degree in thought and vision in the solving of puzzles and the thwarting of problems. It is a degree for social change, a degree for progress. With a law degree, you can run a business—yes, you can run a university—you can run this country, you could even practice law. But now we are sending our students out into a new world, and that requires a new approach to teaching law. Because, ladies and gentlemen, of this, I am certain: We will be the architects of change or we will surely be its victims.

*We will be the architects of change or we will surely be its victims.*

No more than General McClellan, do we have the luxury of waiting for ideal circumstances. We must begin, not in one moment, not next week, not tomorrow, but now. This is our time as never before. Education, uniquely, among all human endeavors, changes lives and forms the building blocks of our future. To serve that future calls for dedication, perseverance, and inspiration on our part. We must exert zeal and energy without fatigue, and be creative without boundaries. In short, we must be equal to the students we serve and the future that we make for ourselves.

You have a magnificent calling. You have an enormous responsibility. You have the time.

---

## President's Message

Continued from page 1

Writ large, you have professional association conferences and annual meetings, and it is hard to apprehend the scale of these or appreciate the many working parts until you hold leadership in the association that hosts them.

This is how I felt last year, as my presidential year in waiting ripened to the 2011 Annual Meeting, and then at the end, I found myself installed as president of your association, the AALS. I write this column to discuss the fundamentals of our Annual Meeting. I come both to praise Caesar and to voice publicly some concerns about the overall health of the enterprise. (I might

as well write enterprises, as we put on many meetings each year, but, like a traditional shopping mall, the January Annual Meeting is the anchor tenant, and it is my primary concern.)

Of course, these events famously have been made fun of, such as in Frederick Crews' *Postmodern Pooh*, the famous sendup of the Modern Language Association Annual Meeting, the piñata of these groups, with a number of attempts to mock it. For years, as part of a book project called *Scholarly Subcultures*, I have attended meetings sponsored by small off-the-grid-research communities, including my favorite,

Kennedy assassination scholars. As I sat there (of course, always in Dallas, Ground Zero for such work), I was struck by the various conventions of scholarly inquiry: specializations (concentrating upon Lee Harvey Oswald, Cubans, New Orleans, autopsy, coverup, Mafiosi), well-stocked book vendor displays, a refereed journal (*The Fourth Decade*), concordances and finding tools, talismanic subjects and objects (the Warren Commission volumes, traded like samizdat), a prolific Posner (Gerald, not Richard, but also swimming against the tide), and hammer and tongs discussions on research assertions. The only

## President's Message

*Continued from page 5*

difference in this regression-to-the-scholarly society-mean was that no pedigree counted, as most of the participants were not academics, but interested civilians.

If we did not have such a legal education meeting, we would have to invent it. For most, it is the major organizational and professional event of our year, whether or not we attend every year. It is a magnet, with many allied organizational events that cluster around and are attracted to it. In San Francisco, some of the groups that met in connection with AALS included the Allied Consortium for Innovative Legal Education, Society of American Law Teachers (SALT) (the Cover workshop/retreat and annual dinner, on two different nights), several Twelve Step meetings, the Access Group, Clinical Legal Education Association (CLEA), American Law Deans Association (ALDA), National Association for Law Placement (NALP), Association of Legal Writing Directors (ALWD), the ABA Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, Law School Admissions Council (LSAC), the International Association of Law Schools (IALS), Latino/a Law Professors, and the Animal Legal Defense Fund. Add to this many dozens of bar associations, alumni groups, book publishers, professional journals, and other legal education supporters who caucus together in January. Many thousands of planned or spontaneous gatherings occur, given the many intellectual nooks and crannies that appear or rise up. Most attendees' dance cards are so heavily spiked in the evenings that people attend in shifts or run from

one event to another. While over thirty years ago, the AALS separated out the hiring conference into its own cycle in late fall each year, much interviewing goes on at the Annual Meeting. Indeed, trying to interview dean candidates and faculty, especially lateral and senior faculty, is increasingly evident. When one adds the many other transactions and conducted business, it is clear that the Meeting is a big tent, with many sideshows and main attractions. And the many vendors have created a lively marketplace for us to review new books and other publications and materials, as well as for us to gather in a large *resolana*, the large intellectual sunroom where many people can and do interact. Indeed, for some faculty, meeting and interacting with others are the whole point of the Meeting. In my view, this is a good thing, if perhaps too much of that good thing, shoehorned into a small window of time, especially with school calendars pressing upon the dates.

Of course, the heart of the enterprise is the research role of the Association, where we conduct our business as a community of scholars. My first Annual Meeting was in Cincinnati, in 1983, and I have attended each tribal gathering since. It is clear by any measure that we are on an upward scholarly trajectory, with many more competitive sessions, more published papers, and more journal/law review involvement than at any point in our history. The staggering productivity evident in the salon of book production is tangible evidence, as more monographs, books, and instructional materials pour out of

prolific faculty. There are so many interesting sessions to attend that some people throw up their hands and resort to the podcasts, usefully available shortly after the Meeting. I have listened to four or five in the last month, due to my inability to get to the sessions, either because they overlapped or because I had other duties. Oh yes, the Annual Meeting hosts hundreds of other meetings, with volunteer Section, Committee, and associational service activities. By any measure, we are more focused upon scholarship and improving the craft of teaching, salutary accomplishments in a time when the professoriate is under fire more than ever.

But, as stewards of our own future, we must examine the business enterprise and organization resources that we invest in this four-day meeting each year. In some respects, there are small fissures that are becoming evident, and I draw them to our attention. First, the sheer centripetal force of the law professoriate can be overwhelming. In 2010, I received flyers, posters, invitations, and phone calls about more than 25 legal education-sponsored workshops, meetings, and conferences—not counting the AALS events in which I participated as president-elect. These ranged from substantive subject matter gatherings (immigration, higher education, and civil rights, among others) to affiliation or affinity events (such as those involving LatCrit, various People of Color, and other places that provide solidarity and a niche) to regional groups (regional POC, and statewide/regional interests). I could not have attended more

*Continued on page 7*

## President's Message

*Continued from page 6*

than a few of them, either due to time commitments, travel money, or class rescheduling, but each of them drew participants, sometimes in the hundreds. The increasing development of new areas and the subspecialties that did not even exist in the last decade have given rise to the proliferation of these get-togethers.

Particularly noteworthy is the rise of substantive writing workshops and feedback sessions where junior scholars and emerging researchers can have their work read and critiqued in a safe setting. I have conducted these over the years myself, or in concert with other like-minded colleagues, and over twenty years ago, I organized a standalone conference, now biennial, where immigration scholars read their work, organize themselves, and critique casebooks. It has now spawned another conference that also meets every other year, devoted to junior scholars. If I were a clinician, I would have literally dozens of standalone or affiliated workshops from which I would be able to choose. Intellectual Property, Health Law, and Empirical Legal Studies are three such well-organized loosely coupled interest groups that have many such support and substantive meetings. This is especially true of the groups whose members cut across disciplines, and where legal academics hold joint appointments or academic advanced degrees.

My UH Colleague Richard Alderman puts on such a conference in Houston every other year for consumer law teachers from all over the world. At times, I think that this must be generational—

with so many people my age putting on the circuses and fairs that Mickey Rooney and Judy Garland organized on screen when we were kids. In most law schools, an entrepreneurial approach, a nearby airport, and a dean with financial and institutional support can produce several such meetings every semester, and at a much lower cost than can the AALS. But given declining travel resources, the increased hassle of travel schleps, and the focused attention span of most legal educators, has this atomization been a good thing, or are we eroding and marginalizing the Annual Meeting, our big tent? When SALT held a conference in Hawaii last January, I knew several friends who attended that event and then did not make it back to the West Coast for the Annual Meeting weeks later. (There are just so many ways to postpone the 100+ papers that need to be graded during this period.)

It is also noteworthy that we have a growing number of pedagogical programs, focusing upon learning theory, teaching alternatives, curricular reform, and the use of technology in the classroom. We have had an enthusiastic response to the Hot Topics and Poster Sessions programming, and the Sections continue to recommend strong and popular daylong Workshops and events in conjunction with the start of the Annual Meetings. We do need to think about how to coordinate these proposals, the mid-year and other workshops, and the variety of other events, so that professors and the AALS staff can plan these more smoothly. Our hard-working Professional Development Committee and staff spend count-

less hours designing programs during the Annual Meeting and throughout the year. I have also asked the Committee on Sections and the Annual Meeting to look carefully at these issues, as well as other concerns about the timing and efficacy of the structure we have built so well over the years.

Other factors are at play, some of them institutional and some of them personal. A number of schools have moved up their spring start dates so that depending upon the dates each year, there are class teaching obligations. Of course, inter-term options have grown, and some faculty are either pressed to do these, or expect to teach in this fashion as a function of their workload. Some family arrangements do not square with the AALS meeting calendar, and the SEALS summer conference has grown into a competitor for reading papers in a smaller setting and for bringing the family along, always in warm climes. Speaking of warm climes, inclement weather and an overextended national and international travel infrastructure leave sojourners vulnerable at a very busy time of year. This year, several colleagues barely made it back to Atlanta, Midwest, and especially East coast locations, given the weather conditions. Some were not able to make their flights or trips home. The success of AALS Summer workshops, where people can combine several topic areas back to back to back, has caused some people to invest in their professional development during the summer rather than in the busy, crowded mid-academic year.

## President's Message

*Continued from page 7*

As I noted, the last time we looked hard at the Annual Meeting format was many years ago. The centripetal force of these developments should prompt us to review the enterprise, although it may be like democracy, the worst possible system except any alternatives. Indeed, our successful Annual Meeting is, for many people, the most visible sign that things are good, if growing attendance is any indication. Its very success has prompted the replication of its many excellent features, on a smaller scale.

I have asked the Committee on Sections and Annual Meetings to advise Susan Prager, Jane La Barbera, and the Executive Committee about our meeting infrastructure. Having sketched my view of these matters, I invite yours.

- Should we keep things as they are, or are there specific changes you would suggest?
- Should we consider moving the Annual Meeting, either to an earlier time between semesters or to another time in the calendar year?
- Are there ways we can improve the scholarly focus, such as submitting competitive paper proposals to be reviewed by Sections? Some Sections do this, and has your experience been positive?
- How can we balance the need for more time to develop proposals thoughtfully with the necessary printing and notification timetables?
- Should we consider a Proceedings volume with all the presented papers (or abstracts), either online or in print format?
- Do you have any administrative or program suggestions about any of the AALS-sponsored meetings? Here, I include the regular summer and other professional development events.
- Are you satisfied with the frequency and availability of programming for large sections (such as those addressing traditional One L subject matter)? For smaller and emerging fields?
- Should we have popular non-law speakers at these meetings?
- Do you have suggestions about improving the format of the actual program sessions and strengthening the programming?
- Do you have suggestions about evaluating the Meeting in a useful and constructive fashion?
- Are there things that other scholarly associations do that we should consider doing for ourselves?

The AALS is your Association, and we can only plan and produce as good an Annual Meeting as you help make it. We are fortunate to have many hundreds of volunteers in the AALS village, all of whom donate their considerable talent to develop programs and to assist our Association in its substantive missions. Building upon these successes, I would appreciate anyone who has suggestions about these issues (or for that matter, any AALS issues), to send me a note at molivas@uh.edu; to help me sort these out, please mark them as Annual Meeting in the subject line.

Thank you, and I hope to hear from you about these important matters.





# 2011 Mid-Year Meeting Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum

June 11-13, 2011

Seattle, Washington

As legal educators, our responsibility is to assess the need for change in light of core values of legal education, and to fashion a worthy law school curriculum. This conference will provide attendees with knowledge and ideas that can inform curricular initiatives at their own schools. Day one will focus on challenges confronting legal education from without and within, drawing on social scientists and leaders in the legal profession as well as knowledgeable law faculty and university administrators. Days two and three, held jointly with the Conference on Clinical Legal Education, will concentrate first on core values, and then on particular responses to the forces pressing for curricular change, such as greater incorporation of experiential and multi-disciplinary learning and a more "globalized" curriculum. Surveys of law school practices as well as exemplary law school programs and experiences will be included in these sessions. Challenges of achieving institutional change given the dynamics of law school governance and decision-making will also be addressed, both by experts in organizational behavior and thoughtful veterans of the process.

This conference will be of interest to all law school teachers and academic administrators. To view the program, brochure and registration information, please visit [www.aals.org/curriculum2011/](http://www.aals.org/curriculum2011/).

## Speakers :

Jane H. Aiken, Georgetown University Law Center; Raquel E. Aldana, University of the Pacific, Mc George School of Law; Marilyn J. Berger, Seattle University School of Law; Susan J. Bryant, City University of New York School of Law; Charles R. Calleros, Arizona State University, Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law; Nancy L. Cook, University of Minnesota Law School; Jonathan L. Entin, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Sheila R. Foster, Fordham University School of Law; Bryant G. Garth, Southwestern Law School; Manuel Gomez, Florida International University College of Law; Robert W. Gordon, Yale Law School; Phoebe A. Haddon, University of Maryland School of Law; H. Reese Hansen, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School; Luz E. Herrera, Thomas Jefferson School of Law; Olatunde C. Johnson, Columbia University School of Law; Mehmet K. Konar-Steenberg, William Mitchell College of Law; Andrew Koppelman, Northwestern University School of Law; Minna J. Kotkin, Brooklyn Law School; Larry D. Kramer, Stanford Law School; James G. Leipold, Executive Director, National Association for Law Placement, Washington, DC; Martha L. Minow, Harvard Law School; Michael A. Olivas, University of Houston Law Center; Calvin Pang, University of Hawaii, William S. Richardson School of Law; Elizabeth Hayes Patterson, Georgetown University Law Center; Deborah W. Post, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center; Jayesh Rathod, American University, Washington College of Law; Mathias Reimann, University of Michigan; Michael Roster, University of Southern California, Gould School of Law; Anthony J. Sebok, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University; Ann C. Shalleck, American University, Washington College of Law; Carole Silver, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law; Lu-in Wang, University of Pittsburgh School of Law

Type of Registration	Received by April 20, 2011	Received after April 20, 2011
<b>Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum (June 11-14)</b>		
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$425	\$450
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$475	\$500
<b>Additional Fee for the Conference on Clinical Legal Education (June 15-16)</b>		
	\$95	\$95

## ~Planning Committee for Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum

Pat K. Chew, University of Pittsburgh School of Law  
 Elizabeth B. Cooper, Fordham University School of Law  
 Franklin Gevurtz, University of the Pacific, Mc George  
 School of Law  
 Carole E. Goldberg, University of California, Los Angeles,  
 School of Law, **Chair**  
 Larry D. Kramer, Stanford Law School  
 Emily J. Sack, Roger Williams University School of Law

# Conference on Clinical Legal Education

## Learning for Transfer: (Re)conceptualizing What We Do in Clinics and Across the Curriculum and Law Clinic Directors Workshop

### (Re)considering Security of Position and Academic Freedom in Clinical Legal Education

**June 13-17, 2011**

**Seattle, Washington**

We are at a pivotal moment in the history of legal education. Forces outside and within the academy are creating a powerful impetus for legal educators to reconsider the law school curriculum. Clinical educators have a critical role to play in this process. As 2010 AALS President H. Reese Hansen said in his letter to the ABA Standards Review Committee dated June 1, 2010, clinical courses are the culminations of the substantive courses in the curriculum, reinforcing and extending the learning in substantive courses. Through clinical courses, Hansen said, "students typically develop problem-solving skills, learn to exercise critical judgment, and enhance analytical thinking as they bring substantive law to bear on practice experience. They represent some of the kinds of integrative education that are highly praised in the

Carnegie Report." As clinical legal educators, we owe it to our students, our law schools, our non-clinical colleagues, and ourselves to review and reconsider what we do in clinical teaching, what we can teach our non-clinical colleagues, and what they can teach us, all with a view to improving the law school curriculum.

To view the program, brochure and registration information, please visit [www.aals.org/clinical2011/](http://www.aals.org/clinical2011/).

### Conference on Clinical Legal Education

#### **Plenary Session Speakers:**

Mark N. Aaronson, University of California, Hastings College of the Law; Jane H. Aiken, Georgetown University Law Center; Raquel E. Aldana, University of the Pacific, Mc George School of Law; Amy G. Applegate, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law; Wendy A. Bach, University of Tennessee College of Law; Marilyn J. Berger, Seattle University School of Law; Susan J. Bryant, City University of New York School of Law; Charles R. Calleros, Arizona State University, Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law; Christine N. Cimini, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law; Nancy L. Cook, University of Minnesota Law School; Jonathan L. Entin, Case Western Reserve University School of Law; Deborah Epstein, Georgetown University Law Center; Sheila R. Foster, Fordham University School of Law; Carole E. Goldberg, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law; Manuel Gomez, Florida International University College of Law; Robert W. Gordon, Yale Law School; Martin Guggenheim, New York University School of Law; Phoebe A. Haddon, University of Maryland School of Law; H. Reese Hansen, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School; Katherine M. Hessler, Lewis and Clark Law School; Conrad Johnson, Columbia University School of Law;

Type of Registration	Received by April 20, 2011	Received after April 20, 2011
<b>Conference on Clinical Legal Education (June 12-16)</b>		
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$425	\$450
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$475	\$500
<b>Law Clinic Directors Workshop (June 16-17)</b>		
Faculty of Member and Fee-Paid Schools	\$200	\$225
Faculty of Non Fee-Paid Law Schools	\$250	\$275
<b>Additional Fee for the Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum (June 11-12)</b>		
	\$95	\$95

### **~Planning Committee for Conference on Clinical Legal Education and Clinical Directors' Workshop**

Bryan L. Adamson, Seattle University School of Law

Amy G. Applegate, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law, **Co-Chair**

Elizabeth B. Cooper, Fordham University School of Law

Elliott S. Milstein, American University, Washington College of Law, **Co-Chair**

Carolyn B. Grose, William Mitchell College of Law

Donna H. Lee, City University of New York School of Law

Barbara A. Schatz, Columbia University School of Law

## Speakers at the 2011 Conference on Clinical Legal Education

*Continued from page 10*

Margaret E. Johnson, University of Baltimore School of Law; Olatunde C. Johnson, Columbia University School of Law; Mehmet K. Konar-Steenberg, William Mitchell College of Law; Andrew Koppelman, Northwestern University School of Law; Minna J. Kotkin, Brooklyn Law School; Larry D. Kramer, Stanford Law School; Linda H. Krieger, University of Hawaii, William S. Richardson School of Law; Elliott S. Milstein, American University, Washington College of Law; Elizabeth Hayes Patterson, Georgetown University Law Center; Calvin Pang, University of Hawaii, William S. Richardson School of Law; Jean Koh Peters, Yale Law School; Deborah W. Post, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center; Jayesh Rathod, American University, Washington College of Law; Mathias W. Reimann, The University of Michigan Law School; Laura L. Rovner, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law; Barbara A. Schatz, Columbia University School of Law; Alexander Scherr, University of Georgia School of Law; Anthony J. Sebok, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University; Ann C. Shalleck, American University, Washington College of Law; Jayashri Srikantiah, Stanford Law School; Tirien Steinbach, East Bay Community Law Center, Berkeley, California; Lu-in Wang, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Carwina Weng, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law

### **Law Clinic Directors Workshop**

#### **Speakers:**

Claudia Angelos, New York University School of Law; Bradford Colbert, William Mitchell College of Law; Jon C. Dubin, Rutgers School of Law – Newark; Phyllis Goldfarb, The George Washington University Law School; Peter Joy, Washington University School of Law; Katherine R. Kruse, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law; Robert R. Kuehn, Washington University School of Law; Richard K. Neumann, Jr., Hofstra University School of Law; David Anthony Santacroce, The University of Michigan Law School; Ian S. Weinstein, Fordham University School of Law

*\*For space reasons, we are unable to list the concurrent speakers, though they are listed in the conference brochure, available online at [www.aals.org/clinical2011/](http://www.aals.org/clinical2011/).*

## 2011 Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality

June 20-22, 2011

Washington, DC

Women seeking equality in America today face an uneven prospect. Women are represented in record numbers in all branches of government, yet also struggle in unprecedented numbers below the poverty line, and they remain notably absent from many corporate boardrooms. Two more women have been appointed to the Supreme Court, including the first Latina justice; yet the popular debate and confirmation hearings were marred by race and gender stereotypes and by homophobia.

The 2011 Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality will address challenges for women, in the broader society and in the specific context of legal education. In analyzing the remaining barriers, we will think specifically about how to understand and to bridge the heterogeneity our group reflects – by glimpsing our shared stake in struggles of particular subgroups, and by focusing on the immediate institutional environment that we all share. We will also ask how we might use many kinds of connections among women – networking, mentoring, sharing of information – to secure greater opportunity, and transform the institutional settings in which we live and work.

“Women Rethinking Equality” will appeal to a full range of teachers and scholars in all subject areas. It will challenge us to think about the meaning, contours and status of equality for women: in legal, social, and institutional settings – and in the specific context of legal education. In the law school setting, discussions will focus on women’s scholarship, teaching concerns and professional development. We have particularly sought to reach out to a wider and more varied group of women faculty, through calls for presentations on substantive

legal questions implicating gender, and for works-in-progress by junior and other scholars seeking commentary and discussion. The substance and format of the program, in general, will offer opportunities for networking and small-group discussion. We welcome participation by all AALS members, and particularly all women, whether or not their scholarship includes a gender focus.

To view the program, brochure and registration information, please visit [www.aals.org/womens2011/](http://www.aals.org/womens2011/).

### Speakers:

Afra Afsharipour, University of California, Davis, School of Law; Jane H. Aiken, Georgetown University Law Center; Janet Ainsworth, Seattle University School of Law; Catherine R. Albiston, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Anita L. Allen, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Anne L. Alstott, Harvard Law School; Constance A. Anastopoulo, Charleston School of Law; Michelle W. Anderson, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Rachel Anderson, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law; Margalynne J. Armstrong, Santa Clara University School of Law; Susan Ayers, Texas Wesleyan University School of Law; Barbara A. Babcock, Stanford Law School; Aditi Bagchi, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Kimberly D. Bailey, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago-Kent College of Law; Katharine K. Baker, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago-Kent College of Law; Kathleen A. Bergin, South Texas College of Law; Johanna Bond, Washington and Lee University School of Law; Douglas M. Branson, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Tomiko Brown-Nagin, University of Virginia School of Law; Lolita Buckner-Inniss, Cleveland State University, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law; Beth Burkstrand-Reid, University of Nebraska College of Law; Andrea Carroll, Louisiana State University Law Center; Jennifer M. Chacon, University of California, Irvine, School of Law; Martha E. Chamallas, The Ohio State University, Michael E. Moritz College of Law; Christine Sgarlata Chung, Albany Law School; Brenda Cossman, University of Toronto Faculty of Law; Bridget J. Crawford, Pace University School of Law; Tucker

### ~Planning Committee for Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality

Kathryn Abrams, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law,  
Chair

Serena Mayeri, University of Pennsylvania  
Law School

Elizabeth A. Nowicki, Tulane University  
School of Law

Angela I. Onwuachi-Willig, The University of Iowa College of Law  
Lisa R. Pruitt, University of California, Davis,  
School of Law

Stephanie M. Wildman, Santa Clara University School of Law

Continued on page 13

## Speakers at the 2011 Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality

*Continued from page 12*

Culbertson, Syracuse University College of Law; Maxine S. Eichner, University of North Carolina School of Law; Mary L. Fellows, University of Minnesota Law School; Katherine E. Franke, Columbia University School of Law; Theresa A. Gabaldon, The George Washington University Law School; The Honorable Nancy Gertner, Federal Judge, United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts; Michele Estrin Gilman, University of Baltimore School of Law; Suzanne B. Goldberg, Columbia University School of Law; Julie Goldscheid, City University of New York School of Law; Leigh Goodmark, University of Baltimore School of Law; David Gray, University of Maryland School of Law; Tristin K. Green, University of San Francisco School of Law; Phoebe A. Haddon, University of Maryland School of Law; Cheryl Hanna, Vermont Law School; Meredith Johnson Harbach, University of Richmond School of Law; Michelle M. Harner, University of Maryland School of Law; Angela P. Harris, University of California, Davis, School of Law; Jill Hasday, University of Minnesota Law School; Jennifer Hendricks, University of Tennessee College of Law; Tanya Kateri Hernandez, Fordham University School of Law; Berta Hernandez-Truyol, University of Florida, Fredric G. Levin College of Law; Nicole Huberfeld, University of Kentucky College of Law; Lyman P.Q. Johnson, Washington and Lee University School of Law; Courtney G. Joslin, University of California, Davis, School of Law; Lily Kahng, Seattle University School of Law; Sonia K. Katyal, Fordham University School of Law; Herma Hill Kay, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Nancy Kim, California Western School of Law; Kimberly D. Krawiec, Duke University School of Law and University of North Carolina School of Law; Angela Mae Kupenda, Mississippi College School of Law; Jennifer E. Laurin, The University of Texas School of Law; Nancy Levit, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law; Melissa T. Lonegrass, Louisiana State University Law Center; Elizabeth L. MacDowell, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law; Kenneth W. Mack, Harvard Law School; Solangel Maldonado, Seton Hall University School of Law; Natasha T. Martin, Seattle University School of Law; Stephanie Hunter McMahon, University of Cincinnati College of Law; Linda McClain, Boston University School of Law; Martha T. Mc Cluskey, University of Buffalo Law School, State University of New York; Deborah J. Merritt, The Ohio State University, Michael E. Moritz College of Law; Saira Mohamed, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Paula A. Monopoli, University of Maryland School of Law; Rachel Moran, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law; Shari Motro, University of Richmond School of Law; Kimberly M. Mutcherson, Rutgers School of Law - Camden; Cynthia E. Nance, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Leflar Law Center; Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law; Michelle Oberman, Santa Clara University School of Law; Juan F. Perea, University of Florida, Frederic G. Levin College of Law; Ann M. Piccard, Stetson University College of Law; Nicole B. Porter, University of Toledo College of Law; Melynda J. Price, University of Kentucky College of Law; Mae C. Quinn, Washington University School of Law; Jaya Ramji-Nogales, Temple University, James E. Beasley School of Law; Tshaka Randall, Florida A&M University College of Law; Vernellia R. Randall, University of Dayton School of Law; Camille Gear Rich, University of Southern California, Gould School of Law; Roberta Romano, Yale Law School; Darren Rosenblum, Pace University School of Law; Laura A. Rosenbury, Washington University School of Law; Erin Ryan, College of William and Mary, Marshall-Wythe School of Law; Christina M. Sautter, Louisiana State University Law Center; Elizabeth R. Schiltz, University of St. Thomas School of Law; Marci B. Seville, Golden Gate University School of Law; Giovanna Shay, Western New England College School of Law; Vicki Schultz, Yale Law School; Reva B. Siegel, Yale Law School; Rosalind Simson, Mercer University Law School; Catherine E. Smith, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law; Dean Spade, Seattle University School of Law; Sandra Sperino, Temple University, James E. Beasley School of Law; Barbara Stark, Hofstra University School of Law; Lara Stemple, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law; Faith Stevelman, New York Law School; Debora L. Threedy, University of Utah, S.J. Quinney College of Law; Deborah Tuerkheimer, DePaul University College of Law; Rose Cuison Villazor, Hofstra University School of Law; Constance Z. Wagner, Saint Louis University School of Law; Deleso Alford Washington, Florida A&M University College of Law; Jessica Dixon Weaver, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law; Deborah A. Widiss, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law; Joan C. Williams, University of California, Hastings College of the Law; Melanie D. Wilson, University of Kansas School of Law; Kamille N. Wolff, Texas Southern University, Thurgood Marshall School of Law; Mary Ziegler, Saint Louis University School of Law; Rebecca E. Zietlow, University of Toledo College of Law; Marcia Zug, University of South Carolina School of Law

## Call for Scholarly Papers for Presentation at 2012 AALS Annual Meeting

To encourage and recognize excellent legal scholarship and to broaden participation by new law teachers in the Annual Meeting program, the Association is sponsoring its 27<sup>th</sup> annual *Call for Scholarly Papers*.

Those who will have been full-time law teachers at an AALS member or fee-paid school for **five years or fewer on July 1, 2011** are invited to submit a paper on a topic related to or concerning law. A committee of established scholars will review the submitted papers with the authors' identities concealed.

Michele B. Goodwin, University of Minnesota Law School, will serve as chair of the review committee. Professor Goodwin is joined by Alan K. Chen, University of Denver, Sturm College of Law; Michael Churgin, The University of Texas School of Law; Edward Fallone, Marquette University Law School; Barbara J. Fick, Notre Dame Law School; Rafael Gely, University of Missouri School of Law; Francine J. Lipman, Chapman University School of Law; Guadalupe T. Luna, Northern Illinois University College of Law; Luis Muniz-Arguelles, University of Puerto Rico School of Law, Melissa Murray, University of California, Berkeley (2011 Scholarly Paper co-winner); Ashira Pelman Ostrow, Hofstra University, (2011 Scholarly Paper co-winner); and Matthew Steffey, Mississippi College School of Law.

Papers that make a substantial contribution to legal literature may be selected for distribution and oral presentation at a special program to be held at the AALS Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. in January 2012. Authors of the presented papers will also be recognized at the Annual Meeting Luncheon. The selection committee must determine that a paper is of sufficient quality to deserve this special recognition, and the AALS is not obligated to select any paper.

**Deadline:** To be considered in the competition three hard copies of the manuscript must be postmarked no later than August 12, 2011 and sent to: Call for Scholarly Papers, Association of American Law Schools, 1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036-2717. Also, an electronic version must be emailed to [scholarlypapers@aals.org](mailto:scholarlypapers@aals.org) no later than August 12, 2011.

**Anonymity:** The manuscript should be accompanied by a cover letter with the author's name and contact information. The manuscript itself, including title page and footnotes, must not contain any references that identify the author or the author's school. The submitting author is responsible for taking any steps necessary to redact self-identifying text or footnotes.

**Form and Length:** The manuscript must be typed, double-spaced, on 8 1/2" by 11" paper in 12-point (or larger) type with ample (at least 1") margins on all sides and must have sequential page numbers on each page of the submitted article. Footnotes should be 10-point or larger, single-spaced, and preferably on the same page as the referenced text. Each submission must be prepared using either Microsoft Word or otherwise submitted in rich text format. Submissions are limited to articles, essays and book chapters. **There is a maximum word limit of 30,000 words (inclusive of footnotes) for the submitted manuscripts. Manuscripts will not be returned.**

**Eligibility:** Faculty members of AALS member and fee-paid schools are eligible to submit papers. The competition is open to those who have been full-time law teachers for five years or fewer as of July 1, 2011 (for these purposes, one is considered a full-time faculty member while officially "on leave" from the law school). Co-authored papers are eligible for consideration, but each of the co-authors must meet the eligibility criteria established above. No one who has won the AALS Scholarly Papers Competition is eligible to compete again. Honorable Mention recipients are eligible to enter again. Professors are also restricted to submitting only one paper—whether that paper is authored or co-authored—in the Scholarly Paper Competition.

Papers are expected to reflect original research or major developments in previously reported research. Papers are not eligible for consideration if they will have been published before February 2012. However, inclusion of a version of the paper on the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) or similar pre-publication resources does not count as "publication" for purposes of this competition. Submitted papers, whether or not selected for recognition, may be subsequently published as arranged by the authors. Papers may have been revised on the basis of review by colleagues.

**Statement of Compliance:** The cover letter accompanying each submission must include a statement verifying: 1) the author holds a faculty appointment at a member or fee-paid school; 2) the author has been engaged in full-time teaching for five years or fewer as of July 1, 2011; 3) all information identifying the author or author's school has been removed from the manuscript; 4) the paper has not been previously published and is not committed for publication prior to February 2012;

## 2012 AALS Annual Meeting Theme: Academic Freedom and Academic Duty

The theme for the 2012 Annual Meeting centers around academic freedom and academic duty – including threats to tenure and to academic freedom, and the concomitant academic duty obligations that arise out of our status as tenured professors. There have been many serious threats to academic freedom arising from the environment and the polity: a law faculty member arrested in Rwanda for his pro bono representation of an opposition candidate in an election matter there; a law faculty-journal editor sued for criminal libel in France for publishing a book review; law school clinics reviled for their work as well as threatened legislatively and in the courts in Maryland, Louisiana, Michigan, New Jersey, and in several other states; a law scholar sued for her research on family law, whose university chose not to indemnify her; a law review that pulled a piece from publication, following threats from the company criticized in the article; and other law faculty and non-law faculty punished for their views.

The zone of protected professorial speech is shrinking. In the 2006 *Garcetti v. Ceballos* case, the Supreme Court ruled that when public employees speak “pursuant to their official duties, the employees are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline,” regardless of whether or not the speech involves a “matter of public concern.” Almost immediately, this limited decision was used by lower courts to allow public colleges to sanction faculty who would not have been punished for their views before *Garcetti*. Legal scholars and the academy have begun to recognize that this case will likely negatively impact college governance policies and practices.

The academy must identify and contend with these external threats as they arise both in legal education and in other fields of study. These programs will draw additional attention to international threats to law professors and academics around the world, as exemplified by the admirable work conducted by Scholars at Risk, who try and rescue these imperiled colleagues to safer situations. Attention must be paid to these examples, which are too common and which diminish us all, even when seemingly-remote threats arise; the bell tolls on behalf of us all. In addition, sessions will spell out the correlative obligations to undertake service and draw attention to the features inherent in academic duty.

There are many other threats as well, such as law school accreditors considering de-coupling their tenure requirements from their insistence upon academic freedom, and no longer requiring a system of tenure or security of position. It is difficult to square these developments with the increased attention we at AALS have paid to our core values. Arguments for tenure include that the promise of continual employment gives faculty an incentive to work on behalf of the institution and that good faculty governance requires a tenure system. Even at major institutions, particularly public universities with the decline of state support so evident, faculty governance is rapidly eroding as changed economic conditions are undermining longstanding governance structures.

Part of our social contract is that we contribute, particularly to legal reform—however defined—and not just work for hire and pay. In fair exchange for extraordinary discretion and deference accorded us, we must repay these privileges with our academic duty. We need not merely speculate about this responsibility, as it is explicated in substantial detail in the Statement of Good Practices by Law Professors in the Discharge of their Ethical and Professional Responsibilities (“Responsibilities to the Bar and General Public”), available at your AALS website. These are aspirational, but lay out the premise of Academic Duty.

The 2012 Annual Meeting’s presidential sessions in Washington, D.C., will examine these and related issues of legal education in this new century. Those crucial issues are: financing legal education and its implications on financial aid and student debt; the restructuring of the professoriate; the institutional balance of instructional technology, distance learning, and asynchronous faculty-student interaction; service learning and skills training issues; and more creative curricular developments in the third year of the J.D. Moreover, GATS and other international negotiations will affect bar membership and legal practice eligibility, in ways not yet divined. All these issues and others are worthy of attention in our deliberations and ongoing dialogues. We do not have a single answer for any of these complex and interlocking issues, but we feel that these likely are among the right questions.

## Workshop for Beginning Legal Writing Teachers

June 22-23, 2011

Washington, D.C.

*The Workshop will be of interest to new legal writing teachers and to all new teachers whose responsibilities include some teaching of legal writing. The program will be particularly valuable for full-time professors and adjunct professors who will be teaching legal research and writing for the first time and new directors of legal writing programs, if those individuals have taught full-time for four or fewer years.*

### Topics:

Working with the Director; Directorless Programs; Legal Writing in the Academy; Designing Assignments and Assessments; Critiquing and Feedback; Holding Effective Student Conferences; Legal Scholarship; Course Design

**Planning Committee for the 2011 Workshop for New Law School Teachers, Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers, and Workshop for Beginning Legal Writing Teachers**

Okianer Christian Dark, Howard University School of Law, **Chair**

Darby Dickerson, Stetson University College of Law

Luz E. Herrera, Thomas Jefferson School of Law

Kellye Y. Testy, University of Washington School of Law

### Speakers and Facilitators:

Mary Beth Beazley, The Ohio State University, Michael E. Moritz College of Law; Sha-Shana Crichton, Howard University School of Law; Christy Hallam DeSanctis, The George Washington University Law School; Diana R. Donahoe, Georgetown University Law Center; Anne M. Enquist, Seattle University School of Law; Amy E. Sloan, University of Baltimore School of Law; Robin Wellford Slocum, Chapman University School of Law; Michael R. Smith, University of Wyoming College of Law; Victoria L. Vanzandt, University of Dayton School of Law

## Workshop for New Law School Teachers

June 23-25, 2011

Washington, DC

*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

State of the Legal Academy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Law School (Changing Nature of Law Students, Changing Nature of Legal Scholarship, Changing Nature of Curriculum and Teaching); Your Evolution as a Scholar; Nuts & Bolts and Tips & Tricks of Scholarship; Teaching: Learning Styles; Teaching: Preparation and Methods; Testing and Assessment of Students, Feedback About Yourself, How You Measure Your Own Progress and Effectiveness as a Teacher; A Dean's Perspective: Service and Institutional Citizenship; Reports from the Early Years

### Concurrent Sessions

Teaching Your First Law School Course; Integrating Technology into Your Teaching; Integrating Skills and Doctrine; Integrating Comparative Law; Tenure Track (Service and Professionalism for Junior Faculty); Entry Level/Job Market Track (Visiting Assistant Professors, Fellowship)

### Speakers

Okianer Christian Dark, Howard University School of Law; Cara H. Drinan, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law; Cheryl Hanna, Vermont Law School; Melissa N. Henke, Georgetown University Law Center; Gerald F. Hess, Gonzaga University School of Law; Cecil J. Hunt, II, The John Marshall Law School; Susan R. Jones, The George Washington University Law School; Paula Lustbader, Seattle University School of Law; Rachel F. Moran, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law; Tracy L. Mc Gaugh, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center; Elizabeth E. Mertz, University of Wisconsin Law School; Lisa H. Nicholson, University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law; Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law; Mark Rienzi, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law; Jennifer L. Rosato, Northern Illinois University College of Law; Kurt L. Schmoke, Howard University School of Law; Sudha N. Setty, Western New England College; Andrew Eric Taslitz, Howard University School of Law; Francisco X. Valdes, University of Miami School of Law; Lu-in Wang, University of Pittsburgh School of Law; Lindsay F. Wiley, American University, Washington College of Law; Laurie B. Zimet, University of California, Hastings College of the Law



# Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers

June 25-26, 2011

Washington, DC

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

## Topics

Teaching; Scholarship Overview; Getting Started with Scholarly Agenda - Identity, Scholarship, Networking; Those Who Have Already Written - Where Are You on Scholarly Agenda; Service: When to Say No, When to Say Yes; Beyond Tenure: Why A Plan Is Important

## Speakers

Leonard M. Baynes, St. John's University School of Law; Angela J. Davis, American University, Washington College of Law; Erika George, University of Utah, S.J. Quinney College of Law; Christian M. Halliburton, Seattle University School of Law; Tanya Kateri Hernandez, Fordham University School of Law; Ernesto A. Hernández-Lopez, Chapman University School of Law; Susan R. Jones, The George Washington University Law School; Andrew Eric Taslitz, Howard University School of Law; Lea B. Vaughn, University of Washington School of Law; Kevin K. Washburn, University of New Mexico School of Law; Serena M. Williams, Widener University School of Law

---

## Call for Scholarly Papers at the 2012 AALS Annual Meeting

*Continued from page 14*

5) the content of the hard copy version of the paper is, in all respects, identical to the electronic version of the paper; and 6) the author must agree to notify the AALS if and as soon as s/he learns that the submitted paper will be published before February 2012.

Each paper author is to indicate up to four subject categories from the list below that best describe the paper. In the event that none of the categories listed captures the essence of the paper or the author feels that another category not listed below best describes the paper, then the author is permitted to write in one topic under "other" that best describes the paper.

**Subject Categories:** Administrative Law; Admiralty; Agency/Partnership; Agricultural Law; Animal Law; Antitrust; Alternative Dispute Resolution; American Indian Law; Arts and Literature; Bank and Finance; Bankruptcy and Creditor's Rights; Civil Procedure; Civil Rights; Commercial Law; Communications Law; Community Property; Comparative Law; Computer and Internet Law; Conflict of Laws; Constitutional Law; Consumer Law; Contracts; Corporations; Courts; Criminal Law; Criminal Procedure; Critical Legal Theory; Disability Law; Dispute Resolution; Domestic Relations; Education Law; Elder Law; Employment Practice; Energy and Utilities; Environmental Law; Entertainment Law; Estate Planning and Probate; Evidence; Family Law; Federal Jurisdiction and Procedure; Foreign Relations/National Security;

Gender Law; Health Law and Policy; Housing Law; Human Rights Law; Immigration Law; Insurance Law; Intellectual Property; International Law – Public; International Law – Private; Jurisprudence; Juveniles; Labor; Law and Economics; Law and Society; Law and Technology; Law Enforcement and Corrections; Legal Analysis and Writing; Legal Education; Legal History; Legal Profession; Legislation; Local Government; Mergers and Acquisitions; Military Law; Natural Resources Law; Nonprofit Organization; Organizations; Poverty Law; Products Liability; Professional Responsibility; Property Law; Race and the Law; Real Estate Transactions; Religion, Law and; Remedies; Securities; Sexuality and the Law; Social Justice; Social Sciences, Law and; State and Local Government Law; Taxation – Federal; Taxation – State & Local; Terrorism; Torts; Trade; Trial and Appellate Advocacy; Trusts and Estates; Workers' Compensation.

**Presentation at the Annual Meeting:** The author of any selected paper will present an oral summary of the paper at a special program to be held at the 2012 Annual Meeting. Copies of the paper will be made available for distribution to those attending the presentation.

**Inquiries:** Questions should be directed to Special Assistant Brenda Simoes at the AALS office in Washington, D.C. (telephone, 202-296-8851, or e-mail, bsimoes@aals.org).

## The AALS Directory of Law Teachers 2011-2012



Association of American  
Law Schools

Printed for Law Teachers as a Public Service by  
West Law School Publishing and Foundation Press

## Update your 2011-2012 *Directory of Law Teachers* listing today!

The AALS *Directory of Law Teachers* updating process is now open online.

Faculty at member and fee-paid schools need to update their own profiles. This online process has replaced the hard copy forms that have to be mailed from, and returned to AALS each spring.

While hard copies of the *Directory* will continue to be mailed to all member and fee-paid schools, this new process allows faculty and schools to keep their information updated year-round, while making production of the hardcopy more streamlined and efficient.

Please visit [www.aals.org/dlt/](http://www.aals.org/dlt/) for instructions, FAQs and to login or update your personal information.

An e-mail with instructions and your current biographical listing will be sent to full-time faculty shortly.

---

## Nominations for AALS Executive Committee and President-Elect

The Nominating Committee for 2012 Officers and Members of the Executive Committee, chaired by Kevin R. Johnson, University of California, Davis, School of Law, invites suggestions for candidates for President-elect of the Association and for two positions on the Executive Committee for a three-year term. The nominating committee will recommend candidates for these positions to the House of Representatives at the January 2012 Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.

Suggestions of persons to be considered and relevant comments should be sent to Executive Director Susan Westerberg Prager, 1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036 or [sprager@aals.org](mailto:sprager@aals.org). To ensure full consideration please send your recommendations by **July 15, 2011**. President Michael A. Olivas has appointed an able, informed, and representative Nominating Committee. The Nominating Committee would very much appreciate your help in identifying strong candidates. To be eligible, a person must have a faculty appointment at an AALS member school.

In addition to Dean Johnson, the members of the Nominating Committee for 2012 Officers and Members of the Executive Committee are: Alicia Alvarez, The University of Michigan Law School; Barbara J. Cox, California Western School of Law; Thomas D. Morgan, George Washington University School of Law, Immediate Past Chair; Victor C. Romero, Pennsylvania State University, The Dickinson School of Law; Rosemary C. Salomone, St. John's University School of Law; and John Valery White, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law.

## Proposals for Professional Development Programs

The Professional Development Committee invites AALS Sections to submit a proposal for a professional development program in 2013. To ensure a comprehensive review of these proposals and facilitate the request for any additional information, **the deadline for submission is May 27, 2011.**

The Association's professional development programming consists of one-day workshops at the Annual Meeting and two-day workshops and three-day conferences at the Mid-Year Meeting. Programs need not fit any particular format, but many past conferences and workshops have fallen into one of the following categories:

1. subject matter programs aimed at faculty who teach particular subjects or types of courses such as the 2009 Mid-Year Meeting Conference on Business Associations and 2010 Mid-Year Meeting Workshop on Civil Procedure;
2. programs for groups with similar interests other than subject matter such as the 2010 Mid-Year Meeting Workshop on "Post Racial" Civil Rights Law, Politics, and Legal Education: New and Old Colorlines in the Age of Obama and 2011 Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality;
3. programs that cut across subject matter lines or integrate traditional subject matter such as the 2008 Annual Meeting Workshop on Local Government at Risk: Immigration, Land Use and National Security and the Battle of Control and the 2006 Mid-Year Meeting Workshop on Integrating Transnational Legal Perspectives;
4. programs that focus upon a type of skill or discipline as in the 2011 Mid-Year Meeting Conference on Curriculum: Understanding Law Across Borders and Cultures and the 2009 Annual Meeting Workshop: Progress? The Academy, Profession, Race and Gender: Empirical Findings, Research Issues, Potential Projects and Funding Opportunities;
5. programs dealing with matters of law school administration or legal education generally such as the 2011 Annual Meeting Workshop for Deans and Law Librarians and the 2012 Annual Meeting Workshop on Academic Support; and
6. programs exploring the ramifications of significant developments in or affecting the law such as the 2008 Annual Meeting Workshop on Courts: Independence and Accountability.

Proposals should be as specific as possible, including a description of the areas or topics that might be covered, in as much detail as possible, and an explanation of why it would be important and timely to undertake such a program in 2013. The Professional Development Committee particularly encourages proposals for programs that are sufficiently broad that they will interest more than the membership of a single AALS section. The AALS strongly encourages proposals that contemplate different or innovative types of programming or develop interdisciplinary themes. A sample of a well-developed proposal is available for review on the AALS Web site at: <http://www.aals.org/profdev/>

The Association welcomes suggestions for members of the planning committee and potential speakers, along with a brief explanation as to their particular qualifications. It is helpful to the planning committee to have as much information as possible about potential speakers in advance of its meeting. Because planning committees value diversity of all sorts, we encourage recommendations of women, minorities, those with differing viewpoints, and new teachers as speakers. Specific information regarding the potential speaker's scholarship, writings, speaking ability, and teaching methodology is particularly valuable.

Proposals are solicited from sections and those proposals are extremely valuable as a starting point for the planning committee. Planning the actual program, including the choice of specific topics and speakers, is the responsibility of the planning committee, which is appointed by the AALS President. The planning committees normally include one or more individuals who are in leadership positions in the proposing section, and other teachers in that subject area.

As indicated above, proposals should be submitted to AALS Managing Director Jane LaBarbera by May 27, 2011. Please send an electronic copy of your proposal by e-mail to [profdev@aals.org](mailto:profdev@aals.org). Jane LaBarbera would be pleased to discuss proposal ideas with you and to answer any questions you have about the Association's professional development programs. Please send your questions by e-mail to [jlabarbera@aals.org](mailto:jlabarbera@aals.org).

# aalscalendar

---

## 2011 Mid-Year Meeting

June 11-17, 2011  
Seattle, Washington

### Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum

June 11-14, 2011

### Conference on Clinical Legal Education: Learning for Transfer: (Re)conceptualizing What We Do in Clinics and Across the Curriculum

June 13-16, 2011

### Law Clinic Directors' Workshop: (Re)considering Security of Position and Academic Freedom in Clinical Legal Education

June 17, 2011

## 2011 Workshop on Women Rethinking Equality

June 20-22, 2011  
Washington, DC

## 2011 Workshops for New Law School Teachers

### Workshop for Beginning Legal Writing Law School Teachers

June 22-23, 2011  
Washington, DC

### Workshop for New Law School Teachers

June 23-25, 2011  
Washington, DC

## Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers

June 25-26, 2011  
Washington, DC

## Faculty Recruitment Conference

October 13-15, 2011  
Washington, DC

## 2012 Annual Meeting

January 4-8, 2012  
Washington, DC

For more information go to [www.aals.org/calendar/](http://www.aals.org/calendar/)

---

### Future Annual Meeting Dates

- January 4-8, 2013
- January 7-11, 2014
- January 2-6, 2015

### Future Faculty Recruitment Conference Dates

- 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](http://www.aals.org)