



SECTION ON

NEWSLETTER

CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION

September, 1983

Reply to:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

By

Kandis Scott

Is the Section doing its job? To answer with jargon: We can know only if we get some "feedback." In Letters to the Editor of our Newsletter fervent Emily from Ely and eloquent Andy from Anchorage could criticize, suggest, or just comment on clinical education generally. Such Letters would seem to be an easy way for clinicians to share their views and keep the Section responsive to its members.

Committee members try to represent the interests of all clinicians, but they cannot be sure of doing so because their work lacks publicity and response. For example, since the Section surveyed its members early this year to learn their opinions about ABA Proposed Accreditation Standard 405(e) (improved faculty status for clinicians), there has been little comment from the membership to guide our advocates on this issue. In another regard, there have been some changes in the Newsletter which have not received mention. What are our members' reactions?

This Newsletter provides more information about the professional concerns of clinical law teachers than any other publication. Historically, the Newsletter has contained information about "union" issues, such as announcements of Section activities and reports on hiring and tenure rules, written by the Editor, and a few others. Last issue two short pieces on the substance of our work: negotiation and clinical curricular design, supplemented the traditional content. In this issue you will find several articles describing developments in the use of computers in clinical education.

Personally, I hope these pieces on substantive matters continue. The Newsletter could also print summaries of articles written by clinicians (see the first step in this direction on page 25). Such digests would help us keep current with the available literature and would facilitate an exchange of ideas about our work. Too, the Newsletter could publish evaluations of the videotapes now being marketed to law schools (see page 10). This would save clinicians the time of viewing inapplicable tapes and the expense of unnecessary purchases.

Changes such as these require work from new volunteers; no Newsletter Editor can take on the greater burden. And this returns us to feedback.

Are the recent changes worth the extra effort? What changes would you like?

As you will read in this issue, the Standards Review Committee of the American Bar Association has not yet approved 405(e). Several people have proposed new language recently. Those who represent our interests in the committees where decisions are being made are like legislators: They must remain open to compromises while remembering their principles and the interests of their constituents. You can help with this difficult task. As you read about the latest developments in this Newsletter and evaluate them in light of your personal interests, let the members of the Faculty Status Committee know your feelings. That group can keep our representatives informed. Send more general comments on faculty status to the Newsletter.

I invite your Letters to the Editor--to improve accountability and to make the Newsletter more of an exchange of ideas, and perhaps to protest the use of "feedback."

FACULTY STATUS COMMITTEE: Chair, Rod Jones, Southwestern; Rick Barron, San Diego; Bob Doyel, Mississippi; Jim Doyle, Georgetown; Doug Frenkel, Penn., Karen Tokarz, Wash.-St. Louis.

COMMITTEE NOTES

CHANGES IN COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS PROPOSED

Roy Stuckey, Chair-elect of the Section, has announced his intention to designate the Section's committee chairs for 1984 and as many committee members as possible and to publish the lists in the next issue of the Newsletter. This will enable the Section's committees to plan meetings during the AALS Annual Meeting in San Francisco (January 4-7, 1984).

In this regard, Roy asks everyone who wants to serve on a committee during 1984 to let him or another member of the Executive Committee know as soon as possible. As in past years, every effort will be made to find a committee assignment for those who volunteer to work. Roy is also interested in hearing from you if you have an idea for a new committee that should be created or if you have any other thoughts about new services which the Section could provide for clinical teachers:

Call or write Roy at:

U.S.C. Law School
Columbia, S.C. 29208
(803) 777-2278

Other members of the Section's Executive Committee are:

Kandis Scott, Chair, Santa Clara

Bea Frank, N.Y.U.
Jennifer Rochow, Boston College
John Capowski, Maryland
Barbara Schwartz, Iowa
Rod Jones, Southwestern
Lonnie Rose, Kansas
Peter Hoffman, Editor, Newsletter, Nebraska
Elliott Milstein, previous chair, American

The Section's standing committees include:

- a. Annual Meeting Program
- b. Awards
- c. Nominating
- d. National and Regional Training Program

The Section's special committees include:

- a. Teaching Materials
- b. Political Interference
- c. Faculty Status
- d. Membership
- e. Tenure and Promotion Advisory Project
- f. Clinical Legal Education Coordinating

Two new committees are being considered:

- a. Computer Technology, to be chaired by Clinton Bamberger, Maryland
- b. Integrating Professional Skills Into the Traditional Curriculum, to be chaired by Joe Harbaugh, Temple (visiting at Georgetown for 1983-84)

AALS ANNUAL MEETING PLANS BEING MADE

By
Paul Bergman, UCLA

The Annual Meeting Committee is in the process of assembling a program for the Clinical Section meeting during the AALS 1983 Annual Meeting. This year's Annual Meeting will be held in San Francisco from January 4 through 7.

The Committee has scheduled a full day for the meeting on Thursday, January 5. The morning and early afternoon sessions are designed to be an integrated examination of a variety of teaching methodologies. In the morning, four different sets of clinicians will demonstrate a variety of teaching methods. Each demonstration will consist of a brief discussion followed by actual audience participatory exercises. In the early afternoon session, the audience will be split into approximately six groups. Each group will discuss the use of the demonstrated teaching methods for

different topics. For example, a group might discuss how each teaching method can be applied to negotiation, interviewing, and substantive law topics. The hope is that those attending the Annual Meeting will go home with very concrete ideas about different classroom teaching methods.

Topics and their presenters include:

1. Jim Countiss and John Barkai, Hawaii--"Teaching Direct and Cross Through Lecture in Disguise"
2. Paul Bergman, UCLA--"Non-Legal Role Plays"
3. John Farago and others, Queen's College--"Integrating Clinical and Substantive Teaching"
4. Roger Haydock and John Sonsteng, William Mitchell--"Law Practicum: A Full Semester 12-Credit Course Integrating Clinic Simulation and Field Work Experiences"

Discussion leaders for the early afternoon session include Bob Seiber, Maine; Bob Bloom, Boston College; Roslyn Lieb, Northwestern; Phil Schrag, Georgetown; Alfred Porro, Baltimore; and Jim Klein, Toledo.

For the second afternoon session, those attending will be able to choose from among a number of discussion topics. The Annual Meeting Committee will select three or four topics that it believes will be of wide interest. As of now, those topics have not yet been selected, and Section members are urged to contact Paul Bergman, UCLA, to make their feelings known. In addition, the Committee will have sign-up sheets available at the Annual Meeting, so that if a group of clinicians have a particular interest in a topic which has not been scheduled in advance, they can make themselves known to each other by signing a sheet and arranging to meet during the second afternoon session.

The Committee hopes the meeting has a little something for everyone: an in-depth focus on teaching methods, a variety of topics of current interest, and flexibility for those who have unique concerns.

SECTION'S ACCOUNTING YEAR CHANGED//
MEMBERSHIP DRIVE BEGINS

The Executive Committee of the Section on Clinical Legal Education has decided to change the effective dates for Section membership to a calendar year basis, rather than July 1 - June 30. The immediate consequence of this is that all present dues paid members have had their memberships extended six months. (If you received a copy of this Newsletter, you are considered a dues paid member.)

The membership committee has begun a campaign to solicit new members. Although the committee intends to contact on an individual basis everyone

It can identify as being involved with clinical education, all members of the Section are asked to help. Please check at your schools to make sure that other teachers who'd be likely candidates for Section membership have joined already or are aware of the process for joining. (Some teachers are not aware that dues must be paid; others don't know about the Newsletter.) Although your dues for 1984 don't have to be paid yet, you will be credited for 1984 if you pay now.

General Information About
Membership in the AALS Section
on Clinical Legal Education

How much?

Annual Dues are \$15.00 for teachers at AALS member schools and Canadian Associates. Associate members dues are \$10.00. Note: Associate members who are not at ABA approved schools must pay an additional \$10.00 to join one section of the AALS. Associate members may not vote or hold office in the Section.

Where to send dues?

Send dues to:

Jane M. LaBarbera
Associate Director, AALS
Suite 370, One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

How to find out if you're paid up?

Call Jane LaBarbera: (202) 296-8351

Who'll answer other questions or handle complaints related to membership?

The chair of the membership committee, Roy Stuckey, USC Law School, Columbia, S.C. 29208. (803) 777-2278.

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING MATERIALS

The Committee on Teaching Materials is currently working on concluding its original charge to compile a list of available teaching materials. At the same time it is undertaking a new project of identifying and critiquing articles, video-tapes, teaching exercises, etc. which are relevant to clinical education. A questionnaire will be going out to section members sometime in November requesting information for these projects. Please be sure to complete and return it.

COMMITTEE ON AWARDS

The Awards Committee is extending its deadline until November 1 for receipt of nominations for the AALS Clinical Section Award for Outstanding Contributions to Clinical Legal Education. See the June, 1983 Newsletter for more details. Send your suggestions to Susan Bryant, Hofstra University School of Law, Hempstead, Long Island, New York 11550.

COMMITTEE ON FACULTY STATUS

The June, 1983 Newsletter reported that the Committee on Faculty Status had completed work on the "Handbook on Status of Clinical Law Faculty." Since then the Handbook has been revised and expanded. The cost is \$5.00. For a copy, write: Rod Jones, Southwestern University School of Law, 675 South Westmoreland Ave., Los Angeles, California 90005.

TENURE AND PROMOTION ADVISORY PROJECT

The Tenure and Promotion Advisory Project Committee (TAP) is prepared to assist clinical teachers in their requests for retention, tenure or promotion. Only one person this year has called upon the Committee for help. That person, with the Committee's assistance, was able to convince the chancellor of the university to overrule its tenure and promotion review committee's recommendation on promotion.

The Committee not only can help you in your fight for tenure or promotion, but will also serve as a depository of examples of egregious denials for use in the battle on standard 405(e). Bill Greenhalgh, Georgetown is Chair of the Committee.

BITS AND PIECES

THE CONTINUING SAGA OF STANDARD 405(e)

By

Roy Stuckey, South Carolina

The Standards Review Committee of the ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar failed again to reach a consensus on proposed accreditation standard 405(e). Therefore, the Council of the Section did not have an opportunity to vote on 405(e) during the ABA Annual Meeting in Atlanta. The committee has pledged that it will have a proposal ready for action when the Council meet in December. If the Council approves a new standard, public hearings will be conducted and the issue could be sent to the ABA House of Delegates for approval during the ABA Annual Meeting in Chicago next August.

It is generally believed that the ABA is going to act in some way to improve the status of clinical law teachers. However, it now seems very possible that, if a new standard is to be approved, it may not resemble the

version which has been on the table for the past year. The Standards Review Committee is circulating additional proposals, any one of which could become the one it supports. It's too early to predict what changes would be required under the alternatives which have been discussed so far. Of course the Council may choose to adopt the Committee's recommendations, substitute a version of its own, or decide not to adopt anything.

ABA PROPOSAL ON PAY FOR CLINICAL STUDENTS
From Information Supplied By
Joe Harbaugh, Georgetown

The current policy of the ABA concerning pay for students in a clinical externship is they may not be paid. This policy may soon be changed through a proposal offered to the August, 1983 meeting of the ABA House of Delegates by the Illinois State Bar Association and supported by the ABA's Young Lawyers Division:

BE IT RESOLVED, that the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association recommends that law schools provide students with opportunities to receive credit for properly supervised, clinical, legal work for which the student may also receive compensation; in accordance with Standard 306 of the American Bar Association Standards for the Approval of Law Schools.

The House of Delegates deferred action on the proposal and referred the matter back to the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. In turn, the Council, at its August meeting, referred the proposal to its Standards Review Committee. The Committee will consider the matter at its October/November meeting. The Committee also will conduct a public hearing on the proposal during the AALS Annual Meeting in San Francisco, January 4-7, 1984. The proposal probably will be back before the House of Delegates at the February Mid-Year Meeting in Las Vegas.

The issue of pay for clinical extern students is of great importance to clinical teachers. A majority of the AALS/ABA Joint Task Force on Clinical Legal Education concurred with the present ABA policy. A change in the policy raises a number of questions. Can we supervise the education of large numbers of students working in a variety of public and private settings? Are we confident students in such settings will not only "learn" but will be "educated" about the law and lawyering? Are there any articulable standards to differentiate between paid law clerk positions? Will this mean that any student who can find a paying law job of, say 15 hours a week, must be awarded 3 hours of credit? Will the creation of such clinical offerings allow us to conduct a meaningful skills class which tries to draw together individual student experiences into a generalized theory of sound lawyering? Will any student who has the choice of receiving credit and compensation ever choose only the credit which is awarded in a school based program? Will it become a newly-styled apprenticeship program with the added bonus of money?

Because we as clinical teachers should help to formulate the answers to these and other questions, we should contact our deans and try to influence their comments to the Standards Review Committee. We also should write directly to the Committee (Dean Gordon Schaber of McGeorge is Chair) about our experiences with externships. Finally we should be prepared to testify at the public hearings in San Francisco.

PLANNING COMMITTEE APPROVED FOR 1984 CLINICAL
TEACHERS TRAINING CONFERENCE

The Planning Committee for the 1984 AALS Clinical Teachers Training Conference has been appointed by the president of the AALS, David H. Vernon, and will meet in Washington, D.C., on October 29th. The Conference is authorized to run for a full week at a date (traditionally early Summer) and place (the location is shifted every year) to be determined later.

The Conference has been held annually since 1977, in which year the purposes of the conferences were described as follows:

The first national conference for training law teachers involved in clinical education is being held as an attempt to respond to the special needs of clinical education. Its focus is on providing guidance to relatively inexperienced clinical teachers on how to organize and teach throughout clinical methods. Beyond that, however, is an equally important purpose of trying to get a sense about who we are as clinicians and the special capabilities of the combination of methodologies commonly termed clinical. Even though the "clinical revolution" is only a decade old, we are in the third generation of clinical teachers and, while significant advancements have occurred in the conception of clinical education, there has been too little communication in this regard.

The process of communication, therefore, is one of the fundamental reasons this conference has been organized. To expand the lines and nature of the dialogue between clinical teachers and to gain essential momentum to carry forward into the next 5-7 year period when decisions will be made concerning whether clinical education will be finally accepted as an essential part of the legal curriculum or be relegated to a secondary status.

The success of the first six conferences is a matter of record. Clinical courses and clinical teachers have been improved through its programs. There is effective communication today among clinical teachers through the formal and informal networks which have grown out of the meetings, and there is no indication that the momentum of clinical education is in danger of subsiding. However, despite the success of the

Conference in prior years, it has been suggested that it is now time to redefine its purposes and format.

The Planning Committee will consider what changes, if any, should be made when it meets on October 29th. The Committee wants to hear from everyone who has an opinion about any aspect of the Conference (the more specific, the better). The questions which must be answered by the Planning Committee include:

- a. what should be the primary goals of the conference?
- b. how should the program be structured to achieve these goals? and
- c. who should be invited to serve on the faculty?

The Planning Committee hopes to hear from you. Its members are: Roy Stuckey, chair, South Carolina, (803) 777-2278; Joe Harbaugh, Georgetown, (202) 624-8339; Elliott Milstein, American, (202) 686-3872; Jennifer Rochow, Boston College, (617) 552-4388; and Kandis Scott, Santa Clara, (408) 554-1945.

CALIFORNIA BAR BEGINS EXAMINING FOR
LAWYERING SKILLS

By
Roy Stuckey, South Carolina

This summer for the first time, the California Bar Exam included a "Performance Test" as a part of the regular examination for all applicants. The "Performance Test" was given on one of three days of the Bar Exam. The other two days were devoted to the Multistate Exam and traditional essay questions.

The "Performance Test" consisted of two problems, each taking three hours to complete. One problem required applicants to respond to a memorandum from a supervising partner in the firm who'd interviewed a client/plaintiff in a personal injury case. The applicants were asked to identify what legal theories were available based on the facts and cases included in the problem, to anticipate the opponents' contentions, and to discuss the factual or proof problems at trial as well as to indicate what further facts were needed.

The second problem provided a file and a library and the applicants were asked to distinguish relevant from irrelevant facts, analyze the legal authorities provide, and prepare two memoranda of law: one being a memorandum of points and authorities in opposition to a motion to intervene. For both memos, students were instructed "to draft the most persuasive arguments" they could.

In both parts of the "Performance Test" multiple choice questions were also asked.

Copies of the California Bar Exam are being distributed to all law schools.

Representatives of the California Bar Examiners and others conducted a meeting in Atlanta during the ABA Annual Meeting about the Performance Testing experience. They explained the history of the California experience with examinations on lawyering skills and the rationale behind this year's test structure and topics. While admitting that the test presently continues to focus on analytical skills more than performance skills, they pointed out that the major innovation of the test is the attention to fact gathering, and appraisal and analysis of fact situations that contain large amounts of irrelevant as well as relevant facts. Most striking however, was the announcement that the California Bar Examiners intend for this to have been the first step in a continuing development of an examination which will eventually (but not too far in the future) test applicants on interviewing, counseling, negotiating, and trial skills. It was also reported that the National Conference of Bar Examiners, which has helped fund the California experiment, has the option of picking up the project once the experimentation stage is completed and could make performance testing available on a national basis.

The panel at the ABA meeting also reported that prior testing experience had shown a direct correlation between performance on the test and courses in law school --- those students who'd had instruction in professional skills fared better on the "Performance Test" than others. This has created a rapidly growing demand by students in California that law schools provide enough courses in professional skills for all students.

ABA TASK FORCE ON PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE
ISSUES FINAL REPORT

By

Roy Stuckey, South Carolina

The final report of the ABA Task Force on Professional Competence is very similar to the interim report issued last year. Printed versions of the report should be available soon. All clinical teachers should obtain a copy and read it carefully, for many of the task force's recommendations could impact directly on clinical education. On the whole, the report is another strong endorsement of clinical education and professional skills instruction in law schools. Excerpts from the report are set forth below:

--The Task Force has benefited from the Cramton and Foulis Reports previously mentioned. Both reports support a perspective on law schools and legal education in which practical training in lawyering skills is vitally important. The Task Force shares that perspective. Historical and theoretical understanding of law and legal institutions, the development of analytical skills, and legal scholarship employing traditional analytic tools and contemporary empirical research methods are all important. However, the development of legal writing skills, oral communication skills, fact gathering, interviewing, counseling, negotiating, and litigation skills is also important -- these skills are among the fundamental skills of the lawyer. As such they deserve an important place in the law school curriculum. We recognize that many legal educators share this view, and

One Cramton Report, the Foulis Report and this Task Force Report do not break new ground on this point.

----the implementation of [the Cramton and Foulis Committees'] recommendations regarding training in lawyering skills should become a top priority of the ABA.

----non-adversarial aspects of the lawyer's role deserve greater attention, and . . . law schools should devote greater attention to informing students about alternative means of dispute resolution.

----the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar [should] adopt a policy of including clinical law faculty on the inspection teams that serve in the law school accreditation process.

----law schools should make more use of experienced lawyers and judges in instruction.

----the distinctive role and workload of the clinical teacher should be recognized as a desirable and acceptable substitute for the traditional scholarship of a law faculty member in tenure and promotion criteria.

----the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar [should] confer with the National Conference of Bar Examiners to explore the implications of the California experience [in examining clinical skills on bar examinations], and . . . such further experimentation and development of performance testing as may be required [should] be supported by the ABA.

At the recommendation of the Task Force, the ABA is putting together a new entity to be called the ABA Consortium on Professional Competence which will have the task of exchanging information and coordinating overall ABA efforts toward improving professional competence.

COMMERCIALY PRODUCED FILMS AND VIDEOTAPES

More and more commercially produced law-related films and videotapes are becoming available. The flyers and ads make them all sound terrific; the prices make it seem risky to actually find out. If you have bought - or rented - or seen - any of these tapes, why not share your reactions with your fellow clinicians? Your review doesn't have to be elaborate to be helpful; those few pithy sentences which have naturally formed in your mind by the end of viewing the film would probably be enough to help the rest of us decide whether there's any chance the film might suit our purposes or not. Notes regarding student reaction would also be helpful - as well as any suggestions for collateral reading, placement within the course, etc. A tape can also be a handy kickoff for a part of a conference - having reviews available would make it easier for people organizing conferences to find suitable possibilities.

If you've seen or used a tape or film, please take a few minutes to jot down your reactions and send them to:

Jennifer Rochow
Boston College Law School
885 Centre Street
Newton Centre, MA 02159

or you can call and deliver your review verbally: (617) 552-4388.

D.C./MARYLAND CLINICIANS MEET

By

Kaven Czapanskiy, Maryland

The first meeting of clinical law teachers located in Maryland and the District of Columbia was held at the University of Maryland Law School on May 7. Thirty-two faculty members from 9 schools and a consortium program, Law Students in Court, attended the meeting.

The meeting, which was called by Clinton Bamberger of the University of Maryland, was the first opportunity for many of the faculty members to meet their neighboring colleagues. After Clint's opening remarks, Elliott Milstein of American University described proposals relating to faculty status for clinical faculty that are under consideration by the AALS and the ABA. He noted that the proposed changes would affect the futures of all clinical faculty and that they could become effective in presenting their views on the subject by joining the Section on Clinical Legal Education. He also described other projects undertaken by the Section and heartily encouraged clinical faculty members to join.

The second item on the agenda was a presentation by the Harrison Institute for Public Law of the Georgetown University Law Center. Jason Newman, Bob Strumberg, Louise Howells and Barbara Bezdek described the work of the Institute, which provides representation for groups, rather than for individuals. The educational goal of the Institute is the professional role development of the students, with emphasis on strategic planning and negotiation. A sample case was described to demonstrate the process undertaken by the Institute's students and staff to reach the goals. The Institute's clinical methodology places primary responsibility for client representation on the students, who are challenged through a variety of techniques to become aware of how their personal characteristics and emotions affect the legal process and their professional development.

The three-hour meeting lasted for four before breaking for lunch and more talking at the local market. A second meeting to be held in Washington on October 8 is being organized by Carla Rappaport of the Antioch School of Law.

OHIO CLINICIANS GATHER
By
Rhonda Rivera, Ohio State

On June 17th 1983 the Ohio State University College of Law hosted a meeting of Ohio clinical law teachers. This was the first time when all nine law schools had the opportunity to discuss their clinical programs together. In attendance were teachers from Ohio State, Akron, Ohio Northern, Dayton, Cincinnati, and Toledo. The meeting lasted from 9:00 in the morning until 4:00 in the afternoon. The largest part of the program was consumed by a presentation by each school describing its clinical programs. A number of questions were asked about each others' clinical programs and a great deal of information was transmitted. In the afternoon a number of topics were discussed including the change in the Ohio student intern rule regarding felony practice for students, the selection of cases, how students could be attracted to clinical programs, the usual issue of simulation versus hands-on practice as well as a lot of other issues traditionally of interest to clinic teachers. Finally, Professor Harriett Galvin did a presentation on a proposed Ohio State University Law School prosecution clinic.

The University of Dayton offered to host the 1984 meeting. All participants felt that the kick-off meeting was a great success.

For further information, please contact Dean Rhonda R. Rivera of The Ohio State University College of Law, 1659 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43210 or 614-422-6821.

SIXTH ANNUAL MEETING OF CALIFORNIA
CLINICAL CONSORTIUM SCHEDULED

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the California Clinical Consortium has been scheduled for November 4, 5 & 6 at the Marriott Hotel, Berkeley Marina in Berkeley, California. Tentative topics for the conference are:

Evaluating Performance
Storming the Barricades--Skills Training in the Core Curriculum
Field Placement Supervision--Part II
Teaching Games

Contrary to its name, the conference now includes participants from the entire West and Hawaii. Non Westerners are also welcome to attend. If interested contact:

Jeanette Rucci
University of San Francisco
School of Law
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California 94117
(415) 666-6743

Mave Stickgold
Golden Gate University
School of Law
536 Mission Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(415) 442-7299

OREGON ATTORNEY GENERAL APPROVES
PACIFIC NORTHWEST RESOURCES CLINIC

By
Michael Axline, Oregon

The legitimacy of in-house legal clinics was recently reaffirmed in an opinion issued by Oregon's Attorney General. The opinion was written in response to inquiries concerning the propriety of spending state funds to pay the salaries of clinicians teaching an environmental law clinic (the Pacific Northwest Resources Clinic) at the University of Oregon School of Law.

After noting that the University has a broad educational mandate and the statutory authority to prescribe courses of study, the opinion focuses on the benefits of clinical legal education and summarizes:

As is attested to by over 300 Law Review articles, clinical legal education is a fact and such clinics encompass far more areas of law than the four at the University of Oregon. The virtues of clinical legal education are now universally accepted, both in its service and pedagogical settings, and has not only been endorsed by the President of the American Bar Association, but also by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The opinion goes on to conclude that there are no legal barriers to state supported in-house clinics and that the fact that third parties (clients) receive the incidental benefits of the clinical teaching process does not mean that state funds which pay professors' salaries are being spent improperly. The opinion does caution that clinicians must insure that they do not allow the University or law school to influence the handling of cases in which the clinician is representing a client. Allowing an outside body or even a governing board to do anything that might affect the clinician's duty to zealously represent clients' interests would run afoul of DR 5-107(B) and EC 5-23 and -24 of the Code of Professional Responsibility. A copy of the opinion may be obtained by writing Michael Axline or John Bonine at the Pacific Northwest Resources Clinic, University of Oregon School of Law, Eugene, OR 97403.

LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL EXPERIENCE PROGRAM GRANTS ANNOUNCED

The Department of Education has announced the recipients of Law School Clinical Experience Program grants for fiscal year 1983. At this writing, the amounts of the grants are not known. A future issue of the Newsletter will report on prospects for continuing the program in 1984.

School

Program

University of Akron
American University
Antioch School of Law

Trial Litigation Clinic
Appellate Advocacy Clinic
Felony Defense Clinic

University of Arkansas, Little Rock
Boston College

University of Chicago
University of Florida
Gonzaga University
Hamline University
Hofstra University
University of Idaho
University of Kansas
Loyola University of Chicago

University of Maine
University of Maryland-Baltimore

University of Michigan
William Mitchell School of Law
University of New Mexico
New York Law School

Northeastern University
University of Pennsylvania
University of Puerto Rico
University of Santa Clara
Southwestern University

SUNY at Buffalo
Syracuse University
Texas Southern University
University of Toledo
Vanderbilt University

Expansion of Clinical Program
B.C. Legal Assistance Bureau
(Mentally Disabled and Special
Needs Children)
Regulatory Practice Clinic
Civil Clinic
Expansion of Clinical Program
Civil Commitment Defense Clinic
Advocacy for the Elderly Clinic
Clinical Studies Program
Criminal Defender Project
Unemployment Compensation
Project
Family Law Clinic
Attorney General Consumer
Protection Clinic
Child Advocacy Clinic
Practicum Clinic
General Practice Clinic
Mediation Clinic
(Landlord/Tenant)
Prisoner's Rights Clinic
Juvenile Law Clinic
Expansion of Clinical Program
Criminal Defense Clinic
Institute for Disabled and
Elderly
Expansion of Clinical Program
Juvenile Advocacy Clinic
Tax Practice Clinic
Legal Clinic (Civil & Criminal)
Expansion of Clinical Program

JOBS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

The University of Florida College of Law is seeking applicants for two full-time positions that involve clinical work. Both positions are full faculty status, tenure track lines. One involves working in the in-house civil clinical program and will begin in January, 1984. Two years experience in practice is required and membership in the Florida Bar is strongly preferred for this position.

The other position involves teaching simulated clinical courses in trial, law office, and pre-trial skills. This position begins in August of 1984. Two years experience in practice is required.

The current program includes four tenure track faculty. For more information or to apply, contact: Professor Stuart R. Cohn, Chairman,

Faculty Appointments Committee, University of Florida College of Law,
Gainesville, Florida, 32611.

The University of Florida is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Boston University School of Law has an opening for a visiting clinical supervisor in its Defender Program, for the semester beginning January 3, 1984. The position entails supervising 10 students in an urban misdemeanor court, and participating with other members of the clinical faculty in teaching the classroom component of the course. Familiarity with Massachusetts criminal procedure is a requirement. Contact Professor David Rossman, Boston University Law School, 765 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Massachusetts 02215.

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The University of Kansas School of Law is seeking well qualified lawyers for positions beginning with the academic year 1984-85. Tenure track appointments in clinical education may be available. Applicants must hold a J.D. or LL.B. with an outstanding academic record from an accredited law school. Significant legal experience is preferred. For information contact Prof. Sidney A. Shapiro, Faculty Recruitment Committee, School of Law, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. The Law School is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Office of Legal Education in the Department of Justice is seeking two Attorney/Assistant Directors for the Legal Education Institute (LEI) and the Attorney General's Advocacy Institute (AGAI).

The Assistant Director of LEI is responsible for developing and conducting national continuing legal education programs for attorneys and other legal personnel employed by Executive Branch agencies throughout the United States. Excellent writing and organizational skills are required. A background in federal law practice and/or litigation is desirable. Applicants must be member of a Bar. Salary range is GM 13-14 (\$34,930 - \$41,277).

Submit Resume to: Legal Education Institute, Department of Justice, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1034, Washington, D.C. 20530.

The Assistant Director of AGAI is one of three -- the other two Assistant Director positions are filled by Assistant United States Attorneys on one-year rotating basis. Incumbent develops and conducts continuing legal education programs for United States Attorneys and their assistants and for

attorneys in the litigating divisions of the Department of Justice. Experience in litigation, particularly in the Department of Justice (including United States Attorney's office) as well as experience in continuing legal education is desirable. Salary range is GM 13-14 (\$34,900 - \$41,277).

Submit Resume to: Attorney General's Advocacy Institute, Department of Justice, Room 1336, 10th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530.

Applications for both must be received by October 14, 1983. Open until filled. No phone calls please.

COMPUTERS AND THE CLINIC

ABA ANNUAL MEETING INCLUDES PROGRAM ON COMPUTER ASSISTED LEGAL EDUCATION

By
Roy Stuckey, South Carolina

Computer technology is advancing more rapidly than its possible to track. Suddenly, it seems, clinical teachers are being confronted with more computer programs than we know how to use, and our offices are generally ill-equipped to assimilate any state of the art. If there was ever a question about what the future holds, rest assured that there is more to come - much more.

Until recently, most computer applications of interest to clinical teachers focused on office management: word processors, docket control systems, time accounting, file management, and the like. Then came computer assisted legal research: Lexis and Westlaw. A few applications related to legal writing and legal bibliography floated around (and some major new programs are reportedly in the works at present). But there was really nothing that we could use to help our students learn to represent clients more effectively . . . nor even help them learn the law or develop particular skills.

The situation is about to change dramatically. The Center for Computer Assisted Legal Instruction offered a day long program during the ABA Annual Meeting in Atlanta which highlighted some of the work its doing to produce programs to help teach law, procedure, and skills. The Center was established in June, 1982, by the University of Minnesota Law School and Harvard Law School. It is a nonprofit corporation created to support the development and use of computer-based aids for teaching and learning law in law schools and for continuing legal education. To carry out this purpose, the Center gives assistance to law professors and lawyers working to create new computer aids, and it provides information and assistance to law schools and others in uses of the computer. Membership in the Center is open to all AALS-accredited law schools, and twenty-five law schools are now members.

The Center presently has fifteen completed exercises and another fifteen or so are in various stages of completion. The existing programs are concentrated in four areas: torts, professional responsibility, evidence and trial advocacy. Unlike many computer exercises, these programs do more than provide students with "right" or "wrong" responses to their answers. All of them provide students with more of an analysis of their answers or information about the issue being examined. Some even try to engage in a quasi-Socratic dialogue with students to lead them toward the right answers.

None of the programs are intended to substitute for an entire course. Rather, they are being used as (1) outside reading; (2) review of something that happened in class; or (3) preparation for class.

A sampling of existing titles of possible interest to clinical teachers includes:

1. drafting a complaint (using facts related to a slander case),
2. drill on the Code of Professional Responsibility,
3. simulated trial - hearsay rule and objections, and
4. decisions before trial.

A list of computer exercises and other information about the Center can be obtained by writing to Professor Roger Park, University of Minnesota Law School, 229 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55455.

VIDEO-COMPUTER INTERACTIVE
LAWYERING SKILLS TRAINING MATERIALS

By
Frank A. Bress, NYU

New York University has embarked upon an ambitious project to provide video-computer interactive lawyering skills training materials. They will consist of a series of interrelated videodisc and videotape problems designed to supplement the teaching of lawyering skills in clinical, advocacy, evidence and other courses by affording individualized supplementary instruction geared to each student's level of understanding, capacity and learning rate. The materials will help maximize the utilization of faculty expertise and teaching time, and expose all students to a rigorous, high level core curriculum.

Video-computer interactive materials present the student with a visual display of an event on a video monitor and require responses to a series of questions and problems selected and posed by the computer during and after the event according to a prewritten program. The computer records each of the student responses and varies the number, order, complexity and kind of questions and problems the student must respond to. The particular permutations encountered by any student are the direct result of the nature and

correctness of their prior answers or actions. The computer may be programmed to allow the student to ask clarifying questions at any time, do simple research before answering a question, review what has occurred, or ask for an evaluation of his or her course of action up to that point. The instructor can later retrieve and evaluate each student's responses, and identify problems of understanding, flawed analysis and lack of knowledge. In that manner each student's instruction can be individualized.

A videodisc has 54,000 concentric tracks, each encoded with a still picture and the sound that accompanies it. A stylus floats above the videodisc and optically scans the disk one track at a time with a laser beam. The beam is reflected by the coding and read by the player, producing an electronic signal that is converted into a still video image and sound. By moving from one track to the next in rapid succession, the videodisc player creates a motion picture with continuous sound from many still frames. Each track or frame is assigned a frame number that also is read by the player. The stylus can access any frame on command by scanning the tracks until it finds the appropriate frame. From the moment a command is given by the computer, the player can access any frame within a few seconds. Likewise, the player can stop upon command when reaching a particular frame.

The videotape and player function much the same as the videodisc and player, with some differences. The videotape, like a phonograph record, contains a continuous signal and ordinarily is not divided into frames. Coding can be applied to a videotape that will divide it into frames, roughly analogous to the frames of a videodisc. In that manner, a videotape player can be made to function as a videodisc player in the interactive system, except that frame-to-frame access time is drastically increased due to the linear tape format.

The video player and the computer interact with each other based upon preprogrammed instructions or upon command of the student. For instance, the program instructions may direct that the computer stop the video at a particular frame and display on the text monitor a question for the student. The video source continually feeds information to the computer about the frame number it is displaying. Upon arriving at the predetermined frame, the computer directs the video player to stop, and then displays the question on the monitor. Similarly, the computer interacts directly with the student based upon preprogrammed instructions or student command. In the example above, upon displaying a question, the computer can present the student with an array of options. For instance, the student may be given the choice of answering the question immediately or doing research first. If the student elects to answer the question and does so incorrectly, the computer can permit or require the student to try again, suggest that research is needed, or proceed to the next question. If the student elects to do research before answering the question, the computer will display first an index to the research materials available and then any portion of the materials that the student desires to see. The materials may consist of statutes, treatises, articles, instructional materials, court decisions and even Lexis or Westlaw. If the research continues beyond a predeter-

mined time limit, the student can be required to stop and answer the question.

COMPUTER APPLICATIONS IN CLINICAL EDUCATION

By

J. Michael Norwood, New Mexico

In the spring 1983, a project to develop computer applications in the clinic was begun at the University of New Mexico Clinical Law Program. To date, work has progressed on two applications.

The first application deals with automating a docket control and a student/attorney time record keeping system. Systems of this kind are available commercially, but the system under development at the University of New Mexico Clinic is geared toward the special needs of the educational process.

The second application is instructional. It is intended to assist students in preparing trial notebooks, and in learning the underlying theory of trial skills. This article provides a brief description of the trial notebook application.

The computer program provides an automated method for developing trial notebooks in a standardized format. It is designed for use by professors and students in the University of New Mexico Clinical Law Program. Other documents not generated through the computer, but which may be necessary for use in court, are brought to the student's attention by materials contained in the program's data base.

To prepare a trial notebook, students work at a computer terminal. The computer prompts the user to supply information necessary to the completion of various segments of a trial notebook. The information entered by the user is compiled in the computer's memory, and automatically formatted. The documents are then printed on 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper and placed in loose leaf bound notebook for use in court.

The program is divided into 15 segments:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Cover page. | 9. Examination of plaintiff's/prosecution's witnesses. |
| 2. Table of contents. | 10. Trial motions/directed verdict. |
| 3. Pre-trial order, pre-trial declarations and stipulations. | 11. Examination of defendant's witnesses. |
| 4. Cases analysis/proof check list. | 12. Jury instructions. |
| 5. Preliminary motions. | 13. Closing statement. |
| 6. Voir dire. | 14. Post-trial motions. |
| 7. Opening statement. | 15. Evidence, procedure and legal memoranda. |
| 8. Documents and exhibits check list. | |

Each segment of the trial notebook program instructs the user on the purposes of that segment and provides information which may be useful in

completing the segment. For example, when the user is working in the cover page segment, he or she is requested by the computer to supply the name of the judge before whom the case is to be heard. The user is alerted by the program that the program contains a data base of information about the characteristics of the judges before whom clinic cases have been tried in the past. This information can be accessed by the user. The information about the characteristics of the judges is easily updated or modified. It is contemplated that over time the computer data base containing information about characteristics of judges will be refined and enhanced by requiring students to prepare a brief statement of their impressions about judges at the conclusion of their trials. Selected bits of this information can be added to the trial notebook program by the faculty in the Clinic.

The student or faculty user is given the option of including any of the information found in the program's data bases in their trial notebook. For example, in the witness examination segments of the program, there are 8 data bases available.

1. Practice hints for direct examination.
2. Practice hints for cross examination.
3. Sample direct examinations, including technical questions for laying foundations and examining experts.
4. Sample cross examinations, including examples of techniques such as impeachment by prior inconsistent statements and use of standard treatises.
5. List of common objections.
6. New Mexico law relating to direct and cross examinations.
7. Information relating to securing the presence of witnesses at trial and the payment of witness fees.
8. Bibliography regarding direct and cross examination skills.

If the user wishes to incorporate any of the information contained in a data base into their work on that segment of the notebook, they are given commands which allow them to do this. Thus, if the user finds a set of foundation questions in the sample direct examination's data base which she wishes to incorporate into her notebook, she is able to do this.

Work in developing a trial notebook can be completed in as many sessions as are necessary. Work which has been completed during a session can be saved for revision or augmentation at a future session.

The trial notebook application is being developed on a DEC Vax mini computer. It is based on the facilities of UNIX. It is being developed as a joint project by Mike Norwood, Director of the Clinical Law Program at the University of New Mexico School of Law, and George Luger, a professor in the University of New Mexico Computer Science Department. They will be happy to discuss the project with anyone who is interested.

THE DEBTOR CREDITOR GAME
By
Lynn M. LoPucki, Wisconsin

The Debtor Creditor Game is a law practice simulation program designed by Lynn M. LoPucki (University of Missouri - Kansas City School of Law, presently visiting at the University of Wisconsin - Madison School of Law) and programmed by the Center for Computer Assisted Legal Instruction at the University of Minnesota. The program is intended for use in a basic course in Debtors' and Creditors' Rights or an advanced Bankruptcy Course; ideally one which has some connection with a negotiation, client counseling, clinical or other legal skills course.

The program generates a fact situation involving a business debtor in financial difficulty and 10 to 15 creditors. Students, working in two person firms assume the roles of lawyers for the various parties and interact, by direct negotiations and by exercising "options" on the computer. The game is played over a period of 7 to 12 weeks, and continues until the debtor's financial situation becomes stable or its assets have been liquidated. Total playing time for the student will vary from about 4 to 40 hours, depending primarily on the role assigned.

The options available to the players include collection, foreclosure and replevin actions, attachments, executions and garnishments, proceedings under chapters 7 or 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, compositions, some discovery and the making of standard forms of agreement. The program generates a cash flow for the business which varies in response to the actions of players. It keeps track of the progress of litigation, the accounts of each of the players including payment schedules, the passage of "game time," the recording of documents in official, UCC, and sheriff's records, and various other aspects of the progress of the game. It performs routine record keeping tasks such as converting game time to real time, accruing interest on the debts, and keeping track of attorney's fees and expenses incurred by the players. An "electronic mail" feature of the program allows it to retain messages generated by the program for students not then at the terminal. The program also includes a routine which permits players to draft a plan of reorganization or composition agreement by selecting alternatives from several menus. Decisions of an administrative nature are made by the program; more complex decisions are referred to the professor who can decide them with or without oral argument by the student players.

The students in Professor LoPucki's Debtor and Creditor classes have played the game for the past two years, using a partially computerized records keeping system. The Center began work on a comprehensive program almost a year ago, and it is expected to be completed before the end of this year. During the spring semester of 1984 the Game will be used experimentally at several law schools. It will be made generally available for rental from the Center beginning in the fall semester of 1984.

IIT CHICAGO-KENT - COMPUTERS AND CLINIC

By

Ronald W. Staudt, IIT Chicago-Kent

IIT Chicago-Kent has been an innovator in experiments with computer systems in the clinical setting. Between 1976 and 1979 the IIT Legal Services Center was the site of a major research project funded by CLEPR to test the American Bar Foundation Processor. Large remote mainframe computers were programmed to help non-technical clinical teachers and their students to automate repetitive client documents. Clinicians wrote five "expert systems" - computer programs that generate client interviews and automatically assemble client documents. Hundreds of client wills and other documents were produced using this technology. (See Sprowl and Staudt: Computerizing Client Services in the Law School Teaching Clinic: An Experiment in Law Office Automation, 1981 ABF Research Journal 699.) The remote mainframe was also used to automate the time and case administration of the clinic. Reports from this system offered modern law office efficiencies to clinical teachers who wished to monitor time and activity data for themselves and their students. (See Staudt and Sprowl: Automation of Administrative Systems in a Law School Teaching Clinic: Designing A Computer System to Process Case and Time Data for Management and Research, 1981 ABF Research Journal 1111.)

The Legal Services Center is now part of a major law school effort to develop microcomputers as aids to education and research on lawyering. James Sprowl, the American Bar Foundation's computer and law expert, has just joined our faculty. We have also constructed a new student computer laboratory. We are co-ordinating a plan to use microcomputers to enhance teaching power in clinical and non-clinical courses. The clinic will experiment with law office systems to manage its fee cases. The clinical faculty will also participate in Law School experiments in networking, writing computerized-aided instruction and using microcomputer expert systems.

EVIDENCE OBJECTIONS: AN INTERACTIVE VIDEODISC
FOR LEGAL EDUCATION

By

Roger W. Kirst, Nebraska

"Evidence Objections", an interactive videodisc, introduces an exciting new element to the use of computer assisted legal instruction in legal education. Interactive television instruction is now available using the technology of the optical laser videodisc. The result is a program of supplemental teaching material that allows realistic student interaction with television action.

"Evidence Objections" can be used in evidence, trial advocacy and clinical courses to provide law students with experience in recognizing when to object and how to argue in support of an objection.

The law student using the material will play the role of defense counsel in a criminal trial. All other participants in the trial will be seen and heard on the television monitor. During the trial the prosecutor's direct examination will include improper questions and some answers of the witness will include improper information. The simulated trial the student is watching will not stop or otherwise "cue" the student to object. Instead, the student can interrupt at any time, but must listen to the dialogue carefully to recognize when to object.

After making the objection, the law student will have to state a reason for the objection. The judge will rule on the objection, and the trial will resume at the proper point. Inadmissible material can be excluded by a successful objection, but it will be introduced if the student does not object or does not argue correctly in support of the objection.

At the end of the exercise, the microcomputer will provide an analysis of how well the law student performed in the trial. The scoring routine will tell the student where the objections were made correctly, incorrectly or not made when there should have been an objection. The student will also be able to ask for an explanation of each of the judge's rulings.

The materials have been designed to simulate an actual courtroom setting as closely as possible while providing educational feedback soon after.

"Evidence Objections" has been supported by a two-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education, United States Department of Education, to demonstrate applications of interactive computer-assisted videodisc technology in legal education. One goal of this demonstration is encouraging law faculty to consider the use of this technology in other areas of legal education.

The Project Director is Professor Roger W. Kirst, College of Law, University of Nebraska. The script for the trial was written by Professor Kirst and Professor G. Michael Fenner of Creighton Law School. The script of the simulated trial was produced on location in the federal District Court courtroom in Lincoln.

The program will be distributed to law schools through the Center for Computer Assisted Legal Instruction, 229 Nineteenth Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

The programming for the project should be completed during Fall 1983, at which time the material will be available in prototype form for further testing by any interested school. The final version of the material will be available in early 1984.

USE OF MICROCOMPUTER IN THE CLINICAL TRAINING OF PARALEGALS

By

Carl J. Hartmann, Institute for Paralegal Training

After analysis of the use of microcomputers in law firms, the Institute for Paralegal Training in Philadelphia has developed a new general practice program. This course of study integrates both emerging technology and clinical design into a competency-based curriculum.

Computers in the Practice of Law. While many researchers have studied the effects of the computer on the law firm, very little attention has been given to the utilization of paralegal personnel in computerized support systems. This, however, is a natural result of asking the question "what can computers do for lawyers," rather than phrasing the issue as "what can computers do to increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of law firms? Immediately such areas as research/document handling, litigation support, docket and calendar control and similar systems spring to mind. Thus, while computerized systems for attorneys may be the wave of the future, computerization of the archaic, time-consuming paper systems handled by paralegals may be the emerging necessity of the present.

Paralegals in Clinics. The program also emphasizes learning both the paper and computer systems in context--this facilitates both instruction and evaluation. Using programs such as LITIGATOR, a litigation document control system designed by the Institute, students are required to confront actual case problems and develop operational solutions in actual practice settings. The Institute is continuing to study the law firm/paralegal/technology relationship, and welcomes questions or comments in any of these areas.

Note: Three recent articles on computer assisted instructions are:

Clark, The Rationale for Computer-Aided Instruction, 33 J. Legal Ed. 459 (1983)

Korn, Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction: Some Reservations, 33 J. Legal Ed. 473 (1983)

Clark, A Postscript on Gary Korn's Reservations about CAI, 33 J. Legal Ed. 489 (1983)

ARTICLES ABOUT CLINICAL EDUCATION

To better let clinicians know what is being said by and about them, a new feature of the Newsletter will be an unannotated listing of recent articles (both law review and less scholarly) of interest to clinical teachers. Future plans are to have an annotated bibliography, but volunteers are needed to take on this task. If interested, please contact the editor. Listed are articles both about clinical education and such related

areas as interviewing, negotiating, etc. In addition, where I have been able to recognize the name, articles by clinical teachers have been included even if unrelated to clinical education. Please help to make this section as complete as possible by dropping the editor a note about any articles omitted.

Clinical Education

Doyel, The Clinical Lawyer School: Has Jerome Frank Prevailed?, 18 New Eng. L. Rev. 577 (1982-83) (Robert Doyel is Director of Court Education and Director of Clinical Education at the University of Mississippi)

Wise, Lawyers Lead City Students Through Maze of Law Practice: 50 Attorneys in 5 Firms in 'Mentor' Program, N.Y. L.J., May 25, 1983, at 1, col. 3

Interviewing and Counseling

Barkai & Fine, Empathy Training for Lawyers and Law Students, 13 S.W. U. L. Rev. 505 (1983) (John Barkai teaches clinic at Hawaii)

Clawar & Brynne, Are Your Clients Getting the Most Out of You?, 17 Docket Call 4 Wntr '83

Craver, Don't Forget Your Problem Solving Function, 69 A.B.A.J. 254 (1983)

Kraut, How to Get the Most Out of Your Client: Time Saving Techniques for the First Interview, 56 Wis. B. Bull. 20 (May, 1983)

Menkel-Meadow & Ntephe, Clients Are People - Or Are They?, 10 Barrister 12(7), Wntr '83 (Carrie Menkel-Meadow teaches clinic at UCLA)

Negotiation

Fisher, What About Negotiation As A Specialty, 69 A.B.A.J. 1220 (1983)

Guernsey, Truthfulness in Negotiation, 17 U. Rich. L. Rev. 99 (1983)

Jacker, Learning to Negotiate: Techniques, Psychology, Nat. L.J., March 21, 1983, at 15, col. 3

Schoenfield, Strategies and Tactics for Successful Negotiations, 69 A.B.A.J. 1226 (1983) (Mark Schoenfield is a former clinical teacher at Northwestern)

General Interest

DeBarr, When Student Turns Lawyer: Practical Skills Training Can Ease the Transition, 17 Docket Call 9(4) Wntr '83

Grant, The Wrong Way to Pursue Lawyer Competency, 69 A.B.A.J. 1231 (1983)

nelly, Education for Lawyer Competency: A Proposal For Curricular Reform,
18 New Eng. L. Rev. 607 (1982-83)

Symposium, Maximizing the Law School Experience, 12 Stetson L. Rev. 551
(1983)

By Clinicians

Capowski, Accuracy and Consistency in Categorical Decision-Making: A Study
of Social Security's Medical-Vocational Guidelines--Two Birds With One
Stone or Pigeon-Holing Claimants?, 42 Md. L. Rev. 329 (1983) (John
Capowski teaches clinic at Maryland)

Goodpaster, The Trial for Life: Effective Assistance of Counsel in Death
Penalty Cases, 58 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 299 (1983) (Gary Goodpaster teaches
clinic at California - Davis)

Menkel-Meadow, Review Essay: Women in Law? A Review of Cynthia Fuchs
Epstein's Women in Law, 1983 A.B.F. Res. J. 189