

March, 1984

Reply to: Peter T. Hoffman  
University of Nebraska  
College of Law  
Lincoln, NE 68583-0902  
(402) 472-2161

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

By

Roy Stuckey, South Carolina

I want to thank those people who have expressed concern about the Newsletter being delayed this long. I also want to thank those people who have been awaiting the Newsletter with equal anxiety, but with quiet stoicism. I trust that your lives have settle down again now that you've become caught up on the most recent news and gossip.

No, I don't really believe that anyone would really care enough about the timeliness of the Newsletter to actually complain about it (now that I'm chairing the Section I can't). However, it is remarkable that so many of us have come to rely on the Newsletter to keep in touch with what's going on in clinical legal education and with each other. It is our community bulletin board. It helps reduce the isolation of clinical teachers who teach at schools where there are not many clinical colleagues, and it helps people keep in touch between the few opportunities we have for face-to-face meetings.

One of the problems with publishing the Newsletter every three months or so is that some of the information in it will always be three months or so old. We originally planned to have this issue in your hands by mid-February, but I asked Peter Hoffman to hold off until we could include information about decisions being made during the ABA midyear meeting. Then I caused further delay by waiting until we could include information about the AALS Clinical Teachers Conference. And so...here we are.

Despite the delay with the Newsletter, the business of the Section (that is, the work being done by the Section's committees) is progressing well ahead of its normal schedule. In fact, some of the Committees held meetings for the first time during the AALS Annual Meeting (one committee even met twice, including once at 7:30 a.m.).

Before the end of January, almost all of the ninety-odd people on Committees (that's ninety-odd, not ninety odd) had been officially asked to serve, and most Committees are well into their projects for the year.

The only message I want to include in this message is to thank everyone for the work they've done for the Section in the past and for the work they are continuing to do now. In addition to members of Committees

who toil for no perqs and precious little recognition, I include at the top of my list of those who deserve my appreciation (as well as that of all clinical teachers) everyone who has contributed to the Newsletter, everyone who has ever offered an unsolicited suggestion, and, yes, even those who would question the timeliness of the Newsletter.

I hope most of you will make it to the Clinical Teachers Conference. It promises to be a memorable experience.

### COMMITTEE NOTES

Roy Stuckey, Chair, has announced committee appointments for 1984 as well as the creation of several new committees. The committees are now in the process of organizing and deciding what activities they will undertake in the coming year. All of the committees are interested in suggestions on how they can better serve the Section and its members; do not hesitate to call or write the committee chair of the appropriate committee if you have an idea you think worth pursuing.

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Roy Stuckey, South Carolina, Chair; Sue Bryant, Hofstra; Bea Frank, NYU; David Gottlieb, Kansas; Peter Hoffman, Nebraska; Carrie Menkel-Meadow, UCLA; Jennifer Rochow, Boston College; Barbara Schwartz, Iowa; Kandis Scott, Santa Clara. *John Capowski, Baltimore*

The Executive Committee, whose members are elected at the Section Business Meeting, decides issues relating to the activities of the Section, makes recommendations on policies affecting clinical education to the AALS Standing Committee on Clinical Legal Education and to the AALS Executive Committee, and works with other Section committees.

The Committee met several times during the AALS Annual Meeting in January in San Francisco. Much time was given to such routine matters as assigning Section members to committees, but several more memorable actions were taken. The Committee:

\*Unanimously authorized the Section Chair, Roy Stuckey, to communicate the Section's desire to the AALS Executive Committee that it endorse proposed ABA Standard 405(e).

\*Discussed the Legal Services Corporation's proposal to give several pilot grants for the funding of clinical programs. The Committee was in general agreement that the program would cause more damage than benefit to clinical legal education.

\*Authorized the Section to co-sponsor a program with the ABA Appellate Judge's Conference at the 1985 AALS Annual Meeting.

\*Approved the plans of the Teaching Materials Committee and the Integration of Clinical Methodology into the Traditional Curriculum Committee to seek co-sponsorship of a number of programs with other AALS Sections during the 1985 AALS Annual Meeting. These programs would be planned jointly and would serve as demonstrations of how clinical methodology could improve the quality of instruction in traditional courses.

\*Authorized Roy Stuckey to recommend to the AALS Executive Committee that it approve a workshop in 1985 on the integration of clinical methodology into the traditional curriculum.

\*Decided to terminate the Special Committee on Faculty Status.

#### ANNUAL MEETING

Rod Jones, Southwestern, Chair; John Barkai, Hawaii; David Koplow, Georgetown; Janet Motley, Cal Western; Graham Strong, Virginia; Mary Walker, Vanderbilt.

The Annual Meeting Program Committee is, as its name suggests, in charge of planning the program for the Clinical Section at the AALS Annual Meeting. Next year's meeting will be in Washington, D.C. in January, 1985.

The Committee currently is engaged in reviewing past AALS programs as well as considering suggestions for next year's meeting. The latter has included having a display of teaching materials for clinicians available throughout the conference; a series of demonstrations using game theory in the classroom; discussion of innovative uses of a classroom component; and interdisciplinary presentations on learning theories, with a particular emphasis on adult learning styles. The Committee actively solicits input from Section members about these ideas or others which might serve to address their needs as clinical teachers.

#### AWARDS

Jennifer Rochow, Boston College, Chair; Sue Bryant, Hofstra; Bea Frank, NYU; David Gottlieb, Kansas; Peter Hoffman, Nebraska; Carrie Menkel-Meadow, UCLA; Barbara Schwartz, Iowa; Kandis Scott, Santa Clara; Roy Stuckey, South Carolina.

The Awards Committee selects nominees for the Clinical Section Award which is given each year to an individual who or organization which has made an outstanding contribution to clinical legal education. The contribution may be superior clinical teaching, scholarship, leadership, service to the Section, etc. Past recipients have been:

|      |                    |
|------|--------------------|
| 1984 | Robert McKay       |
| 1983 | William Greenhalgh |
| 1982 | Neil Smith         |
| 1981 | David Barnhizer    |

The Committee will start soliciting recommendations in the spring.

#### BYLAWS

Vance Cowden, South Carolina, Chair; Claudia Angelos, NYU; Bob Bloom, Boston College; Mary-Lynne Fisher, Loyola-Los Angeles; Mark Heyrman, Chicago; Bob Seibel, Maine; Norm Stein, Arkansas-Little Rock.

The Bylaws Committee is being revived this year because there are several issues in the current bylaws needing clarification. Examples are, who is eligible to vote at the Business Meeting, what are the powers of the Executive Committee, what to do if a vacancy in a Section office occurs, and how to handle the withdrawal of a nominee for a Section office before the election but after the deadline for nominations. If you have suggestions for other changes, be sure to contact the Committee Chair.

#### CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (CLECC)

Bill Greenhalgh, Georgetown, Chair; Clint Bamberger, Maryland; Sue Bryant, Hofstra; Joe Harbaugh, Georgetown; Elliott Milstein, American; Gary Palm, Chicago; Dean Rivkin, Tennessee.

CLECC has the responsibility of monitoring and reporting the activities of other organizations which are relevant to the purposes of the Clinical Section and coordinating all such activities. In 1984, CLECC expects to serve a broader and more active role by developing strategies to influence the AALS and other organizations to make decisions and take actions which will benefit clinical teachers and clinical education. Some of the topics that will be considered are how to most effectively assure the continued involvement of clinical teachers in the decision-making process of organizations important to clinical teachers and, two, what should be done with respect to 405(e) between now and the ABA Annual Meeting.

#### COMPUTERS

Frank Bress, NYU, Chair; Karen Czapanskiy, Maryland; Lynn LoPucki, UMKC; Mike Norwood, New Mexico; Kandis Scott, Santa Clara; Ron Staudt, Chicago Kent.

The Committee on Computers is another new committee. It is now in the process of developing its mission. Any suggestions or ideas would be appreciated.

#### CONTINUING CLINICAL EDUCATION

Holly Hartstone, CUNY, Chair; Tom Geraghty, Northwestern; Roger Haydock, William Mitchell; Gary Lowenthal, Arizona State; Michael Meltsner, Northeastern; Carrie Menkel-Meadow, UCLA; Abe Ordovery, Emory; Al Porro, Baltimore; Michael Zeldin, Antioch.

The Continuing Clinical Education Committee is new this year. While its specific mission is not yet clearly established, the Committee was created because the Section has not had a group concerned with post graduate clinical training. Many CLE programs have started using clinical methods while others would like to but have hesitated because of insufficient expertise; more and more CLE courses are being presented covering traditional clinical subjects such as interviewing and negotiation; an increasing number of law firms are developing in-house training programs; and the list goes on. The Committee will look at how to encourage this trend and how clinical teachers can become more involved in these programs.

#### INTEGRATION OF CLINICAL METHODOLOGY

Joe Harbaugh, Georgetown, Chair; Paul Bergman, UCLA; Stacy Caplow, Brooklyn; Bob Dinerstein, American; Bob Doyel, Mississippi; John Elson, Northwestern; Henry Hecht, Cal-Berkeley; Chet Mirsky, NYU; Rex Pershbacher, Cal-Davis; Maude Pervere, Hastings; Don Peters, Florida; Andy Shepard, Columbia; Glen Scully, McGeorge; Karen Tokarz, Washington U -St. Louis.

The Committee on Integration of Clinical Methodology into the Traditional Curriculum is new this year. While the Committee is currently developing plans and projects, one idea being considered is to co-sponsor programs at the Annual Meeting with other AALS sections on how clinical methods can complement and improve instruction in traditional, non practice-oriented courses.

#### MEMBERSHIP

Susan Kovac, Tennessee, Chair; Stephen Befort, Minnesota; Len Cavise, DePaul; Paula Galowitz, NYU; Bob Goodwin, Cumberland; Peter Hoffman, Nebraska; Theresa Player, San Diego; Jenifer Schramm, Puget Sound; Wendy Watts, Georgetown.

The Membership Committee has as its task the expansion of the Section's membership and, more importantly, developing ways the Section can improve and expand the services it provides to members. Any suggestions or comments will be more than welcome.

#### NOMINATING

Elliott Milstein, American, Chair; Jim Countiss, Hawaii; Bea Frank, NYU; Jane Johnson, Tulane; Roslyn Lieb, Northwestern; Arnie Siegel, Loyola-Los Angeles; Steve Wizner, Yale.

The Nominating Committee will be responsible for nominating candidates for election to Section offices during the Section's Business Meeting at the AALS Annual Meeting in Washington next January. The Committee will be nominating candidates for Chair-Elect (to become Chair at the 1986 Annual Meeting) and for two seats on the Executive Committee (three year terms). The Committee will start soliciting recommendations in the spring. Nominations must be made not less than 90 days before the

Annual Meeting.

#### POLITICAL INTERFERENCE

Jim Stark, Connecticut, Chair; Michael Axline, Orgeon; Bob Catz, Miami; Neil Franklin, Idaho; Wally Mlyniec, Georgetown; Liz Schneider, Brooklyn.

The Political Interference Committee is the one committee we all hope will be inactive during the coming year. Nonetheless, the Committee's task is to monitor incidents of political interference with clinical programs.

#### TEACHING MATERIALS

Don Gifford, Toledo, Chair; Frank Bloch, Vanderbilt; Lois Knight, Boston University; Susanne Reilly, Pennsylvania; Carlos Ramos-Gonzales, Puerto Rico; Jennifer Rucci, San Francisco; Roy Simon, Washington U - St. Louis; Barry Strom, Cornell.

The Committee on Teaching Materials will be working on four projects during 1984:

- (1) Completion of Classification of Teaching Materials Previously Gathered

As most of you know, several years ago clinicians throughout the country were surveyed and asked to describe and submit teaching materials used in their clinical programs. This survey resulted in people sending in approximately 17 boxes of materials. What we hope to accomplish this year is to design a multi-factorial classification system which will categorize the materials according to the substantive area of law, the lawyering skill being taught (e.g., competitive negotiation strategy or active listening) and the type of material (e.g., syllabus, simulation, demonstration transcript or text). Once a classification system is established, we will catalogue the materials obtained during the earlier survey and ask clinicians to send additional and supplemental materials. The cataloging system would thus provide a central clearing house to put those people in search of a specific type of clinical teaching material in touch with someone who has developed such a material. In the future, we would anticipate that the system will be computerized. In the meantime, it is our firm intention to have the cataloguing system in place before next year's annual meeting.

- (2) Conference on Integrating Clinical Methodology Into The Traditional Curriculum

Our Committee will be working together with the Committee on Integration of Clinical Methodology into the Traditional Curriculum to sponsor conferences or workshops on integrating clinical methodology into traditional courses. A joint breakfast meeting with the representatives of both Committees was held in San Francisco and at that time, it was tentatively decided that the Clinical Section would approach the chairpersons of substantive law sections, such as corporations, taxation

or family law, and attempt to co-sponsor programs about introducing clinical methodology into traditional courses at the 1985 AALS Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. It is also anticipated that there will be a follow-up conference specifically on this topic sometime later in 1985.

### (3) Second Survey of Research Projects and Clinical Scholarship

In December 1983, a second survey questionnaire was sent to the members of the Clinical Section asking them to describe ongoing research projects and scholarship relating to clinical methodology or lawyering skills and to describe published materials which they found most useful in teaching lawyering skills. The results of that survey are trickling in. It is anticipated that the results of that survey may be used to put clinicians with similar research interests in touch with each other and to indicate to other clinicians areas where further scholarship and research is needed.

### (4) Reviews of Books and Articles on Lawyering Skills and Clinical Methodology

Another of the projects begun by the Committee last year was to determine the names of clinicians who would be willing to write reviews or books or articles relating to lawyering skills or clinical methodology. A number of clinicians have indicated an enthusiasm or a willingness to do so. If you are willing to write a review of such a book or article, please contact Don Gifford, Toledo ((419) 537-2950). The Committee will serve the function of locating a law review willing to publish a series of reviews on clinical texts and will match the journal with reviewers and clinical texts. It is hoped that this might be an ongoing project. There are a number of very important texts on lawyering skills which have been published during the last year or which will be coming out during the next six months. It is hoped that complimentary copies of these reviews will be available for all members of the Clinical Section at next's year's Annual Meeting.

## TENURE AND PROMOTION

Kandis Scott, Santa Clara, Chair; John Capowski, Maryland; Michelle Herman, New Mexico; Jim Klein, Toledo; Carol Liebman, Boston College; Jack Sammons, Mercer; Jed Scully, McGeorge; Phil Schrag, Georgetown.

The Tenure and Promotion Advisory Project will collect written descriptions of programs providing status and security to clinicians other than tenure. The following schools are thought to have or to be designing such programs: Columbia, Pennsylvania, Arizona State, Georgetown, N.Y.U., and Tennessee. Please tell any member of TAP if there are other schools with such programs so that the group can monitor developments. Whether or not adopted, such proposals would be useful to a law school just beginning to consider such an approach.

TAP will continue last year's effort to assist individuals seeking tenure or promotion. Committee members will help find evaluators and will offer advice about writing topics, publication possibilities, etc. Well before a tenure vote, a teacher or faculty can seek an evaluation of the clinical teaching or program at a law school so as to design a route to tenure. TAP will help arrange such evaluations. Finally TAP offers a confidential source of "savy" about the tenure process likely to be applicable at many law schools.

TAP has asked the Clinical Teachers' Conference Planning Committee for the opportunity to present a workshop on tenure strategies at this summer's conference.

Most important to those applying for tenure or promotion is a network of people with useful experiences or insights. For this reason TAP asks you to complete the following form and mail it to Kandis Scott, Univ. of Santa Clara Law Clinic, 3100 The Alameda, Santa Clara, CA 95050.

-----  
I am a clinical teacher who is

- Tenured.
- On a tenure track (separate or the same as other faculty).
- On a long-term contract or other arrangement which gives me job security and some perquisites of regular faculty. ("substantially equivalent" status.)
- Other secure status. Please describe.

Name:

Law School:

-----  
WORKSHOPS

Sue Bryant, Hofstra, Chair; Steve Emens, Alabama; Larry Grossberg, New York; Phil Hamilton, New England; Jeff Hartje, Gonzaga; Rick Perna, Dayton; Carla Rappaport, Antioch; Nicole Russler, Tennessee; Jed Scully, McGeorge.

The National and Regional Workshops Committee is in charge of promoting regional clinical conferences as well as other clinical training programs. If you are interested in putting on such a program contact the Committee for assistance. A wealth of materials and information has been gathered to help make your program a success.



BITS AND PIECES1984 AALS CLINICAL TEACHERS CONFERENCE  
SCHEDULED FOR MAY 19-25

Duke University will be the site for the eighth annual Clinical Teachers Conference. Duke has one of the most beautiful campuses in the country, especially in May, and its outstanding facilities will make this one of the most convenient and comfortable of clinical conferences (and hopefully among the least expensive).

The program for the Conference is the most ambitious ever and clinicians of all backgrounds and levels of experience should find it exciting, rewarding and fun. In addition to the professional education provided at the Conference, almost all participants at previous clinical conferences have reported the experience to be personally rejuvenating. The invaluable network of professional relationships which exists among clinical teachers was a byproduct of these conferences and it is sustained by them. While the work of the Conference will be serious and intensive, opportunities for recreation and relaxation are also being planned.

The central theme of the 1984 conference will be an examination of the advantages and disadvantages of clinical legal education, particularly the unique aspects of the client clinic. At this juncture in the evolution of clinical legal education it is appropriate to sum up what it is that makes the casework phase of clinical education truly distinct from the rest of legal education.

Because most clinical educators utilize simulation as a pedagogical technique to enhance student interest and learning, the Planning Committee has created a simulated problem which will pull together the various issues identified as inherent in the overall theme. This creative approach to the Conference will force participants to grapple with the fundamental issues of clinical education.

The basic simulation involves a proposed new law school which is in the process of identifying its goals, recruiting its faculty, choosing its curriculum and allocating its resources. A school in such a position is likely to confront the difficult decision of whether to establish a client clinic and, if so, deciding how the clinic will fulfill its particular mission within the law school.

The participants in the Clinical Teachers Conference will comprise the membership of a group of clinical educators who have been engaged by the school to describe the strengths and weaknesses of client clinics and to make recommendations about the design and operation of a clinical program. This will inevitably require participants to distinguish the appropriate educational function of client clinics from simulation and other courses as well as from postgraduate training and experience.

The Conference will be conducted "in role" as much as possible, particularly by the conference faculty who will be making presentations throughout the week.

Throughout the Conference, the simulation will form the core of the substantive discussion each day. It is hoped that the simulated problem will allow sophisticated discussion of important clinical education issues. By focusing on the "problems" confronting the new school, the participants will be forced to abstract many of the questions which they face in the reality of their own clinics.

While anyone who is interested in developing a clinical program from scratch could expect to benefit from the Conference, the program is being designed primarily for people who are presently teaching in existing programs.

Some of the goals of the Conference are intended to serve the needs of clinical teachers in general: for example, the Conference is expected to promote a better understanding of the current status of clinical education and its future and to promote the sharing of ideas among participants. However, the Planning Committee recognizes that it is equally important that the Conference serve the special needs and interests of individual participants. With this in mind, a significant portion of the Conference will be spent in small groups. This year for the first time, some of the small groups will be assigned on the basis of subject matter interests (types of clinics) and/or levels of experience. The registration materials will ask participants to indicate if they would prefer assignment to a specially selected small group.

Throughout the week the program will be varied in format as well as subject matter. However, four major topics will be explored in depth as a means of focusing the participants on issues which lie at the core of clinical legal education. These are "decision-making by students/lawyers"; "values"; "skills" (particularly, counseling); and "curriculum".

Each of these topics will be analyzed from three perspectives:

- First, substantive content.
- Second, methodology.
- Third, research.

Each segment will begin with a presentation by members of the faculty. This presentation will be done "in role" and could take a variety of forms. It might be a debate or it may involve some form of gaming or the use of videotapes. However, there will only be lectures from a podium when it is particularly appropriate because of the simulation.

Following the presentation, participants will meet in small groups to discuss issues raised by the presentation or otherwise related to the topic. Some of the small group sessions will allow participants to engage in role playing exercises. These will reflect real life situations, that

is, they will be drawn from the "teaching opportunities" which occur repeatedly in most clinical programs, as opposed to the rare or unusually difficult problems (these will be a separate subject for discussion during the conference).

The Research Component is one innovation which will be a rather special segment of the Conference. Many clinical teachers are interested in doing more research, but are hindered primarily by two factors (in addition to too little time or money): (1) we are not aware of the broad range of research models which could be used in our work and (2) clinicians have not shared ideas sufficiently about research topics. This portion of the program will help clinicians overcome these problems and encourage more clinical teachers to use clinical programs as laboratories for studying legal education and law practice.

No one should be misled by the Research Component. The emphasis of this segment of the Conference will be on the long term needs of clinical legal education in the broadest sense. Most of the specific ideas for research projects which will come out of this will probably require some period of time to bring to completion. No one should expect much help from this with impending tenure or promotion decision. (One of the evening programs will be designed to provide some help with immediate problems).

On most evenings, there will be one or more optional programs on topics not included in the main Conference agenda. Participants with particular interests may opt to organize their own group meetings during the evenings.

An outstanding faculty has been assembled for the Conference. The following list is reasonably firm, although a few changes could occur before the Conference begins: David Binder, UCLA; Frank Block, Tennessee; Sue Bryant, Hofstra; Bill Greenhalgh, Georgetown; Roger Haydock, William Mitchell; Peter Hoffman, Nebraska; David Koplou, Georgetown; Gary Lowenthal, Arizona State; Carrie Menkel-Meadow, UCLA; Elliott Milstein\*, American; John Morris, Utah; Bea Moulton, Stanford and San Francisco; Frank Munger, Antioch; Don Peters, Florida; Marty Peters, Ph.D., Florida; Dean Rivkin, Tennessee; Jennifer Rochow\*, Boston College; Kandis Scott\*, Santa Clara; and Roy Stuckey\*, South Carolina. (\* indicates members of the Planning Committee. Joe Harbaugh is also a member of the Planning Committee.)

#### SPECIAL NOTICE #1

A one day conference sponsored by the ABA Standing Committee on Continuing Education of the Bar may follow the AALS Conference (noon Friday, May 25 through noon Saturday, May 26). The purpose of this conference would be to train participants to assist local bar associations in presenting the ABA Lawyering Skills Program. This is the NITA-style interviewing, counseling and negotiation program which has been developed for the ABA by David Binder and Carrie Menkel-Meadow.

The shortage of qualified trainers is thought to be the primary reason the Program has not been more enthusiastically embraced by the Bar. The participants in this special conference will be eligible to be placed on the ABA's list of certified trainers. (Note: trainers are usually paid for their work.)

For their trouble, all participants will be given a set of the materials (but not the videotapes). There will be no additional registration fee and the only additional expense will be one day's room and board.

Faculty for this extra conference is expected to include David Binder, Carrie Menkel-Meadow and Bea Moulton.

Although these plans are not yet firm, there is a high probability that it will happen. Information about this will probably be included in materials for the AALS Conference.

#### SPECIAL NOTICE #2

The AALS Standing Committee on Clinical Legal Education, chaired by Clinton Bamberger, Maryland, may hold an open meeting one evening during the Conference. This will give participants an opportunity to help the Committee identify issues of concern to clinical teachers which would be addressed by the Association of American Law Schools.

Registration materials for the Conference should be mailed to you in the near future. The registration fee is expected to be at least \$200.00 and may be higher (one or two dinners will be included). However, the dormitory rates and food service should be quite reasonable.

Those people on limited budgets (is there anyone who isn't?) may wish to make flight reservations now into Raleigh/Durham. Surprisingly low excursion fares are possible if you stay seven nights, that is, either come in on Friday if you'll be leaving on Friday, or plan to stay over until Saturday for the ABA extra conference. Those with access to New York Air may find very special rates available without regard to the length of stay. For example, \$96.00 roundtrip from Washington, D.C.

If you have questions about the AALS Conference, call Jane La Barbera, Associate Director, AALS (202) 296-8851 or Roy Stuckey, Chair, Planning Committee (803) 777-2278.

Summary of Program  
AALS Clinical Teachers Conference  
May 19-25, 1984

SATURDAY: THE CONFERENCE BEGINS

OVERVIEW OF THE CONFERENCE  
FACULTY MEETING OF NEW SCHOOL (VIDEO)  
KEYNOTE SPEAKER

evening: small groups meet

SUNDAY: DECISION-MAKING

evening: war story-telling

MONDAY: VALUES

evening: stress management

TUESDAY: SKILLS: COUNSELING

evening: tenure and promotion

WEDNESDAY MORNING: PROBLEMS

afternoon and evening will be free time

THURSDAY: CURRICULUM

evening: (testing)

FRIDAY MORNING: THE DEAN'S REACTION AND ADJOURNMENT

#### TITLE IX DEADLINE NEARS

Grant application packets under the Law School Clinical Experience Program should have been received by all law schools. The application deadline is March 16, 1984. If you are in need of a packet, call Alan Schiff of the Office of Post Secondary Education of the Department of Education: (202) 245-2347. Forty grants are expected for next year with an average grant of \$25,000. The grant applications will be read from March 26-29.

#### PAY FOR CLINICAL STUDENTS DEFEATED

The current policy of the ABA concerning pay for clinical students is contained in an interpretation of Standard 306 of the ABA Standards for the Approval of Law Schools:

Student participants in a law school externship program may not receive compensation for a programs for which they receive academic credit.

The Illinois State Bar Association submitted a proposal to the August, 1983 meeting of the ABA House of Delegates to overturn this interpretation and to recommend that law schools provide students with opportunities to receive pay as well as credit for clinical work. (see September Newsletter). The House of Delegates deferred action and referred the matter to the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar for consideration.

The proposal by the Illinois State Bar Association arose out of a concern over lawyer competence. The argument was that if students could be paid for their clinical work, this work could then be performed in private law offices where students would receive the necessary training in professional competence.

The proposal generated considerable controversy and public hearings were held on the matter at the 1984 AALS Annual Meeting in San Francisco. The Executive Committee of the AALS had previously come out in opposition to the proposal. The matter finally came to a head at the February ABA Midyear Meeting held in Las Vegas, where the House of Delegates and the Young Lawyers Division voted down the proposal. As a finishing shot, the Council of the Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar at its February 11 meeting, in opposition to the proposal, adopted the following report as Council policy:

- (1) The Standards Review Committee does not favor adoption of the proposal. The conclusion of a majority of comments received by the Standards Review Committee is that this proposal would be detrimental to the development of law school clinical programs. Clinical programs are grounded in the idea that a properly supervised clinical program can provide a valuable educational experience for law students. Adoption of the Illinois State Bar Association's proposal would both encourage and require law schools to give academic credit for part-time student work which is unlikely to have the educational value of systematic clinical instruction. It would seriously undermine efforts to improve the quality of clinical legal education.
- (2) The Executive Committee of the Association of American Law Schools endorses the current Council policy and Interpretation.
- (3) A survey of accrediting organizations of other professional disciplines indicates that students may not be compensated for clinical experience for which academic credit is awarded.
- (4) Standard 802 provides that the Council and its Accreditation Committee may grant a variance for a law school program not in conformity with the Standards and their interpretations. Should the faculty of any law school approved by the American Bar Association wish to apply for a variance to conduct an experimental clinical program supervised by the law school faculty which would permit both the awarding of academic credit and compensation, the Standards Review Committee suggests that the Accreditation Committee give careful examination to such a proposal.

UPDATE ON PROPOSED 405(e)  
From Information Supplied By  
Dean Rivkin, Tennessee

As reported in the November Newsletter, the Standards Review Committee of the ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar adopted by unanimous vote a new proposed Standard 405(e) and Interpretation for presentation to the Section Council. Since the November Newsletter the Council at its December 3, 1983 meeting passed a motion to extend notification of its intention to adopt the proposed

Standard and accompanying Interpretation and also to extend notification of its intention to recommend their adoption by the ABA House of Delegates. The proposed Standard and Interpretation will now be circulated for comment to the deans of ABA approved law schools, chief justices, and the chairs of boards of bar examiners.

While no formal action was taken at the ABA Midyear Meeting in Las Vegas the proposed amendment to Standard 405(e) was extensively discussed in meetings of the Skills Training Committee, the Standards Review Committee and the Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. (The proposed amendment is contained in the November Newsletter). The controversy centers around two areas, Interpretation C and the application of 405(e) to legal writing instructions.

Interpretation C states 405(e) "does not preclude a limited number of fixed, short-term appointments in a professional skills program so long as the program is predominantly staffed by full-time faculty members within the meaning of this Standard." Dean Rivkin reports movement both to delete and to strengthen this provision with no clear consensus either way. The application of 405(e) to legal writing instructors is also causing concern and the proposed amendment may be altered to exclude this group.

The Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar will consider the amendment again at its May Meeting. Strangely, the amendment generated little comment at public hearings held at the ABA Midyear Meeting and none at all at the AALS Annual Meeting in January.

#### ANNUAL MEETING A GREAT SUCCESS

The Section on Clinical Legal Education held an all day program on January 5 at the AALS Annual Meeting in San Francisco. The morning session consisted of discussion and demonstration of four different teaching methods:

\*John Barkai and Jim Countiss, both of Hawaii, showed how they use a technique of teaching clinical skills through a form of team teaching called Lecture-In-Disguise. The two teach a skill such as interviewing by giving a lecture on the subject conducting interviews of each other. Other topics are also covered by using lectures in the form of the skill being taught (see November Newsletter for a more complete description). The presentation to the group was done by using the direct and cross examination techniques they were describing.

\*Several faculty members from CUNY-Queens, Victor Goode and Vanessa Merton, demonstrated their use of clinical methodology in teaching first year students. The audience was divided into several law firms representing either the mayor of a city or its police department. Each firm was assigned the problem of deciding how to carry out its client's wishes concerning police layoffs under a consent judgment regarding the hiring of minority officers. The simulation illustrated the use of the clinical method to force discussion of values underlying substantive decision making and to teach substantive areas of law.

\*Roger Haydock and John Sonsterng, William Mitchell, described a new course offering called the Legal Practicum (see November Newsletter for more complete description.) They demonstrated how they use simulation to teach techniques of client interviewing and decision making by posing a problem of a client arrested for drunk driving calling a lawyer in the middle of the night. The lawyer, played successively by several audience members, had to advise the client on whether to take a breathalyzer test. After the advice was given, the student/lawyer was critiqued and the advice discussed.

\*Paul Bergman, UCLA, concluded the morning program by describing his teaching of clinical skills through non-legal simulations and problems. He illustrated this technique by giving an example of how we judge hearsay and credibility problems if we hear at a party that A & P is giving away free turkeys. The factors we use in this setting were then related to the restrictions on courtroom evidence.

The afternoon was broken into two segments. The first session consisted of small group discussions of the morning's presentations. The second session, also small group discussions, was of several topics of interest to clinical teachers. The discussions in both sessions were wide ranging and informative.

The Section Business Meeting was held in the evening following the program. The main item of business, following several committee reports, was the election of Sue Bryant, Hofstra, as Chair-Elect and David Gottlieb, Kansas, and Carrie Menkel-Meadow, UCLA, to the Executive Committee. Roy Stuckey, South Carolina, assumed the duties of Chair and, praised Kandis Scott's tenure as Chair to long applause.

#### AALS REGS AND TENURE

It has been suggested that some clinical teachers who face promotion and tenure decisions may be able to make advantageous use of the following Regulations of the AALS Executive Committee:

##### 6. Procedures for Academic Freedom and Tenure Cases.

- 6.1 a. A complaint that a member school has (1) violated a faculty member's academic freedom or tenure rights or (2) discriminated in the employment of a faculty member [Bylaw Section 6-4], shall be sent or referred to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (Hereinafter referred to as CAFT). Unless the complaint is in writing and signed by the aggrieved party, CAFT shall not consider it.
- b. A complaint concerning the failure to grant tenure or otherwise continue the employment of a non-tenured faculty member shall be considered by CAFT only if the complaint clearly raises issues involving academic freedom or employment discrimination. CAFT ordinarily will review



neither the adequacy of a member school's academic procedures nor actual compliance with these procedures unless it appears that the impact of challenged procedures or practices constitutes a substantial threat to a faculty member's academic freedom or equal employment opportunities.

- 6.12 Complainant's Advocate. After consulting with CAFT, the Executive Committee shall periodically publish a list of members of the faculty of member schools who are qualified and willing to act as advocates for complainants and the regions in which they will serve. A complainant may choose as her or his advocate a person on this panel or any other person. On request, the Association shall, consistent with the Association's travel reimbursement policies, pay the travel expenses of the advocate who resides within the region in which the law school against which a complaint has been made is situated or within 500 miles of the law school. If the advocate resides at a greater distance, the Association shall, except in unusual cases, pay only those travel expenses that the advocate would have incurred had she or he resided within 500 miles of the school.

#### McKAY RECEIVES SECTION AWARD

By  
Sue Bryant, Hofstra

Robert B. McKay received the 1984 Clinical Legal Education Section Award for outstanding contributions to clinical education. The award is given each year to individuals or organizations who have supported and encouraged the inclusion, expansion and improvement of intellectually sound, experientially-based learning programs in the nation's law schools. Robert McKay was selected by the Committee on Awards based on his longstanding contributions to clinical education. His contributions include his support while dean for the development of the outstanding clinical programs at N.Y.U. and his work on the AALS-ABA Committee on Guidelines for Clinical Legal Education. Finally, his contributions to the passage of 405(e) as a member and chair of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar made Robert McKay the Section recipient this year. The Award was presented at the Section luncheon on January 5 at the 1984 AALS Annual Meeting in San Francisco.

#### ANTIOCH LAW JOURNAL REQUESTS ARTICLES

By  
John Perrotta, Editor, Antioch Law Journal

The Antioch School of Law has long been known for its pioneering steps in clinical legal education. With this in mind, the Antioch Law Journal, which is affiliated with the law school, is setting up a section in each volume dedicated to this topic. As such, we would like to ask if clinical teachers, their colleagues or advanced students would be interested in writing an article exploring its many aspects.

Articles do not have to follow the strict rules of traditional law review articles. They may be shorter, less heavily footnoted, or more upbeat. They may describe, for example, clinical methods, the setting up of a clinic, or how students attacked an unusual case. Articles should be interesting and unique. They should serve to advance clinical legal education. They should not be mere reports of mundane facts about a clinic or case.

Of course, we are open to suggestions and would like to hear your ideas. Please feel free to write to or call the Antioch Editor, John Perrotta, at 202-462-7234 (evenings).

NSIEE SERVICES AVAILABLE TO AALS MEMBERS  
By  
Jane C. Kendall, Executive Director of NSIEE

The National Society for Internships and Experiential Education provides services for faculty and students involved in all aspects of clinical and experiential education. NSIEE is an association of faculty, administrators, managers, and students who support the use of experiential learning in all fields. The services and publications currently available are:

1. Directories of internship opportunities,
2. "How to" guide for students on choosing field experiences and making the most of them,
3. Publications for faculty and administrators -- resource papers on quality practices in the design of courses and programs for experiential education, theoretical and practical papers about pressing issues in experiential education.
4. A talent bank of faculty across the country who have volunteered to help others who want to design or improve a program for clinical/experiential education.
5. Annual national conference that provides a stimulating forum for professional development for those committed to programs for hands-on experience in their fields (this year in San Diego, California, on October 18-20, 1984),
6. The Experiential Education newsletter with articles and announcements about emerging issues and new resources available (sent only to NSIEE members),
7. A clearinghouse for dissemination of published and unpublished materials, and
8. Professional liability insurance (available only to NSIEE members).

Membership in NSIEE is open to interested persons and institutions. The services listed above (except for #6 and #8) are available to non-members as well. For a packet of materials that provides details on each of these services and on membership in NSIEE, contact the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 124 St. Mary's Street, Raleigh, NC, 27605, (919) 834-7536.

#### ALLIANCE FOR JUSTICE SEEKS INFORMATION

The Alliance for Justice has secured funding to conduct a comprehensive survey of public interest law centers: their functions and activities; challenges they will have to meet in the future; and strategies for meeting those challenges. Current funding for public interest law will also be examined. The report issued at the conclusion of the survey will include the views of foundation leaders on the future commitment of the philanthropic community to financing public interest work and recommendations for expanding the financial resources of the public interest community.

As part of its survey, the Alliance is seeking information about clinical programs engaged in public interest advocacy. If your clinic is involved in such work, please send a description of it and the types of public interest advocacy being pursued to Monica Hauck, Assistant to the Director, Alliance for Justice, 600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

#### SHORT STUFF

Andy Shookhoff, Vanderbilt, is chairing the AALS Family and Juvenile Law Section.

Tony Bocchino, Temple, is visiting at Richmond this semester.

Joe Harbaugh, Temple, who is presently visiting at Georgetown, will join the faculty at American next Fall.

Vance Cowden, South Carolina, was counsel for the prevailing appellant in Thomas v. Leeke, 4th Cir. Ct. of Appeals, Opinion No. 83-6255, January 12, 1984. The case overturns long-standing South Carolina law placing on criminal defendants the burden of proving self-defense.

Elliot Milstein, American, is a member of the Accreditation Committee of the AALS.

Bob Seibel, Maine, is Chair-Elect of the AALS Section on Law and Computers.

JOBSUNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS  
AT LITTLE ROCK

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock has a tenure track position open involving both clinical and traditional classroom teaching responsibilities. The position does not involve direct student supervision. If interested, contact Prof. Kenneth Gould, School of Law, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, 400 West Markham, Little Rock AR 72201.

## CINCINNATI

The University of Cincinnati College of Law seeks a clinical methods teachers. The position is a tenure-track position to be filled at the assistant or associate professor level. The clinical program is an integral component of the skills curriculum, and it operates within the Center for Studies in Professional Skills. The Center has as its mission the teaching of skills, the development of new teaching methodologies and the study of the effectiveness of professional performance and development. Candidates for the clinical teaching position should have an excellent academic record, preferably law review and published scholarship, and experience in practice. Prior experience as a clinical teacher is not required. In addition to supervising the clinical programs, the clinical methods professor may be required to teach skills simulation courses such as trial practice or negotiations. Contact: Professor Glen Weissenberger, Director, Center for Studies in Professional Skills, University of Cincinnati College of Law, Cincinnati, OH 45221.

## HAWAII

Live it up in luxurious Hawaii as visiting clinical professor for Fall, semester 1984 or Spring semester 1985. Free sunshine, beaches, ocean recreation. Salary negotiable. Expenses are tax deductible. Submit resume to Jim Countiss, Director of Clinical Program, University of Hawaii School of Law, 2515 Dole Street, Honolulu, HI 96822.

## NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

The New York University School of Law is planning to add one to two persons to its clinical faculty. Experienced clinicians are particularly encouraged to apply. It is not contemplated that the position will be tenure track, but can lead to long term employment. Please send letter and resume to Prof. Anthony Amsterdam, NYU School of Law, 40 Washington Square South, New York, NY 10012.

ESSAYS

The essay topics for this issue of the Newsletter are proposed Standard 405(e) and the Legal Services Corporation's plan to award a limited number of pilot grants to clinical programs. While unrelated to each other, the topics are of current interest to a number of clinical teachers. The Legal Services Corporation was requested to provide an article presenting the Corporation's views on the grant program, but was unable to meet the Newsletter deadline. It is hoped that the next issue will contain the promised article. Again, anyone interested in contributing to the Essays section should contact the Editor.

## SOME EFFECTS OF PROPOSED 405(e)

By

Gary Palm, Chicago

Many law schools have set up programs with one clinical teacher having faculty status and the rest of the attorneys being relegated to the non-faculty status of supervising attorneys. The AALS-ABA Guidelines approved this structure and proposed it as the norm. Although the Guidelines are only five years old, the ABA appears ready to improve the status of all supervising attorneys through an accreditation standard. The adoption of 405(e) in its present form is not a certainty. There are major efforts underway to organize opposition to defeat the proposed standard on the floor of the House of Delegates. Also, amendments may be offered to exclude supervising attorneys from protection under 405(e) or to define 405(e) in such a way that supervising attorneys who do not teach in the classroom are not covered. Supporters of 405(e) will need to undertake a vigorous and careful campaign to assure its passage.

If 405(e) passes, it still must be applied and interpreted. The questions I have been struggling with involve how 405(e) will affect supervising attorneys and programs staffed by supervising attorneys. Will the adoption of proposed accreditation Standard 405(e) improve the lot of supervising attorneys in clinical programs? Will 405(e) improve clinical programs staffed predominately by supervising attorneys? My crystal ball tells me the answer is a clear, unambiguous "maybe." What is certain to occur is that each law school will have to examine the role and status of supervising attorneys. This attention is long overdue and will be a very important result of the adoption of 405(e).

Too long have those who are performing the most significant teaching in our clinical programs been treated as third class citizens in the law school community ranking behind the academics and the director of the clinical program. They have been exploited with low salaries, few perquisites, little participation in the governance of the school and total uncertainty about their short-term and long-term futures. Worst of all, the uncertainty about their own future is combined with the apparently never-ending re-evaluation of the very existence of their clinical programs (a phenomenon not occurring for other parts of law school programs). Many supervising attorneys are funded under precarious

financial arrangements that are only finalized just before each school year begins. But the most troubling problem has been the official and unofficial view of many in the law school world that clinical teaching conducted by supervising attorneys was not appropriate for a career. Supervision of students has been thought not to provide sufficient opportunities for personal and career development. Some programs have gone so far as to require that supervising attorneys not even be allowed to be retained for more than two or three years no matter how talented they are.

My hunch is that 405(e) will aid the growing recognition that supervision of students on actual cases should be recognized as a career. If this one change occurs because of 405(e), those who are teaching by supervising students will have gained very much indeed. They will be recognized as permanent members of the legal education community and not simply as temporary visitors. Their colleagues eventually will become concerned about their growth, productivity and success. As time passes, differences in treatment not related to differences in function will likely disappear too.

Some have argued that 405(e) will force law schools to abandon clinical programs rather than undertake the financial and other institutional requirements necessary to comply. To be sure this would happen at some schools. Other schools may use other approaches to try to avoid giving career opportunities to its supervising attorneys such as using visiting appointments or downgrading their clinical courses to non-credit status. Those concerned about the future of clinical education will have to be vigilant to assure that our clinical colleagues at other schools receive the full benefits accorded by 405(e). We will need to monitor ABA accreditation reviews and advocate for effective enforcement of 405(e). But overall, I expect that most law schools employing supervising attorneys have been uncomfortable about the ambiguity of their status. Clinical programs will not be abolished or crippled because they have been found to be effective and stimulating additions to legal education. As long as we continue to be effective teachers and to push ourselves to be innovative, I am confident we will have a significant role in legal education. After all, our reform is still quite young. And our programs have successfully passed most evaluations. In short, clinical education has become recognized as an appropriate and effective aspect of legal education. I do not expect law schools to eliminate these worthwhile programs simply to avoid the effects of 405(e).

This is not to say that those individuals who are now supervising attorneys will necessarily reap the benefits from 405(e). Most schools will probably "raise" the credentials required for clinical teachers. They will likely require supervising attorneys to compete for the new tenure eligible positions with others who have not been doing clinical teaching at the school. Some clinical teachers will not be retained. Those who stay will have benefitted greatly because they will now know where they stand and will have the opportunity to make clinical teaching their career. For them, I predict much will have been accomplished with the uncertainty and ambiguity greatly diminished. For those who are not retained, clinical education will benefit from their work and they will

have benefitted too from the opportunity to develop their practice and teaching skills in the clinical education program. However, based on those schools that have already upgraded their clinical teachers, I do not expect the body count to be high. Most supervising attorneys have been retained although without adequate credit for the time they have already been doing clinical teaching. The availability of career positions will allow us to recruit and retain more outstanding clinical teachers in the future and will more than offset the temporary losses we will suffer.

Of greater concern is the possibility that law schools which do not now have in-house programs will be deterred by 405(e) from beginning new programs. There are still a large number of schools which have yet to employ any full time clinical teachers. Many of these schools are put off by the expense of a good clinical program. When short-term funds have been provided by CLEPR, the Department of Education and like sources, many schools began clinical programs in the past. But now they may not be willing to make the kinds of commitments to clinical teachers contemplated by 405(e), and therefore will not begin new programs even when funding is available. Or they may decide to restrict their involvement in clinical education to out-of-house placements so as to avoid employing any full time clinical teachers who would be covered under 405(e). Of course, schools are always free to abolish any clinical program. Section 405(e) specifically provides for this eventuality and gives clinical teachers no rights to be retained for non-clinical duties. Clinical teachers would have no more rights than faculty in any other department which is terminated. Also 405(e) as presently drafted would only require that a skills training program be predominately staffed by persons who are covered by 405(e). Other clinical teachers can still be employed as supervising attorneys on short term appointments. As 405(e) is interpreted and applied by the ABA in the next decade, further flexibility in particular cases may also be appropriate to assure that schools can experiment with clinical education in good faith for a short period.

I would prefer 3 to 5 years contracts renewable only on merit for all teachers, clinical and academic alike. Indeed, early on in the discussions about 405(e), the suggestion was made that clinical teachers join deans and academic teachers in seeking to abolish tenure. But the established powers in legal education, many of whom oppose regulation by the ABA, would not agree to seek the repeal of 405(d). Those of us who have been responsible for directing programs which serve clients through law students supervised by supervising attorneys are concerned about what we will do with the non-productive supervising attorney who has tenure. We all hope that standards of ethics and professionalism will prevail and that judgments made in awarding tenure will be carefully considered and correct. But we may have to remove some tenured clinical faculty for unprofessional performance. I do not know whether we will be able to meet client and student demands and provide reasonably similar job conditions. Eventually we may need to establish accreditation standards for caseload and number of student supervision hours in order to allow clinical teachers to perform all their functions effectively and also meet the clinical program's training and service goals.

So what will 405(e) do for supervising attorneys? Many more will have careers in clinical education and retire on TIAA/CREF pensions. Others, but only a "limited number" at each school, will remain as supervising attorneys with short term appointments and low pay. Eventually I expect that we will conclude that 405(e) was just a halfway step toward equality for clinical teachers and career opportunities. Then we will join the ABA in extending 405(d) or 405(e) to all clinical teachers. Standard 405(e) is a present compromise. As such, it is not satisfactory to all. But it is my feeling that it is the best we can get now and that it will improve the status of clinical teachers.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION GRANTS  
FOR CLINICAL EDUCATION

By

John J. Capowski, Maryland

The Legal Services Corporation is soliciting grant applications from clinical programs, but programs and law schools should resist the temptation this money presents. For a number of reasons, they should not apply for these grants.

At a time of decreased funding for the Legal Services Corporation and an increased need for its services, funding should go to the most efficient providers of legal services for the poor. The cost of grants to clinical programs will come from the general appropriation to the Legal Services Corporation, and dollars for clinics will be dollars taken from existing Legal Services programs, ones which have already been racked by severe budget cuts in recent years. In times of increased legal services funding, experiments concerning the delivery of legal services may be appropriate; but, in periods of reduced resources, funds should not be siphoned off to clinical programs. Clinical programs, if done well, require significant supervision and low student caseloads. They can provide high quality casework but are ineffective in reaching large numbers of clients.

Clinical programs which receive Legal Services funds are likely to face serious conflicts between their interest in grant renewal and their educational and professional responsibilities. The Reagan administration and its Legal Services Corporation board appointees have attacked Legal Services programs most strongly for law reform efforts, and the board of the Corporation is attempting to eliminate the back-up centers. Clinical programs which will receive LSC grants and have engaged in law reform activities, even when necessary in an individual case, are unlikely to have their grants renewed. Also, because the grant's stated purpose is to test the effectiveness of clinical programs in delivering legal services to the poor, programs will suffer pressures to provide a high volume of service, and the educational goals of programs are likely to suffer.

Looked at with the background of recent attacks upon Legal Services programs by the Reagan administration and the LSC board, diverting funds from Legal Services programs to clinical programs is simply one additional strategy for weakening the effectiveness of Legal Services offices. In the



ast, this administration has called for the abolition of the Corporation, ought to divert Legal Services funds to the private bar, and fought for restrictions on types of representation and client eligibility. Seen in light of these acts, one is hard pressed to believe that the Corporation, in funding clinical programs, is truly searching for a more efficacious vehicle for providing effective legal services to indigents.

For these reasons and for all the problems inherent in funding any clinical program on soft money, law schools should refrain from seeking Legal Services Corporation grants.

### ARTICLES ABOUT CLINICAL EDUCATION

#### Clinical Education

Bellow, On Talking Tough to Each Other: Comments on Condlin, 33 J. of Legal Ed. 619 (1983)(Gary Bellow, Harvard, directs the Legal Services Institute in Jamaica Plain, MA)

Condlin, Clinical Education in the Seventies: An Appraisal of the Decade, 33 J. of Legal Ed. 604 (1983)(Bob Condlin teaches Clinic at Maryland and is visiting at Indiana-Bloomington)

Kennedy, The Political Significance of the Structure of the Law School Curriculum, 14 Seton Hall L. Rev. 1 (1983)

Luban, Epistemology and Moral Education, 33 J. of Legal Ed. 636 (1983)

Meltsner, Feeling Like A Lawyer, 33 J. of Legal Ed. 624 (1983)(Mike Meltsner, Dean of Northeastern, has long been active in clinical education)

Reaves, 3 Dixie Bars Consider Requiring Internships, 9(3) Bar Lead. 31 (1983).

Redlich, The Moral Value of Clinical Legal Education. A Reply,, 33 J. of Legal Ed. 613 (1983)

#### Interviewing and Counseling

Saltman, The Client Post-Interview Report (with Form), 29(7) Prac. Law. 79 (1983).

Weil, First Impressions and New Clients, 57 Fla. B.J. 608 (1983).

Negotiation

Carbone, Goldizen, Hendricks & Davis, Negotiation Skills Training with Juvenile Offenders, 34(3) Juv. & Fam. Ct. J. 31 (1983).

Greenberg, The Lawyer's Use of Quantitative Analysis in Settlement Negotiations, 38 Bus. Law. 1557 (1983).

General Interest

Hazard, Completing Aims of Legal Education, 59 N. Dakota L. Rev. 533 (1983)

Kestin, Bridging the Gap Between School and Practice, 70 A.B.A.J. 56 (1984)

By Clinicians

Scott, California's Dormant Hearsay Exception: Section 1200(b) of the Evidence Code, 23 Santa Clara L. Rev. 157 (1983) (Kandis Scott teaches clinic at Santa Clara)

Gottlieb, Reform in Kansas Domestic Violence Legislation, 31 Kansas L. Rev. 527 (1983) (David Gottlieb teaches clinic at Kansas)

Books

G. Muinneke, Your New Laywer, The Legal Employer's Complete Guide to Recruitment, Development and Management (ABA Section of Economics of Law Practice 1983).