



SECTION ON

CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION

November, 1986

Reply to: Peter T. Hoffman
University of Nebraska
College of Law
Lincoln, NE 68583-0902
(402) 472-1264

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

By
Gary Palm, Chicago

This Message will explore ideas closely related to those presented in my last Message on scholarship and clinical education. My first point is that in order to maintain excellence in clinical education, we must establish some autonomy from the rest of the academy. Secondly, I have concluded from examining my own teaching that the most important justification for my work is that it introduces students to poverty, the failure of our system to provide equal justice for all and to alleviate poverty and the professional responsibility of lawyers to seek solutions. My conclusion is that we should seek funding to provide legal services to the poor in clinics in order to accomplish both of these goals of teaching professional responsibility and creating autonomy. In particular, we should develop a compromise so that law school clinics can obtain funding from the Legal Services Corporation.

Clinical Programs Need Autonomy

From discussions with clinical teachers, it seems that we need a way to assure that clinical programs continue to provide excellent teaching. I have concluded that we need a dramatic re-emphasis on client service as one of our goals. The future of live-client representation as the centerpiece of our methodology is endangered as the values of many of our clinical teachers change. We must keep the academic institution from taking over our resources and staff and imposing on them the same priorities that are used elsewhere in the law school. It seems to me that so long as our mission is solely educational, the live client experience will lose out.

Quality teaching of skills is in jeopardy once we allow the values of the law school about teaching and learning to be applied within our programs. Indeed, those who argue that we are inefficient urge upon us ratios closer to those used in large law school lectures and Socratic dialogues. We must fight against this effort to downgrade quality learning and teaching. It is one of the elements of our reform to provide opportunities for students to learn through close direct interaction with a teacher collaboratively in a matter of importance to both teacher and

ANNUAL MEETING
INFORMATION AT BACK

student. I question whether any kind of clinical teaching (simulation or live-clients) can avoid becoming less concerned with quality teaching and more concerned with other institutional values, unless it maintains an institutional independence from the rest of the academy. Just as with many other oddballs in legal education, we need to identify independent sources of funds which will give us this autonomy. In my experience legal services funding and attorneys fees have provided this opportunity. Recognition that providing services to poor people is a major goal of our clinical movement should enable us to preserve our autonomy and thereby insure that we can provide quality training.

Clinics Should Teach That Legal Services to the Poor is the Professional Responsibility of All Attorneys

Many of us have decided tactically to downplay the service aspect of our work, but I think we have been wrong and are now paying the attendant institutional costs. Packaging clinical education as skills training has been and is a trap for many of us. First, it is true that, to the extent we are trying to train students to be proficient in performing legal skills, we cannot compete with the next forty years of training they are going to receive, particularly if they practice in a law firm. We can give them initial instruction in sound models of preparation and performance but this information too can be transmitted after graduation. At my school, as at many others, I cannot justify clinical education as skills training for students who are going into lucrative practices with major law firms. Nor do I want to justify my work solely by how much better my graduates' corporate clients are served. If my graduates lack some fundamental skills, they can purchase whatever additional continuing education courses they need.

What we should be doing is providing students with instruction that they will never otherwise receive. This instruction includes learning about poverty, and the pain of hunger, cold and sickness caused by lack of sufficient income. They should confront the failure of our government to provide equal justice and fair legal procedures for the poor. They should confront the failure of our government to provide equal justice and fair legal procedures for the poor. They should understand that poverty is the result of the failure of our economic and political system. I hope that we can teach our students to use their legal talents to provide legal representation to the poor and to work toward eliminating poverty in America. We should help them structure their careers to include pro bono work that combines routine legal services cases and impact work through community group representation, litigation and legislative advocacy. Indeed this sensitization of students to poverty and opportunities for redress and improvement through law seems the critical justification for our work.

This goal might even achieve pragmatic results. We can expect that our students will serve in important capacities in local and national bar associations, and hold important political and governmental positions. Many will have impact on major philanthropic foundations and community organizations. They will have power and we should try to encourage them

to continue to be concerned about poverty throughout their careers and to be active whether through pro bono representation, financial contributions to legal services or personal service on boards of directors and committees. It is the very provision of legal services to poor clients by students which provides the best and most lasting lessons in professional responsibility.

So, my proposition is that we must seek funding for legal services to the poor and autonomy from law schools. In my view law schools should allocate some sizeable portion of their budget for legal services. In my opinion, legal services to the poor is the professional responsibility of students, faculty and administrators. Indeed, most medical schools underwrite some portion of service to the poor. So should law schools.

I propose that additional funding should be sought to expand legal services beyond that already provided from the school's contribution. Funding for services can be obtained in various forms, including fees from individual clients (although this might not expand services to the poor unless it is used to underwrite the poverty work) and attorneys fees under 42 U.S.C. 1988, Title VII, the Social Security Act, and other fee award provisions. Grants could be obtained from organizations with specific litigation interests such as children, the elderly or the mentally ill. General service grants could be obtained from lawyer's trust funds and foundations interested in the provision of legal services. The most obvious, and most controversial, source we need to develop as an ongoing source of funding is the Legal Services Corporation.

I urge that we work out a compromise funding arrangement to present to the next Administration of the Legal Services Corporation. It should be clear to those who have urged the "Meese" approach, that law schools cannot and will not undertake to replace staff programs even if funding is provided by the Legal Services Corporation. Also, there is a national consensus of lawyers, educators and politicians strongly opposed to such arrangements. But there is also little justification for multi-million dollar awards to individual schools as occurred during the Carter years and recently. It seems to me that in the long run the legal services community should want to have its message formally recognized in law school curricula and presented to students through clinical courses. The long term viability of federal funding of legal services depends on the support of individual lawyers, as well as the organized bar. Creation of the future constituency for legal services should begin in law school clinics.

I hope that those in the legal services community recognize that law school clinics make important contributions in the provision of legal services whether by providing representation to individual clients and community organizations or through prosecuting impact litigation and engaging in legislative efforts. Although we can debate whether law school clinics can meet emergencies or be particularly responsive consulting with staff programs as a backup center, we should agree that appropriate legal work undertaken by law school clinics is performed excellently with very close and careful supervision. In particular, the

record of impact and major cases litigated by law school clinics is remarkable. In the long run, as individual caseloads with their unexciting, repetitive content exhaust the patience and interest of talented legal services attorneys, it may well be that only law school clinics will provide ongoing opportunities for significant casework by experienced attorneys on behalf of the poor.

But we must never threaten the ongoing existence of strong, vital and well funded legal services staff programs. Those programs must have increased funding which returns them to levels closer to those provided in the late 1970's. My proposal for a compromise is that once pre-Reagan funding levels have been restored for L.S.C. staff programs, an experimental grant program should be established to fund increased legal services provided by clinical programs. The amount provided for each service could be fixed by reference to the costs for the same service if provided by an L.S.C. staff program. I know that these amounts will not be sufficient to meet all, or much more than half, the costs of providing these services. Clinical education is a much more costly way of delivering services so that additional local resources would have to be used to "match" the LSC grants. Other criteria could also be established to avoid duplication of effort. Preference could be given to clinics with innovative service methods or those serving clients not otherwise served by LSC staff programs or those marshalling the resources of the whole University in major systemic reform efforts. Funding of clinical programs should be carefully evaluated. When the results are in, I expect that a permanent program for funding some of the service costs of law school clinics would be justified as an ongoing, institutional component of providing legal services to the poor.

Annual Meeting - "ITS A SMALL WORLD AFTER ALL."

I look forward to seeing all of you in Los Angeles. We will have an open Executive Committee meeting on Friday evening from 8 - 10:00 p.m. with a cash bar and some snacks. I am particularly pleased that Bill Greenhalgh prevailed upon the leadership of the AALS to give us back our day-long program. Our joint program with the Law and Computers Section is very timely for those of us still trying to "boot" the darn thing.

I look forward to discussing the many issues facing us.

COMMITTEE NOTES

Peter Hoffman, Nebraska, Chair Elect, will be making committee assignments over the holidays. Section members who are interested in serving on a committee should contact Peter at the AALS Annual Meeting in Los Angeles or by writing him at the University of Nebraska College of Law, Lincoln, NE 68583.

The success of the Section rests in its committees. Not only do the committees provide an opportunity to influence the course of clinical education, but they also provide an opportunity to get to know and exchange ideas with fellow clinicians. Get Involved!

LEGAL SERVICES

The final report by the Legal Services Corporation on the 14 law school clinical programs that LSC funded from September, 1984 to June, 1986 is scheduled to be issued in December, 1986. Supposedly, there were LSC field evaluation reports of the clinical programs. Despite repeated requests, LSC has not given the Committee these reports or comments by the clinical programs on the interim report. Anyone who has information on field evaluation reports or comments on interim reports should contact Paula Galowitz, NYU.

Some news on the LSC budget and continuing resolution. For the 1987 fiscal year budget, LSC received \$305.5 million. Of this, \$1.3 million was earmarked program development which includes law school clinical programs. (Funding of clinical programs is not a separate item in the budget). The bill included restrictions on how the funds should be spent. It provided funding, for Clearing House Review and 7.5 million for national support, despite LSC's prior decision about defunding national support centers. (See prior Newsletter). LSC is also prohibited from using funds to implement the 5/31/85 and 8/31/85 regulation lobbying; this probably means that the 1984 riders are ineffective.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee, chaired by Mike Norwood, New Mexico, and composed of Stacy Caplow, Brooklyn; Jeff Hartje, Gonzaga; Mark Hyerman, Chicago; Jane Johnson, Tulane; Kandis Scott, Santa Clara; and Roy Stuckey, South Carolina, is pleased to notify the Section membership of the names of those it has nominated for the elective positions of the Section on Clinical Legal Education that are due to become vacant in January. The nominees are:

William Greenhalgh (Georgetown)
for the office of Chairperson-Elect

Susan Kovac (Tennessee)
Theresa Player (San Diego)

for three-year terms of the Executive Committee

Bob Dinerstein (American)
to fill the position vacated by Bill Greenhalgh if elected chair

The vacancies on the Executive Committee will be created by the expirations of the terms of Carrie Menkel-Meadow (UCLA) and Mike Norwood (New Mexico).

BITS AND PIECES

AALS NATIONAL CLINICAL TEACHERS' WORKSHOP PLANNED FOR THE SPRING

By
Graham Strong, UCLA

Plans are beginning to crystallize for the 1987 Workshop on Clinical Legal Education. The workshop is currently scheduled for March 12-14 in the scenic riverfront restoration area of San Antonio. The Planning Committee is, however, exploring the possibility of a re-scheduling of the Workshop to a date in late May or thereafter. The Workshop's topic will be "Teaching Across Skills."

Clinical workshops and teaching conferences have, over the years, performed a powerful role in the formation of a national community of clinical legal educators, and in the evolution of the clinical method itself. They are not occasions for the casual reconsideration of a static field of study, but are rather opportunities to participate in the continuing process of innovation and reformation that has characterized the clinical movement.

This gathering of the national clinical community will explore ways in which the subject matter of clinical instruction can be reconceptualized. Such a reconceptualization can suggest ways to reorganize our programs, but, perhaps more significantly, can also help us gain a new understanding of the subject matter of clinical education.

Traditionally, teaching within most clinical programs has been organized around a familiar set of lawyering skills or activities. Many of us have found, however, that there are certain themes that cut across traditional skill categories, and that we therefore find ourselves reteaching similar concepts and approaches in the context of teaching each traditional skill. The workshop will focus upon four of these cross-cutting themes (idea-generation, planning, judgment, and values) in relation to four traditional skill categories (investigation, counseling, negotiation, and litigation).

It will explore the possibility of using such cross-cutting themes as organizing principles in our programs. The participants will actively engage in a "re-slicing" of the clinical curriculum by cross-cutting themes, and consider how such a re-slicing could play out through a variety of teaching methods and formats (including classroom lecture/discussion, simulation, individual casework supervision, and the group case conference).

The Workshop Planning Committee would welcome your suggestions regarding the program, including nominations for the workshop faculty. The Committee's members are Tony Amsterdam (N.Y.U.), Gary Palm (Chicago), Ann Shalleck (American), and Graham Strong (visiting at U.C.L.A.), Chair.

A summary of the Workshop program follows.

AALS WORKSHOP ON CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION
"Teaching Across Skills"

San Antonio, March 12-14

Thursday, March 12

- 5:00-8:00 p.m. Registration
6:00-8:00 p.m. Reception with cash bar

Friday, March 13

- 8:30-9:00 a.m. Welcome
Millard H. Ruud, Executive Director, AALS
- 8:40-9:00 a.m. An Overview of the Workshop
"Re-slicing the Clinical Cake"
- 9:00-10:30 a.m. Plenary Session
"Cross-cutting Themes in the Teaching of
Traditional Lawyering Skills"
- This session will introduce the notion that common themes cut across the traditional skill categories of clinical education. Four such themes (idea-generation, planning, judgment, and values) will be considered in the context of four traditional skill categories (investigation, counseling, negotiation, and litigation).
- 10:30-10:45 a.m. Refreshment Break
- 10:45-12:15 p.m. Small Group Workshops
- The participants will explore the concept of "re-slicing" the subject matter of clinical education, and begin to identify and consider the themes that have cut across their own teaching of traditional skills.
- 12:15-2:00 p.m. Lunch and Free Time
- 2:00-3:15 p.m. Plenary Session
"A Sample Slice: Teaching Idea-Generation Across
Traditional Skills"

This session will examine how the first of the cross-cutting themes -- idea-generation -- can be taught independently, or taught thematically in the context of traditional skill categories.

- 3:15-3:30 p.m. Refreshment Break
- 3:30-5:00 p.m. Small Group Workshops
- Each small group will draw upon the model of the plenary session to generate ideas about how the second of the cross-cutting themes -- planning -- can be taught independently, or taught thematically in the context of traditional skill categories.
- 5:00-7:00 p.m. Reception with cash bar
- 8:30-10:00 p.m. Simultaneous Informal Discussion Groups
1. Externships and Standard 309
 2. Scholarship and the In-House Clinic
 3. Maxi-Simulation Courses

Saturday, March 14

- 9:00-10:15 a.m. Plenary Session
 "A Second Sample Slice: Teaching Judgment Across Traditional Skills"
- 10:15-10:30 a.m. Refreshment Break
- 10:30-12:00 noon Small Group Workshops
- Each small group will exercise its collective judgment about how the last of the cross-cutting themes--values -- can be taught independently, or thematically in the context of traditional skill categories.
- 12:00-1:30 p.m. AALS-Sponsored Luncheon
 Entertainment Program
- 1:30-2:15 p.m. Plenary Session
 "Teaching Across Skills and Clinical Methodology"
- This session will consider how a re-slicing of the traditional subject matter of clinical education could play out in the context of four primary teaching methods: classroom lecture/discussion, simulation, individual casework supervision, and the group case conference.
- 2:15-2:30 p.m. Refreshment Break
- 2:30-4:00 p.m. Small Group Workshops
- The small groups will focus upon the translation of the re-slicing concept into practice through a variety

of clinical teaching methods and formats. The final portion of the small group session will be devoted to an evaluation of the program.

4:00 p.m.

Adjourn

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER
NEW TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

Building: 25 E Street, N.W.

<u>Department Name</u>	<u>Professor</u>	<u>New Number</u>
Coordinator of Clinical Education	Wally Mlyniec	662-9590
Appellate Litigation Clinic	Steve Goldblatt	9555
Center for Applied Legal Studies	Phil Schrag & Dave Koplow	9565
Criminal Justice	William Greenhalgh, Rhonda Winston & Jim Doyle	9575
D.C. Street Law	Rick Roe	9615
Harrison Institute	Robert Stumberg	9600
I.P.R.	Doug Parker & Laura Macklin	9535
Juvenile Justice	Wally Mlyniec	9590
Sex Discrimination Clinic	Sue Ross	9640
E. Barrett Prettyman Program	William Greenhalgh	9575
Women's Law & Public Policy Fellowship Program	Sue Ross	9640
South African Lawyer Program	Ed O'Brien	9617

REQUEST FOR DEATH PENALTY INFORMATION

Michael Millemann, Maryland, is interested in finding out about other clinics and clinical teachers who are doing death penalty work. He is interested in exchanging ideas and information as well as possibly working up a consortium proposal involving as many law schools as possible to represent death row inmates in the South. If interested, contact him at Clinical Law Office, University of Maryland School of Law, 510 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201

DOE ANNOUNCES GRANTS

The Law School Clinical Experience Program administered by the U.S. Department of Education has announced the awarding of 41 grants to create, expand or improve clinical programs:

American	\$ 57,488
Antioch	[unknown]
Arizona State	23,120
Arkansas	39,530
Brooklyn	42,700
Chicago	47,580
Cleveland State	42,665
Colorado	19,829
Columbia	41,000
Drake	39,406
Franklin Pierce	35,702
Hamline	39,754
Hofstra	16,599
Idaho	36,900
ITT	39,000
Inter American	28,000
John F. Kennedy	30,578
Kansas	30,940
Loyola - Los Angeles	32,850
Maine	48,231
Maryland	30,300
Michigan	34,230
New Mexico	34,800
North Carolina	40,000
North Carolina Central	32,191
Northeastern	48,387
Northwestern	42,250
Pennsylvania	32,630
Rutgers-Newark	43,836
San Francisco	55,350
Santa Clara	42,807
Seaton Hall	35,000
St. Louis	36,967
Stanford	33,074
Vanderbilt	19,309
Washburn	15,000
Widener (Del)	25,508
William Mitchell	34,410
Wisconsin	32,103
Yale	<u>39,754</u>
TOTAL	\$1,381,970

The Department is planning a solicitation for applications for the 1987-88 academic year for distribution of \$1.5 million in new grants. The application packets should be sent out by December 15 and the application deadline is tentatively planned for February 20, 1987. For further information contact Barbara Harvey, (201) 732-4863.

ESSAYS

The essays in this issue are on an innovative course developed by Ed Greenebaum at Indiana and on clinic fundraising by Steve Wizner at Yale. The Newsletter is always interested in printing descriptions of new approaches to clinical teaching and administration.

INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY OF CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

By

Edwin Greenebaum, Indiana-Bloomington

Shared study of clinical experience by members of diverse clinical professions should be possible and profitable. Such a joint exploration should increase insight into issues of clinical work from the viewpoints of diverse professional cultures, into the problems of interdisciplinary collaboration, and into the ways in which society has created and "uses" its system of helping services. Participants would, further, develop increased understanding of how they and the institutions in which they work respond to issues, such as: allocation of scarce resources and management of institutional change; provision of equal opportunity, overcoming stereotypes of race and gender, while maintaining professional standards; management of professional and staff development to enable appropriate response to the competing demands of client service, research, and public service.

The Workshop on Understanding Clinical Experience, which has been offered during the past two summers at Indiana University, is designed to provide an opportunity, "to increase members' ability to understand clinical experience." In clinical work we confront problems of communication, of trust, of adopting roles which are neither too dominant nor too passive, of accommodating the conflicting interests of individuals and groups, of agreeing on the clinic's tasks and implementing an organizational structure to accomplish them, and of managing transactions between the clinic and the larger community on which it depends for necessary support. By working together to increase their understanding of these common issues of clinical work, Workshop members become better able to respond constructively to the constraints of their professions, of their clinical institutions, and of their relations with their clients. Participation from diverse professional disciplines facilitates exploration of these matters in their commonalities and differences across professions.

The premise underlying the Workshop is that the Workshop itself is a model of clinical experience. In the Workshop, professionals (the Workshop staff) and their clients (Workshop members, seeking the staff's assistance in members' professional development) confront problems of communicating and testing the reality of information and values; of working in and representing groups; of trust in helping relationships; of conflicting interests and viewpoints of clinic and client; of agreeing on the clinic's tasks and implementing an organizational structure to accomplish them; and of managing transactions (between clinic and client, between parts of the clinical organization, and between the clinic and its

environment) which are necessary for the clinic's work, but which always represent threats to clinics' and individuals' integrity.

Workshop members study these common issues of clinical work in the "here and now" of their present Workshop experience. A frame of reference for understanding clinical experience is offered, but the Workshop staff (the "Director," "Consultants," and "Administrator") does not prescribe what members will learn, and it is members' responsibility to decide what they will take with them from the Workshop for their future use. To make the Workshop an environment for safe exploration, no evaluations or reports are made of participation in the Workshop. The Workshop is designed to be open ended so that learning will continue as members reflect on their Workshop experience in the course of their professional work.

The theoretical frame of reference which has guided the development of the Workshop is in a tradition of group and organizational studies with its roots in The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in England. This tradition is influenced by psychoanalytical insights into human behavior and by open-systems approaches to organizational theory. The work, however, is open-textured and provides opportunities to study group experience from diverse viewpoints. In this country the work has been led by members of the A.K. Rice Institute and its affiliated centers. Work in this tradition has included organizational consultation and group relations training conferences. Clinical teachers in legal education who have participated in "Tavistock" group relations training have found the experience useful. For work influenced by "Tavistock" experience, see Aiken, Koplow, Lerman, Ogilvy, and Schrag, The Learning Contract in Legal Education, 44 MD. L. REV. 1047 (1985); Meltsner, Feeling Like a Lawyer, 33 J. LEGAL Ed. 624 (1983); Meltsner and Schrag, Scenes From a Clinic, 127 U. PA. L. REV. 127 (1978).

The immediate antecedent for the present Workshop is a course on Understanding Clinical Experience which I have taught at Indiana University School of Law, Bloomington. See Greenebaum, The Professional School as a Focus for Clinical Education, 8 J. LEGAL PROF. 101 (1983). Concentrating the equivalent of my three hour course into an eight-day workshop makes possible bringing additional qualified faculty to our campus from other universities and, then, to open enrollment to a larger and more diverse group. While the Workshop has been conducted these first two years in the Indiana University School of Law, Bloomington, with participation by several law students, membership has included graduate students, faculty, and staff from several departments and three campuses of the university.

Workshop events provide opportunities to study theoretical materials and to explore their applicability in laboratory experience. Discussion events include the Introduction, Academic Discussion Event (six sessions), Review and Application Group (seven sessions), and the Workshop Review. The laboratory events are the Study Group Event and Collaboration Event (seven sessions each). In studying "here and now" behavior in laboratory events, members have the opportunity to utilize their intellect and

experience of emotion, without neglecting one for the other, to examine how members and workshop staff take up roles and how work is accomplished and impeded. Assigned readings include my text, Understanding Clinical Experience (draft), and articles from A. D. Colman and W. H. Bexton, eds., Group Relations Reader (1975), published by the A. K. Rice Institute. The event schedule, below, from last summer's Workshop shows the interplay of the events through the several days of the program. (We believe that, with the experience we have had, we can reduce the Workshop program from eight to six days and plan to do so next year.) I will discuss the methods and learning opportunities of the various events in the order in which members first encounter them.

1986 Workshop on Understanding Clinical Experience
SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

	Wed.	Th.	Fri.	Sat.	Mon.	Tu.	Wed.	Th.
Intro	AD	AD	SG	AD	AD	CE	RA	
	AD	SG	SG	CE	SG	SG	SG	WR
	SG	CE	CE	RA	CE	CE	CE	RA
	RA	RA	RA	--	RA	RA	AD	--

Key:

Intro = Introduction	RA = Review and Application Group
AD = Academic Discussion	CE = Collaboration Event
SG = Study Group	WR = Workshop Review

Introduction - The Workshop opens with a session in which members have the opportunity for an initial examination of the Workshop program and the premises on which it is based. The tasks of this session are crossing the boundary, entering the Workshop and commencing the establishment of working relationships. The format of this introductory session is traditional: The staff sits facing the membership, the director makes an opening statement and invites questions and discussion. Nevertheless, members have been alerted by the Workshop Syllabus that they are embarking on an unfamiliar learning experience, which they hope to adapt to the agenda of their diverse needs, and anxieties engendered by these factors are already present in the Introduction. If the Workshop does nothing else for its members, it at least reacquaints them with the difficulties of inexperienced clients working with professionals in an unfamiliar discipline.

Academic Discussion Event - The task of this event is discussion of issues pervasively relevant to clinical experience. The Workshop text provides a structure for organizing members' discussion and a starting point for those with limited prior experience of explicit exploration of these issues. Chapter topics include: Treatment: Clinics' and Clients' Shared Task (cognitive learning, learning skills, and adjusting roles and relationships); "Understanding . . ." (reality testing, managing

individuals' boundaries, and processing information and values); Working in Groups (influences of group cultures, shared emotional experiences in groups, role behavior, and intergroup relations); Individuals' Tasks (growth and development, managing anxiety, and grieving); Clinics' Tasks and Organization; and Development and Reform. Because the entire membership works together in the Academic Discussion, it is a significant opportunity to look at clinical work from diverse professional viewpoints. The format of this event is the most traditional academic setting in the Workshop.

The Study Group Event is the first laboratory event which members encounter. The Syllabus states:

The task of this event is to develop members' understanding of their present experience of the exercise of authority, responsibility, and leadership in the Study Group Event. Study Groups will be composed of a consultant and no more than twelve members, drawn to the extent feasible from diverse professions. Consultants will participate in the Study Groups in such manner as will in their judgments best facilitate members' work on the Study Group task.

In contrast to the traditional and familiar structure of the Academic Discussion Event, the Study Group is, for many members, strange and disorienting. The usual paraphernalia of academia are absent, except for a circle of chairs, one for each member and the consultant. As the event begins, members are given no explanation or directions regarding what they should do and only have the guidance of the statement regarding the Study Group and its task in the Syllabus (the paragraph above). Because consultants to the Study Groups cannot read members' minds or tell them what their experience is, consultants comment on events in the Study Group only when they believe they have an understanding of their own experience which they judge may be helpful to the group's work. While our understanding of our own and others' behavior is the basis on which we make decisions in social situations, our understanding of behavior is usually tacit and unexamined. Increasing facility in examining and assessing current experience should increase the effectiveness and responsibility of clinical work, but members typically resist open and shared examination of the illusiveness and complexity of their present Study Group experience. Members frequently feel frustration that consultants do not provide clearer guidance and a more familiar style of leadership, and only through their Study Group work do members come to recognize their own responsibilities in the present situation. In spite of the stresses and discomforts of the Study Group, many members come to think of the Study Group Event as the most engaging and rewarding learning experience in the Workshop.

Review and Application Groups - Coming at the end of the day, Review and Application Group sessions are an opportunity to step back from the ebb and flow of Workshop dynamics, to try to make sense in an over all way of what is going on. As stated in the Syllabus:

In Review and Application Groups members can discuss the relevance of

the Workshop's theoretical materials to members' experience of Workshop events, examine members' and staff's roles in Workshop events, and explore the applicability of Workshop learning to members' professional work. . . . To the extent feasible, Review and Application Groups will be composed of members from the same or closely related disciplines or work roles.

The Collaboration Event provides members an opportunity to plan and execute their own event working on the Workshop's task, which is: "to increase members' ability to understand clinical experience." By the time members encounter the Collaboration Event, they have experienced sessions of all the other events which the Workshop design provides (with the exception of the final Workshop Review). With that experience they are in a position to contribute to the structure of the Workshop to meet their special needs in increasing their ability to understand clinical experience. As members do so, they have the opportunity to reflect on their present experience of designing an organization for the accomplishment of a task.

The membership is faced in the Collaboration Event with the problems of organizing itself to explore options regarding task, structure, and methods, to make decisions, and to carry them out. Working as a committee of the whole has its difficulties and costs, while working in subgroups raises problems of intergroup relations, including problems of representation. Group representation and intergroup issues are present in this event in any case as the member group is differentiated from the staff group in role and in task and, therefore, must represent itself to the staff if it wishes to conduct transactions with the staff as consultants or management. Intergroup relations are implicated as well by the fact that members carry with them their memberships in other groups: professional and personal. To the extent members seek staff consultation, consultants try to help member groups identify factors which are facilitating and impeding their work. But members frequently have difficulty agreeing to seek consultation, feeling the ambivalence towards seeking and using help typical of clients in clinical contexts generally.

In the Collaboration Event members must allocate scarce resources to exploring and choosing options, to developing plans, and to executing them. Available resources include time (seven 75 minute Workshop sessions), work space, staff consultation services (available by agreement between staff and member groups), members' personal resources, and information (including information which members bring with them from prior experience and information which they develop through their work in the event). To the extent the membership group, subgroups of it, and the staff work in different places, they do not share the same sources of information, and how members cope with this information problem will depend on how member groups manage their group boundaries.

The Academic Discussion, Study Group, Collaboration Event, and Review and Application Group are the events which occur in several sessions over the course of the Workshop. As these events interact in the Workshop program, members may examine and critique how the staff has adopted

different methods, structures, and styles of leadership for diverse subtasks in the overall Workshop design.

Workshop Review - Near the end of the Workshop, members and staff meet in plenary session to review Workshop experience and learning and to assess unfinished business. This event is a final opportunity to examine this "clinical" experience with all elements of the Workshop present.

The final event within the Workshop boundary is a Review and Application Group session. Because the intent is for learning to continue, we will be offering this year Follow-up Review and Application sessions five and ten months after the Workshop.

As stated in the introduction to my text:

The social transactions and influences which comprise a system through which professional help is given and received are complex. The individuals participating in various roles in the process are influenced by their past, by the groups to which they belong, and by the multitude of life's problems and opportunities with which they are coping. The potentials for intimacy, dependency, aggressive competition, and conflicts of interest inherent in helping relationships evoke anxieties. Professionals and clients cope with their feelings of discomfort in accordance with their individual styles and with their sense of what is acceptable to their colleagues, their profession, their families and to the other groups important to them. Since work groups, including educational ones, structure themselves and their work in ways which will minimize recurrent, pressing discomforts, the systems through which professionals educate and help their clients may be studied impart as defenses against the anxieties of the work.

. . . Seeking [to understand clinical experience] is not a modes ambition as to do so requires an understanding of human behavior, of the nature of knowledge and of relevant events and of how these factors interact to become law, medicine, psychology, theology, or other professional discipline. As elusive as such understanding is, individuals engaged in social systems, such as those through which professional services are rendered and received, must act on such understanding as they have; they are infrequently in a position to call time out for scientific measures and controls, and they act on such mental images (models) of human behavior and social processes which they carry in their minds. These models may be more or less primitive, articulate or in awareness (conscious), but in any case they influence clients' and professionals' action decisions, including the goals they select and the effectiveness and responsibility with which they pursue those goals.

To work profitably in the Workshop on Understanding Clinical Experience, a member must accept that increasing understanding of human social behavior is possible and desirable. The Workshop differs from traditional "Tavistock" group relations conferences in two respects. The

first is the Workshop's focus on clinical experience, rather than on group experience more generally. The second is that the Workshop contains supportive and didactic elements not found in typical "Tavistock" conferences: the Academic Discussion Event, the increased frequency of Review and Application Groups, and the invitation in the collaboration Event to respond to members' needs as they view them. These features make the Workshop especially useful with professional groups, of which lawyers are only one, in which explicit and deep examination of the human relations aspects of work is counter-cultural. The Workshop, as we have offered it, has been aimed at interdisciplinary study of clinical experience, but the Workshop format could also be used within an established clinical education program which wanted to add a learning component to its work regarding how the structure of a clinical organization, and how authority is exercised within it, affects the services which the clinic renders its clients.

CLINICAL PROGRAM ALUMNI -- AN UNTAPPED FUNDING SOURCE

By
Stephen Wizner, Yale

"Dear Steve"

Enclosed is the first check that I have written and sent to Yale since the last time tuition was due I've been content to transfer the traditional Yale fund raising requests from mailbox to recycling box. Granted, Yale gives one a fine legal education . . . but it has very few structural incentives to keep students from the lures and wiles available to the rich and powerful. Certainly, LSO¹ is no panacea. Many students view it as a means of getting practical experience with nose held firmly all along. Nevertheless, it does have the potential of sparking the resources of social justice and meaningful work that must be buried even in the law students of this generation. For that reason, I'm glad to send you the enclosed contribution.

Best of Luck,

Phil"

The sentiments expressed in this letter are typical of the responses we receive to our fund-raising letters to Yale Law School alumni who participated in the clinical program. For the past two years we have been writing to all of our former students, soliciting their financial support for the clinical program. The response has been good, especially in view of the minimal effort we have expended, and suggests that there are law school alumni in significant numbers (many of whom do not contribute to the law school alumni fund) who will support clinical legal education if asked. Based on our limited experience, we believe that clinical program

¹ Yale's clinical program, The Jerome N. Frank Legal Services Organization, is known as "LSO".

alumni represent an important, untapped funding source.

Two years ago we proposed to the Law School administration that we be permitted to try fundraising with clinical program alumni. Initially we met with resistance because law school alumni fund staff were opposed to restricted gifts to the Law School, and wary of "competing" with the clinical program in fundraising. We agreed to furnish a list of clinical program alumni from the preceding 15 years for analysis of their giving record.

The analysis disclosed that our 1000 clinical alumni had a poor record of giving to the law school. A significantly higher proportion of them than law school alumni generally had never given to the alumni fund. Of those who had contributed, the average amount of their gifts was significantly lower than that of alumni generally.

There are several possible explanation for what we found. It may be that clinical program participants are more alienated from the law school than their non-clinical classmates. Perhaps clinical program alumni are more likely to take lower paying legal services, public interest, government and small firm jobs than other law school alumni. Clinical program alumni may be more likely to concentrate their charitable giving on causes other than alumni funds. Or it may be simply that clinical program alumni have not been offered an appealing opportunity to give financial support to something they care about.

Whatever the explanation, if the Yale experience is in any way typical, clinical program alumni as a group constitute an important potential source of financial support for clinical legal education.

In June, 1984 we sent a solicitation letter to 1136 clinical program alumni:

We are writing to ask you to contribute to the Yale Law School Fund, on behalf of LSO. Arrangements have been made with the Law School for LSO to increase its budget by means of this direct fundraising appeal to our own LSO alumni And contributions are fully tax deductible.

We felt that it was important to emphasize that alumni contributions would increase the clinical program budget, not relieve the Law School of its responsibility for supporting our program. And, of course, we wanted to emphasize that we were seeking tax-deductible charitable gifts.

We need the money for two purposes. First, to establish an LSO Litigation Fund. Second, to expand our clinical faculty [T]he current law school students and their clients need an improved and expanded clinical program Our clients in prisons, mental hospitals, and the ghettos of New Haven -- the seventh poorest city in the nation -- need all the legal help they can get. Fortunately, student interest in LSO is continuing to rise But we lack the resources to teach

all of them with the kind of careful supervision and attention they and the clients need. The kind you got (close enough, but not too close) With your help, an expanded clinical program will not have to shut its doors to students and clients who want what LSO has to offer. And with a real LSO Litigation Fund we finally will be able to afford the depositions, expert witnesses, and other litigation expenses our indigent clients cannot finance themselves.

Having told our prospective contributors what we planned to do with their money, we closed with a direct pitch for money.

Whatever sort of work you are doing now, we hope your interest continues, and that you will help us, our current generation of law students and clients. . . . We hope you will fill out the enclosed reply card and return it with your tax deductible contribution.

Without further solicitation by personal contact or telephone follow-up, almost 22% of those who received the letter, 246 alumni, made contributions averaging nearly \$75, a total of \$18,120. We are advised by Alumni Fund staff that these results are surprisingly good, considering the fact that we only sent a letter.

In addition, after our letter went out, one of our alumni made a gift to the Law School of \$20,000 for the purpose of endowing a fellowship to pay a stipend to a law student employed in the clinical program during the summer.

The following year we again wrote to our alumni:

Last year, we asked you to contribute money to help LSO. Thanks to your help, we raised over \$18,000. As a result, we were able to establish a small litigation fund and to expand our clinical faculty by adding an additional attorney working on a half-time basis.

During the past year, we have accomplished a lot. We offered Legal Assistance and Trial Practice courses during both semesters. Our litigation fund increased our capacity to use experts and discovery procedures, enabling us to represent our clients more effectively and to broaden the educational experience of our students. While we are not much higher tech than you remember, we have purchased computer and video equipment.

The work of the clinic remained ambitious and varied. Students worked on cases involving the rights of handicapped persons (including the right of children with AIDS to attend school); the rights of women in the prison system of Connecticut; the rights of mentally ill and mentally retarded adults and children; and a wide variety of "poverty law" issues. Students appeared before the Court of Appeals for the Second

Circuit in cases involving the parole rights of federal prisoners, as amicus to the Connecticut Supreme Court in a case involving the rights of foster children; and in federal and state trial courts in cases involving juvenile delinquency, housing problems, child custody disputes, sentence modification, parole recission procedures, and the substantive rights of prisoners, including the rights of imprisoned sex offenders to hormone therapy. Students also represented clients in administrative proceedings involving matters such as Social Security benefits, unemployment compensation, parole release, and deportation.

In addition, through the generosity of one of our alumni, LSO received a gift of \$20,000 for the purpose of establishing a fellowship for students working at LSO during the summer. This special endowment is the first of its kind for LSO.

We have high hopes for the future . . . Among other things, we would like to increase our capability to work on housing problems and homelessness. Both of these areas offer unique educational experiences and address overwhelming needs in the New Haven community. We are planning additional instruction in legal ethics and complex civil litigation. In short, we are continuing to make LSO as vibrant and exciting an educational and public service program as possible within the limitations of our resources.

As you must have guessed by now, we need your help. . . We hope you will contribute again this year, and that you will consider increasing your contribution. If you have already given to the Yale Law School Fund, please make a special contribution on behalf of LSO. As you know, all contributions to the Law School are tax deductible.

We will not know before the end of the year the results from this year's letter. All indications are that we will receive approximately the same amount in gifts as last year. What we do know is that a great many of our clinical program alumni share the feelings expressed by a recent contributor.

"Dear Steve,

Your recent fund raising letter was a real pick-me-up. In an age in which too many law students pursue wealth and prestige without even blushing at the mention of other values, it is nice to see that LSO is still helping students face the real responsibilities of our profession [T]hese were the reasons that I continue to feel so indebted to Yale Law School generally

Yours,

Peter"

SHORT STUFF

Joe Harbaugh, American, was elected to a three year term on the Council of A.B.A. Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar.

Keith Bystrom, Oklahoma, has been named Associate Dean there.

Peter Hoffman, Nebraska, spoke at an American Enterprise Institute Conference entitled "Maximizing Access to Justice for Poor Persons" held in Washington, D.C. on November 12. The topic of his remarks was "The Need for Innovation in Public Legal Services and Law School Clinics."

JOBS

BUFFALO

The State University of New York at Buffalo Law School invites candidates for permanent tenure track clinical positions. Criteria for appointment include experience in practice that relates to our clinical program, the ability to be a highly competent teacher in various clinical settings, an interest in the methods and theory of clinical education, and the capacity to undertake significant scholarship. Salary range of \$42,000 to \$45,000 for rank of Assistant or Associate Professor. The Law School and the University are Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Employers.

Interest candidates should apply to the: Law School Appointments Committee, 319 O'Brian Hall, SUNY at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York 14260.

GEORGETOWN

Georgetown University Law Center is now accepting applications for a graduate fellowship from candidates who want to develop their skills as clinical law teachers. The Advocacy Fellow selected will work in the Center for Applied Legal Studies, one of Georgetown's clinical programs, with Karen Bouton, Yvonne Cherena, David Koplow, and Philip Schrag. The fellow will supervise students who are responsible for handling the Clinic's cases, and will share responsibility for planning and executing classroom instruction in the Clinic. There will also be the opportunity for the Fellow to undertake scholarly research and writing and to participate directly in agency hearings, litigation, or other legal proceedings, particularly during months when classes are not in session.

The instructional methodology used in the Clinic is somewhat similar to that described in Meltsner and Schrag, "Scenes from a Clinic," 127 U. Pa. L. Rev. 1 (1978). A more recent work elaborating one aspect of our pedagogy is Aiken, Koplow, Lerman, Ogilvy and Schrag, "The Learning Contract in Legal Education," 44 U. Md. L. Rev. 1047 (1985). Persons interested in this Fellowship should read both articles before applying.

The fellowship runs from July 1, 1987, to June 30, 1989. The Fellow

selected will receive full tuition and fees in the LL.M. program of the University, as well as a stipend. The amount of the stipend (currently a tax-free payment of \$15,350 per year) has not yet been determined, but will be final shortly. Upon successful completion of the program, the Fellow will be granted the degree of Master of Laws (Advocacy). In addition to working in the Clinic, the Fellow will be expected to produce published scholarship during the Fellowship period. Any person who has graduated from an accredited law school (or who will have graduated by June 1987) may apply for a Fellowship. The Fellow will be required to become a member of the District of Columbia Bar.

To apply, send a resume and a detailed statement of interest to: Professors David A. Koplow and Philip G. Schrag, Georgetown University Law Center, 600 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20001. The statement of interest might include reactions to or a critique of either of the two cited articles. Since the clinic also emphasizes the role in lawyering of interpersonal relations and sensitivity to group dynamics, applicants might comment upon their experiences and interests in this area. The application deadline is December 1, 1986.

GEORGETOWN

Georgetown Law Center is seeking to fill a full time clinical professor position on a long term contract track beginning July 1, 1987. The person hired will be responsible for training and supervising the litigation of 1st year Prettyman Legal Interns and Stiller Fellows who are LL.M. candidates. Additionally, he or she will be responsible for classroom teaching in the Criminal Justice Clinic and will assist second year Interns and Fellows in their supervision of third year law students in the clinic. Writing is an essential component for advancement on this track.

Applicants should have substantial criminal litigation experience, be admitted to the D.C. Bar or capable of securing admission by August 1987, and have superior academic credentials.

Interested persons should send a resume with references before January 15, 1987 to Professor Wallace Mlyniec, Coordinator of Clinical Education, 600 New Jersey Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Wally Mylanic and Bill Greenhalgh will be in Los Angeles at the AALS Meeting and will be available to talk with interested persons.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER FELLOWSHIPS

Georgetown University Law Center is seeking 20-24 graduate fellows in its clinical program. Each Fellowship lasts for two years, offers an LL.M. degree and pay around \$19,000 per year. Recent graduates as well as more experienced lawyers are eligible. Five Fellowships are available in the Prettyman/Stiller Legal Intern Program specializing in Criminal or Juvenile Litigation, four in the Institute for Public Representation which litigates various issues involving the public interest and one each in

CALS, Appellate Litigation, Street Law and the Harrison Institute which specializes in Tenant and Housing law. In addition the Women's Law and Public Policy Fellowship is sponsored through Georgetown. 10 non degree Fellowships are awarded in the program.

For more information, write directly to the specific Clinical Program at Georgetown University Law Center, 25 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

KANSAS

University of Kansas School of Law is seeking well qualified lawyers for positions beginning with academic year 1987-88. These positions are contingent upon the availability of funding and include permanent, visiting, 12-month, 9-month, semester, and summer session appointments. Positions can include tenure-track appointments in clinical education. Applicants must hold J.D. or LL.B. with an outstanding academic record from an accredited law school. Significant legal experience is preferred. For information, contact Professor Elenor P. Schroeder, Faculty Recruitment Committee, School of Law, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. We are an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer.

MAINE

The University of Maine School of Law seeks applicants or nominees for the position of a tenure-track Clinical Law Professor and/or a Clinical Program Director, depending on the qualifications of the applicant. Preference will be given to those persons who have an outstanding record of academic achievement and a strong general practice background, including trial practice. Prior law teaching experience desirable but not mandatory.

Applications or nominations must be mailed to Professor Judy Potter at the University of Maine School of Law, 246 Deering Avenue, Portland, Maine 04102.

The rank and salary of the position will depend on the qualifications of the applicant or nominee.

The University of Maine System is an equal opportunity employer.

PUGET SOUND

The University of Puget Sound School of Law. Long-term contract position which may or may not include the title and responsibility of Director of the Clinical Law Program. Candidates should have substantial litigation experience in the family or criminal law area. High academic credentials required; teaching experience desirable. Contact Jenifer Schramm, 949 Market Street, Suite 366, Tacoma, WA 98402, (206) 591-2278.

The following positions were listed in the October 17, 1986 AALS Placement Bulletin:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF LAW, LOS ANGELES seeks applicants for teaching positions to begin August 1987 or January 1988. We seek both experienced and beginning teachers for permanent and visiting, clinical and nonclinical positions. In addition, we have a limited number of openings for temporary part-time or full-time law teachers. Our principal though not exclusive interest is in individuals who would like to teach business associations, property and property-related courses and taxation. Qualifications for all positions include excellence in academic legal training and scholarly distinction or promise. Applicants primarily interested in clinical teaching and research should also have clinical or litigation experience, at least two years' bar membership in any jurisdiction, and California Bar membership or willingness to take the California Bar exam no later than July 1987. The School has a special interest in enriching its intellectual environment through further diversification of the range of ideas and attitudes represented within the faculty. We therefore particularly welcome applications from minority group members, women and others whose varying backgrounds may contribute to this end. Contact: Chair, Faculty Appointments Committee, University of California School of Law, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF LAW invites applications for five tenure-track or visiting faculty positions. Applicants are sought for all ranks (i.e., assistant, associate and full professor) and for all areas of law teaching. All first-year course areas and upper-division areas including, but not limited to, the supervision of legal extern/clinical studies, wills and trust, legal profession, antitrust and consumer protection. Applicants must have baccalaureate degree and first professional degree in law from nationally accredited (ABA/AALS) American institutions and an affirmative interest in teaching at an institution committed to both day and evening legal educational opportunities. Previous experience in law teaching or practice experience in area required. Applications and nominations close January 10, 1987. Contact: Chair, Faculty Search Committee, Georgia State University College of Law, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303-3092. Telephone: (404) 658-2044.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW invites applications for several tenure-track positions beginning with the 1987-88 academic year. Candidates with superior academic records and a strong commitment to scholarship are sought. All specialties, including clinical areas, will be considered. Women and minorities are particularly encouraged to apply. Contact: Professor Jesse A. Goldner, Chairman, Faculty Appointments Committee, Saint Louis University School of Law, 3700 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, MO 63108.

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW seeks to fill faculty positions with persons who will teach primarily in the areas of property, oil and gas, wills, trusts, and estates, business associations, securities, civil clinic and other related areas. The positions may be available at the assistant, associate or full professor levels for the academic year 1987-88. The School is seeking to diversify its faculty and to attract women and minority candidates. Contact: Professor Daniel W. Shuman,

Chair, Faculty Appointments Committee, Southern Methodist University School of Law, Dallas, TX 75275.

VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW seeks to interview candidates interested in a full-time permanent teaching position in the following areas: evidence, clinical program and trial practice. Contact: Seymour Moskowitz, Chairman, Faculty Recruitment Committee, Valparaiso University School of Law, Valparaiso, IN 46383.

VERMONT LAW SCHOOL invites applications for regular faculty and visiting positions for the 1987-88 academic year. Strong academic background and high scholarly promise are essential. We prefer persons with teaching and research interests in one or more of the following areas: criminal law, criminal procedure, commercial law, property, civil procedure, commercial law, property, civil procedure, family law and evidence. We also invite applications for persons qualified to direct our Clinic. Candidates with clinical and administrative experience preferred. Contact: Professor Gil Kujovich, Chair, Faculty Appointments Committee, Vermont Law School, South Royalton, VT 05068.

The following position was listed in the November 17, 1986 AALS Placement Bulletin:

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA SCHOOL OF LAW invites applications for possible one year or continuing positions for the nine-month academic year beginning August 16, 1987. Consideration of any applicant will depend on current curricular needs. These needs may include instructors, assistant, associate or full professors in clinical or classroom positions. Candidates should have an excellent academic record in law studies together with law related graduate study or recent successful teaching experience or practice experience plus demonstrable potential for teaching. We will receive applications until a suitable pool of applicants is formed and the position, should one become available, is filled. Contact: Chair, Faculty Selection Committee, University of North Dakota School of Law, Grand Forks, ND 58202.

PUBLICATIONS

ADR

Delgado et al., Fairness and Formality: Minimizing the Risk of Prejudice in Alternative Dispute Resolution, 1985 Wis. L. Rev. 1359

ETHICS

Milord, The Right Choice, 72 A.B.A.J. 62 (Nov. 1, 1986)

TRIAL ADVOCACY

Devitt & Barnum, 10 Tips for Preparing Better Briefs 22 Trial, No. 10, p. 75 (Oct. 1986)

Symposium, Litigation Management, 53 U. Chi. L. Rev. 306 (1986)

GENERAL INTEREST

Reidinger, Civil War in the Ivy, 72 A.B.A.J. 64 (Nov. 1, 1986)

BY CLINICIANS

Moss, The Ethics of Law Practice Marketing, 61 Notre Dame Law. 601 (1986)
(Fred Moss teaches clinic at SMU)

Tonkovich, The Use of Title III Electronic Surveillance to Investigate Organized Crime's Hidden Interests in Gambling Casinos, 16 Rutgers L.J. 811 (1985) (Emil Tonkovich teaches clinic at Kansas)

AALS ANNUAL MEETING

Plans are well in hand for the Clinical Section program during the 1987 AALS Annual Meeting to be held in Los Angeles from Saturday, January 3 through Wednesday, January 17, 1987. The Clinical Section Program is scheduled for the first day, Saturday, January 3. This section of the Newsletter is designed to be ripped off and brought with you to Los Angeles.

OPEN MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
January 2, 1987

8:00 to 10:00 p.m. Open Meeting of Executive Committee.
San Fernando Room. All Invited.
Lobby Level,
Bonaventure Hotel.

CLINICAL SECTION DAY LONG PROGRAM
January 3, 1987

9:00 to 9:30 a.m. CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION - REVIEW OR DEJA VU
San Jose Room. David Barnhizer, Cleveland-Marshall
2nd Floor,
Bonaventure Hotel.

9:30 to 10:30 a.m. § 405(e)
San Jose Room. Northwestern - regular tenure track
2nd Floor, John Elson, Northwestern
Bonaventure Hotel.

NYU - separate clinical tenure track
Randy Hertz, New York University

Georgetown - long term contracts
John Kramer, Tulane

10:30 to 10:45 a.m. Coffee Break

10:45 to 12 noon WORKSHOP FOR BEGINNING CLINICIANS - TEACHING
San Fernando Room. ABILITY
Lobby Level, What Goes In: syllabus, materials, case
Bonaventure Hotel. load, supervision, evaluation, grading
Randy Hertz, New York University
David Medine, Indiana (Bloomington)

10:45 to 12 noon WORKSHOP FOR INTERMEDIATE CLINICIANS -
San Bernadino Room. SCHOLARSHIP
Lobby Level, Traditional, Non-traditional, and Whatever
Bonaventure Hotel. Richard Boswell, Notre Dame
Lois Knight, Boston University
Roy Simon, Washington University (St.
Louis)

- 12 Noon to 1:15 p.m. LUNCHEON - Speaker
 Avalon Room. Robert MacCrate, President, A.B.A. (1987-
 3rd Floor, 1988)
 Bonaventure Hotel.
- 1:30 to 2:45 p.m. WORKSHOPS (simultaneous)
 San Fernando Room. (1) Teaching Substantive Law - Can A Clinician
 Lobby Level, Teach Local Government Law?
 Bonaventure Hotel. Robert Stumberg, Georgetown
- San Bernadino Room. (2) Externships - Do They Have A Place in Law
 2nd Floor, Schools?
 Bonaventure Hotel. Jim Cohen, Fordham
 Liz Cole, Vermont
- 2:45 to 3:00 p.m. Coffee Break
- 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. SEXUAL HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE
 San Jose Room. Supervisor vis a vis Student, or vice versa
 2nd Floor, Susan Ross, Georgetown
 Bonaventure Hotel.
- 4:00 to 4:30 p.m. MISCELLANEOUS - Ask Not What Your School Can Do
 San Jose Room. for a Clinic, Ask What Your Clinic Can Do
 2nd Floor, for Your School.
 Bonaventure Hotel. Wendy Watts, Mercer
- 4:30 to 5:00 p.m. CONFERENCE EVALUATION
- 5:00 tp 6:00 p.m. Business Meeting.
- 9:00 to 10:30 a.m. COMMITTEE MEETINGS
 Suites 308, 309, 310, 312 January 5, 1987
 Sheridan Grand Hotel.

IMPORTANT
 SECTION LUNCHEON

The Section Luncheon will be held on January 3 at noon following the morning session of the Clinical Section Program. The Section's Annual Award given to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution to clinical legal education will be announced at the luncheon. The cost of the luncheon is \$19.00 per person. The luncheon will be held in the Avalon Room of the Bonaventure Hotel located on level three. Tickets may be purchased at the Section program the morning of January 3 from Peter T. Hoffman.

JOINT PROGRAM OF AALS SECTIONS ON CLINICAL EDUCATION
AND LAW AND COMPUTERS

January 6, 1987

2:00 p.m.

Clinical teachers are beginning to use computers to assist in the day to day teaching and lawyering tasks in a variety of ways. The range of the tools being used or developed is from simple organizational aids to applications of artificial intelligence. The two sections have put together a program that will focus on computer usage in clinics with tools that are being used now, rather than plans that are strictly on the drawing board.

Each panelist will discuss and demonstrate a different method of using a micro-computer to assist directly in the teaching or lawyering in a law school clinic. The applications include AFDC eligibility and budgeting determinations, trial preparation assistance, and case planning and analysis combined with automated document production. We hope that the programs shown will be available to other teachers at a reasonable cost, and that they will be usable by all interested teachers, including those who have little or no knowledge of computers. All of the programs run on IBM or compatible micromcomputers, and in some cases other computers as well.

The program will also address some of the major issues relating to how the use of computers may fundamentally alter both the substance and methods of teaching law and of lawyering. In many ways the implications are very speculative, awaiting experience with larger scale use of computer assistance. In some instances there may be precedent for examining how teachers have adapted to or incorporated technological change and its effects on the profession.

The participants will be:

Marc Lauritsen, Executive Director of Project Pericles and Director of Clinical Programs, Harvard Law School.

Michael J. Norwood, Professor and Director of Clinical Programs, University of New Mexico School of Law.

Robert F. Seibel, Senior Lecturer and Associate Director of Cornell Legal Aid Clinic, Cornell Law School.

Moderator:

Karen Czapanskiy, Associate Professor, University of Maryland School of Law.

SECTION ON WOMEN IN LEGAL
EDUCATION PROGRAM
January 4, 1987
9:00 a.m.

The Section on Women in Legal Education is sponsoring a panel entitled "Sexual Harassment in Academe" at the AALS Annual Meeting on Sunday, January 4, 1987 from 9:00 a.m. to Noon. The speakers will be Chris Littleton, UCLA; Taunya Banks, Tulsa; Monroe Freedman, Hofstra; and Kitty Mackenua. Since there are more women employed by law schools in clinical capacities than in any other teaching category, this program may be of particular interest to them.

Clinical teachers may join the Section at no cost by writing Jane LaBarbara, AALS, 1 DuPont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.