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A History of Writing Advisors at Law Schools: Looking at Our Past, Looking at Our Future

Jessie Grearson and Anne Enquist*

I. INTRODUCTION

The tradition of having interdisciplinary scholars in law schools is well established.¹ Economics, political science, business, and ethics professors, to name but a few, have often taught or team-taught courses in law schools at the junctures where their disciplines intersect law.

It should not be surprising, then, that composition and rhetorical theory scholars, i.e., writing professors, are teaching in many law schools across the country. After all, writing is not just connected to law: it is central to the legal profession. The law itself is, for the most part, written language in the form of statutes, regulations, constitutions, and judicial opinions; and words, both spoken and written, are the lawyer’s tools of the trade. Consequently, the specialized knowledge and expertise of the writing professor has direct application to much of what a law student must learn, particularly in his or her legal writing courses.

Thirty-four law schools across the country have, to date, decided that a writing professor’s expertise is needed in their school and have added thirty-nine writing professors to their legal writing programs.² (See Appendix A.) These writing professors, most of whom do not have law degrees, are known sometimes as Writing Advisors and sometimes as Writing Specialists.

The authors, themselves Writing Advisors at The John Marshall Law School and Seattle University School of Law respectively, have recently surveyed both Directors of Legal Writing and Writing Advisors across the country to learn more about the

---

* Jessie Grearson is Professor of Writing at The John Marshall Law School and Anne Enquist is the Writing Advisor at Seattle University School of Law.

¹ A search of the AALS DIRECTORY OF LAW TEACHERS on Westlaw shows that there are currently over 125 non lawyers teaching on law school faculties around the country.

² Since the survey was conducted, two additional Writing Advisors have been added to this list.
phenomena of Writing Advisors in law schools. This article will report the results of that survey. First, however, we will give a brief history of the events surrounding the arrival of Writing Advisors at law schools, including the rise of the writing-across-the-curriculum (WAC) movement, and then we will describe how these events set the stage for Writing Advisors at law schools. Second, we will use the data we obtained from the survey to present a snapshot of the current field of Writing Advisors in law schools. This snapshot will include information about who is filling these positions, what responsibilities they have, and how much they are paid, as well as the words of the Writing Advisors themselves as they describe the rewards and challenges of these positions. Third, using the survey data, we will discuss how current Writing Advisors may shape their roles within their law schools and how law schools that are considering adding a Writing Advisor position to their program may develop such a position. Finally, we will look at the future of Writing Advisor positions and discuss the challenges and opportunities for Writing Advisors in the next decade.

II. HISTORICAL EVENTS SETTING THE STAGE FOR WRITING ADVISORS

To best understand the history of Writing Advisors at law schools, it is helpful to consider the surrounding cultural events that were changing the nation and shaping its views on teaching writing during the time the first of these positions developed. Dating back to the 60's, a number of factors worked together to create an environment that made it natural, if not inevitable, that Writing Advisors would be part of the law school environment. This brief history focuses particularly on the 60's and 70's—the decades preceding the advent of Writing Advisors at law schools.4

3 The authors would like to thank Professors Elizabeth Fajans, Nancy Jones, and Mary Barnard Ray for the suggestions they made about the survey questionnaire; Assistant Dean John McNamara for his help formatting the survey; Jennifer O'Reilly for her assistance with data entry; Lori Lamb for her invaluable help tracking down and organizing the surveys; Professor Julie Spanbauer for her ideas regarding drafts of this article; Viren Sapat for his cheerful willingness to create charts depicting the survey data, and Professor Judith Maier for her generous help with the presentation of the survey results at the 1998 Legal Writing Institute conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

A. 1960’s

The 1960’s were, of course, a remarkable era of social and educational reform. The 1960’s civil rights movement, combined with that decade’s massive boom in higher education that was itself a response to the baby boom, prompted increased numbers of students from increasingly diverse backgrounds to seek access to higher education. The 60’s also witnessed the rise of the newly professionalized writing professor, with an accompanying boom in membership to organizations like the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC). This new writing professional was influenced at such national conferences by teachers like Peter Elbow, Donald Graves, James Moffat, and Kenneth Macrorie, whose pedagogies, a product of the times, are best characterized as anti-authoritarian, student-centered, focused on class as community and writing as a means of learning. Meanwhile, British scholar James Britton was developing the ideas that would form the basis of the WAC movement.

B. 1970’s

In the 70’s these factors combined to produce the “widest social and institutional demand for writing instruction” that the nation had seen—a demand catalyzed by a mid-70’s outcry against perceived illiteracy and declining standards. “Why Johnny Can’t Write,” the now famous December 8, 1975, Newsweek article, captures the degree of concern and the inflammatory language of that national discussion with its opening words, “If your children are attending college, chances are that they will be unable to write ordinary, expository English.” The article continues by predicting literary culture’s demise and by characterizing America’s youth as showing a “massive regression toward the intellectually invertebrate.” The article also docu-

---

5 *Id.* at 274. For example, in 1960 there were 2,006 institutions of higher education and in 1980 there were 3,125—a 50% increase in a 20 year period.

6 *Id.* In fact, it was during this decade that growth in the composition faction of CCCC began to outstrip that of its communication membership—teachers who focused on teaching speech.

7 *Id.* at 273.

8 The WAC movement is particularly relevant to our research because Writing Advisors can be seen as a classic example of this movement: the professional writing teacher moving into a particular disciplinary environment.

9 *Id.* at 275.

ments the reaction of graduate schools of “law, business and journalism” with officials reporting “gloomily that the products of even the best colleges have failed to master the skills of effective written communication so crucial to their fields.”

Part of the solution to this perceived crisis came in the form of the WAC movement, a movement influenced greatly by the work of James Britton. The 70’s and 80’s were a golden time for the WAC movement in the U.S.; according to Russell, WAC’s success distinguished it from other cross-curricular programs since the 1900’s. WAC provoked this “unprecedented interest” in educators for several reasons: 1) the movement explored the link between language and learning; 2) it harnessed educator’s efforts to transform faculty attitudes about teaching writing and coincided with the increasing professionalization of the writing instructor; 3) it coincided with new institutional goals of retention that arose from a post-60’s ideological and cultural consciousness shift toward open admissions inclusion; 4) it coincided with a boom in higher education that created more schools for more students of increasingly diverse educational backgrounds; and 5) it coincided with a social and institutional demand and accountability for writing instruction in light of a new scrutiny on “declining standards.”

C. Effect on Law School Environment in the 80’s and 90’s

These same factors that prompted heightened national attention to the teaching of writing influenced the law school environment as well, because increased numbers of diverse students also began arriving at law schools a few years later. By the late 70’s and early 80’s, law school teachers were beginning to feel the effects of the new and diverse students yielded by 70’s undergraduate open admission policies, as well as a growing sense of institutional accountability to address the needs of this newly diverse student body in the very traditional setting of law school.

---

11 Id.

12 Russell, supra note 5, at 275. As Russell notes, it is no coincidence that this “crisis” occurred as diverse students with their accompanying range of diverse talents sought access to the traditional realms of higher education.

13 Id. at 283. (Noting that the first workshop was held in Pella, Iowa).

14 Id. at 275.

15 These students were racially and economically diverse as well as diverse in their levels of academic preparation.
D. The Introduction of Writing Advisors

To address these needs, many law schools first looked within and tried hiring students to help other students who were poor writers. The mixed or poor results of many of these early tutorial arrangements convinced several law school deans that they needed to look outside the law school walls for someone who had real expertise in teaching writing.

1. The First Wave—"The Law School Tutor"

Because many law schools are part of a larger university with an English department, a few law schools as far back as the 60's and 70's looked to these English departments for this expertise and hired an English professor to come to the law school to work with a selected handful of students. For example, at the University of Puget Sound School of Law, the dean would simply call the chair of the English department, who would then select a member of the English department who was an expert in composition and rhetoric to spend a few hours one day a week over at the law school tutoring individual law students in writing. The "law school tutor" rotated through a number of members of the composition and rhetoric faculty. Even though these individuals were undoubtedly delighted to see such a clear example of writing-across-the-curriculum at work, it was not too surprising that these individuals were far more invested in their positions in the English department than in their smaller, temporary roles in the law school. Very few, if any, had professional contact with other Writing Advisors at other law schools. The work was viewed as more of a professional courtesy between the English department and the law school.

At free-standing law schools that were not part of a university, such as Brooklyn Law School, the dean advertised for persons with credentials in English composition and rhetoric to serve as a writing tutor. Originally many of these early tutors were part-time faculty or staff whose primary or exclusive role was to do remedial work in writing with weaker law students.

At another pioneering school, the University of Wisconsin Law School, the dean advertised for a writing tutor originally because the school had made a special commitment to minority law students. This desire to provide remedial help for minority law students who needed extra work on their writing laid the groundwork for what grew into an additional writing conference resource available to all students.
2. The Second Wave—"The Career Writing Specialist"

The 1980's began with three significant events that helped synthesize and crystallize the law school community's thinking about legal writing and how and why it should be taught. In 1980, the first American Association of Law Schools' workshop on legal writing was held. In the following year, the Plain English Movement, a kind of "consumers' rights" approach to eradicating legalese, was "born" with the formation of a Plain English Committee. The third event was the Albany Law Review's publication of a symposium issue on the teaching of legal writing.

As part of that symposium issue, Lynn Squires wrote an article describing her role as the Writing Specialist at the University of Washington School of Law. Her article drew the attention of law school deans and legal writing directors who began to realize that a Writing Advisor could play a key role in their legal writing program. Increasingly, Writing Advisors were not limited to remedial tutoring, but expected to share their insights and strategies about teaching writing with the legal writing faculty. Through their Writing Advisors, many legal writing programs learned about new approaches to teaching writing, most notably the process approach, that were being developed by English departments and could be transplanted to the law school.

A few deans began to ask for bigger commitments from their English department tutors. For example, the dean of the University of Puget Sound Law School now wanted the English department tutor three half days a week. Furthermore, he wanted the same person from year to year. He also wanted the tutor, who was now thought of as a Writing Advisor, to be available to any student who wanted to work on his or her writing. This scenario was replicated at several other law schools around the country.

By the mid 80's Writing Advisors had been added at a number of other law schools, including Southwestern University School of Law, the University of Florida College of Law, New York Law School, the University of Bridgeport School of Law at Quinnipiac, the University of Missouri-Columbia Law School, Seton Hall School of Law, City University of New York at Queens College School of Law, the University of Dayton School of Law, the University of Texas Law School, North Carolina

---

16 Lynn B. Squires, A Writing Specialist in the Legal Research and Writing Curriculum, 44 ALB. L. REV. 412 (1980).
Central University Law School, Notre Dame Law School, Howard University School of Law, and Northeastern University School of Law.17

The expanded role that many law schools wanted their Writing Advisors to play made an immediate difference. Writing Advisors began working with a wider spectrum of the law student population. Instead of meeting with only the weakest writers, the Writing Advisors were finding that more and more students from the middle and top of the class were signing up for writing conferences with them. Law students, who are naturally quite competitive, quickly learned that there was an extra resource that they could use. They sensed a possible advantage and started flocking to writing conferences with Writing Advisors. Suddenly having a Writing Advisor a few hours a week was not enough to meet student demand. As a consequence, several of the positions were increased to half-time, three-quarter time, or even full-time positions.

As Writing Advisors spent more time at law schools, they quite naturally began to develop expertise in the specific types of writing lawyers do. They were also in a unique position to critically examine legal discourse. With the confidence of another discipline’s preferences in writing, they were a bit more willing to question some of the unexamined conventions of legal prose, particularly in areas that related to conciseness, precision, organization, and writing style.

A number of other changes started to take place. A few Writing Advisors now had joint positions with both a law school and an English department. Several others found that because of the added time they were spending at a law school, they were increasingly invested in the work they were doing with law students. Indeed, many enjoyed the different way their expertise was regarded at the law school. In contrast to undergraduate students who often treated writing as a curricular hoop through which they had to jump (usually in the form of Freshman Composition 101), law students saw writing as critically important to their success as lawyers.

17 In a very few schools like Southwestern University School of Law, the English professors became the primary teachers of the legal writing class. In at least one school, Notre Dame Law School, the English professor (Teresa Godwin Phelps) became the Director of Legal Writing, and at the University of Florida College of Law, the Writing Specialist (Gertrude Block) became the Coordinator of Legal Writing.
Meanwhile, in the summer of 1984, the first national legal writing conference was held at the University of Puget Sound, and the Legal Writing Institute was established shortly thereafter. At that first conference and at the second one in 1986, several of these Writing Advisors became acquainted. Prior to the conferences and the Institute, they had worked in isolation, for the most part unaware that there were other Writing Advisors in other law schools scattered around the country. Now they began to realize the potential for a professional community.

In May 1988, in the fledgling newsletter of the Institute, the Second Draft, the following notice was posted:

Elizabeth Fajans of Brooklyn Law School and Anne Enquist of the University of Puget Sound Law School are interested in organizing a network of people who are currently working in legal writing programs as Writing Advisors, writing consultants, or writing specialists. The purpose of the network would be to establish a forum for the exchange of ideas and for the discussion of issues related to these positions. If you are currently working in one of these capacities, please send you name and address either to ... Betsy Fajans . . . or Anne Enquist . . . .

Using the responses to this notice, Betsy Fajans and Anne Enquist organized the first Writing Advisor meeting, which occurred at the Legal Writing Institute conference in the summer of 1988. From that first meeting, the group compiled a list of fourteen Writing Advisors and named itself “the Writing Specialists Network.” The members composed and shared descriptions of their individual positions, exchanged copies of favorite handouts, and compiled an annotated bibliography, which Mary Barnard Ray published and distributed. Ray also developed a library of resources for the Writing Specialists Network housed at the University of Wisconsin Law School. In addition, three members of the Writing Specialists Network were on a panel at the 1988 Institute conference explaining the work Writing Advisors were doing in law schools.

In 1992, the Writing Specialists Network renamed itself the “Writing Specialists’ Association” and started a regular column in the Second Draft, which was no longer a fledgling newsletter and now had a mailing list of well over 1,000 members of the Legal Writing Institute. The column continues today.

Despite their relatively small numbers and lingering outsider status, Writing Advisors began to play significant roles in
the larger community of legal writing professionals. Four Writing Advisors served on the national Board of Directors of the Legal Writing Institute, with one of the four serving as the Chairman of the Board and as the editor of *The Journal of Legal Writing*. Another Writing Advisor served as the editor of the *Second Draft* and had a regular column in the *Texas Bar Journal*. Yet another Writing Advisor wrote regular columns for many bar journals including the *Florida Bar Journal*, the *New York Bar Journal*, and the *Illinois Bar Journal*. By 1992-93, six had published articles in the field, and six were authors or co-authors of books about legal writing. Several more had made presentations about legal writing at national and regional conferences.

3. The Third Wave—“Growing Pressures → Growing Numbers”

In the last four or five years, the number of Writing Advisor positions has doubled, possibly because of the success of some of the earlier Writing Advisors but also almost certainly because of some growing pressures on law schools throughout the 90's.

Perhaps the most obvious pressure has been the national decline in applications to law schools, which started in 1992 and which virtually every law school has experienced to some degree. The decline in applications has forced all law schools to focus more and more on retaining the students they invest in attracting, and one-on-one conferences with a Writing Advisor appear to be an effective retention strategy.

While the decline in applications is undoubtedly connected to the demographic lull of the post-baby boom “baby bust,” it has also been fueled by the tightening job market for lawyers. In an effort to give their graduates a competitive edge, law schools have looked to their legal skills and legal writing programs for training that will impress prospective employers. Here again, having a Writing Advisor is further proof that a law school is committed to teaching its students how to write well.

The profession itself has been vocal in its appeal to law schools to develop their legal writing programs. In 1992, the MacCrate Report explicitly urged law schools to intensify their efforts to teach writing: “In view of the widely held perception that new lawyers today are deficient in writing skills, further concerted efforts should be made in law schools to teach writing
at a better level..."18 The 1993 Garth Martin study expanded on the MacCrate Report and revealed that hiring partners at law firms most valued capable writers,19 thus confirming law schools' assumptions that emphasizing writing would help their graduates get jobs. More recently, in 1996, the ABA recodified its standards to include an explicit emphasis on analytical skills including "oral and written communication."20 The bar exam itself shows an increasing trend toward using the Multi-state Performance Test (MPT), which has a written component that requires students to demonstrate their analytical and writing abilities.21

In 1997, the value of Writing Advisors to legal writing programs was recognized in the Sourcebook on Legal Writing Programs, which was published by the ABA Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar as a "compilation of those parameters and common features" "that define successful programs"22 teaching legal writing. The Sourcebook lists seven responsibilities that Writing Advisors, or Writing Specialists, commonly have: holding student conferences, training legal writing teachers, providing writing workshops, training law review and advanced moot court students, teaching upper-class advanced writing courses, reviewing upper-class seminar papers, and publishing scholarly articles and books.23 In addition to recognizing the Writing Advisors' value as experts in writing, the Sourcebook stated that "they may have a greater understanding of teaching methodology than the typical law teachers who have had little or no background in teaching."24

While the Sourcebook's recognition of Writing Advisors was an important milestone for this group of professionals, the most significant indicator of their perceived value by the larger legal

20 ABA STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND INTERPRETATIONS, Standard 302 (a) (2), (August 1996).
21 With 14 states now using the test, approximately 35% of students sitting for the exam will be taking the MPT in 1998, Frank Morrissey, former president of National Council of Bar Examiners, in conversation.
22 RALPH L. BRILL et al., SOURCEBOOK ON LEGAL WRITING PROGRAMS 1 (The American Bar Association 1997).
23 Id. at 86-88.
24 Id. at 85.
merely substituting for other “traditional” ways of teaching writing. We must also consider how well we have adapted process practices to a law school setting. Have we fully taken into account the institutional influences of law school on such practices? Looking at the earlier list of beliefs associated with process, one can see how process tenets become more problematic, less adaptable to a law school setting the further down the list one goes. How often do law students get to select their topics; how often do we discuss “voice” beyond active and passive? After all, law school is still predominantly product-centered and teacher-centered, more competitive than collaborative. Recent Internet discussions about the difficulties involved in grading collaboratively produced writing should not be surprising, then, since these teaching methods were developed in college classes where they would be graded holistically. How can we adapt potentially useful practices so that they will work in law school classrooms, despite their differences from the college classrooms where the practices developed? Is it possible to adapt student-centered practices while still maintaining a powerful position in the legal education environment that still does not value student-centered teaching? How might an unsupportive institutional environment threaten to “warp” such transplanted teaching methods?¹⁸

Or how might teaching THE writing process as what Anne Ruggles Gere has called an uninspected “lockstep”¹⁹ formula erase the individuality we set out to recognize and protect using process pedagogies? More specifically, how might teaching THE writing process as a series of universal stages through which all writers pass rather than as a highly fictionalized, albeit useful, concept blind us to considerations of how factors such as race, gender and culture affect such processes for different writers?²⁰ When does this useful fiction of “the” writing process break down in the face of what real writers actually do in a variety of real writing situations; how might teaching such stages as an uninspected ritual actually impede rather than help students?

¹⁸ For example, given the surrounding legal educational environment that does tend to “put down” students, it would be easy to follow suit; we must guard against letting such influences subvert sound process practices—for example, discussing student writing in class in any way that might embarrass students.

¹⁹ Anne Ruggles Gere, Narratives of Composition Studies, 3 LEGAL WRITING 51,52 (1997).

²⁰ See Tobin & Newkirk, supra note 17, p.10.
For example, Flowers and Hayes' ideas about writing as problem solving and their suggested heuristics by which writers can more easily move from reader-based to writer-based prose can help legal writing teachers illustrate how students might short-circuit their drafts with a too-early emphasis on creating reader-pleasing, polished prose. This generalized fiction of the writing process, however, may not assist in teaching non-traditional students or the growing population of ESL students because it does not take into account their writing process or their writing goals. After all, the reader-based/writer-based prose chart assumes that the writer's goal is always to move toward the clarity of the reader-friendly prose that we value in our very Western, very writer-responsible culture. But some Asian cultures are "reader-responsible" cultures. Teaching clarity as a universal value or presenting writer-based prose as the "natural" destination of the universal writer may create additional hurdles for some students. After all, some cultures consider this directness insulting; as one ESL teacher explained to me, "It's like starting with the punch line and then going back and telling the joke." How should our increasing knowledge about other cultures and their writing values affect how we teach THE four stages of the writing process and how responsible the student feels to "spell things out clearly and concisely" as she moves to the "reader-based prose" side of the writing process equation?

Or how might the influence of another culture's organizational patterns affect ESL students' writing processes? Fan Shen, a Chinese graduate student who has researched the cul-

21 See the reader/writer continuum in Table 2; see also Linda S. Flower and John R. Hayes, Problem-Solving Strategies and the Writing Process, in RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION: A SOURCE BOOK FOR TEACHERS AND WRITERS 269 (Richard Graves ed. 1984).

22 It is interesting to note how quickly the authors' idea of stages as heuristics were converted into standardized stages of "the" writing process despite the authors' emphasis that the stages are not discrete and the process as a whole is not linear. See id. at 281.

23 For example, Sherrie Gradin raises interesting questions about how socially constructed gender influences might affect different writers depending on their level of comfort with models of writing based on combative metaphors such as "attacking" and "defending"—metaphors on which we rely to teach persuasive writing. See Sherrie Gradin, ROMANCING RHETORICS: SOCIAL EXPRESSIVIST PERSPECTIVES ON THE TEACHING OF WRITING 129-130 (1995).


25 This insight was shared with me in a conversation with Debra Parker, a fellow writing advisor at The John Marshall Law School.

26 See Gradin, supra note 23, at 151.
tural nature of writing, explains how the idea of a “point-first”
topic sentence runs counter to the Chinese “bush-clearing” pat-
tern in which the writer “clears the surrounding bushes before
attacking the real target.” The Chinese bush clearing pattern
is a two-thousand-year old organizational pattern that directly
opposes IRAC’s point-first organization structure. Although we
need not abandon values such as clarity or organizational tools
such as IRAC, we must consider how our students’ previous
writing backgrounds will influence their writing in order to help
such students learn to adapt to “the way we do things here.”

Finally, when considering how best to discuss writing
processes with our students, we will need to address the “wild-
card” of technology. What impact will composing on a computer
have on a student’s draft? What effect will revising without a
hard copy have on a finished product? One new legal writing
text recommends that students “compose with a word proces-
sor,” citing reasons of ease and efficiency. Although this recom-
mandation makes sense for many writers, it leaves out those of
us whose necessary composing process includes scribbling on
napkins, or composing on a Dictaphone while driving. We must
continually question the methods with which we teach, making
sure that they take into account changes in our classrooms and
in our student populations.

B. Social Construction and Legal Writing

Some of these questions about how a person’s writing pro-
cess may be influenced by social factors are addressed by social
construction. As a writing theory, social construction is newer
and less codified than process pedagogies, but its roots are
equally complex, with a host of influences as diverse as Marx-
ism and Poststructuralism. Social construction developed in
the composition world as a critique of, if not an attack on, prac-
tices associated with the process approach. I also see it as a

27 Id.
28 Although I can find no research to support this impression, one potential draw-
back of “composing on screen” seems to be a lack of what students call “flow.” Students’
computer written drafts often tend to be coherent in screen-sized chunks rather than or-
organized in a more global sense.
29 Edwards, supra note 16, at xxii.
30 It also may not take into account some students’ economic realities—and if not,
could intimidate a student who fears he or she is not “doing it right.”
31 Faigley, supra note 7.
32 Scholars in the composition world have tended to pit “process” ideas against those
more "elite" theory coinciding with the professionalizing of composition theory as a discipline with an increasing level of status and power in College English departments, and one which seems to exacerbate the unfortunate "teachers" versus "researchers" polarization.

TABLE 3- Beliefs Associated with Social Construction

- Writers write within and are influenced by the sometimes unarticulated rules of the discourse communities they enter.
- Many problems students encounter are temporary and arise because students are confused about (or lack of knowledge about) the new rules and conventions of an unfamiliar discourse community.
- Expertise in writing per se is a myth; expertise exists within and in relation to a particular discourse community and what that community values.
- Writers are "written" by culture and context; writers making "individual" choices is a myth.
- Individual voice is a myth.
- Students best learn to write within a new discourse community by critiquing and reading "skeptically" texts produced within that community in order to see how each writer is written by culture and context.

associated with social construction, as evidenced by the widely publicized and now published debates between Peter Elbow and David Bartholomae. See Writing with Teachers: A Conversation with Peter Elbow, 46 C. COMPOSITION & COMM. 62 (1995).

See Carol Berkenkotter's Paradigm Debates, Turf Wars, and the Conduct of Sociocognitive Inquiry in Composition, 42 C. COMPOSITION & COMM. 151 (1991)(provides an interesting reminder of how scholarly production and theory making is tied to professional self-interest).

One of social construction's chief contributions is that it reminds those attracted to THE process approach that writing does not occur in a vacuum but flows from and always exists within human-made discourse communities\textsuperscript{35} where that writing makes sense and has value. Thus, the social constructionist questions the idea of ONE process able to accommodate the activities of the many writing communities populated by a multitude of many writers performing a variety of different writing tasks.

Instead of a focus on the individual learner/writer, this theory emphasizes the context within which a writer writes, and even suggests, in its most extreme formulation, that the individual is "written" by culture and by context, that the "individual" writer does not exist because such writers are always a part of a larger WE that exerts a powerful influence on "individual" choices. Such an idea serves as a helpful check on the idea of the individual creator as completely autonomous agent, in control of and responsible for his or her process OR product (which is often how students are judged and ranked in law school). Social construction can help us understand how experienced writers who have done well in other discourse communities can be so terribly disconcerted when they shift into the discourse community of legal writing with its new rules, conventions, purposes, and audiences.

Finally, this theory also helps us (and all disciplines) remember with some humility that expertise itself is created by communities of individuals agreeing that something is valuable or works well and that patterns of deductive or inductive reasoning are created by humans and are not discovered Universal principles. It is easy to forget that the organizational tool IRAC, so pervasive in our legal writing world, is a human-made creation that has served us well as a group, that we have decided to endorse and pass along to our new members, but it is not, as the 2,000-year-old "bush-clearing pattern" example reminds us, the only or the most important way in the world to organize thinking.

However helpful social construction may be, it is not without its dangers. Because it incorporates so many influences and

\textsuperscript{35} The idea of a discourse community may be simply understood as a fancy way of saying "the way we do things here" within our discipline or, to use Patricia Bizzell's definition, "a group of people who share certain language-using practices."\textit{Patricia Bizzell, Academic Discourse and Critical Consciousness,} 222 (1992).
ideas, social construction seems to hold some attraction for most teachers. In fact, Patricia Sullivan, reviewing several new books on social construction, calls it the "default theory of the 90's"—a kind of "Alice's restaurant" where writing teachers "can get anything we want." This theory requires real attention to the whole and could be very dangerous if taken up only in part. For example, what legal writing teachers might find particularly attractive is the social constructionist idea of legal writing as a discourse community—because accompanying this idea is the clear-cut professional role of expert initiators of novice students desiring to enter into this discourse community. Unfortunately, this genuinely benign position—helping students into the legal writing discourse community—is perilously close to what was emphasized in the "bad old days" of the current traditional paradigm. If we used the idea of discourse community unselfconsciously, it would be very easy to become "in-focused" on our concerns and on our increasingly specialized ways of doing things. After all, any idea of community can lose its inviting inclusive meaning and become more exclusive. Rituals of initiation can quickly become elaborate forms of hazing in a place where students have little power. Unlike many process practices, the idea of initiating students into a discourse community has ready-made alliances with the law school world, which you can hear in Kingsfield's phrase from The Paper Chase: "You arrive here with a head full of mush and you leave thinking like a lawyer." This quote captures the expert-novice divide, the initiation rituals that reinforce that divide, and the idea of fully realized, merely to-be-learned conventions.

An example of how easy it is to subvert a positive, inclusive sense of discourse community into a more exclusive and less friendly one is provided by Joseph Williams' article, "On the Maturing of Legal Writers." An influential piece that prepared the ground for the legal writing community's interest in ideas from social construction, the article focuses on the socialization of new legal writers and attempts to explain their "seeming incom-

37 Gere, supra note 19, at 52.
38 In fact, increasing specialization is one of the six criteria that applied linguist John Swales suggests should determine whether a "given social group is a discourse community." John Swales, Approaching the Concept of Discourse Community, quoted by BIZZELL, supra note 35, at 226.
petence" at legal writing as more a matter of unfamiliarity with expert legal writers' ways of doing things than a result of declining literacy skills in the United States. Williams does acknowledge expertise, briefly, as a social construct; however, the article, if not read carefully, could do more to introduce the term "discourse community" as a potentially detachable concept, and less to invite the legal writing community to self-consciously analyze and reconsider the ways in which the group uses language to construct knowledge and "expertise." An inadvertent emphasis on "social[ization]" without a balancing emphasis on "construction" could have damaging consequences.

Although the article suggests reenvisioning the student-teacher relationship by dismantling the power structure of teacher-on-the-mount, Williams' reimagined visual metaphor is still limiting since it relies on and reinforces the insider/outsider distinction. In Williams' picture, this discourse community has a rigid, if not impermeable rind and one narrow opening, and its us/them division suggests the exclusivity of the inner community. Here the desired action is one way: in. Although Williams acknowledges that "we are all novices in some communities and experts in others," it is not clear from this image how or if the constant traffic of students/experts brings any change to the legal writing discourse community. The limit of this image in social constructionist terms is that it cannot accommodate the possibility of enriching overlaps and intersections of previous experience or expertise that help keep a discourse community alive and healthy. Finally, envisioning "us" as a detachable discourse community taken out of an institutional context tempts us to ignore what social construction asks us to recall: that discourse communities are built and maintained by power structures.

Without that important background information in mind, the benign role of "initiating students into our discourse community" could begin to sound more ominous and more hierarchical—aren't experts always "higher" than novices? The phrase (with its expert initiators and novice students) sounds painfully

---

40 Id. at 15.
41 Id. at 13.
42 Williams' image, meant to replace the hierarchical model of teacher on the mount with students struggling up the slope of knowledge with an expert-teachers "us" inside a circle and a novice-students "them" outside trying to get in, looks very similar to the "us/them" image above in Table 1.
43 Id. at 31.
was that witnessing the students' development as writers was the greatest reward.

A big reward comes from watching students emerge as capable, articulate writers and thinkers—knowing their growth is due in part to your diagnostic skills, suggestions, support, and enthusiasm.

Mentioned almost as frequently was the reward of working with the diversity of writing questions students brought to the writing conferences, as well as the intellectual challenge that comes from teaching highly motivated law students.

Every student who walks into my office will be different and so will every session. My position in the whole affair shifts from task to task; growing in my ability to reason to these multiple possibilities is quite a thrill indeed.

[The most rewarding thing about being a Writing Advisor is] the intellectual challenge of understanding a student's thinking habits that underlay his or her writing, and then proposing one change—a "surgical strike" that (a) will be possible for the student to implement and (b) will result in better writing. Writing is physical evidence of a person's thought process and changing it is tangible and yet multifaceted. It presents a puzzle I haven't tired of trying to solve in nineteen years. Few fields offer that.

[The most rewarding thing is] law students—their intelligence, eagerness, relative maturity, willingness to work.

Several Writing Advisors said the greatest reward was using their knowledge of writing and composition theory in a legal education environment and being able to make a difference in another field.

I enjoy being able to bring the insights of composition and rhetorical theory to a law school setting.

I love the contact with the students and the feeling that I am helping to upgrade the level of law practice in the State of . . . . It means a lot to me to know that the work I do will make a difference to so many people, both the students and the clients they will represent in the future.

In answering the question "What have you found most challenging/difficult about being a Writing Advisor," almost all of
the Writing Advisors described as the top challenge the demanding nature of the positions.

... I find that few other faculty members realize the time commitment involved in working with students individually, keeping current in the field, doing my own research and writing, advising members of the writing faculty, keeping up with committee work, etc.

Balancing/juggling diverse responsibilities, meeting the needs of varying populations, negotiating the political controversies.

Others responded to this question by discussing the lack of understanding of or appreciation for their work, coupled with what a few saw as counterproductive attitudes among law faculty about writing.

Just about the thorniest challenge ... is to somehow separate 'writing' from 'legal substance' in tutoring sessions. Most faculty are willing for students to get help from Writing Advisors as long as we do not address the accuracy of the student's legal analysis or their understanding of the law. Anyone who has taught writing knows that the form and the substance go hand in hand, that you cannot truly divorce them. Yet we must tread very carefully here and use the kinds of questions in tutoring sessions that focus on form or logical inconsistencies or unexpected jumps, rather than questions that would announce themselves addressing the legal analysis head-on. Needless to say, the tight-rope we must walk is a taut one, and it often feels as if there is no net beneath us.

---

27 This issue of how—or whether—Writing Advisors should comment on problems they see in the content of law students' writing is indeed a difficult one. On the one hand, most Writing Advisors resist playing the role of proofreader and find it is not pedagogically sound to limit their advice to just how the student conveyed his or her ideas without addressing the logic and coherence of the ideas themselves. On the other hand, many Writing Advisors have degrees in English, not law, and consequently are wary of giving advice that seems to be a form of teaching law. Just how Writing Advisors negotiate this nebulous area where substance meets style is a frequent subject of conversation among these teachers. Some suggest the best approach for the Writing Advisor to use is reader-response methodology, where the Writing Advisor enacts the reader's reactions for the student: "As your reader, I am confused about this passage because ... "
Not surprisingly, many others described status issues, politics, and the insecurity of their positions as the major challenges facing Writing Advisors.

[The most challenging part of being a Writing Advisor is] job insecurity (lack of tenure, promotion opportunities), institution’s perception of this job, being left out of the decision-making about curriculum, and work load.

The most difficult aspect is not having full-time status at the law school . . . . It is frustrating to have to move offices frequently, to work only part-time, and to make a meager wage. Although the Legal Research and Writing staff value me, the university system will not pay me more nor give me more hours.

Still others described the loneliness of being the “Other,” of not being a classroom teacher, of being the one English professor in a world of law professors, and of missing the world that English professors usually live in.

As a Writing Advisor working one-on-one with students, I miss the classroom: the dynamics of student interaction, the thinking on your feet aspects of classroom teaching.

The biggest challenge is not being a lawyer; not having a J.D.—the credential that matters most around here. The second biggest challenge is not being part of an English dept. I miss having people around who talk about literature.

Finally, a few of the Writing Advisors described their surprise both at finding a hostile working environment in their law school and at learning that legal prose is often disappointing in its conventions.

Initially the greatest challenge for me was a sense of culture shock. I was shocked, for instance, at the harsh climate of law school, where students—graduate students!—were often not treated with respect. I was surprised at how I was defined as what I was NOT—a lawyer—instead of what I was—a writer and a teacher of writing. And early on I was shocked by a lot of the conventions of legal writing, which really did seem to me to be boring, repetitive, all that I thought of as bad writing. However, I think this sense of shock helps me work with students who are similarly dismayed.
It was interesting to note that the responses to questions about rewards and challenges seemed linked; the challenges people listed often were the flip-side of the rewards listed. The only exception to this was the negative aspect of stresses associated with politics, institutional red tape and status issues; these were challenges that had no advantages associated with them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pressure of juggling multiple roles</td>
<td>Rewards of the Renaissance person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of drawing boundaries around levels</td>
<td>Rewards of witnessing one's assistance pay off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The loneliness of being the &quot;Other&quot;</td>
<td>Benefits of working with a community of like-minded colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing our own conventions</td>
<td>Challenge of bringing composition insights to a new field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stresses of politics, institutional red tape and status issue</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. DESIGNING AND SHAPING A WRITING ADVISOR POSITION

In addition to the information from the Writing Advisors' survey, the survey we sent to the Directors of Legal Writing programs also yielded insights into the nature of these positions. When asked "which of the following reasons describes why your law school does not have a Writing Advisor," twelve Directors checked the answer "do not need the position," and thirty-seven checked "do not have the financial resources to support the position." Nine other Directors said that they were trying to meet the need in other ways, which usually meant through either a Writing Center on an undergraduate campus or student writing tutors.

Two Directors said that they are currently working to add a Writing Advisor position, and two additional Directors said that their school was currently discussing the possibility of adding such a position. In addition, during the time since the survey was conducted, a conversation has developed on the list-serve for the Association of Legal Writing Directors concerning how to develop a Writing Advisor position. The authors have also re-
ceived several requests for information about developing Writing Advisor positions.

A. What a Law School Should Consider in Designing a Writing Advisor Position

In designing a Writing Advisor position, a law school should undoubtedly begin by determining the needs of its legal writing program and then examining the Writing Advisor Responsibilities chart to see what kinds of things other Writing Advisors are doing. (The Sourcebook for Legal Writing Programs also has a section on the responsibilities of Writing Advisors.) The charts showing the differences in the responsibilities between a Writing Advisor at the low end of the salary range and one at the high end of the salary range also give a strong indication of what is reasonable to expect at different compensation levels. Writing Advisors on the low end of the salary range tend to spend the vast majority of their time (over 85%) working one-on-one with students in writing conferences. This type of position may be desirable, at least initially, for law schools whose primary reason for adding a Writing Advisor position is to offer more writing expertise in one-on-one conferences. The disadvantage of such a position is that the amount of student contact may exhaust the Writing Advisor over time. The lack of variety in the Writing Advisor's work life and the lack of opportunities for professional growth and rejuvenation also lead to burn-out, and these factors may make the position unattractive to highly qualified candidates.28

Designing a position in the mid or higher salary range allows a law school to make one-on-one conferences a key responsibility for the Writing Advisor (possibly consuming one-third to one-half of the Writing Advisor's time) and still draw upon the Writing Advisor's expertise in other ways. For example, other courses that current Writing Advisors are teaching or team-teaching include advanced legal writing seminars, drafting labs, law and literature courses, language and the law courses, thesis

---

28 One thing to consider with applicants who have a Ph.D. in English is whether the individual's doctoral studies were in literature or whether they were in composition and rhetoric. A doctorate in medieval literature, for example, has little if any application to legal writing or student writing conferences. Indeed, an applicant with a degree such as a M.F.A, M.A in composition, rhetoric, English-as-a-second-language, or a M.A.T. in teaching writing may have more directly useful expertise for a Writing Advisor position than will the typical applicant with a Ph.D. in literary studies.
writing for LL.M. participants, editing courses for law review staffs, remedial writing courses for academic support programs, and a wide variety of independent studies to meet special needs such as those of English-as-a-second-language law students.

Most Writing Advisors in the mid or higher salary ranges also have responsibility training the rest of the legal writing faculty. In these situations, the Writing Advisors shares expertise in composition and rhetorical theory, learning theory, teaching methodology, curricular design, conferencing techniques, and critiquing strategies. In fact, historically this group of Writing Advisors has taken the lead in introducing critiquing strategies such as holistic assessment, reader-response commenting, and portfolio review. As people who have thought deeply about voice, narrative, and rhetorical analysis, these Writing Advisors bring an important perspective to the profession's thoughts about facts, arguments, and points of view.

In addition, mid to higher range Writing Advisors often have responsibilities outside of the legal writing program that enhance the larger institution. For example, this group of Writing Advisors advises student journals, serves on committees for institutions, assists admissions office with writing samples, works with faculty on their writing, and teaches in the school's Continuing Legal Education programs.

What most clearly distinguishes higher salary range positions from lower salary range positions, however, is the school's expectation about professional and scholarly activity. Lower salary Writing Advisors have no time (and no energy) for a high level of involvement in professional organizations—including attending or presenting at conferences—or for scholarly research and writing. Higher salary range Writing Advisors, on the other hand, have traditionally been exceptionally active in the professional organizations associated with legal writing. Several have proven to be unusually productive scholars and writers. (See Appendix B, "Bibliography of Publications by Writing Advisors.")

29 The lack of involvement in organizations like the Legal Writing Institute accompanied by a lack of opportunity and not having an opportunity to maintain a scholarly approach to one's work may also contribute to burn-out for lower salary range Writing Advisors.

30 For a bibliography of presentations by Writing Advisors, contact Jessie Grearson at The John Marshall Law School.
In programs that currently have a Writing Advisor, the Directors of Legal Writing were asked how they found the person they hired. There were almost as many answers as there are Writing Advisors. A few deans and directors posted the opening on bulletin boards and listed the position in newspapers like the Chronicle of Higher Education, but more often than not the position was filled by an internal referral or by hiring someone already known by the dean or director.

The survey also asked whether the current Writing Advisors had written job descriptions and whether they were evaluated. Surprisingly, only seven of the current Writing Advisors had written job descriptions. Only twenty had some form of evaluation, usually student evaluations or occasionally evaluation by a dean or the director, and only two of the current Writing Advisors go through a formal evaluation process with the faculty. While there may be some advantages to loose, unwritten job descriptions, it seems unwise to establish positions without outlining their responsibilities and without evaluating how these responsibilities are carried out.

B. What a Writing Advisor Should Consider in Helping Shape a Position

Whether a person is currently a Writing Advisor or considering applying for a Writing Advisor position, there are a few things he or she should consider beyond the obvious categories of salary and responsibilities: the status attached to the position, potential growth within the position given the needs of the law school, and the relationship of the Writing Advisor to the law students coming in for writing conferences.

As the earlier chart on status indicated, the current Writing Advisors are split with about 60% having some form of faculty status and about 40% having staff or other status. Within the faculty group, only two persons have a tenure track position, which has its obvious advantages and disadvantages. Slightly more persons have long-term contracts than have annual contracts, with the presumed benefit of more job security for those with long-term contracts. For the most part, those with long-term contracts are in the highest salary range. Only three Writ-
ing Advisors indicated that they have adjunct status, and all of their salaries were in the lowest range. Of the individuals with staff status, only one had a salary in the highest range, and that person was also an administrator. The obvious point to make here is that considering the salary ranges for law school faculty and staff, Writing Advisors will find it advantageous to have their positions classified as faculty rather than staff, at least for salary purposes.³²

In working with the law school to design a new position or re-shape a current position, Writing Advisors should consider what their individual legal writing program and law school needs and what they as individuals can offer and what they need to have for satisfying jobs. Through the Writing Specialists Association and the list-serve for Writing Advisors,³³ they can learn more about the responsibilities other Writing Advisors have and whether those responsibilities would be appropriate in their situation.

Although the survey did not ask about the writing conference relationship between Writing Advisors and their students, an important issue for any new Writing Advisor to consider is whether his or her students will be signing up for writing conferences voluntarily or whether there will be mandatory conferences, at least for students identified as weak writers. Writing Advisors should also consider how they will handle the demand for their time, particularly during peak periods when legal writing papers are due. They should also set policies so that the pedagogical objectives of the legal writing program are met. How much and what kind of help a Writing Advisor should give any individual student are just a few of the many questions that must be addressed before the flood of students starts coming through the door.

V. THE FUTURE OF WRITING ADVISOR POSITIONS

Writing Advisors have been an interdisciplinary presence on law school campuses for nearly a quarter of a century — the very part of the century that has arguably seen the most dra-

³² The survey neglected to ask whether the Writing Advisor was paid on the law school scale or on the English department scale. This is an important consideration because law school salary scales for faculty are typically much higher than those of English department faculty.

³³ To be added to either the Writing Specialists' Association or the list-serve, contact Anne Enquist at Seattle University School of Law.
matic change to the teaching of writing in all educational settings, and certainly the greatest change to the teaching of writing at law schools. Twenty years ago, Lynn Squires outlined many of the benefits such interdisciplinary teachers could provide: Writing Advisors, trained in the fields of composition studies and rhetorical analysis, could collaborate with legal writing teachers, helping improve the quality of writing instruction by bringing "expertise in teaching writing."\(^3\)\(^4\) They could work directly with law students in classes, workshops, and individual conferences to improve student writing not only by reminding students of the "standards of normal usage . . . .[in] a field of study where abnormal usage abound[s]" but also by providing students with a "preview of the audience they will have outside of law school . . . . less familiar with the law than they are."\(^3\)\(^5\) Working with legal writing teachers and law students, Writing Advisors could employ a repertoire of skills and teaching styles brought from another discipline, and in doing the above interdisciplinary work, ultimately help improve the image of lawyers who have "suffered from lay criticism of their writing" since the 13th century.\(^3\)\(^6\)

Squires' descriptions of the benefits of Writing Advisors have continued to hold true for two decades. Now seems an appropriate time to take stock, to reconsider the role of Writing Advisors at law schools, considering both future challenges and opportunities faced by teachers in these positions.

The voices of Writing Advisors themselves speak clearly of a challenge central to the role: coping with the demanding nature of these positions. How can these individuals remain energized while doing the intense work of teaching writing and meeting individually with students under tight time constraints? Anyone teaching writing is already keenly aware of this challenge, but it is one that is undoubtedly intensified for some Writing Advisors whose roles are limited almost exclusively to working individually with students.

Comparing the activities associated with low and high-end Writing Advisor salaries, where the low-end positions are almost exclusively devoted to tasks of intense student contact and the high-end positions are much more varied in their responsibilities, prompts a blunt question: How long can people in part-

\(^{34}\) Squires, supra note 17, at 412.

\(^{35}\) Id. at 419.

\(^{36}\) Id. at 412.
time, low-paying positions continue enthusiastically bringing their interdisciplinary insights to this role? Anyone who has taught writing knows the answer—not long, when facing mountains of student papers, tight deadlines, anxious, sometimes demanding law students and our own high expectations. Our experience as writing professionals has also taught us how much is lost with this revolving door scenario, where expertise accumulated in a two or three year period inevitably departs with the "burned out" teacher. Thus, these positions are not only damaging to the teacher involved but are also short-sighted in terms of the institution the teacher serves. The benefits of interdisciplinary insights should ideally enrich not only students but the wider law school environment as well. When Writing Advisors are limited to roles of exclusive student contact and, for example, do not serve on faculty committees or are restricted from attending conferences to exchange insights, it is a loss not only for the individual teacher but for these wider academic communities as well.

Also, as Squires pointed out, Writing Advisors by definition have the advantage of interdisciplinarity, bringing insights from one teaching world to another. But when a Writing Advisor lives between worlds, as neither a member of an English department nor a legal writing department but as an uncategorized "other," that advantage may quickly become a disadvantage. The very versatility associated with being an interdisciplinary scholar may leave these Writing Advisors without departmental shelter during the "storms" of leaner times. Writing Advisors may be heralded as part of the solution to working with an increasingly diverse student population brought by 90's application drops and downsizing, but may also be, as primarily untenured faculty or staff members, among the first sacrificed to budget cuts caused by downsizings associated with dwindling student numbers in tuition-driven schools.

In an era of slow but steady change toward professionalizing the role of legal writing faculty at law schools, it is also interesting to consider the relationship of Writing Advisors to that of an increasingly professionalized legal writing faculty. As Legal Writing professors become increasingly political and powerful members of law schools, and as expertise in the teaching of writing increases within law schools, it is interesting to consider

---

37 Jan M. Levine, Voices in the Wilderness: Tenured and Tenure-Track Directors and Teachers in Legal Research and Writing Programs, 45 J. LEGAL EDUC. 530 (1995).
the following questions. Will the role of Writing Advisors continue to be that of collaborators and contributors to a growing field? To quote David Russell, "Will writing specialists be tenure track faculty, members of a department, or will they primarily be administrative staff consultants, temporary instructors, support personnel?"\(^{38}\)

Despite these questions and concerns, we feel optimistic about future opportunities for the field. The 21st century seems to hold much promise, for example, of increased institutional appreciation fostered by the new demands of the information age.\(^{39}\) Russell notes that those who “study employment trends agree that in fifteen years most jobs will involve information processing” and may “depend on rhetorical skill, the ability of the workforce to communicate in writing . . . not only from one person to another, but from one community to another.”\(^{40}\) His remark, made in 1990, seems prescient given the recent explosion of Internet activity and an era of “virtual connections.” It also seems most relevant to law school graduates, who certainly rely on rhetorical skill and their ability to communicate in writing. Furthermore, since 1992, there has been a decline in traditional legal jobs\(^{41}\) resulting in more law students taking employment in non-legal fields.\(^{42}\) As a consequence, law school graduates have been forced to branch out into other workplaces, required, in a very real sense, to become interdisciplinary practitioners themselves, writing across business communities, to a variety of audiences to communicate a sometimes specialized legal knowledge.

Finally, Writing Advisors may already be tapping into another opportunity Russell names—researching the conventions of different disciplines and investigating the pedagogical impli-

\(^{38}\) Russell, supra note 5, at 306.

\(^{39}\) Again, in a buyers' market, the importance of placement and thus training in job-related skills becomes clear: a recent AALS study on what prospective law students consider when applying to a particular school reveals that job placement is a critical concern among prospective applicants, ranking higher than concerns about reputation and tuition. "Who Gets The APP? Explaining Law School Application Volume, 1993-1996," AALS, 1998, at 3.

\(^{40}\) Russell, supra note 5, at 305.

\(^{41}\) For example, see Sneers, Lack of Jobs Reduce Interest in Law, THE CHARLESTON GAZETTE, Sept. 24, 1995, at 6B. "About 15% of the law school class of 1994 were still unemployed six months after graduation, compared with a jobless rate of 9% for the class of 1990."

cations of such disciplinary rhetorics. As appendix bibliography B vividly illustrates, Writing Advisors at law schools have been engaged in this kind of interdisciplinary research for many years.

We feel optimistic, given the contributions Writing Advisors have already made and the positions of leadership that they have assumed within law schools, that they will continue to be an important part of the solution to law schools' continuing focus on bettering the teaching of writing at law schools.

APPENDIX A: WRITING ADVISORS AT LAW SCHOOLS

as of June 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Adams</th>
<th>Elizabeth Fajans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago-Kent College of Law</td>
<td>Brooklyn Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Brendel</td>
<td>George D. Gopen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University Chicago School of Law</td>
<td>Duke University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Chaim</td>
<td>Jeffrey Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Williams University School of Law</td>
<td>The John Marshall Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Dailey</td>
<td>Mark Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University College of Law</td>
<td>Columbia University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Dailey</td>
<td>Jessie Grearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinnipiac College School of Law</td>
<td>The John Marshall Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estelle Davidson</td>
<td>Lisa B. Hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University Law School</td>
<td>J. Rueben Clark Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Enquist</td>
<td>Deborah Hecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle University School of Law</td>
<td>Touro College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jacob D. Fuchberg Law Center

---

43 Russell, *supra* note 5, at 301.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>University/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perry Hodges</td>
<td>Indiana University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Panella</td>
<td>Vermont Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Johnston</td>
<td>Drake University Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Parker</td>
<td>The John Marshall Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Jones</td>
<td>University of Iowa College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichelle Perry</td>
<td>North Carolina Central University Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Kishline</td>
<td>University of Denver College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary K. Polacheck</td>
<td>Dickinson School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trudy Krisher</td>
<td>University of Dayton School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Barnard Ray</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri LeClercq</td>
<td>The University of Texas School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Rideout</td>
<td>Seattle University School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louvisa Lyman</td>
<td>J. Rueben Clark Law School Brigham Young University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Smith **</td>
<td>Cecil Humphreys School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Mills</td>
<td>New England School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Taylor</td>
<td>DePaul University College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Mills</td>
<td>New York Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Tschantz</td>
<td>University of Tennessee College of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne C. Palmer</td>
<td>Cumberland School of Law of Samford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Vartoukian</td>
<td>Howard University School of Law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stephanie Vetne
Valparaiso University School of Law

Paul Von Blum
Loyola Law School Los Angeles

Nancy Wanderer
University of Maine School of Law

Shelley Rice Weinberg **
University of Chicago Law School

Kristin R. Woolever
Northeastern University School of Law

*Names added after completion of survey
APPENDIX B: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WRITINGS PUBLISHED BY WRITING ADVISORS

Susan J. Adams
*Because They're Otherwise Qualified: Teaching Learning Disabled Legal Writing Students*, *Journal of Legal Education* (1996).

Robert Chaim

Susan R. Dailey

Portfolios In Law School: Creating A Community Of Writers, Situating Portfolios (Kathleen Blake Yancey & Irwing Weiser, eds., Utah State University Press, 1997).


Anne Enquist

Law Related Education: Linking Language Arts and Social Studies, co-authors Margaret Armancas-Fisher and Julia Gold (UPSICEL 1993).


How Not To Conduct A Writing Conference, (Fall 1986) (videotape distributed by The Legal Writing Institute to Legal Writing Preparation Programs).

Beyond Labeling Student Writing Problems: Why Would A Bright Person Make This Mistake? The Second Draft (Spring 1986).

Good Writing Is Good Lawyering, Washington English Newsletter (June 1985).


Elizabeth Fajans

Writing and Analysis in the Law, co-authors, Helene Shapo & Marilyn Walter (Foundation Press 3d ed. 1995).

Writing and Analysis in the Law, co-authors, Helene Shapo & Marilyn Walter (Foundation Press 2d ed. 1991).

Writing and Analysis in the Law, co-authors, Helene Shapo & Marilyn Walter (Foundation Press 1989).


George D. Gopen


A Course In Composition For Pre-Law Students, 29 JOURNAL OF LEGAL EDUCATION 222-231 (1978).

A Question Of Cash And Credit: Writing Programs At Law Schools, 3 JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY LAW 191-200 (1977).

Work completed and submitted for publication:
THE COMMON SENSE OF WRITING: TEACHING WRITING FROM THE READER'S PERSPECTIVE.

Work in progress:

Jessie C. Grearson


Teach The Transition, 10 THE SECOND DRAFT, No. 1 (Spring 1997).

Perry Hodges
Writing In A Different Voice, Texas Law Review.

Nancy Jones
Extending The Classroom: The Writing Resource Center And The Teaching Of Legal Writing At The University Of Iowa, In Perspective: Teaching Legal Research And Writing (West Publishing Apr. 1993).

Trudy Krisher
Writing For A Reader (Prentice Hall 1994).

Terri LeClercq
Guide To Legal Writing Style (Little, Brown 1995).

Expert Legal Writings (University of Texas Press 1995).


U.S. News & World Report 'Notices' Legal Writing Programs, Perspectives (Spring 1995).


Cast Your Vote: Doctrine Of The Last Antecedent, The Second Draft (June 1992).


\textsc{Editing Workbook for Attorneys}, (University of Texas Law School 1983-1988) (Continuing Legal Education Seminars for practicing attorneys).

\textsc{Editing Workbook for Opinion Writers}, (University of Texas Law School 1984-1986) (Continuing Legal Education Seminars for Judges).

\textsc{Editing Workbook for Students}, co-author with Fred Asnes (University of Texas Law School 1984).

\textbf{Mary Barnard Ray}


\textit{Avoiding Colon Trouble}, 64 \textit{Wisconsin Law Review} 49 (1996).
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