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Lauren K. Robel, University of Indiana Maurer School of Law, Bloomington

Last week, the National Law Journal published its Top 10 Law School Stories of 2011. Mercifully, one of them involved a dog. The NLJ reported that a compassionate Yale law librarian brought Monty the dog to the stacks to soothe students’ exam-jangled nerves.

The remaining nine stories constituted the past year’s bill of particulars against law schools. The stories were arrayed along a fairly narrow spectrum from dreadful to horrible: breaches of data integrity; calls for Congressional hearings about law school debt or graduate unemployment; declining applicants; high and rising law school costs; lawsuits by graduates; and claims that legal academics are, in the NLJ’s striking summary, “ivory tower–dwelling chin strokers who neglect to teach their students how to practice law.”

Perhaps law schools should have engaged more adorable animals this past year!

Many law faculty, administrators, and staff who have committed their lives to legal education are deeply disheartened and dismayed by the past year’s barrage of negative press, consumer class actions, and senatorial suspicion. Some of the critics frame their stories in ways that cast those in the academy as the adversaries of our students and graduates. To most of us who make our lives in the legal academy, these stories have been painful, sometimes excruciatingly so. Our vocation commits us to do our level best to honor and bring to fruition the hopes and dreams of the human beings who entrust their futures to us – and to do this with full knowledge that we are preparing our graduates to be the guardians and advocates of those who will in turn entrust their futures, dreams, hopes, businesses, families, and lives to them. This is not trivial work, and few could sustain it without the deeply human rewards it brings. Much of the human joy of being a teacher comes from the long arc of trust and relationships we build with our students and graduates. At our alumni reception here a few days ago, I stared intently into the face of a former student until I conjured his name. He had devoted his life to the JAG corps. He was now a colonel, and that life had been filled with integrity, purpose, and service. All of our lives are measured most meaningfully by the successes of such a student, and the intense pleasure of seeing a graduate build a career of integrity and purpose is unmatched. Too many of our graduates face the disappointment and
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frustration of a world that diminishes their chances to use their educations to build such lives and careers, and that is disappointing and frustrating to us as well. We understand that many of them are angry and discouraged.

It is also completely understandable that faculty members are discouraged and angered by suggestions that the entire enterprise of scholarship is irrelevant and unworthy of support. I was appreciative today in the sparkling session with Justice Stephen Breyer of the ways he described the virtuous circle that exists at its best with the academy, the bench, and the bar. We have a distinctive place in that circle. We are partnered with the profession, but our home is the academy. Scholarly inquiry is as central to our own professional identity as fidelity to clients is to a lawyer’s, or concepts of stare decisis to judges. It increases our understanding of the world and the profession, and challenges and expands our conceptions of what law can do in the service of justice. At the first meeting of this House, as Susan Prager read the names of the colleagues we lost last year, it was not their faces but their ideas that flashed through my mind. Jane Larson and feminist legal history; David Baldus and the relationship between race and capital sentences; Larry Ribstein and the economics of the profession; Derrick Bell and critical race theory. The impact of these ideas has been enormous. One of the most inspiring speakers at Thursday’s Workshop on the Future of the Legal Profession and Legal Education was a 2009 graduate of St. Louis University’s School of Law, Thomas Harvey. Fresh out of school, he and two of his classmates had the courage to create a nonprofit, ArchCity Defenders, to provide holistic legal services to individuals, mostly homeless, facing state prosecution. All three of them do this in addition to other legal work, Thomas in a solo practice. Their nonprofit has already won both a contract with the city and awards from the Bar Association in St. Louis. When he spoke about what inspired him to do such a thing, Thomas explained the importance of his critical race class, an international human rights internship, and a clinical experience. Derrick Bell’s work lives on in the immense service Thomas Harvey provides to the otherwise voiceless population he serves. Scholarship should not require a sustained defense, but if it does, I would point to Thomas Harvey.

Many of us were also puzzled by the \textit{New York Times}’ editorial suggestion that Christopher Columbus Langdell might be transported to a 2011 law school and fail to notice that the century had changed and he wasn’t at Harvard anymore. The four new member schools initiated into the Association two days ago nicely illustrate the breadth and diversity of the legal academy. Those schools include a historically-black public school with a strong bent towards access that fosters the professional success of people who are historically underrepresented in the profession; a religiously-affiliated school with a mission of inculcating a particular vision of professional accountability; an urban school with full and part-time programs; and a brand-new private school with a cooperative education program rich in externship opportunities. I think Langdell would be delighted by the diversity he would see in legal education, not only in the missions of our member schools, but also in the curricula they offer.
The AALS has been a showcase for curricular innovation. Examples abound, including this Annual Meeting, with its terrific day-long Workshop on the Future of the Legal Profession and Legal Education and this past summer’s AALS Mid-Year Conference on the Future of the Law School Curriculum. Both demonstrate how many faculty members and schools have worked hard to embrace thoughtful curricular innovation about everything from professional competencies and leadership skills to transactional and global lawyering. The popular narrative about law schools, even among many in the profession and the judiciary who know us best, misses so much of this activity and diversity. That is our problem to correct.

I have been most struck, however, at this Annual Meeting in particular, by how most in our community have resisted the urge to turn a defensive face to this wall of critique and have instead engaged with its questions. I support the characteristic generosity and intellectual honesty of this impulse. For the sake of our students, our graduates, and the society we serve, we are right to bring the rigorous and open-minded analysis that characterizes our scholarly and teaching commitments to bear on the questions that legal education’s critics raise. We are also right both to engage with the profession that is our partner in ensuring the quality of legal education and to insist on their partnership in the education of young lawyers. We must think carefully about whether an issue is unique to legal education, or common to challenges facing higher education, or even our country, more generally.

What an adventure to imagine and reimagine our schools, our teaching, and our scholarship in light of the changing world. Many of the most pressing and complicated current questions surround the relationship between the destabilized profit model of the profession at the largest law firms, and the financing and cost of legal education. Much of the commentary on the cost and financing of a law degree has focused on this relationship, and much terrific scholarship focuses on it as well. While our relationship with the profession tells part of the story, can we add to our understanding by shifting the frame to our commonalities with higher education generally?

Law schools are not unique in many of the questions we face, whether they surround the amount of public investment in education (directly or through student loans), the amount of student debt, the value of incurring educational debt in light of employment returns, or the causes of rising instructional costs. Legal education shares all of these questions about financing and cost with higher education generally.

These topics raise complex questions about which reasonable people can and do disagree. We can all agree that there is certainly room for schools to reduce or redistribute costs, and we all have our favorite examples of law school costs we think are unwise or unjustified. Nonetheless, we would get new insights into questions of cost and financing if our analysis put law schools back into context within higher education more generally and distinguished more among their missions. For instance, we are experiencing the rapid privatization of public education, including public legal education, a long-term trend that has accelerated as a result of states’ economic distress. The scope of public disinvestment in public higher education, and public legal education, is unprecedented. In many ways, in-state tuition at public law schools sets the floor for law school costs more generally. The ABA’s President, Bill Robinson, mentioned in his address here a few days ago that over 65 law schools in the country have tuitions at or below $26,000. I am willing to bet they are almost all public. Now do a thought experiment; imagine the overall effect on costs at all law schools if public support for public schools had not dropped so precipitously. Discussions about costs that do not take account of this broader context – discussions that frame cost issues as if law schools’ cost structures were all the result of unconstrained choices, student behaviors, US News, and labor market restructuring – miss a critical part of a broader story about the cost of legal education.

What do we lose if we lose public legal education? How does pulling this thread affect the other parts of legal education? If our analysis does not identify and acknowledge the impact of severely reduced public investment in higher education, and in turn on students and the share of cost they are asked to absorb as a result, it tacitly accepts privatization without examining its premises or its broader impact. It tells an incomplete story. Fuller pictures are better, as we think about cost, financing, and the elements of our system of legal education that have made it so attractive globally.

And in what new ways might we cooperate and collaborate to improve quality without increasing costs? US News didn’t invent hierarchy, nor would hierarchy disappear tomorrow if the magazine were gone. But its rankings have contributed to an atomistic culture that frames us all first and foremost as competitors.
Michael Olivas, Lauren Robel, H. Reese Hansen

We appreciate all of our vendors very much.

AALS Executive Director Susan Prager hosts a reception for AALS committee members.

A Conversation with Justice Stephen Breyer
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We will always compete for the best faculty and students. But my sense is that we also ache for a more cooperative, collaborative culture, one that honors our shared sense of the importance of our missions, the urgency of the changes we are facing, and the importance of the work we do in the world.

What an adventure it would be to be the architects of that culture! And what inspiring and imaginative steps in that direction we have heard at this annual meeting. We have heard about wonderful classes, like the one taught by Lou Bilionis and Judith Wegner, that link different schools through technology to share a vision for professional development. We have heard about consortia, such as Law Without Walls and Educating Tomorrow’s Lawyers, and the Labor Law Group, among others, that cross traditional law school hierarchies and use technology to share the costs, and the best ideas, in service of students and research. We have heard many wonderful initiatives that connect lawyers, teachers, and students through technology in ways that are both replicable and ripe for multi-school participation. AALS has always provided a forum for sharing the best ideas about scholarship and teaching. It can play an important role in helping connect us through new and imaginative collaborations to reduce our programmatic costs and increase the benefits for our students.

Like the question of law school costs, the serious questions surrounding the legal profession, and the nature of the change it is experiencing, are shared with many other service professions. We are extraordinarily lucky to be experiencing a boom in high-quality, empirically grounded research on the profession in law schools. We learn even more when we connect that research, as many legal academics have begun to do, to the experiences of other professions.

Those experiences, in our own and other professions, are profoundly shaped by the effects of a globalized economy and globalization more generally. No matter what happens with the domestic economic situation, globalization is to the immediate future of the profession, and of legal education, what rapid and inexorable technological change was to our immediate past. Justice Breyer spoke today about its impact on the Supreme Court’s docket. It affects deeply such diverse areas of the law from the balance of power between the states and the federal government, and among the branches of the federal government, to the ways in which litigation is shaped. The scholarship that has poured out of the legal academy on globalization, the debates that scholarship is framing with respect to both public and private law, and the opportunities for imaginative engagement with the world, are staggering.

So let me make three points.

First, globalization’s effects on practice are more pervasive than we generally recognize and reach much more broadly across practice contexts. As many have observed, this pervasiveness has broad implications for law schools.

Second, law schools are already enormous sites of globalization, driven in large part by U.S. higher education’s stellar and deserved reputation internationally. This phenomenon gives us huge opportunities to prepare our students for their future in creative and exciting ways – especially if we are willing to collaborate and leverage common resources.

Third, it is time for the AALS to go global.

I have been surprised by the resistance to the argument that globalization pervasively affects the profession. Few people resist the assertion that large private firms have a global reach, that they have rapidly expanded into other countries, or that they deal regularly with transnational legal issues. But the extent of globalization’s reach into the smallest of practice settings is not as familiar a story. So let me tell you of rural Spencer, Indiana, population 13,000, home to personal injury lawyer, Roger Pardieck. Roger’s website accurately notes the (let me just claim) Hoosier values that have made him successful, including the close and empathic relationships he develops with his clients and the public service that makes lawyers like Roger the backbones of their communities.

Yet Roger routinely engages in transnational work in the products liability cases in which he has developed a small specialty. To win those cases, he has to follow products up the global supply chain, which regularly means out of the United States. One of the cases he has won through careful transnational investigation, for instance, involved comparing the black-box warnings used on a drug in a variety of Asian nations, including Japan, with what was done here. He has also leveraged his time by outsourcing some research to India and tells me that the same Indian firm was willing to take over the front and back office operations of his tiny firm from Bangalore (he politely declined). The idea of Indian outsourcing came through Roger’s connection with a group of personal injury
lawyers located around the country, and he speaks of other solo lawyers like him who use this service often to leverage their resources in service to their clients. Like many lawyers in smaller practice settings, Roger is connected to larger networks of lawyers through technology, and those networks give him access to the world.

Roger’s experience on the individual services side of the practice hemisphere is increasingly matched by that of the lawyers who serve the small and medium sized businesses, often family owned, that are being pulled or pushed into unfamiliar transnational waters. The Department of Commerce notes, for example, that more than a third of U.S. exports to China were from over 16,000 small to medium-sized businesses1. The number of small manufacturers who source parts overseas, or have moved their manufacturing across borders, is huge. Whether because of sourcing or outsourcing needs or because of other market opportunities, smaller business entities that have traditionally used in-house counsel, or smaller regional law firms, now need legal counsel who can plan and execute cross-border transactions, and their lawyers have to be able to provide these services if they want to retain that business. In turn, this set of legal competencies requires familiarity with a host of regulatory schemes, both domestic (like the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act) and nondomestic. And it requires new kinds of knowledge, such as how the legal professions in other countries are, and are not, like the one in the United States.

As Laurel Terry’s work has demonstrated, those who negotiate bilateral trade agreements increasingly conceptualize lawyer regulation as a form of trade barrier. The U.S. has entered over fifteen agreements that, at least in theory, commit us to understanding what this means in practice. These developments raise huge questions about lawyer regulation, but as a result, other countries, like Korea, are opening in new ways to foreign lawyers, including lawyers from the United States.

Globalization creates risks for the profession, but it also creates opportunities. And whether the profession can seize those opportunities depends in part on understanding and enhancing the role that U.S. legal education plays in creating an increasingly large cadre of foreign lawyers who have studied in our schools and in successfully building professional networks between these students and our J.D. students.

Colleges and universities, law schools included, are already massive sites of globalization. In his book, The Great American University, Jonathan Cole notes that “American higher education represents one of the few sectors of the U.S. economy with a favorable international balance of trade.”2 This is certainly true for U.S. legal education, where the number of LLM degrees, primarily to foreign students, grew by 65% between 1999-2009.3

Ironically, at a time when U.S. legal education is subject to such broad domestic criticism, the global attractiveness of U.S. legal education, and a U.S. law degree have never been higher.

The profession’s ability to compete globally is enhanced by assuring that a U.S. legal education remains important not only to those who come from abroad, but also through our creative thinking about how to work together to create and sustain curriculum, scholarship, and linkages that engage globally.

During the past year, the AALS Executive Committee asked for a report from a special committee, chaired by the visionary Judith Areen, on the Association’s role in a global future. That report outlines a host of actionable ways in which the AALS can support our members as they engage with global issues and pursue collaborative opportunities for their students. Critical to these is providing our schools with more ways to lower the cost barriers to engagement with our colleagues in legal education abroad and to our students’ engagement with the world. As we move forward with implementing this work, our focus will be on assuring that we work closely with our members to support initiatives that you tell us are important to you, that facilitate sharing and collaboration, that work to provide resources for important connections, and that provide non-U.S. law schools and faculty more opportunities to engage with our member schools.

To conclude, we all recognize that we have real issues to address in the academy, including indefensible breaches of public trust around data, and difficult and complex questions of cost and financing. I hear deep commitment from my colleagues at our law schools to address these issues head-on, and collectively, and this Association will support you in every year.

But it’s a new year. Let’s approach it from a new place. Let’s declare a new zeitgeist and commit to build its vocabulary. Here’s my vocabulary list:


---

1David A. Steiger, The Globalized Lawyer ix (2008).
AALS Administration and Stewardship of IALS Has Ended

At the IALS Board Meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina in April 2011, the Association of American Law Schools (AALS) Executive Director Susan Prager indicated to the International Association of Law Schools (IALS) Board that it was now time to implement the original concept shared by the IALS Board and the AALS Executive Committee that AALS staff support would be of short duration. The IALS Board announced to the IALS General Assembly on April 14th that the AALS would transition out of staff support capacity for IALS, with a transition of all functions to be completed prior to mid-January 2012.

IALS came into existence after international and U.S. delegates were invited to attend two Association of American Law School conferences: The AALS Conference of International Legal Educators at New York University’s Villa La Pietra (Florence, Italy, 2000) and the AALS Conference on Educating Lawyers for Transnational Challenges (Honolulu, Hawaii, 2004). It was determined at those conferences that an International Association of Law Schools should be formed.

In 2005, IALS was established by Charter at a meeting in Istanbul, Turkey. During the intervening six years AALS has supported the founding of IALS by providing administrative support to IALS from its inception; AALS also provided significant monetary support for IALS during its first four years. Through the efforts of past and present IALS Board Members, and the support of the host schools for IALS conferences, IALS accumulated significant funds, making this an appropriate time for IALS to establish its own administrative capacities.

The IALS Governing Board identified Barbara J. Holden-Smith, Vice Dean and Professor of Law at Cornell University Law School as the new IALS General Secretary/Treasurer effective October 11, 2011. AALS ceased the financial administration for IALS on November 30th; IALS assumed control of the assets of the organization the following day. IALS is fortunate indeed to have Professor Holden-Smith succeed Professor Carl Monk in this important role for the organization.

“AALS remains committed to the goal of supporting meaningful interactions with colleagues and schools throughout the world and we will be, as we always are, interested in the thoughts of member schools and their faculties,” said Prager. “There is much to do in the international arena and we wish IALS success in its mission.”

For additional information regarding AALS and globalization, please see Lauren Robel’s 2012 Presidential address to the Second Meeting of the House of Representatives during the Annual Meeting on page 1.
Why Attend?

The conference’s overarching goal is to provide clinical educators with concrete lessons, examples, and ideas for improving teaching, student assessment, and clinical program self-evaluation in the face of a changing legal profession and world. Plenary sessions, mini-plenary sessions, concurrent sessions, and working groups will be structured to emphasize and produce takeaways for improving the teaching of lawyering skills and professional values, incorporating reflection components into externships/field placements and in-house clinical courses, successfully meeting the teaching challenges of today, designing effective student assessment instruments, and engaging in meaningful self-evaluation of clinical programs.

The legal profession and needs of law school graduates have been rapidly changing. The last five years have brought profound changes in the legal profession, including law firm downsizing, a weak legal employment market, and an increasing call for practice-ready law graduates. At the same time, the needs of our client communities continue to evolve, as do our students’ goals and expectations for their clinical experience. These changes have placed, and will continue to place, more demands on clinical legal education within law schools. This conference will explore what these changes mean for clinical faculty while providing attendees with concrete tools they can use at their home institutions.

The conference this year will take place over three and one-half days and will address the changing environment by examining three major themes: (1) setting goals and structuring in-house and externship/field placement clinical courses in an environment in which student goals, client needs, and the profession itself are changing; (2) developing effective techniques for teaching skills, given how the practice of law has evolved and expanded in the 21st century; and (3) measuring the effectiveness of our teaching by learning from different clinical models (simulations, externships/field placements, and in-house clinics).

There will be a plenary for each of these major themes, and presenters will include faculty who focus on externships/field placements, in-house clinics, and simulation skills teaching as well as experts from other disciplines. A subtheme of the conference will be to compare and contrast what occurs in each type of clinical pedagogy and what we can learn from each other as legal educators in our common enterprise to prepare students for the practice of law.

Concurrent sessions will explore issues roughly broken into six categories: general clinical pedagogy; teaching and assessing specific lawyering skills and professional values; sessions with externship/field placement emphasis; sessions with in-house clinic emphasis; professional development for faculty; and sessions addressing diverse areas such as case and data management in clinics, and preparing students for today’s legal market.

The conference structure will have fewer large plenary sessions, and concurrent sessions will be structured to run in tracks (e.g., in-house and externship/field placement tracks) to minimize conflicts within areas of interest. There will also be four slots on different days of the conference for AALS Clinical Section committee meetings and one time slot for affinity group meetings that are not duplicative of working groups. None of these meetings will conflict with conference sessions.

While the emphasis of the plenaries and concurrent sessions will be on concrete tools faculty will be able to use, the sessions will also explore the underlying educational theories necessary to understand, modify, and develop these tools. Working groups will be organized to examine topics generated by the plenaries and to help answer questions about the effective use of the takeaways in the context of the teaching we do.
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In addition to the general conference, there will be a special session and orientation to clinical teaching and the conference for new clinical faculty the morning of the first day of the conference, and clinic administrators will have a working group and sessions geared to their interests. Also, during the conference, there will be a time slot set aside for multiple concurrent sessions for works-in-progress.

Planning Committee for Conference on Clinical Legal Education
Jon C. Dubin, Rutgers University School of Law - Newark
Margaret M. Jackson, University of North Dakota School of Law
Peter Joy, Washington University School of Law, Chair
Luz M. Molina, Loyola University New Orleans College of Law
Jayesh Rathod, American University Washington College of Law

Topics Include: Structuring Clinics in a Changing Environment; Teaching Lawyering Skills in the 21st Century; Teaching and Evaluating Self Assessment: Takeaways from Different Clinical Models (Simulations, Field Placements, In-House); Poster Presentations, Concurrent Sessions, Works-in-Progress, Affinity Groups.

Location:
The conference will take place at the Westin Bonaventure Hotel & Suites, 404 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, CA 90071. This striking building is located in the center of the downtown financial district with easy access to cultural and entertainment venues.

Hotel Information:
Single/double occupancy is $169 plus 15.57% sales tax. Children staying in the room with their parent(s) are free of charge. There is an additional charge of $20 per person for more than two adults sharing a room. Check in time is 3:00 p.m.; check out time is 12:00 p.m. This hotel has a smoke-free policy. To reserve a room, visit www.aals.org/clinical2012/ and click on the “Hotel” tab.

Registration:
Registration fee per person for the Conference on Clinical Legal Education is $425 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $475 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools, if registration is received at AALS by April 17, 2012. There is an additional charge of $50 to register after April 17th.

Look for online registration and registration forms at the AALS website www.aals.org/clinical2012.
Nominations for AALS Executive Committee and President-Elect

The Nominating Committee for 2013 Officers and Members of the Executive Committee, chaired by Dean Rachel F. Moran, University of California, Los Angeles School of Law, invites suggestions for candidates for President-Elect of the Association and for two positions on the Executive Committee, each for a three-year term. The Nominating Committee will recommend candidates for these positions to the House of Representatives at the January 2013 Annual Meeting in New Orleans.

President Laure K. Robel has appointed an able, informed, and representative Nominating Committee. In addition to Dean Rachel Moran, the members of the 2013 Nominating Committee are as follows:

- Douglas A. Kysar, Yale Law School
- Jeremy R. Paul, University of Connecticut School of Law
- Susan Poser, University of Nebraska College of Law
- Kevin R. Johnson, University of California Davis School of Law (previous Chair)

The Nominating Committee would very much appreciate your help and the help of members of your faculty in generating strong candidates for its consideration. To be eligible, a person must have a faculty appointment at an AALS member school.

Suggestions of persons to be considered and relevant comments should be sent to Executive Director Susan Westerberg Prager, Association of American Law Schools, 1201 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 800, Washington, DC 20036 or sprager@aals.org. To ensure full consideration, please send your recommendations by July 15, 2012.

2012 Annual Meeting Podcasts

Over 140 sessions from the 2012 AALS Annual Meeting were digitally audio recorded and are posted on the AALS website. These recordings, known as 'podcasts,' are available at no charge to faculty and professional staff from AALS member and fee-paid law schools.

To access podcasts visit www.aals.org/am2012/ and select “Podcasts” to listen to the recorded sessions. You can browse the Annual Meeting podcast program by scrolling down or search for a specific session by typing ‘Ctrl F’ and then typing a keyword. Click the Section name of the session you are interested in, and your media player should open and begin playing the recording. Longer sessions have been broken up into multiple recordings—they will have several links (such as ‘morning’ or ‘afternoon’) directly beneath the session name.

A user name and password is required to access the podcasts. Your user name is your primary e-mail address, and your password is the same one you use to register for conferences and update your DLT profile. If you do not have or do not remember your password, click the ‘forgot password’ link on the bottom of the login screen.
Why Torts Law Teachers Would Attend?

Tort scholarship and tort practice has been concerned with large-scale losses since the advent of the class action. Recent events, such as the attacks of 9/11 and the BP oil spill, have illustrated that the tools of aggregate litigation may not be enough to handle the job of ascertaining both responsibility and compensation after a disaster. The Torts and Compensation Law Section will take advantage of its joint meeting with the Environmental Law Section to provide a fresh look at the special problem that disasters pose for tort law in the 21st Century.

The topics covered by the torts portion of the joint meeting will include whether tort law should be limited in times of disasters, the role (if any) of tort principles in the design of public compensation and private settlement funds, and the relationship between tort and insurance law in times of disaster. At the end of the program there will be a session on the incorporation of issues relating to disaster in the torts curriculum. The program will provide torts and insurance scholars of all levels of seniority with new insights into their own research and teaching.

Why Environmental Law and Natural Resources Law Teachers Would Attend?

Rather than a singular catastrophic event, Hurricane Katrina seems more and more like the opening act in what will become known as an age of disaster. Since Katrina, not only hurricanes, but also oil spills, earthquakes, floods, tornadoes, terrorist attacks, volcanoes, heat waves, blizzards, and all manner of other disasters seem to be occurring in the United States and across the globe with increasing regularity and destructiveness. The sober predictions of climate models suggest that the frequency and scale of weather-related events will continue to increase. The implications of this age of disaster for environmental law are profound, including the rise of vulnerability assessment and adaptation planning as new areas of expertise, the renewal of debate over scientific uncertainty and worst case scenarios as key drivers of policy, and the challenge of defining and achieving justice for disaster victims.

Disaster takes center stage for this Mid-Year Meeting, the first in Environmental Law since 2004 and the first to be organized concurrently with a Tort Law event. This Workshop — Torts, Environment and Disaster — will bring together scholars and teachers for two days of intensive presentations and discussion on disaster. Plenary sessions for both Environmental Law and Tort Law attendees will consider such topics as the history and psychology of disaster and perspectives on the precautionary principle. Environmental Law sessions will include such topics as disaster planning and prevention, federalism and disaster, and climate change adaptation. Engaging lunchtime speakers, professional development and teaching sessions, and breakout group discussion will round out the program.

Planning Committee for AALS Workshop on Torts, Environment and Disaster

Robin K. Craig, Florida State University College of Law
Eileen Gauna, University of New Mexico School of Law
Laura Hines, University of Kansas School of Law, Chair
Douglas A. Kysar, Yale Law School
Robert L. Rabin, Stanford Law School
Anthony J. Sebok, Yeshiva University Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law
Lisa Grow Sun, Brigham Young University J. Reuben Clark Law School
**Workshop on Torts, Environment and Disaster** continued from page 12

**General Topics:** History of Disaster; Psychology of Disaster; Precautionary Principle: Regulatory and Tort Perspectives.

**Torts Topics:** Tort Principles in the Context of Disaster; Principles for Compensation Programs and Mass Settlements: Public and Private; Interaction of Tort and Insurance Law; How to Teach Disaster as Part of a Torts Curriculum.

**Environmental Law Topics:** Climate Change, Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Social Cost of Carbon; Generations of Environmental Law; Disaster Prevention; Disaster Federalism; Climate Adaptation

**Confirmed Speakers:**
Jonathan H. Adler (Case Western Reserve), Joonhong Ahn (Department of Nuclear Engineering, University of California Berkeley); Tom Baker (Pennsylvania); Rebecca M. Bratspies (CUNY); Robert D. Bullard (Barbara Jordan-Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs, Texas Southern University); Ann E. Carlson (UCLA); James Ming Chen (Louisville); Daniel H. Cole (Indiana Maurer); David A. Dana (Northwestern); Mary J. Davis (Kentucky); Howard M. Erichson (Fordham); Daniel A. Farber (California, Berkeley); Victor B. Flatt (North Carolina); Sheila R. Foster (Fordham); Myriam Elizabeth Gilles (Cardozo); Michael Green (Wake Forest); Blake Hudson (Stetson); Keith Norman Hylton (Boston University); Gregory C. Keating (Southern California) Carolyn Kousky (Kennedy School of Government, Harvard); Susan S. Kuo (South Carolina); Christian Lahnstein (Former Department of Risk, Liability and Insurance, Munich Re, Munich, Germany); Gregory C. Keating (Southern California); Gregg P. Macey (Brooklyn); Jonathan Masur (Chicago); Rachel Morello-Frosch (Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, College of Natural Resources, California Berkeley); Jaime Naper (Department of Psychology, Yale); May Nguyen (formerly Vietnamese Community Group, Los Angeles, CA); Michael L. Rustad (Suffolk); J. B. Ruhl (Vanderbilt); Adam F. Scales (Rutgers – Camden); Peter H. Schuck (Yale); Catherine M. Sharkey (NYU); Jed H. Shugerman (Harvard); Jason M. Solomon (William & Mary); Rena I. Steinzer (Maryland); Stephen D. Sugarman (California, Berkeley).

**Location:**
The Mid-Year Meeting will take place at the Claremont Hotel in Berkeley, California. Situated overlooking the San Francisco Bay and set amid palm trees and rose gardens, this historic Berkeley Hills property is 2 miles from the University of California at Berkeley and 12 miles from downtown San Francisco.

**Hotel Information:**
Single/double occupancy is $189 plus 14.065% sales tax. Children staying in the room with their parent(s) are free of charge. There is an additional charge of $20 per person for more than two adults sharing a room. Check in time is 4:00 p.m., check out time is 12:00 p.m. To reserve a room, visit www.aals.org/midyear2012/ and click on the "Hotel" tab.

**Registration Information:**
Registration fee for the Workshop on Torts, Environment and Disaster is $495 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $585 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools, if registration is received at AALS by May 3, 2012. The fee for registrations received after May 3rd are $545 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $645 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools

There is a discounted registration fee for attending both workshops (Workshop on Torts, Environment and Disaster and Workshop on When Technology Disrupts Law: How Do IP, Internet and Bio Law Adapt?) of $780 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $865 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools, if registration is received at AALS by May 3, 2012. The fee for registrations received after May 3rd are $865 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $960 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools.

Look for online registration and registration forms at the AALS website www.aals.org/midyear2012/.
2012 AALS Workshop on When Technology Disrupts Law: How Do IP, Internet and Bio Law Adapt?

June 10-12, 2012
The Claremont Hotel
Berkeley, California

Why Attend?

Synthetic biology, regenerative stem cells, chimera, fMRI, nanotechnology, cloud computing, social networks, and web 2.0 are just a few of the many technological advances of the first decade of the twenty-first century to which intellectual property (IP), internet and biolaw professionals are having to help the law adapt. This workshop will bring together leading thinkers not only from the legal academy, but also from fields of economics, business, biology, and computer science, to share insights about these technologies and how the law and lawyers can best adapt to these new phenomena.

The conventional wisdom in the IP field has long been that the grant of exclusive rights such as patents and copyrights is essential to foster innovation in virtually all fields of endeavor. This wisdom has been called into question to some degree by the rise of peer production processes, such as open source development, and by other modes of open innovation. How has and how should the law respond to open innovation? If users are innovating by tinkering with products that are patented or copyrighted, should special rules privilege this tinkering? The internet and other advances in information technology have made it possible for people to collaborate at a distance to construct significant information resources such as Wikipedia. Who owns what has been created collaboratively? What role do commons play in promoting innovation and progress? The rise of amateur creations such as remixes and mashups of copyrighted content, which are widely available on sites such as YouTube, have generated more legal questions than answers.

Social networks allow sharing of information beyond anything that could have been imagined a decade ago. What responsibilities to the operators of these networks have toward their users, particularly as to data mining with personal data about the users? Data mining has also become extremely important with large data sets, and bioinformatics is a new field of research that does not fit within standard models of disciplinary fields. Among the challenging questions that have arisen in the biological sciences have been whether products of synthetic biology can be copyrighted or subject to Creative Commons licenses. Thickets of patents on stem cell innovations and genetic materials are said by some to pose threats to the ongoing progress of research in these fields, and law professors, among others, are offering suggestions about how to overcome obstacles of this sort.

Beyond IP, advances in biology and biotechnology increasingly challenge not just the margins, but the core of the law as well. Functional brain scanning can now provide a detailed picture of the living, thinking human brain, complicating our understanding of such legal concepts as scienter, responsibility, guilt, and punishment. Rapid, inexpensive genome sequencing allows patients intimate knowledge of their genetic heritages, with consequences for employment, insurance, health, and family law. Embryonic stem cells raise myriad bioethical issues, renewing legal debates over property rights in human body parts and abortion rights. And, synthetic biology raises concerns biosafety, biosecurity, and the democratization of biotechnology.

This workshop will not only consider these types of questions, but also what kinds of changes to legal institutions might be necessary or desirable to render the institutions better able to adapt to the rapidly changing technological environment in which we live. Should the Federal Communications Commission have more regulatory authority over the internet? Do we need to recreate the Office of Technology Assessment inside the U.S. Congress? Is the Patent & Trademark Office able to handle the influx of applications in new fields of technology? How might the U.S. Copyright Office be revamped to make better use of information technologies and the internet? Does the Food & Drug Administration need to be redesigned? Because so many of the technology challenges today are not just national, but global in character, how does or should the regulatory infrastructure on an international scale need
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to be reconfigured to respond to these changes? To what extent do technologies themselves express policy and even regulatory choices?

This two and a half day workshop will feature three keynote speakers, several plenary panels on substantive issues such as those mentioned above, a debate about the patenting of genetic information by lawyers who have been involved in active litigation on these matters, an opportunity to converse with a remarkable group of senior women in the IP field, breakout sessions to discuss open innovation in various fields, creative ways to teach difficult subjects with and about technology, and influences from other fields of knowledge that have a bearing on the work of IP, Internet, and biolaw professionals.

Planning Committee for Workshop on When Technology Disrupts Law: How Do IP, Internet and Biolaw Adapt?
Margo A. Bagley, University of Virginia School of Law
Mark P. McKenna, Notre Dame Law School
Paul Ohm, University of Colorado Law School
Pamela Samuelson, University of California Berkeley School of Law, Chair
Andrew W. Torrance, University of Kansas School of Law

Topics Include: Open Innovation and Governance Keynote; Open Innovation Panel; Updating the Regulatory Infrastructure – Domestic Regulatory; Challenges of Updating International Regulatory Infrastructure; Debate; Conversation with Senior Women in the Intellectual Property Field; Big Data / Evolutionary / Geonomics; Technology as Policy; Concurrent Sessions (User-Generated Content on Social Networks and Other Collaborative Websites; Open Biology; Commercializing Open Innovations; Social Networks and Privacy; Teaching Biotech; Teaching with Digital Technology; Teaching Cyber Law; Clinical Education; New Institutional Economics; Behavioral Economics; Neuroscience/Cognitive Psychology/Marketing Behavior; Experimental)

Speakers: Carliss Y. Baldwin (Harvard Business School); Tenielle Brown (Utah); Dan L. Burk (California, Irvine); Rochelle C. Dreyfuss (New York University); Rebecca S. Eisenberg (Michigan); Andrew Endy (Stanford School of Medicine); Edward W. Felten (Federal Trade Commission); William W. “Terry” Fisher III (Harvard); Brett Frischmann (Yeshiva); Daniel J. Gervais (Vanderbilt); Michael Goldberg (Cornell); Wendy Jane Gordon (Boston University); Stuart Graham (The Business School at Georgia Tech); Henry T. Greely (Stanford); Paul Heald (Illinois); Christopher M. Holman (Missouri, Kansas City); Chris Hoofnagle (California, Berkeley); Joseph P. Jackson III (Open Science Summit); Christine Jolls (Yale); Jeff Jonas (IBM Research); Amy N. Kapczynski (California, Berkeley); Daniel Katz (Michigan State); Orin S. Kerr (George Washington); Edward Lee (Chicago-Kent); Peter Lee (California, Davis); Jessica Litman (Michigan); Lydia P. Loren (Lewis & Clark); Deirdre K. Mulligan (University of California, Berkeley School of Information); Ira S. Nathenson (St. Thomas, Florida); Kevin E. Noonan (McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP); Sean O’Connor (University of Washington); Ruth Okediji (Minnesota); Dave Opherdbeck (Seton Hall); Frank A. Pasquale (Seton Hall); Victoria Phillips (American); Arti K. Rai (Duke); Daniel Ravicher (Yeshiva); Christopher Sprigman (Virginia); Victoria C. Stodden (Columbia); Rebecca Tushnet (Georgetown); Greg R. Vetter (Houston); Eric Von Hippel (Massachusetts Institute of Technology); Fred von Lohmann (Google, Inc.); Philip J. Weiser (Colorado); Christopher S. Yoo (Pennsylvania).

Location:
The Mid-Year Meeting will take place at the Claremont Hotel in Berkeley, California. Situated overlooking the San Francisco Bay and set amid palm trees and rose gardens, this historic Berkeley Hills property is 2 miles from the University of California at Berkeley and 12 miles from downtown San Francisco.
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### Hotel Information:
Single/double occupancy is $189 plus 14.065% sales tax. Children staying in the room with their parent(s) are free of charge. There is an additional charge of $20 per person for more than two adults sharing a room. Check in time is 4:00 p.m., check out time is 12:00 p.m. To reserve a room, visit www.aals.org/midyear2012/ and click on the “Hotel” tab.

### Registration Information:
Registration fee for the Workshop on When Technology Disrupts Law: How Do IP, Internet and Bio Law Adapt? is $495 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $585 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools, if registration is received at AALS by May 3, 2012. The fee for registrations received after May 3rd are $545 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $645 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools.

There is a discounted registration fee for attending both workshops (Workshop on When Technology Disrupts Law: How Do IP, Internet and Bio Law Adapt? and Workshop on Torts, Environment and Disaster) of $780 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $865 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools, if registration is received at AALS by May 3, 2012. The fee for registrations received after May 3rd is $865 for faculty of AALS member and fee-paid schools, and $960 for faculty of non-fee-paid law schools.

Look for online registration and registration forms at the AALS website www.aals.org/midyear2012/.

---

### AALS Section Chairs and Chair-Elects for 2012
The following chairs and chair-elects were elected at the Section’s business meeting held during the AALS Annual Meeting in January. Section chairs and chair-elects are now in the process of selecting their topics and planning their programs for the 2013 Annual Meeting to be held in New Orleans, Louisiana.

**ACADEMIC SUPPORT**
Chair: Herbert N. Ramy, Suffolk University Law School
Chair-Elect: Louis N. Schulze, New England Law, Boston

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW**
Chair: Jeffrey S. Lubbers, American University, Washington College of Law
Chair-Elect: William D. Araiza, Brooklyn Law School

**ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME LAW**
Chair: Charles Norchi, University of Maine School of Law
Chair-Elect: John W. Reifenberg, Jr., Michigan State University College of Law

**AFRICA**
Chair: Paolo Galizzi, Fordham University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Matthew H. Charity, Western New England University School of Law

**AGENCY, PARTNERSHIP, LLC’S AND UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATIONS**
Chair: Douglas K. Moll, University of Houston Law Center
Chair-Elect: Lyman P.Q. Johnson, Washington and Lee University School of Law

**AGING AND LAW**
Chair: Barry Kozak, The John Marshall Law School
Chair-Elect: Susan E. Canelosi, Wayne State University Law School

**AGRICULTURAL LAW**
Chair: Alison Peck, West Virginia University College of Law
Chair-Elect: Neil D. Hamilton, Drake University Law School

**ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION**
Chair: Ronald G. Aronovsky, Southwestern Law School
Chair-Elect: Jennifer W. Reynolds, University of Oregon School of Law

**ANIMAL LAW**
Chair: David S. Favre, Michigan State University College of Law
Chair-Elect: David N. Cassuto, Pace University School of Law

**ANTITRUST AND ECONOMIC REGULATION**
Chair: Michael A. Carrier, Rutgers School of Law – Camden
Chair-Elect: Darren D. Bush, University of Houston Law Center

**ART LAW**
Chair: Steven A. Hetcher, Vanderbilt University Law School
Chair-Elect: Megan Carpenter, Texas Wesleyan University School of Law

**BALANCE IN LEGAL EDUCATION**
Chair: Amy C. Buschaw, Lewis and Clark Law School
Chair-Elect: Lawrence S. Kiwiger, Florida State University College of Law

**BIOLAW**
Chair: Michele Goodwin, University of Minnesota Law School
Chair-Elect: Eileen M. Kane, Pennsylvania State University The Dickinson School of Law

**BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS**
Chair: Brett H. Mc Donnell, University of Minnesota Law School
Chair-Elect: Joan M. Heminway, University of Tennessee College of Law

**CHILDREN AND THE LAW**
Chair: Jessica Dixon Weaver, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jonathan Todres, Georgia State University College of Law

**CIVIL PROCEDURE**
Chair: Lonny S. Hoffman, University of Houston Law Center
Chair-Elect: Linda S. Simard, Suffolk University Law School
CIVIL RIGHTS
Chair: Melissa Hart, University of Colorado School of Law
Chair-Elect: Michele Alexander, University of Mississippi

CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION
Chair: Robert L. Jones, Jr., Notre Dame Law School
Co-Chair Elect: Elizabeth B. Cooper, Fordham University School of Law
Co-Chair Elect: Marisa S. Ciampiariello, Chapman University School of Law

COMMERCIAL AND RELATED CONSUMER LAW
Chair: Sarah Howard Jenkins, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, William H. Bowen School of Law
Chair-Elect: Amelia H. Boss, Drexel University, Earle Mack School of Law

COMPARATIVE LAW
Chair: Julie C. Suk, Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University
Chair-Elect: Fernanda Giorgia Nicola, American University, Washington College of Law

CONFLICT OF LAWS
Chair: Tobias Barrington Wolff, University of Pennsylvania Law School
Chair-Elect: Louise Weinberg, The University of Texas School of Law

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW
Chair: Mark S. Scarberry, Pepperdine University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Miguel Schor, Suffolk University Law School

CONTINUING LEGAL EDUCATION
Chair: J. Noah Fundenberg, The University of Alabama School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jennifer Dabson, American University, Washington College of Law

CONTRACTS
Chair: Thomas W. Joo, University of California at Davis School of Law
Chair-Elect: Larry T. Garvin, The Ohio State University, Michael E. Moritz College of Law

CREDITORS’ AND DEBTORS’ RIGHTS
Chair: Alan M. White, Valparaiso University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Kelli A. Alces, Florida State University College of Law

CRIMINAL JUSTICE
Chair: Bennett Capers, Hofstra University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Nita Farahany, Vanderbilt University Law School

FOR THE LAW SCHOOL DEAN
Co-Chair: Darby Dickerson, Texas Tech University School of Law
Co-Chair: David N. Yellen, Loyola University, Chicago, School of Law

DEFAMATION AND PRIVACY
Chair: Amy Gajda, Tulane University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Gaia Bernstein, Seton Hall University School of Law

DISABILITY LAW
Chair: Leslie P. Francis, University of Utah, S. J. Quinney College of Law
Chair-Elect: Richard M. Peterson, Pepperdine University School of Law

EDUCATION LAW
Chair: Kimberly Jenkins Robinson, The University of Richmond School of Law
Chair-Elect: Mark C. Weber, DePaul University College of Law

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS AND EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION
Chair: Susan E. Cencelos, Wayne State University Law School
Chair-Elect: Brendan Maher, Oklahoma City University School of Law

EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION LAW
Chair: Sandra Sperino, University of Cincinnati College of Law
Chair-Elect: Deborah A. Widiss, Indiana University Maurer School of Law-Bloomington

ENVIRONMENTAL LAW
Chair: Denis Binder, Chapman University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jacqueline P. Hand, University of Detroit Mercy School of Law

EVIDENCE
Chair: Jane Campbell Moriarty, Duquesne University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Erik Lillquist, Seton Hall University School of Law

FAMILY AND JUVENILE LAW
Chair: Theresa Glennon, Temple University, James E. Beasley School of Law
Chair-Elect: Linda C. McClain, Boston University School of Law

FEDERAL COURTS
Chair: Carlos M. Vazquez, Georgetown University Law Center
Chair-Elect: Stephen I. Vladeck, American University, Washington College of Law

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER FINANCIAL SERVICES
Chair: Erik F. Gerding, University of Colorado School of Law
Chair-Elect: Saule T. Omarova, University of North Carolina School of Law

GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR NON-U.S. LAWYERS
Chair: Khary Hornsby, University of Minnesota Law School
Chair-Elect: Mark R. Shulman, Pace University School of Law

IMMIGRATION LAW
Chair: Nora V. Demleitner, Hofstra University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Munee I. Ahmad, Yale Law School

INDIAN NATIONS AND INDIGENOUS PEOPLES
Chair: Matthew L.M. Fletcher, Michigan State University College of Law
Chair-Elect: Ezra E.S. Rosser, American University, Washington College of Law

INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT
Chair: Mary H. Hoagland, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School
Chair-Elect: Julia A. Yaffee, Santa Clara University School of Law

INSURANCE LAW
Chair: Michelle E. Boardman, George Mason University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Joshua C. Teitelbaum, Georgetown University Law Center

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
Chair: Jeanne Fromer, Fordham University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Colleen Chien, Santa Clara University School of Law
INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS
Chair: William V. Dunlap, Quinnipiac University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Michele Alexandre, University of Mississippi

INTERNATIONAL LAW
Chair: Christiana Ochoa, Indiana University Maurer School of Law–Bloomington
Chair-Elect: Stephanie Farrior, Vermont Law School

INTERNATIONAL LEGAL EXCHANGE
Chair: Jeffrey Ellis Thomas, University of Missouri–Kansas City School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jeffrey Dodge, Hofstra University School of Law

INTERNET AND COMPUTER LAW
Chair: Michael W. Carroll, American University, Washington College of Law
Chair-Elect: Paul Ohm, University of Colorado School of Law

ISLAMIC LAW
Chair: Clark B. Lombardi, University of Washington School of Law
Chair-Elect: Seval Yildirim, Whittier Law School

JEWISH LAW
Chair: David C. Flatto, Pennsylvania State University
The Dickinson School of Law
Chair-Elect: Michael A. Helfand, Pepperdine University School of Law

JURISPRUDENCE
Chair: Paul Litton, University of Missouri School of Law
Chair-Elect: Robin B. Kar, University of Illinois College of Law

LABOR RELATIONS AND EMPLOYMENT LAW
Chair: Jeffrey M. Hirsch, University of North Carolina School of Law
Chair-Elect: Peggie Smith, Washington University in St. Louis School of Law

LAW AND ANTHROPOLOGY
Chair: Wenona T. Singel, Michigan State University College of Law
Chair-Elect: Kristen A. Carpenter, University of Colorado School of Law

LAW AND ECONOMICS
Chair: James W. Bowers, Louisiana State University, Paul M. Herbert Law Center
Chair-Elect: Jonathan Klick, University of Pennsylvania Law School

LAW AND INTERPRETATION
Chair: Keith J. Bybee, Syracuse University College of Law
Chair-Elect: Frank S. Ravitch, Michigan State University College of Law

LAW AND MENTAL DISABILITY
Chair: Jennifer A. Gundlach, Hofstra University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Alison Barnes, Marquette University

LAW AND RELIGION
Chair: Paul Horwitz, The University of Alabama School of Law
Co-Chair Elect: B. Jessie Hill, Case Western Reserve University School of Law
Co-Chair Elect: Bernadette A. Meyler, Cornell Law School

LAW AND SOUTH ASIAN STUDIES
Chair: Shubha Ghosh, University of Wisconsin Law School
Chair-Elect: Sudha N. Setty, Western New England University School of Law

LAW AND SPORTS
Chair: Joseph G. Hylton, Marquette University
Chair-Elect: Kenneth D. Ferguson, University of Missouri–Kansas City School of Law

LAW AND THE HUMANITIES
Chair: Melissa E. Murray, University of California, Berkeley School of Law
Chair-Elect: Bennett Capers, Hofstra University School of Law

LAW AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES
Chair: Meera Deo, Thomas Jefferson School of Law

LAW LIBRARIES AND LEGAL INFORMATION
Chair: Michelle M. Wu, Georgetown University Law Center
Chair-Elect: James E. Duggan, Tulane University School of Law

LAW, MEDICINE AND HEALTH CARE
Chair: Jennifer S. Bard, Texas Tech University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Elizabeth Weeks Leonard, University of Georgia School of Law

LEGAL HISTORY
Chair: Daniel W. Hamilton, University of Illinois College of Law
Chair-Elect: Tahiri V. Lee, Florida State University College of Law

LEGAL WRITING, REASONING AND RESEARCH
Chair: Kathleen Elliott Vinson, Suffolk University Law School
Chair-Elect: Judith A. Rosenbaum, Northwestern University School of Law

LEGISLATION & LAW OF THE POLITICAL PROCESS
Chair: William S. Blatt, University of Miami School of Law
Chair-Elect: Daniel P. Tokaji, The Ohio State University, Michael E. Moritz College of Law

LITIGATION
Chair: Kenneth Kandaras, The John Marshall Law School
Chair-Elect: Jose Felipe Anderson, University of Baltimore

MASS COMMUNICATION LAW
Chair: Anuj C. Desai, University of Wisconsin Law School
Chair-Elect: Ron Nell Andersen Jones, Brigham Young University, J. Reuben Clark Law School

MINORITY GROUPS
Chair: Audrey G. McFarlane, University of Baltimore
Chair-Elect: Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law

NATIONAL SECURITY LAW
Chair: Stephen Dycus, Vermont Law School
Chair-Elect: Afshien J. Radsan, William Mitchell College of Law

NATURAL RESOURCES LAW
Chair: Irma S. Russell, University of Montana School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jason J. Czarnecki, Vermont Law School

NEW LAW PROFESSORS
Chair: Marcia L. McCormick, Saint Louis University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Christopher C. Lund, Wayne State University Law School
NON-PROFIT LAW AND PHILANTHROPY
Chair: Dana Brakman Reiser, Brooklyn Law School
Chair-Elect: Robert A. Katz, Indiana University
Robert H. McKinney School of Law

NORTH AMERICAN COOPERATION
Chair: Elizabeth N. Burleson, Pace University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Fernando Villarreal-Gonda, Free Faculty of Law of Monterrey

PART-TIME DIVISION PROGRAMS
Chair: Linda S. Anderson, Stetson University College of Law
Chair-Elect: Jon M. Garon, Northern Kentucky University,
Salmon P. Chase College of Law

POST-GRADUATE LEGAL EDUCATION
Chair: Arnold S. Rosenberg, Thomas Jefferson School of Law
Chair-Elect: Matthew Parker, University of Pennsylvania
Law School

POVERTY LAW
Chair: Emily Benfer, Loyola University, Chicago, School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jessica Steinberg, The George Washington
University Law School

PRELEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSION TO LAW SCHOOL
Chair: Michelle Allison, Thomas Jefferson School of Law
Chair-Elect: Alicia K. Cramer, South Texas College of Law

PRO-BONO & PUBLIC SERVICE OPPORTUNITIES
Chair: Elizabeth Tobin-Tyler, Roger Williams University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Marni B. Lennon, University of Miami School of Law

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
Chair: Peter Margulies, Roger Williams University School of Law
Chair-Elect: John P. Sahl, University of Akron,
G. Blake McDowell Law Center

PROPERTY LAW
Chair: Shelley Ross Saxer, Pepperdine University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Hari Michele Ososky, University of Minnesota
Law School

REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS
Chair: Debra P. Stark, The John Marshall Law School
Chair-Elect: John A. Lovett, Loyola University New Orleans
College of Law

REMEDIES
Chair: W. Jonathan Cardi, Wake Forest University School of Law
Chair-Elect: Samuel Jordan, Saint Louis University School of Law

SCHOLARSHIP
Chair: Orde F. Kittrie, Arizona State University
Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law
Chair-Elect: Arthur B. Laby, Rutgers School of Law - Camden

SECURITIES REGULATION
Chair: Kimberly D. Krawiec, Duke University School of Law
Chair Elect: Richard W. Painter, University of Minnesota Law School

SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY ISSUES
Chair: Jose M. Gabilondo, Florida International University
College of Law
Chair-Elect: Saru Matamandazo, Tulane University School of Law

SOCIO-ECONOMICS
Chair: Irma S. Russell, University of Montana School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jeffrey L. Harrison, University of Florida,
Frederic G. Levin College of Law

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT LAW
Chair: Rick Su, University at Buffalo Law School
Chair-Elect: Sheila R. Foster, Fordham University School of Law

STUDENT SERVICES
Chair: Michelle D. Mason, Florida International University
College of Law
Chair-Elect: Jennifer T. DiSanza, Capital University Law School

TAXATION
Chair: Reuven S. Avi-Yonah, The University of Michigan
Law School
Chair-Elect: Leandra Lederman, Indiana University
Maurer School of Law-Bloomington

TEACHING METHODS
Chair: Barbara A. Glesner Fines, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law
Chair-Elect: Michael H. Schwartz, Washburn
University School of Law

TORTS AND COMPENSATION SYSTEMS
Chair: John Valery White, University of Nevada, Las Vegas,
William S. Boyd School of Law
Chair-Elect: Jennifer Wriggins, University of Maine School of Law

TRANSACTIONAL LAW AND SKILLS
Chair: Joan M. Heminway, University of Tennessee College of Law
Chair-Elect: Eric Heminway, Western New England
University School of Law

TRUSTS AND ESTATES
Chair: Laura A. Rosenbury, Washington University in St. Louis School of Law
Chair-Elect: William P. LaPiana, New York Law School

WOMEN IN LEGAL EDUCATION
Chair: Nancy Levit, University of Missouri-Kansas City
School of Law
Chair-Elect: Bridget J. Crawford, Pace University School of Law
Call for Proposals for Crosscutting Programs for 2013 AALS Annual Meeting

AALS is requesting proposals for Crosscutting Programs for the 2013 AALS Annual Meeting in New Orleans, LA. Crosscutting Programs focus on multi-subject and interdisciplinary subjects with new perspectives on legal issues or the profession. Crosscutting programs will attract a wide audience of law faculty teaching a variety of topics.

Faculty members at AALS member law schools may submit a proposal for a Crosscutting Program. Foreign, visiting and adjunct faculty members, graduate students, and fellows are not eligible to submit a proposal.

Successful proposals will include creative topics and presentation formats and should not feature a program or subject that could be offered by an AALS Section. Additionally, they should not conflict with other program topics being presented at the 2013 AALS Annual Meeting. To ensure there is no overlap, the Crosscutting Selection Committee will evaluate all proposals in light of AALS Section and AALS Committee programs already planned for the 2013 Annual Meeting.

The committee will consider the following:

- Is the format innovative?
- Will the program attract a broad audience?
- Is there a diversity of presenters and multiplicity of planners?
- Is there junior and senior professor involvement?
- Does the topic cross over common issues and transcend a particular subject area?
- Would there be a publication coming out of the program?

For a proposal to be considered, it must include the following information:

- Program title.
- Detailed description and explanation of what the program is trying to accomplish.
- Names of the planners of the program and description of how the program idea was generated.
- Names of speakers to be invited including their full names and schools with a link to or copy of their curricula vitae.
- Presentation format of the program.
- Program publishing information: Will the program be published? If so, where would it be published?

Examples of prior Crosscutting Programs include the following:

- "The Business of Tax Patents: At the Crossroads of Patent, Tax and Business Law"
- "New Legal Realism"
- "The Law and Science of Trustworthy Elections: Facing the Challenges of Internet Voting and Other E-Voting Technologies"

Please email your submissions and required information to crosscutting@aals.org by April 13, 2012.
Linda Jellum Appointed as AALS Associate Director

Effective January 1, 2012, Professor Linda D. Jellum of the Mercer University School of Law began her term as AALS Associate Director.

Often referred to as a “triple threat,” Jellum earns the respect and awe of colleagues as a teaching award winner who at the same time is an engaged, productive scholar, yet with the added bonus of a talent for service. Jellum has volunteered for AALS in multiple capacities, conveying high energy and a positive approach to whatever it is that she takes on. One of the mainstays of the program for candidates at the Faculty Recruitment Conference and a key member of the team that has put together the SEALS Conference for years, Jellum will offer insight as to how AALS can improve and expand programs and further serve faculty and academic leaders at member law schools.

“I’ve come to believe that AALS very much needs the additional capacity grounded in an experienced legal educator, particularly at this time of so much positive ferment within legal education combined with intense external criticism of law schools and legal education,” stated Susan Prager, AALS Executive Director, in a December 2011 memorandum to member school Deans. “I’m grateful to Linda and to her family for their willingness to move to Washington D.C. so that Linda can contribute her many talents to improving the work of AALS.”

During the fall of 2011, Jellum visited at Florida State College of Law where she taught Property and Administrative Law. In addition to teaching, she has coached numerous moot court teams throughout her eight years of teaching. She has received numerous teaching and coaching awards for her service.


“I am thrilled to be joining AALS during this challenging time for legal education,” said Jellum. “I look forward to contributing to the team and providing a necessary perspective.”

Professor Jellum serves or has served on many professional committees and boards. She recently was a board member for the Southeastern Association of Law Schools; she is a council member for the American Bar Association Section’s on Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice; and she has served on AALS committees, spoken at programs, and served in the leadership of numerous sections.

Prior to joining the Mercer faculty, Professor Jellum spent five years working for Washington State’s Attorney General’s office. While there, she served as lead attorney for the Department of Social and Health Services. Before working as an assistant attorney general, she served as a law clerk for the Honorable Paul Yesawich in New York State.

Professor Jellum received her J.D. from Cornell Law School and her undergraduate degree from Cornell University. She has the unique honor of having sat for and passed five states’ bar exams.

For Jellum’s full bio, please visit http://www.law.mercer.edu/facultystaff/bios/linda-d-jellum.
Attention Deans and Associate Deans!
Upcoming Workshops for Your New Law School Faculty and the Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Faculty

Workshop for New Law School Teachers
June 21-23, 2012 (Thursday – Saturday)
Washington, D.C.

Why Attend?
At the 30th annual Workshop, 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.

Topics Include:
A Dean’s Perspective; Welcome to the Profession; Nuts and Bolts – Tips and Tricks of Scholarship; Getting Started with Your Scholarly Agenda – Identity, Scholarship, Networking; Those Who Have Already Written – Where Are You on Scholarly Agenda; Teaching: Learning Styles; Teaching: Preparation and Methods; Managing the Classroom; A Dean’s Perspective: Service and Institutional Citizenship; Tenure Track (Service and Professionalism for Junior Faculty); Entry Level/Job Market Track (Visiting Assistant Professors, Fellowship); Evaluation; and Reports from the Early Years.

Speakers Include:
Rory D. Badahur (Washburn); Derek W. Black (Howard); Zachary Bray (Houston); Erika George (Utah); Phoebe A. Haddon (Maryland); Kevin R. Johnson (California, Davis); Lawrence C. Levine (Pacific McGeorge); Paula Lustbader (Seattle); Jeffrey A. Maine (Maine); Russell A. McClain (Maryland); Lisa H. Nicholson (Louisville); Mariela Olivares (Howard); Jennifer L. Rosato (Northern Illinois); Rose Cuiso Villazor (Hofstra); Lu-in Wang (Pittsburgh); Lindsay F. Wiley (American); Serena M. Williams (Widener); Laurie B. Zimet (California, Hastings).

Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers
June 20-21, 2012 (Wednesday-Thursday)
Washington, D.C.

Why Attend?
The Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers is designed to offer new faculty member 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 include 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.

Topics Include:
History and Current Trends in Clinical Legal Education; Teaching Goals, Skills and Values of Clinical Legal Education; Future Trends; Program/Clinic Design; Navigating the Academy; Scholarship; and Things I Wish Someone Had Told Me When I Started.
Speakers Include:
Bryan L. Adamson (Seattle); Okianer Christian Dark (Howard); Phyllis Goldfarb (George Washington); Leigh Goodmark (Baltimore); Renee M. Hutchins (Maryland); Carol L. Izumi (California, Hastings); Katherine R. Kruse (Nevada); Antoinette Sedillo Lopez (New Mexico); Tamar Meekins (Howard); J. P. "Sandy" Ogilvy (Catholic); Brenda V. Smith, (American); Jessica Steinberg (George Washington); Valorie K. Vojdik (Tennessee).

Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers
June 23-24, 2012 (Saturday-Sunday)
Washington, D.C.

AALS thanks and recognizes the Law School Admission Council for their generous grant to support this workshop.

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 challenges 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 people of color law school teachers.

Topics Include:
Teaching; Scholarship Overview; Getting Started with Scholarly Agenda – Identity, Scholarship, Networking; Preparing the Tenure File; Service: When to Say No, When to Say Yes; Beyond Getting Tenure: Why a Plan is Important.

Speakers Include:
Steve Beider (Seattle); Karen E. Bravo (Indiana, Indianapolis) Henry L. Chambers, Jr. (Richmond); Robert S. Chang (Seattle); Angela J. Davis (American); Tanya Kateri Hernandez (Fordham); Ernesto A. Hernandez-Lopez (Chapman); Gilbert A. Holmes (Baltimore); Susan R. Jones (George Washington); Veryl Victoria Miles (Catholic); Angela I. Onwuachi-Willig (Iowa); Margaret M. Russell (Santa Clara).

Information for all three Workshops:
Registration Information:
The registration fee for the Workshop for New Law School Teachers for AALS member and fee-paid law schools is: $550 early bird fee, $600 is the regular fee.

The registration fee for the Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers for AALS member and fee-paid law schools is: $255 early bird fee, $305 is the regular fee.

The registration fee for the Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers for AALS member and fee-paid law schools is: $255 early bird fee, $305 is the regular fee.

Two Combined Workshops:
The registration fees for attending two combined Workshops (New Law School Teachers and Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers or New Law School Teachers and New Law School Clinical Teachers) for AALS member and fee-paid law schools are: $660 early bird fee, $710 is the regular fee.

The registration fees for attending all three Workshops (New Law School Teachers, Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers and New Law School Clinical Teachers) for AALS member and fee-paid law schools are: $770 early bird fee, $820 is the regular fee.

Look for online registration and registration forms at the AALS website at www.aals.org/ntl2012/.
Location:
The Workshops will take place at the Mayflower Renaissance Hotel located at 1127 Connecticut Ave. NW, Washington, DC. The Mayflower opened in 1925 and was quickly labeled Washington, DC’s “Second Best Address” by President Harry Truman. This historic hotel is near Dupont Circle, the Farragut North Metro stop, and national monuments and museums.

Room Rates:
Single/Double occupancy is $239 per night plus 14.5% sales tax. Children staying in the same room with their parent(s) are free of charge. There is an additional charge of $20 per person for more than two adults sharing a room. Check-in time is 3:00 pm; check-out time is 12:00 p.m. This hotel has a smoke-free policy. To reserve a room, visit www.aals.org/nlt2012/ and click on the “Hotel” tab.

Planning Committee for AALS Workshop for New Law School Teachers, Workshop for Pretenured People of Color Law School Teachers and Workshop for New Law School Clinical Teachers
Okianer Christian Dark, Howard University School of Law
Susan R. Jones, The George Washington University Law School
Sapna Kumar, University of Houston Law Center
Xuan-Thao Nguyen, Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law, Chair
Laurie B. Zimet, University of California Hastings College of Law

It’s a Banner Year for Membership

On January 5, 2012, the House of Representatives approved the membership of four law schools, the largest yearly increase since the early 1980s: the Earle Mack School of Law at Drexel University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; North Carolina Central University School of Law in Durham, North Carolina; the University of St. Thomas School of Law in Minneapolis, Minnesota; and Texas Wesleyan University School of Law in Fort Worth, Texas. "This is a very special year, as far as membership,” said Executive Director Susan Westerberg Prager. “Each one of these schools brings its own personality to our membership.”

The Earle Mack School of Law at Drexel University opened in 2005. The law school defines itself as one that pursues innovation in teaching and program. A part of its mission is to infuse service through the program provided to students. At the same time, the law school has been able to develop strong scholarly values. The strong support and commitment of the University has been a key factor in the law school’s ability to establish itself very quickly and to make rapid progress in its early years. Equally important in the law school’s development was the recruitment of an experienced and accomplished core faculty of teacher-scholars who are interested in the potential of a new institution. Faculty members have been significantly involved in governance from the outset, and this culture should serve the law school well in numerous ways in the future.
North Carolina Central University School of Law opened in the 1940. Authorized by the North Carolina General Assembly as a “separate—but-equal” option for African Americans, this law school was the nation’s second Historically Black College. Today, the law school has continued to emphasize, share, and promote its vitally important mission. Central to this mission is the education of students who are committed to public service and to meeting the needs of the underserved. The faculty remains admirably and passionately devoted to ensuring the success of their students so that graduates successfully enter the practice of law and work to serve the interests of justice within their state. Now, students of all races and many backgrounds come to North Carolina Central to become part of this mission. The law school is aided in this mission by the success of so many alumni who have become members of the judiciary and other effective members of the legal profession. Improvements in recent years include the successful effort to equalize the funding of the state law school. Equally important, the Chancellor elevated the school’s aspirations and stressed the importance of successful research efforts to the education students receive and to the long term health of the University.

The University of St. Thomas first operated a law school from 1923-1933. More than fifty years later, the University commissioned a feasibility study to consider reopening the law school. The University had a strong commitment to creating a new law school. The Board of Trustees then approved the reopening of the law school on the understanding that the school would focus on the Roman Catholic intellectual and moral tradition. A strong faculty was assembled. Its members demonstrate a commitment to teaching and evidence productivity in research, as well as a devotion to the school’s vision of the role it can play as a Catholic law school dedicated “to integrating faith and reason in the search for truth through a focus on morality and social justice.” The law school is also committed to the professional preparation of its students and to encouraging students’ integration of their faith and deepest ethical principles into their professional character and identity. This law school has developed innovative programs to help achieve its integrated mission.

Texas Wesleyan University School of Law originally opened in 1989 as the Dallas/Fort Worth School of Law, which was affiliated with Texas Wesleyan University. In 1992, the law school assumed its current name. The law school’s mission includes access to education and diversity, with a special emphasis on first generation college students. It is evident that a belief in the importance of this mission is clearly shared by the University’s leadership and by its faculty. The law school has managed its finances well and takes pride that its tuition levels help support its commitment to access. The law school is a strong and viable institution. This strength comes in part from the President and the University as a whole, as well as from the Fort Worth community. The law school’s strength also has grown because of the leadership of key faculty members who have effectively encouraged the development of scholarship, while simultaneously remaining focused on the importance of teaching and students. This dual focus is impressive and should serve the law school well.

While these law schools are each quite different from each other, they share a commitment to the core values of the AALS. With the addition of the four schools, AALS now has 176 members.
Standing Room Only at the 2012 Workshop on the Future of the Legal Profession: Implications for Legal Education

Susan D. Carle, Planning Committee Chair, American University Washington College of Law

The AALS 2012 Annual Meeting Workshop on “The Future of the Legal Profession: Implications for Legal Education” took place on January 5, 2012, before standing-room only crowds. The workshop examined the interaction between changes in the legal profession and changes in legal education.

Although it might seem that the workshop planning committee nimbly put together this workshop in response to the recent spate of negative publicity about law schools in the New York Times and elsewhere, planning for the workshop actually took place in stages over several years. Its origins began in ideas generated by the AALS Professional Responsibility Section in 2009, as developed by a creative and energetic proposal committee composed of Ted Schneyer (Arizona), Peter Joy (Washington University), Barbara Glesner-Fines (Missouri-Kansas City), Louise Hill (Widener), Peter Margulies (Roger Williams), and me. Tom Morgan (George Washington) proposed a similar idea as well. In early 2010, a workshop planning committee began planning the details of this conference. The planning committee members were Carla Pratt (Penn State-Dickinson), Renee Knake (Michigan State), Carol Needham (Saint Louis), and Mitt Regan (Georgetown). Their creative ideas and hard work brought the many sessions to fruition.

The full-day workshop brought together members of the legal academy to focus collectively on the implications of structural changes in the legal profession that will be affecting legal education far into the future. As we learned during the day, these changes are affecting all sectors of the legal profession: big firms, medium-sized firms, and small firms; government work; so-called “business” employment (a catch-all category for many kinds of legal and non-legal work); and public interest and non-profit sector jobs. We intended the workshop to focus on the professional and educational needs of students heading into all of these practice locations. We did not plan to focus on any one type of practice; nevertheless, as the speakers pointed out, we need to pay attention to what is happening with Big Law. Big Law’s current troubles are impacting legal employment more generally. As Big Law undergoes seismic, structural, and permanent change on a global scale, large firms are hiring substantially fewer lawyers, especially junior lawyers. Law firms are subcontracting and off-shoring much of the work junior associates used to do. Firms are providing legal services through leaner project management arrangements, which are supplanting traditional hourly billing arrangements and forcing greater efficiencies in project staffing. These arrangements are increasing business and production pressures on junior lawyers. Many firms are struggling in the face of international and cross-disciplinary competition; even some very large firms have imploded and vanished like dead supernovas. The law firms that are succeeding in this new more competitive environment are doing so by becoming leaner and meaner. The indisputable result of these Big Law changes for our students is that there are fewer law jobs than there used to be, and there is more competition to get them.

Structural changes have been underway for a long time, as scholars who study the legal profession have noted. The changes are not simply due to the Great Recession, though the Recession did exacerbate economic competition and thus speed up the rate of such change. Nor will these developments entirely reverse themselves when the Great Recession ends. Indeed, as legal historians have long documented, ongoing structural change has been a continual feature of the American legal profession throughout its history, driving changes in practice arrangements and legal education alike. There is no reason lawyers today should be any more immune from these pressures than lawyers from any other historical era have been. Thus, the workshop brought home the reality that legal educators should embrace calls for change in legal education because such change is inevitable; the key question is how legal education should respond, not whether it must do so.

What does change mean for legal education? It means, to be sure, as a number of speakers pointed out, that legal education – along with many other sectors of American enterprise – is currently in something of a crisis. But this crisis has presented worthwhile opportunities for rethinking and retooling practices in ways that can and will make legal education much better, more effective, more creative, and more beneficial to our students.
As the planning committee discovered in a vivid and concrete way while exploring innovations in legal education in preparation for this workshop, there already is a great deal of very exciting work underway in law schools throughout the country that is either directly or indirectly responding to the well-recognized need to retool legal education to respond to the new challenges of the 21st Century. Last summer, the planning committee sent out “A Request For Proposals” regarding innovations in law teaching and innovations at the intersections among scholarship, teaching, and service. Nearly one hundred AALS-affiliated faculty members sent in proposals describing a wide and rich range of innovative ideas for law teaching that respond to the changing demands of the profession. The responses were so varied that it is hard to summarize them, but at least five general categories and themes emerged.

First, a great deal of experimentation with co-teaching across disciplines is going on, especially work in which law professors and students collaborate with faculty and students in other disciplines, including in such fields as architecture, medicine, business, social work, psychology, anthropology, and other social sciences. This work is often aimed at problem-solving for client organizations or groups in real-world situations. The workshop sessions featured just a few of these many programs.

Second, there is a move towards enriching the educational experiences of our sometimes bored third-year students. New courses such as capstone courses and third year practicums are being offered. The latter often involve students working with clients or legal organizations in real world situations on advanced and challenging legal problems that require students to bring to bear a wide set of skills they have learned in the course of their law studies and experiential placements.

Third, there is earlier and more sophisticated work being done to help students think about their career options, values clarification, and planning and pursuit of professional goals.

Fourth, there is – and has been for some time now – more work on so-called skills training, as encouraged by the Carnegie Report but as has been virtually ignored in high-profile media reports on legal education in recent months. This integration of skills training with doctrinal study in law schools is by no means new news, but some of the ways that this training is taking place may be new and interesting news: Law faculties are pioneering technology-rich experiments with virtual law firms, computer-based writing self-assessment, on-line role playing simulations, web-based outcome assessment of teaching, podcasting, electronic discovery management, student software development to enhance access to legal services, and much more.

Fifth, there are also many experiments focusing on teaching the affective, personal character, ethics, and service-oriented aspects of being a good lawyer. Again, the importance of focusing on these aspects of legal education is by no means new, but some of the ways we are doing so is new. Indeed, the annual meeting workshop was not the only recent AALS event to consider these aspects of legal education. Last summer’s AALS mid-year conference on “The Future of the Law School Curriculum” highlighted these and other aspects of developing a rich law school curriculum. Carole Goldberg (UCLA), the planning committee chair, mentioned two such themes in particular for that conference: first, the pedagogical innovations of clinical legal education, which emphasizes problem-solving rather than doctrinal and policy analysis; and, second, attention to the multicultural and multinational dimensions of law and legal representation. These are themes that deserve continued attention as we discuss educating students for a broad range of practice options in the face of a rapidly changing profession.

We were so excited about the groundbreaking and innovative changes taking place that we decided to post many of the responses we received. To find these responses, look for a reference on the AALS home page (www.aals.org) to “In the Spotlight.” These responses reflect the great, untold story of changes in the legal profession and implications for legal education today. The New York Times and other media outlets have been covering a sensationalized version of the “bad” of legal education, but they are giving no equivalent in-depth attention to the innovation, serious soul searching, change that is taking place as law professors and law school administrators pioneer innovations from the ground level up at institutions across the country.

In sum, the workshop provided yet another step in sharing assessments about the future of the legal profession and about how law schools are adapting to that changing future. Participants discovered new ideas and innovations they could take back to their own institutions. More importantly, the workshop helped foster connections and begin the dialogue by which such sharing will continue far into the future.
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