

Schedule—Friday, September 26

Registration opens at 11:30

12:30-1:00 Dean's Welcome, Room MC 195

Time	Room RB 175	Room RB 180	Room MC 195
Session I 1:00–1:50	<p>Teaching Cases: How Legal Writing Textbooks Approach the Rule Support Section (25 minutes) <u>Alissa Bauer</u> Brooklyn Law School</p> <p>Law professors and lawyers do not consistently name or conceptualize one important component of the IRAC or CRAC structure – the rule support section, sometimes called case illustrations, rule explanations, or a variety of other terms. This presentation summarizes my empirical analysis of the fifteen most popular first-year legal writing textbooks and describes the varied ways that the textbooks explain some of the most basic and fundamental questions about this section. Although this lack of consistency may not be a huge issue for practicing lawyers and judges, it is a real challenge for law students, especially in their first year of law school. In addition to fleshing out the different approaches to this important section, this presentation also summarizes some common ground between textbooks. Finally, this presentation offers some initial pedagogical takeaways from the textbooks' diversity of approaches, including incorporating some relatively straightforward solutions into the first-year legal writing course.</p>	<p>Providing Feedback to Prepare Students for Practice (25 minutes) <u>Randall Ryder</u> University of Minnesota Law School</p> <p>One of the most critical aspects of feedback is the why -- why something needs to improve/change and why it matters in the professional setting.</p> <p>Today's law students have a much more diverse background in professional settings. Things that we used to assume - attendance, professional communications, professional tone - are now having to be taught inside/outside the classroom.</p> <p>The presentation will address the variety of ways to highlight the importance of these professional skills in both 1L and upper level courses - from appropriate syllabus language, to expectations on day one, to dealing with the occasional unprofessional email or work product.</p> <p>Judicial Writing as a Guidebook for Analytical Rigor (25 minutes) <u>Janet Brown</u> Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law</p> <p>The most effective judicial opinions are those that apply legal principles in a neutral and transparent manner, explain</p>	<p>How to Deal with Students Who Don't Read Without Losing Your Mind (25 minutes) <u>Jaime Bouvier</u> Case Western Reserve University School of Law</p> <p>People who succeed in law school are the people who read the directions for the latest board game for everyone else. People who excel in law school are the people who read Monopoly directions just for fun. Yet, since Covid, a larger and larger component of students appear not to be reading anything at all, not the syllabus, not the textbook, and not the cases that they are relying on in their legal writing assignments. How do we reach these students?</p> <p>First, we need an understanding that students today are bombarded with constant demands for their attention: texts, social media, notifications from everything from computer updates to breaking news. We now live in what has been deemed an attention economy. Our attention is a valuable commodity sought by many large corporations that have studied and developed ever more insidious ways to capture it.</p> <p>This is what educators are competing against. We are being asked to educate students who are immersed in a stew of</p>

Defining Rigor through Active Learning in the Advance Legal Writing Classroom (25 minutes)

Kathleen Dillon Narko

Northwestern Pritzker School of Law

What does rigor look like in an advanced legal writing course? Too often, rigor is equated with workload or complexity of content. This presentation redefines rigor as sustained intellectual engagement, high-level analytical thinking, and consistent application of professional-level writing standards—achieved not through passive absorption, but through active learning.

In "Defining Rigor through Active Learning in the Advanced Legal Writing Classroom," I will explore how three student-centered teaching strategies—editing exercises, individual live commenting, and collaborative group work—create a rigorous learning environment that helps prepare students for the demands of legal practice.

First, targeted editing exercises invite students to diagnose and revise flawed legal writing, sharpening their attention to tone, clarity, concision, and structure. These short, high-intensity tasks build precision and independence in legal writers. Second, individual live commenting sessions—brief, face-to-face feedback conferences—hold students accountable for every sentence on the page while reinforcing self-editing habits and professional responsiveness. Finally, structured group work challenges students to critique each other's writing, negotiate revisions, and co-author complex documents, building real-world collaboration skills. This presentation will include examples of each technique,

how the facts and law support their reasoning, and demonstrate respect for the law and those impacted by it. While judges are appropriately viewed as "neutrals," they still must pick a side in the matters and motions before them. And their writing, while not advocacy, typically seeks to persuade their various audiences that the decision reached is well-reasoned and supported, including carefully considering all the arguments, justifying the conclusions reached, and explaining why contrary facts or authority do not carry the day. Of course, neutral decision-makers like judges can allow the facts and law to lead them to the just outcome, while advocates must pursue arguments that benefit their clients. So what lessons can law students extract from judicial writing to guide them in applying the same high level of procedural and substantive rigor, even while zealously advocating for a particular outcome? This presentation will identify a handful of specific ways in which law students (and lawyers) can use the fairness mindset applied by judges to ensure that their advocacy is analytically thorough, precise, candid, and unpretentious. In doing so, they will make themselves a more persuasive and trustworthy source for the court to rely upon when, indeed, it's time to pick sides.

constant volleys for their attention.

To address this, we need to (1) confront head on the negative effects of electronics and encourage students to take breaks from them, (2) bring students back to paper and pen, and (3) most difficult, format our syllabi and assignments in an efficient & elegant way to compete against the intuitive platforms students spend so much time within.

Like we ask our students to write briefs that follow an expected order, with transparent arguments that a court can easily follow, we need to do the same for every assignment we give. And like writing an excellent brief, this is easier said than done

sample materials, and implementation strategies designed to foster rigor without sacrificing student support or creativity.

By emphasizing rigorous thinking over rote output, active learning methods cultivate the habits of mind essential to effective legal analysis and clear writing.

1:50-2:00

Break—Snacks Provided

Time	Room RB 175	Room RB 180	Room MC 195
Session II 2:00-2:50	<p>Rubric as Pedagogy: Evolving Toward Rigor in Legal Writing Assessment (25 minutes) <u>Erin DeWalt</u> University of Oklahoma</p> <p>In this session, I trace the transformation of my legal writing grading rubric from a simple, point-based checklist into a robust, criteria-driven assessment tool. Initially designed to offer clarity and efficiency, the original rubric served its purpose but lacked the nuance to meaningfully distinguish levels of student performance. Over time—and through reflection, student feedback, and curricular alignment—I developed a more detailed rubric with calibrated descriptors across performance levels, fostering deeper transparency and rigor. This presentation will explore how this evolution enhanced both teaching and learning: making expectations clearer for students, enabling more consistent and formative feedback, and supporting programmatic goals.</p> <p>Teaching Legal Analysis and Writing Brick by Brick: A Blueprint for Modular Design (25 minutes)</p>	<p>My Way or the Highway: Is Enforcing Personal Preference a Form of Rigor? (50 minutes) <u>Kim Peterson</u> <u>Desmund Wu</u> <u>Dustin Brown</u> <u>Ashby Fox</u> <u>John Strange</u> <u>Andrew Norman</u> University of Wisconsin Law School</p> <p>Many legal writing professors have specific preferences in how students write a brief or memo, and they require students to incorporate those specific preferences in their final product. Of course, legal writing professors vary in how many preferences they have, and the specificity of those preferences. We all require some form of organizational structure, and best practices for legal writing. We are not talking about those more conventional requirements, but rather, preferences that relate to more specific formatting or writing conventions where reasonable people might disagree with the professor's choice. For example, one professor might require a specific number of case illustrations to include in each memo, or another might have a preference for how the standard</p>	<p>How Learning Science Can Transform the Brief Writing Journey (50 minutes) <u>Dawn Young</u> <u>Jonathan Sheffield</u> Loyola University Chicago School of Law</p> <p>In today's law school classroom, students enter with diverse backgrounds and varying levels of academic preparedness. This session introduces a step-by-step brief writing approach grounded in cognitive science and learning theory. Presenters will demonstrate how to scaffold students' development using a recursive, metacognitively driven process.</p> <p>By integrating techniques, such as cognitive schema development, spaced repetition, and retrieval practice, this approach supports deeper level learning while maintaining rigor. The session will provide attendees with several techniques and tools they can adapt to their own courses.</p> <p>Designed for faculty seeking to strengthen students' legal writing skills, this session emphasizes fostering self-directed, reflective learners - one of the most powerful drivers of long-term academic success.</p>

Amy Levin

Geoff Kehlmann

LMU Loyola Law School, Los Angeles

Today's law students are not entering law school with the same reading, writing, and problem-solving skills as previous generations, yet the traditional first-year legal writing course demands they generate the same lengthy, polished products (memos and briefs). These documents require mastery of nearly every tool in an attorney's toolkit: close reading of authorities, identifying rules, rule synthesis, rule-based reasoning, analogical reasoning, counter-analysis, organization, citation, tone, and editing. This traditional approach creates a form of rigor without reflection—a course that is challenging not because it fosters deep cognitive engagement, but because it requires students to assemble a complex whole without first mastering each individual skill. Students are asked to build a house before fully understanding how to hammer a nail. Then, they receive copious feedback on all parts of the finished product, making it difficult to focus, prioritize, or improve on any one area before the next major assignment arrives. Understandably, students experience cognitive overload, stress, and anxiety.

This presentation proposes a course redesign grounded in modular skill-building to improve student learning and mental health without sacrificing intellectual rigor. Rather than asking students to integrate all skills early and often, professors would sequence instruction and assessment into focused, in-depth modules addressing one skill or family of skills at a time (e.g., explaining the law,

of review is discussed and where. Some may have preferences for how headings should be formatted, or how the student should refer to the parties in the brief. In our presentation we will discuss the pros and cons of requiring students to conform to these preferences in a first-year legal writing course, and how to handle inconsistencies in these preferences among faculty.

applying the law, writing an Introduction). Each module would include targeted instruction, practice, assessment, and formative feedback before students move on. Each semester of a yearlong course would culminate in a capstone graded assignment (e.g., fall: Discussion section of an objective memo; spring: complete trial brief) that integrates all prior skills in a single, summative product.

Attendees will leave with a sample modular course structure, example assessments for individual skills, and strategies for enhancing long-term learning and skill retention.

Time	Room RB 175	Room RB 180	Room MC 195
Session III 3:00-3:50	<p>Teaching Law Students vs. Training Future Lawyers (50 minutes) <u>Irene Ten Cate</u> Brooklyn Law School <u>Megan Davis</u> University of Houston Law Center <u>Catharine Du Bois</u> New York Law School</p> <p>Are we teaching law students or training future lawyers? Or should we strive to do both? While these questions go to the entire project of legal education, they are especially relevant for the first-year legal analysis and writing course. And they take on new urgency as we, together with our students, confront the ways in which the rapid rise of Gen AI and the rollout of the NextGen Bar Exam shake up legal education and the legal profession. Our presentations focus on how to rethink and refresh our teaching and assessment in a time of transformation.</p>	<p>Neuroscience and the Lawyer as Writer: How the Science of Reading May Impact Legal Writing and Editing Skills (25 minutes) <u>Jim Dimitri</u> Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law “Proofread more than once.” “Edit on paper.” “Set your draft aside for an extended period before you edit it.” Do modern neuroscience principles support the editing advice that lawyers often receive from legal writing experts? Particularly, how might studies about our brains’ activity while we read, write, and edit text in print and on screen inform how lawyers should proofread and edit the legal documents they write? And how might these studies impact how lawyers use artificial intelligence to aid them in the proofreading and editing process? In this presentation, I intend to explore these questions and discuss how the answers to them might impact the way we teach</p>	<p>Bluepoints for Brilliance: Using Rubrics to Model Effective Legal Writing (25 minutes) <u>Michael Tripp</u> University of Missouri-Columbia</p> <p>This presentation focuses on the use of rubrics to model effective legal writing and to create an opportunity for student self-evaluation. Rubrics that not only include evaluation of good legal writing skills but also that embed legal writing structure and a model answer allow students the opportunity to reinforce their understanding of good legal writing and to self-assess their own work. In addition, detailed rubrics of this nature can increase consistency in evaluation of student work.</p> <p>From Legal Aid Practice to Legal Writing Classroom: In-class exercise ideas (15 minutes) <u>Lorraine Gaynor</u> University of Iowa College of Law</p>

First, Megan Davis will urge legal writing professors to train young lawyers (rather than teach law students) to perform to professional (rather than law school) expectations. She will provide concrete suggestions for implementing this shift and also address how legal writing professors can reduce bias in teaching and assessment.

Next, Catharine Du Bois will pose that the question is not whether to limit AI or whether to teach it; it is how to teach and fairly assess the analytical discernment needed to produce deep legal analysis. This presentation assumes that students are using AI and focuses on assignments that help build the foundational skills of legal reasoning. It also explores strategies and assessments that develop students' ability to evaluate first drafts—identify weaknesses, refine arguments, and strengthen analysis.

Lastly, Irene Ten Cate will discuss how grades interact with the educational goals identified by the other presenters. Grades play an outsized role in law schools and don't exist in professional environments. The hybrid nature of many assessments in our courses complicates matters further. While the tensions between grades and learning cannot be resolved without drastic changes to prevailing grading policies, we can take steps to reduce them.

writing and editing skills to our students.

Diverse Learners and the Relativity of Rigor (25 minutes)

Danielle McCain

University of Illinois Chicago Law School

The population at many of our law schools is changing with increasing numbers of diverse learners, meaning students that require accommodations, who speak English as an additional language, and/or are first generation law students. UIC Law School, one of the most diverse law schools in the country, and other law schools are grappling with this new landscape of students and how to meet their learning needs. Students are requiring accommodations and adaptive learning in course teachings and accommodations on exams. In an environment that is rooted in rigor and high academic standards, some legal educators experience providing accommodations and adaptive learning as less than rigorous; and subsequently, lowering academic standards. What do law schools truly mean by rigor, how is it defined, and who does that definition apply to in law schools? Another point of inquiry, is how do we balance support in rigorous environments – holding to law school standards while understanding student needs? This presentation will first interrogate the underpinnings of the discourse on rigor in legal education. Secondly, I will explore how the relativity of rigor necessitates thoughtful approaches to student learning to address the diverse learning needs and experiences of our future practitioners.

During the fall semester, I tried to incorporate some in-class exercises inspired by my time as a legal aid attorney practicing in housing and unemployment benefits. I would like to present about lessons learned from a few of these activities. For example, during one class, I handed out copies of the security deposit section of the landlord/tenant code and presented the students with questions from hypothetical clients that required them to apply the security deposit statute to the facts and try to answer clients' legal questions. Part of this exercise was to identify explicit rules vs. terms in the statute that were more ambiguous. It also gave us a nice context for discussing absent facts and client interviewing. We discussed how an attorney on intake likely would need to ask the clients additional questions to gather the facts necessary to more fully answer their questions and advise them. For one of the client's hypothetical questions, students drafted their response in a brief CRAC email to the client, and then we discussed their drafts and compared them with a sample CRAC email I shared with them. Another class period, we did an in-class exercise based on some unemployment benefits regulations relating to the timeliness of appeals and the meaning of a "temporary employee." This class followed a similar format where I presented students with regulations and then some hypothetical facts and questions from a client. We discussed what arguments the client might have and what additional information we might need to find out.

Session IV
4:00-4:50

Your Professor is Not Making This Up: Incorporating the Business of Law Practice into 1L and Upper-Level Writing Classes (50 minutes)

Meredith Geller
Northwestern Pritzker School of Law

We talk a lot to students about the expectations of law practice and law partners and why that informs the rigor expected in law school. However, often students don't understand why expectations are so high and how law practice works. I've found that by taking some time at the start of a semester class to discuss the business of law practice, including how law firms operate, how timesheets are used and partner expectations, helps give students a context for high expectations in law school and legal writing classes.

Incorporating practice skills increases student buy-in by granting a "legitimacy" to what is being taught and provides support for critique students receive. It also reminds students that law firms are businesses and helps them understand the financial incentives for new attorneys to work effectively and well. This interactive session will discuss ways to incorporate practice expectations into legal writing, including how and when to incorporate law practice into a first-year or advanced legal writing course, a timesheet exercise to pair with a short memo assignment, and a peer-editing exercise involving the in-class review of appellate briefs written by practitioners.

From Quill to Code: Training the Next Generation in AI-Assisted Contract Practice (50 minutes)

Cynthia Adams
Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law

As artificial intelligence reshapes the landscape of contract drafting and negotiation, legal education must evolve accordingly. This session offers law professors a practical roadmap for integrating AI tools into traditional contract drafting pedagogy without sacrificing analytical rigor. Drawing from the third edition of *A Practical Guide to Drafting Contracts: From Concept to Closure* (Adams & Cramer, 3rd ed., Aspen, 2025), we will explore classroom-tested exercises that bridge conceptual understanding and practical skill-building. Participants will learn how to adapt classic drafting assignments to incorporate AI assistance meaningfully, while preserving students' ability to think critically about language, risk, and structure. The session will also showcase an experiential model drawn from my International Negotiations course, in collaboration with the National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University School of Law in Taiwan. Here, students engage in an extended, cross-border simulation using AI tools to sharpen their negotiation skills and facilitate real-time dealmaking. Attendees will leave with ready-to-use exercises, strategies for integrating AI responsibly, and concrete methods for training law students to draft and negotiate with both human and machine collaborators.

Integrating the Foundations of Leadership Skills into the First Year Curriculum (50 minutes)

Cliff Zimmerman
Northwestern Pritzker School of Law

Every law student needs to be a leader in both their professional career and in their personal life. The foundational skills of leadership development, self-awareness and empathy, can and should be integrated into courses across the curriculum. This session will start with a brief explanation of the leadership skill development model taught in the Leading in the Law course at Northwestern. The session will then focus on ways to introduce foundational leadership skills, in a complementary manner, in a traditional legal research and writing course. The session will close with discussion about the facility of this with attendees given their program, course, and teaching style.

6:00-8:00

Cocktail reception at Osteria Via Stato

Schedule—Saturday, September 27

8:00

Breakfast

Time	Room RB 175	Room RB 180	Room MC 195
Session V 9:00-9:50	<p>Becoming a Lawyer: Explaining High Standards Through a Professional Identity Lens (25 minutes) <u>Emily Dinsmore</u> University at Buffalo School of Law</p> <p>Many students, especially those who go straight to law school from undergrad, seem confused by the need for a high level of professionalism on all assignments and communications. Without a framework for understanding why precision matters, students may not develop the attention to detail needed for lawyering. One way to encourage students to consistently produce high quality work is to explicitly connect that work with the transformative process of becoming a lawyer. By incorporating the Model Rules of Professional Conduct (including the Preamble), real-world examples of lawyering, and reflection exercises throughout their writing courses, professors can explain why legal writing needs to be concise, precise, grammatically correct, and free from typos. This isn't a harsh process: instead, students can develop pride through learning how to write like a lawyer. In this presentation, I will describe how I introduce these concepts and integrate them throughout a two-semester Legal Analysis, Writing and Research course.</p>	<p>Slowing Down without Losing Momentum: Refining and Revising the LLM Legal Analysis, Writing, and Research Curriculum (25 minutes) <u>Michelle Falkoff</u> <u>Sarah Brown</u> Northwestern Pritzker School of Law</p> <p>As more and more students from non-English-speaking countries seek LLM degrees in the United States, we face greater challenges in helping them succeed in legal analysis, writing, and research courses. At Northwestern, we've tried a number of approaches to make sure we're giving these students the best possible education while recognizing that they have different and increasing writing issues that require us to make adjustments in how we teach these skills, particularly as compared to our JD students. We are about to pilot a revised curriculum this fall, and in this session we'll discuss what prompted us to make this change and what we're planning. This is still a work in progress, so we're hoping this will be an interactive discussion that will allow us to make changes as we learn what's worked for all of you.</p> <p>“It’s Not Personal—It’s Strictly Business”: Shifting First Year Law Students’ Approach to Writing from</p>	<p>Ghosts at the Gate: An Increasing Urgency to Teach Vigilance Against AI-Generated Hallucinations (25 minutes) <u>Christina Frohock</u> University of Miami School of Law</p> <p>As generative artificial intelligence programs become ubiquitous in modern life, case hallucinations are appearing more frequently in the legal profession. I propose that the need to teach students vigilance against AI-generated hallucinations is even more urgent than it appears. Sanctions are an obvious risk. Many lawyers have been rebuked for citing cases that do not exist, with sanctions rising into the thousands of dollars. Courts often justify these steep penalties by finding ethics violations, specifically lack of competence, meritorious claims, and candor to the court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and related Rules of Professional Conduct. Yet, apparitions in the law are nothing new. Analogizing to the history of copyright law, I will show that a deeper risk lies ahead in the unfolding story of AI-generated hallucinations. Specifically, hallucinated citations can take on a life of their own, gaining traction and respect through repetition and reliance. Lawyers have duties of competence, merit, and candor,</p>

Let Them Speak!: Teaching Self-Talk as a Tool for Legal Thinking and Motivation (25 minutes)

Patricia Winograd

LMU Loyola Law School

In legal education, rigor is often associated with external performance standards: precision, logic, and formal expressions of both. But preparing students for the rigors of law practice also means equipping them with internal tools that support metacognition and emotional regulation. This presentation explores the role of self-talk—the inner dialogue students use to navigate cognitive tasks and professional challenges—as a vital but underemphasized tool in the law school classroom. Grounded in tried and true principles of educational psychology, this session will explore the theory and explain strategies to show how law students can be taught to internalize problem-solving language as part of their developmental arc. In particular, the session will examine how structured self-talk strategies can help students reframe negative automatic thoughts, enhance motivation, and persist through difficulty—key markers of rigor in both academic and professional settings. In helping students build a productive internal voice, we can empower all students to become more self-regulated, motivated, and resilient learners—capable of meeting the rigors of law not just with skill, but with psychological endurance.

Personal Expression to “Work Product” (25 minutes)

Rebekah Holman

Northwestern Pritzker School of Law

Most first year law students view writing as a creative endeavor. This is especially true of students with humanities majors. Viewing writing as personal expression makes learning to write like a lawyer more difficult. Students who view writing as personal expression may devote inadequate time to pre-writing, focusing more on their own ideas than on researching and synthesizing rules and applying them. Students may struggle to be objective in evaluating and revising their writing. Receiving feedback may be painful, as it will feel like personal criticism. Students who view writing as personal expression are surprised by, and resistant to, the rigor of legal writing. They usually move past this, but often not until Spring semester. The solution is to accelerate students’ shift to viewing legal writing as “work product,” a tool designed to aid their audience, rather than as personal expression of their ideas. This can be accomplished by emphasizing, from the very first class, the direct connection between the skills they are learning and real-life legal practice. Legal writing professors can emphasize this connection in three ways: First, by contextualizing skills in reference to their own practice experience. This also builds the professor’s credibility. Second, by incorporating guest practitioners throughout the semester. A fifteen-minute zoom interview of a practitioner, focused on the skill being taught, can demonstrate to students the real-world application of the skill. Finally, by utilizing

to be sure; they must check that cases are valid—and in existence—before citing them. But lawyers also have a more profound duty: to protect the body of law. Members of the Bar should treat the corpus juris as a shared, common good, which we are all duty-bound to keep pristine and healthy. In today’s world of shifting facts and narratives, it is particularly urgent to shield the integrity of the law. Hallucinated cases lurk as ghosts at the gate, and we must teach future lawyers to act as rigorous gatekeepers.

Rethinking Rigor in the Age of AI: Scaffolding Intellectual Work in the Legal Writing Classroom (25 minutes)

Alison Julien

Marquette University Law School

As generative AI tools like ChatGPT and Claude become more common in law school classrooms, legal writing professors face a growing concern: will these tools erode rigor by allowing students to bypass the hard work of legal analysis and writing? This presentation argues that the opposite is possible. When used intentionally, AI can actually enhance rigor by shifting the cognitive load away from mechanical writing tasks and toward higher-order skills such as legal reasoning, revision, and professional judgment. The session will offer concrete examples of how AI-integrated assignments can promote intellectual engagement. These include exercises in which students critique and revise AI-generated text, compare multiple outputs based on refined prompts, and reflect on how their choices align with legal norms and rhetorical purpose. In each case, the emphasis is not on banning AI but on designing tasks that

		<p>Teaching Assistants to share their experiences with a relevant skill. TAs can illustrate the relevance of first year legal writing skills in law school, whether on exams or in clinic work, or outside law school during summer employment and externships. Early emphasis on the connection to practice will convey to students the goal and purpose of legal writing, and the high standards for legal writing in the workplace.</p>	<p>require students to evaluate, refine, and improve upon its output. Rather than seeing AI as a shortcut that undermines learning, the presentation invites faculty to see it as a catalyst for rethinking what we ask students to do—and why. With thoughtful scaffolding and well-designed assignments, we can use AI to deepen student learning, sharpen legal skills, and reinforce the kind of rigorous thinking that defines professional legal writing.</p>
<p>Session VI 10:00-10:50</p>	<p>Reimagining Rigor: The Promise and Pitfalls of Contract Grading (50 minutes) <u>Anne Alexander</u> <u>Jayne Woods</u> University of Missouri-Columbia</p> <p>What does it mean to define rigor in a legal writing course? In this session, two legal writing professors reflect on a two-year experiment with a contract-style grading floor and explore what happens when pedagogical ideals meet institutional realities. The grading floor promised students a minimum grade—regardless of performance—if they (1) submitted all assignments on time and (2) made a good faith effort on each. Our goals were twofold: to reduce chronic late work and minimal effort on ungraded assignments, and to reward diligence among students who were unlikely to rise to the top of the curve but who demonstrated sustained engagement and improvement.</p> <p>In some ways, the system worked: students submitted work more consistently and on time. But new issues emerged. Some students fixated on meeting the baseline contract terms, paying less attention to substance and learning goals. Others, whose writing</p>	<p>Bringing the Rubric to Life: Using Guided Opposition Memos to Help Students Develop a Disciplinary Framework for Good Legal Research and Writing (15 minutes) <u>Michelle Brown Cue</u> DePaul University</p> <p>To teach students who may not be prepared for the demands of law school and practice, professors should continue to assign rigorous assessments but adjust the scaffolding they provide to meet the needs of their students. This presentation will share a formative assessment that pairs supporting memoranda from practicing attorneys with guided questions to help students write an opposing memorandum. The questions make visible the thought process that goes into drafting an opposition memo. And critiquing the work of other attorneys makes visible the criteria for good legal research and writing. This exercise will prepare students to write opposition memos in practice, but the ultimate goal is for students to focus the lens of critique inwardly towards their own work. For example, when students see how easy it is to oppose a motion when the supporting memorandum has an incomplete rule synthesis,</p>	<p>Bringing Practice to Life in the Classroom (50 minutes) <u>Joy Roberts</u> <u>Jessie Wang-Grimm</u> Northwestern Pritzker School of Law</p> <p>This presentation will provide a framework for bringing practitioners' experiences into the classroom. We will draw on our collective practice experiences that have successfully translated into the classroom for first-year law students. Our presentation encompasses three main components: (1) the "why" behind class assignments and their relationship to the rigor and demands of today's law practice; (2) the importance of professionalism and how classroom expectations relate to success in the workplace; and (3) teaching methods and customized approaches to reach students with varied learning styles. We draw from real life scenarios through predictive writing, persuasive writing, and oral advocacy models from our courses. Through these shared accounts, we demonstrate the importance of legal writing and reasoning skills and how they inform our professional identities. Part 1 highlights the value of utilizing storytelling as a framework to explain concepts and provide a context for classroom assignments,</p>

performance would have triggered academic probation, passed out of support pathways they arguably needed.

This session will describe what worked, what didn't, and why we're now rethinking how to embed rigor into our assessment practices without undermining student development. Attendees will walk away from this interactive discussion with a candid case study of grading reform and how rigor and support can coexist.

they will conduct their own research more thoroughly; when students see how easy it is to oppose a motion when the supporting memorandum has inaccurate rule statements, they will better appreciate the importance of drafting accurate rule statements; and when students see the disastrous consequences of citing a court opinion without reading the entire opinion, they will fully read the authorities they cite. Thus, drafting a guided opposition memorandum will bring the criteria in the rubric to life and help students develop a disciplinary framework for good legal research and writing that will help them move from novices to experts.

Teaching Motion Drafting in the 1L Curriculum for Practice Readiness (15 minutes)

Jordan Burton

Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law

This presentation will discuss why the 1L writing curriculum should teach basic motion drafting skills and describe an assignment designed to teaching those skills.

Under ABA Standard 203(d), law schools' learning objectives must include competency in "other professional skills" needed for competent practice. Most students will not work at large firms after law school. They are more likely to draft basic motions in their first year of practice than office memoranda or appellate briefs. Therefore, to be practice ready, students must feel comfortable drafting routine motions.

Basic motion drafting skills can be taught effectively as a complement to the traditional 1L writing curriculum. I

including being mindful of who is your audience, time frame for work completion, work product quality, critical thinking and implementation, rules of practice, and more. Part 2 demonstrates how sharing practice stories amplifies professionalism demands such as timeliness, effective communication, ethical compliance, and civility. Rigorous classroom expectations prepare students for similar standards in the workplace. Part 3 focuses on using practice stories to reach students of varying backgrounds and abilities. Specifically, we cover how sharing stories of vulnerability fosters students' growth mindsets. This discussion includes understanding cognitive overload, the unlearning that occurs during the first-year legal writing and reasoning course, and the enhanced clarity of instruction required to reach different learners.

assigned students in my 1L writing course to draft a motion for enlargement of time based on sample motions and trial court rules. The assignment was designed to increase students' ability to (1) reproduce the format of basic motion, (2) identify and apply applicable trial court rules in a basic motion, and (3) use an example motion as a template for drafting their own motion.

To conclude the presentation, I will summarize the results of my students' work on the motion drafting assignment and lessons learned for improving the assignment in future years.

Generative AI: Taking the Easy Way Out? (15 minutes)

Lori Roberts

Western State College of Law

There's nothing new about students looking for an easy way out of a daunting writing assignment, thus dismantling the rigor and high standards that we build into our courses. Plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration have been the primary illicit tools used by students for years, and now generative AI presents yet another very tantalizing option.

Law professors can easily justify a complete prohibition against plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration, as academic dishonesty, but we can't do that with generative AI. Legal employers expect new attorneys to have a strong competency in using generative AI for efficiency in legal research and drafting, so if our goal is to prepare students for practice, we must incorporate it into our teaching.

This presentation will provide an overview of a successful "experiment" that I conducted in an upper level writing course

– permitting unfettered use of generative AI. I will share the type of training provided to students, the exercises done in class, and the teaching approach that I think made this an overall success in terms of teaching the intended writing skills, maintaining the necessary rigor in the course, and the also preparing students to use this important efficiency tool in practice.

Session VII
11:00-11:50

Developing a Strategic Approach to Integrated Questions Set on the NextGen Uniform Bar Examination (50 minutes)

Wanda Temm

University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law

Shawn Shepard

Helix Bar Review

The NextGen Uniform Bar Examination challenges law schools to rethink both their curriculum and their assessment methods. This presentation will address a new assessment format—Integrated Question Sets—that is not incorporated into most current law school assessment. The NextGen Uniform Bar Examination has now been adopted by forty different jurisdictions. Ten states will be administering the exam in July 2026. This year's 3L students will be the first takers. Two parts of the exam are similar, although not identical to the current UBE. Most faculties, including LRW faculty, address only pieces of this new assessment. Developing specific strategies for our students to be prepared for this exam and incorporating them into our current curriculum and assessment tools is essential to their success. This presentation addresses specific strategies to improve our students' performance on the two types

Teaching Rigor By Inviting Failure (50 minutes)

Yan Slavinskiy

Stephanie Der

Loyola Law School, Los Angeles

This presentation will discuss the presenters' efforts to prepare Generation Z students for the rigors of legal practice given their unique learning style and needs. It will focus on a "Summer Success" program the presenters started two years ago, where students complete research and writing assignments that – unbeknownst to them – are intentionally designed with student failure in mind. The student "failures" are then used as a springboard to encourage increased rigor, creativity, resilience, and attention to detail in practice.

As the presentations at this conference will likely reflect, "rigor" is not susceptible to a single definition. Critical to defining rigor in the legal writing classroom is understanding the needs of the current generation of students. This community has been on the forefront of discussing the learning styles and needs of the Generation Z students who comprise the majority of our students. See Olivia R. Smith Schlinck, Ok, Zoomer: Teaching Legal Research to Gen Z, Cardozo Legal Studies Research

Comparing The Confident Briefwriting Voice To The Indirect Everyday Layperson Voice (50 minutes)

Jim Sowerby

The University of Illinois Chicago School of Law

Legal writers, especially briefwriters, are taught to use a confident and assertive voice, minimizing uncertainty and doubt. For some students, this new voice can initially feel strange, exaggerated, and even inauthentic. One possible explanation for their reaction is that in our everyday conversations, for example discussing where to eat lunch with friends, we tend to use a more exploratory and tentative style, indirect and deferential. (Of course, there can be cultural and gender variations in how much directness is considered to be acceptable.) I will discuss the benefits of explicitly comparing these two seemingly opposing voices or styles. For one thing, it is fun to look at humorous examples where an argument style is mismatched for a particular context. More substantively, a comparison of these styles leads to a deeper discussion of important concepts including hedging, commitment language, confidence, tentativeness, politeness, wordiness, and acknowledging counterarguments. Justice

of Integrated Question Sets--
Counseling and Drafting

Paper No. 684 (2022); Tiffany D. Atkins, #ForTheCulture: Generation Z and the Future of Legal Education, 26 Mich. J. Race & L. 115 (2021); Carolyn V. Williams, #CriticalReading #WickedProblem, 44 S. Ill. Univ. L. J. 179 (2020); Laura P. Graham, Generation Z Goes to Law School: Teaching and Reaching Law Students in the Post-Millennial Generation, 41 U. Ark. Little Rock L. Rev. 29 (2018). Scholars have also criticized some of the efforts made by professors to accommodate this cohort by deemphasizing rigor and protecting students from failure. See Emily Grant, Helicopter Professors, 53 Gonz. L. Rev. 1 (2017). The presenters will engage with this scholarship and share with attendees how “failure-oriented” assignments are both intrinsically rigorous and helpful for teaching Generation Z students the value of rigor in their future practice.

Roberts once commented that admitting a weakness in your argument can be a risky but—at the same time—a very effective strategy. In my experience, a nuanced briefwriting style will borrow some of the politeness conventions from everyday discourse, which in turn means that the perceived gulf between these two styles may be overstated.

12:00-1:30

Lunch and *Celebration Honoring Wanda Temm!*

Time	Room RB 175	Room RB 180	Room MC 195
Session VIII 1:40-2:30	<p>Using an Attorney Development Plan to Build Executive Function (25 minutes) <u>Kelly Gamble</u> Willamette University College of Law</p> <p>This session introduces the use of an Attorney Development Plan the first year skills class as a way to help students build the planning and organizational skills necessary for success in law school and legal practice. The Attorney Development Plan provides a framework for key professional development that also gives students some autonomy over both the substance and timing of the</p>	<p>Diving Straight into the DNA-Deep-End: Teaching Weight/Hierarchy of Authority through the Lens of Maryland v. King & Its Progeny (25 minutes) <u>Richard Gutierrez</u> University of Illinois Chicago School of Law</p> <p>Langdell’s legacy of a first-year curriculum ungrounded by the jurisdictionless morass of common law has largely left it to lawyering skills / legal writing courses to shoulder the significant burden of navigating—from introduction through mastery—the complex arena of authority (its weight and hierarchy, stare decisis, and</p>	<p>Farewell, Flipped Classroom! (25 minutes) <u>Whitney Heard</u> University of Houston Law Center</p> <p>Prior to the pandemic, I never used a flipped classroom model. However, one of my “pandemic pivots” was to create asynchronous videos that students were assigned to watch in advance of the online synchronous sessions. My hope was that the combination of assigned readings and videos would help with the potential for pandemic learning loss. When we returned to teaching in person, I decided to experiment with a flipped</p>

work. It requires students to set project deadlines, pursue self-directed learning and reflection, and engage in repeated, detail-oriented practice in discrete skill areas, reinforcing metacognition and accountability in ways that align naturally with the goals of the first-year curriculum.

**Practitioner Identified Skills:
How Well Are Students
Performing (25 minutes)**

Maurine Berens

Northwestern University
Pritzker School of Law

Practicing attorneys and judges who work with summer associates and recent law school grads have up close knowledge about how well our students are performing after they take our courses. I've been curious for a long time what they think about our students' skills after they leave us. So, I interviewed some of them to find out.

My interviews focused on two questions: what legal skills practitioners think are most important for students and recent grads, and how well our law students and recent graduates are performing these skills.

I've compiled the data from the interviews to report back to our community what we are doing right, and what we might adjust and change to enhance students' skills where they need further development.

even federalism). These topics require early attention—students, after all, cannot much advance their research of writing skills without knowing where to look or whose opinions trump—and the time professors can devote to them is limited to say the least. But especially in a federal system made of over 100 circuit and district courts, constitutions galore, and court labels seemingly designed to frustrate the uninitiated (I mean who calls trial courts “supreme” New York?) students are likely to struggle when asked to cull command from cursory review. In my (albeit limited) experience, the way through, is not to water down these issues or spoon-feed students, but instead to jump straight into the deep end. This session introduces an exercise I call “The Supremes Against the World.” It thrusts students directly into current and pressing constitutional issues surrounding DNA collection and the 4th Amendment while forcing them to grapple with dissents, federal versus state constitutions, and stare decisis. Students read excerpts from the United States Supreme Court’s controversial decision to allow warrantless DNA collection as part of routine booking procedures in *Maryland v. King* and must then answer a series of questions based around state and lower court reactions to that decision and its breadth. What happens when police want to collect DNA after routine booking has ended? Can state constitutions offer greater protection than King does? Whatever is the Scalia fan club to do with his dissent? Though such questions are arguably more “challenging” than typical textbook exercises on weight and hierarchy of authority my students have both enjoyed and

classroom model. I continued to assign the asynchronous videos and tried to spend most of my class time focusing on more hands-on learning activities. Every semester, I felt like something was missing in my flipped classroom, and I made tweaks here and there. Then, one day, an EdSurge story landed in my inbox “Does ‘Flipped Learning’ Work? A New Analysis Dives Into the Research.” When I finally got around to reading the story, I felt like I had found what I was missing – a reason to say, “Farewell, Flipped Classroom!” So, for the first time since Fall 2020, I did not flip my classroom this year. And, I was astounded by how much better my students seemed to grasp the material when I provided them with an interactive lecture and targeted activity during each class session. If given the opportunity, I would like to explore my experiences discontinuing the use of a flipped classroom model based on my reading of the EdSurge story. During the presentation, I would also like to facilitate a group discussion with participants sharing their insights into the advantages and disadvantages of a flipped classroom model as well as any interesting adaptations or alternatives for today’s students. Ultimately, I concluded that a flipped classroom model was not meeting my students where they were, and I needed to adjust my teaching to better prepare them for practice.

Making the most of office hours (25 minutes)

Caroline Sheerin

University of Iowa College of Law

In the age of AI, personal and individualized teacher/student interactions are becoming even more valuable. To that end,

aced this exercise. Motivated by real-world application and encouraged when they succeed, students build confidence and experience the reward of practice level rigor all in week 1!

Introducing a new, FREE book on legal drafting (25 minutes)

Joe Kimble
Cooley Law School

Bryan Garner and I have collaborated on a new book called Essentials for Drafting Clear Legal Rules. It is available for free online. Although it grows out of our work redrafting all five sets of federal court rules, the guidelines and techniques we recommend are broadly applicable to all forms of legal drafting. The book is replete with before-and-after examples—well over 200 of them. We think it will be a useful addition to any course on drafting. I will highlight some of the book's features in my presentation.

professors of writing should be wringing every bit of value out of opportunities to meet with students. One of these opportunities, office hours, is often underutilized during slow periods. In contrast, during crunch time, professors often see the same students over and over, who are often asking increasingly unhelpful questions. It is time to take a step back and think about whether we can be more intentional in using this time throughout the semester. I am at the beginning of a project that will investigate how students perceive office hours, how they use them, and whether there are ways to improve our approach. Over the summer, I plan to create a study that will solicit student participation to ask the questions: 1) how do you utilize office hours? and 2) what are your expectations about office hours? I will then utilize different methods of how to use the time during the semester (e.g., providing questions in advance, creating mini-assignments for the students to complete with me, inviting students to come visit me, etc.). The goal will be to determine if any of the new methods are effective, and whether the students have suggestions. As this conference will take place mid-semester, I will explain my project, provide an update on my work to date, and share and solicit suggestions for how to make use of office hours.

Session IX
2:40-3:30

From Feedback to Evaluative Judgment: Honing Students' Capacity to Recognize "Good" Work and Make It Better to Improve Academic Outcomes, Bar Readiness and Practice Preparation (50 minutes)

Jennifer Spreng
Southern Illinois University
Simmons Law School

Promoting Rigor in Writing Through a Multi-Tiered Approach to Memo and Brief Draft Feedback (50 minutes)

Nancy Marcus
California Western School of Law

In this presentation, I will describe a multi-tiered system of feedback I have developed for

Debating the Grading (50 minutes)

Joyce Rosenberg
Pam Keller
Betsy Six
Jordan Carter
Lisa Lattan
Kansas University School of Law

We will hold a moderated panel discussion in the style of a

Do your students know if their work product is “good”? Would they know if it was “better” than a classmate’s? And if they compared the two products, would they learn information that would help them make their work even better still?

Acquiring and exercising such “evaluative judgment” is intellectually rigorous. To determine if work product is “good,” students must learn what professional quality standards demand and in a complex discipline such as legal writing, they are often tacit, fuzzy, and even contradictory. Then, students must apply those standards to their own and others’ work product to assess their respective quality. The NextGen Bar Examination will test takers’ evaluative judgment, both directly and indirectly.

Helping students hone their evaluative judgment helps them achieve more academically and professionally. Evaluative judgment tells a student what to edit in a brief, how much the student is learning in a course, and how to improve performance test results on the bar exam. One ideal of evaluative judgment is that students constantly assess their work in production and learn to make improvements in real time. Another is that by comparing their work to analogous exemplars, students give themselves “self-feedback” and improve work product without professor intervention. Evaluative judgment is a practice skill that clients, employers, and the judiciary expect from emerging, independent professionals.

This presentation will first argue that legal writing professors can help students

assessing students’ memo and brief assignments. This multi-tiered draft assessment approach on the one hand elevates both my and my students’ respective teaching and learning experiences, and also results in an in-depth assessment system through which feedback is both individually tailored and able to be repackaged to assist each cohort group as a whole. Within each assignment, my feedback takes the form of both individual written and conference feedback and group feedback in the form of common issue summaries and follow-up quiz games. Each assignment’s “common issues” document I create is then incorporated into future slide shows and lessons, improving my own teaching and assessment capabilities by helping me preemptively hit trouble spot areas before they arise. Furthermore, the coupling of common issues feedback with individual feedback then allows me to keep my finger on the pulse not only of each individual student’s progress, but also of general patterns among the students. As common issues reappear from one assignment to the next, the ability to cross-reference past and present assignments through common issues lists also helps me pinpoint for each class as a whole which writing issues in the future may be weighted more heavily in grading rubrics, if they are issues I have covered numerous times in class. The possibility of higher deductions for mistakes repeated from one assignment to the next has resulted in a noticeable improvement in the quality of writing, and a much more pleasurable grading experience for me as I see my students’ writing dramatically improve from their first week of their 1L

daytime TV talk show. Discussion will include the value of the forced curve and grades in general; the appropriate role of academic support; whether the legal writing classroom has gotten too forgiving of student weaknesses; and what approach to teaching and learning ultimately benefits students and the profession. The discussion will reflect the frequent debates on these topics we have among ourselves as collaborative teachers working from the same syllabus and with the same simulations and exercises. Audience questions and participation will be encouraged, as is common to the genre. We will share and discuss in-class exercises we have used to provide scaffolding to students’ development of analytical skills.

hone their evaluative judgment and then reveal how to do it. The focus will be two recognized legal writing pedagogies, analyzing work product exemplars and peer review/feedback, which are gold standards in evaluative judgment literature. Both trigger powerful spontaneous comparisons that also lead students to “give feedback to themselves” about how to improve work product. Participants will leave knowing why they should adopt new pedagogies or how to maximize the productivity of those they already use to improve students’ evaluative judgment, bar readiness, and practice preparation.

experience to their final assignment.

3:30-3:40 Snacks

Time	Room RB 175	Room RB 180	Room MC 195
Session X 3:40-4:30	<p>Good Timing: The Benefits of an In-Class, Timed Graded Assignment (25 minutes) <u>K. Renee Schimkat</u> University of Miami</p> <p>Contemporary legal practice demands high-quality work product, often in a short amount of time. Accordingly, I introduce my international LL.M. students to the rigor of practice in the United States with an in-class writing assignment that is both timed and graded. Every spring, my students are prepared to attend one two-hour class knowing that a writing assignment will be distributed at the start and due at the end. That assignment balances the high standards of legal practice with the support provided in the classroom in two distinct ways. First, clients demand excellent writing in short time frames. Yet, because this assignment is worth only 5% of the students’</p>	<p>The Goldilocks Approach to Teaching Case Illustrations (25 minutes) <u>Jonathan Sheffield</u> Loyola University Chicago</p> <p>Legal writing faculty often grapple with how to present case illustrations in ways that both accommodate students at varying stages of learning and meet rigorous analytical expectations of practice. To adequately prepare students, legal writing educators must equip them with flexible, nuanced case illustration writing skills.</p> <p>This presentation introduces The Goldilocks Approach, a structured method to teaching students how and when to illustrate cases of three different lengths: (1) comprehensive full-paragraph case explanations, (2) concise one- or two-sentence illustrations embedded within a paragraph of multiple</p>	<p>Bridging the Feedback Gap: Preparing New Attorneys for Constructive Criticism in the Legal Field (25 minutes) <u>Kirsten Williams</u> Esbrook PC</p> <p>In law school, students are often accustomed to detailed, supportive feedback from their professors. However, once they transition into the practice of law, many new attorneys are surprised by the quick, blunt feedback they receive from experienced colleagues. This shift can be disorienting—new attorneys may interpret it as a sign of poor performance or even develop negative feelings toward their coworkers. In reality, attorneys often lack the time or the experience to provide the same kind of in-depth feedback law students are used to. As a result, new attorneys may struggle with job satisfaction and feel uncertain about how to improve. This</p>

course grade, the assignment does not feel overwhelming. My students know that, when grading, I will take into account the limited amount of time they have to complete the assignment. Second, this one in-class assignment gives the students a sense of accurate deadlines, underscoring the reality of time management and work pressures. Yet, this pressure is balanced against other assignments throughout the semester, which provide much longer deadlines: six weeks for a trial-court motion in the course rather than six days for a motion in practice. Every year, students are nervous for this in-class, graded assignment. But the vast majority of students are then exhilarated when they complete the assignment, knowing that they can do an attorney's work on time. Nervousness transforms into confidence.

Paper Deadlines: Real, Strict, or Something Else? (25 minutes)

Joel Schumm

Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law

One second late is late. "Your client could literally die if you file something late" (citing a Texas case <https://abcnews.go.com/WN/story?id=3724883&page=1>) has been part of my first-year legal writing class for decades. "It's better to be strict from the beginning" and "we need to prepare them for practice" seem to guide this approach.

In the real legal world, however, not much happens when a lawyer is seconds late on a motion or brief. Yes, it even happened to me after more than 20 years of timely filings. Mindful that professors are expected to develop learning outcomes regarding

illustrations beginning with a thesis statement connecting all illustrations within the paragraph, and (3) efficient explanatory parentheticals showing how a broad rule in the text applies in specific factual circumstances. By balancing depth with efficiency, this method helps students develop a flexible, strategic approach to analogical reasoning using case illustrations.

The session explores optimal timing for teaching each illustration type within the first-year curriculum and offers practical strategies for classroom exercises and feedback. The session will include practical examples of how to integrate these formats into first-year legal writing courses and considerations for scaffolding student learning in a practice-oriented writing course. Participants will discuss how this method enhances analytical depth, balances clarity with rigor, and aligns legal writing instruction more closely with professional practice.

Scaffolding Strategies for Writing Case Descriptions of Varying Lengths (25 minutes)

Mandee Baumer

Penn State Dickinson Law

Many recent federal appellate opinions are filled with short case descriptions, as short as a participial phrase. Law students' writing assignments typically are filled with long case descriptions, ranging from several sentences to several paragraphs. Are these lengthy, maximalist case descriptions always necessary, and if not, how can students learn how to write shorter yet effective case descriptions? This presentation will discuss the utility of longer vs. shorter case descriptions, offering examples for when

difficulty in adapting to feedback may be partially rooted in the upbringing of Gen Z. Having grown up in the age of smartphones, Gen Z's transition from a play-based childhood to one dominated by phone interactions has impacted their ability to handle and solve real-world problems. While legal writing professors can't undo the effects of a phone-centric childhood, they can help prepare students for the feedback dynamics they will face in the workplace. In this presentation, I will first explore how the phone-based childhood has shaped Gen Z's approach to challenges, as outlined by Jonathan Haidt in "The Anxious Generation." Then, I will share examples of the type of feedback new attorneys can expect and offer strategies for responding effectively. As a new attorney, I believe that helping students understand these feedback styles—and teaching them not to take criticism personally—will better equip them to thrive in their legal careers.

From Boomers to Zoomers: Teaching Tips for Rigor Across the Generations (25 minutes)

Susan Bakhshian

LMU Loyola Law School, Los Angeles

Every generation of students brings a unique set of preferences and styles to the classroom. This presentation rejects the stereotype of the curmudgeon professor who complains that today's students are lazy, uncommitted, or simply inferior to past students. The reality is that every generation of students has a complex mix of characteristics – including some improvements over the prior generation and some characteristics that chafe previous generations. This

“professional skills needed for competent and ethical participation as a member of the legal profession” under ABA Standard 302(d), this interactive presentation will challenge professors to reconsider their policies on late papers. Practical considerations of administrative burden, preserving anonymity, and the need for consistency (within a class and across sections) will also be considered

longer case descriptions are warranted and when shorter case descriptions should suffice. Further, the presentation will explain how shorter case descriptions can include enough important details so that the case can be used in analogical reasoning. A scaffolding lesson will be introduced that gives students practice writing descriptions of the same case in three different ways and of three different lengths. Students first learn how to write a longer, comprehensive description of the case. When they have mastered that technique, they then learn how to write (1) a shorter in-text description and (2) an explanatory parenthetical description. The lesson could be used for first-year or upper-level students and would prepare students to write more like practicing attorneys.

presentation will focus on the characteristics that each new generation brings to the law classroom and how we can adapt our teaching strategies to maintain that sweet spot of rigor that is challenging enough to learn without lowering standards.