



GW Law Faculty Publications & Other Works

Faculty Scholarship

2016

Using the Student-Edited Law Review to Teach Critical Professional Skills

Karen Thornton
George Washington University Law School

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.law.gwu.edu/faculty_publications

 Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Thornton, Karen, Using the Student-Edited Law Review to Teach Critical Professional Skills (2016). Karen D. Thornton, Using the Student-Edited Law Review to Teach Critical Professional Skills, 40 J. Legal Prof. 163 (2016). ; GWU Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 2018-20; GWU Legal Studies Research Paper No. 2018-20. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3168764>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in GW Law Faculty Publications & Other Works by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact spagel@law.gwu.edu.

USING THE STUDENT-EDITED LAW REVIEW TO TEACH CRITICAL PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

By Karen D. Thornton¹

*The summer before my term began, as I set about planning the year ahead, full of eagerness and sharpened pencils at the ready, I began to admit many things to myself: I had no editing experience. I had no managing experience. I was not an expert in third world legal issues - I wasn't even a lawyer! How, I contemplated with a dawning sense of horror, would I manage a staff of twenty-seven and edit an academic journal of the law?*²

~Michael O'Donnell, Editor in Chief, Vol. 24, *The Boston College Third World Law Journal*

I. INTRODUCTION

Most student editors, if you ask them to be perfectly honest, feel overwhelmed, disconnected, and generally do not enjoy their journal experience. These feelings lead to an apparent absence of professionalism that has been the subject of years of criticism and ridicule by faculty authors. Law schools have an obligation to teach critical professional skills, and one way to do that is to change the editorial experience by treating it as an apprenticeship in professionalism. Unpacking the various skills that make a leader within the legal profession and encouraging student self-reflection can shift editor motivation from extrinsic to intrinsic. Research shows an individual who is motivated intrinsically has greater self-confidence, empathy, desire to serve, and, ultimately, happiness.³ Teaching

1. Professor of Legal Research and Writing, Associate Director of Legal Research & Writing Program, The George Washington University Law School; LL.M. The George Washington University Law School, J.D. Georgetown University Law Center, B.A. Providence College. The author wishes to express deep gratitude to Iselin Gambert, Chip Lupu, Todd Peterson, Nathan Saunders, Steve Schooner, and Sean Thornton for engaging conversations and invaluable feedback.

2. Michael O'Donnell, *A Year in the Life of a Law Review Editor*, B.C.L. SCH. MAG. 15, 16 (Spring/Summer 2004), available at <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/bclsm/24/>.

3. An intrinsically motivated person seeks opportunities that create personal growth and lead toward "fundamental life purpose," rather than valuing wealth or seeking to impress others. Lawrence S. Krieger, *The Inseparability of Professionalism and Personal Satisfaction: Perspectives on Values*,

editors how to shift their motivation will increase students' sense of connectedness and relevance, raise the level of author satisfaction, and bring law schools recognition for responding to the need for professional skills training.

At a time when law schools are being urged to add experiential learning opportunities to their curricula, law reviews may have been overlooked because the need is so obvious. Law schools have published law reviews since long before they required a college degree for admission.⁴ For decades, beginning with a seminal article in 1936, professors, practitioners, and judges have chronicled law reviews' decline.⁵ Scorn and satire lace numerous articles by faculty authors decrying the treatment they and their writing have received at the hands of cocky, under-educated, ill-trained 3L editors.⁶ The articles offer little more than barbed criticism, suggesting that 3L editors need greater faculty supervision and coursework in proper editing of the English language. Few if any schools have implemented these recommendations and problems persist, yet even the critics agree editorial board service is excellent training for practice.⁷

Producing a journal is a professional endeavor requiring leadership by student editors who are in the process of forging their professional identity. A growing body of literature asserts law schools have a responsibility to teach critical professional skills as part of the pedagogy to shape future attorneys.⁸ Law schools can in fact train student editors in the skills needed

Integrity and Happiness, 11 CLINICAL L. REV. 425, 429 (Spring 2005). "Empirical research for the past two decades has shown that when intrinsic values and motivation dominate a person's choices she tends to experience satisfaction and well-being, whereas when extrinsic values and motivation are most important to her she will experience angst and distress." *Id.*

4. The longest running journal still in existence is the *Harvard Law Review*, founded in 1887. Roger C. Cramton, *The Most Remarkable Institution: The American Law Review*, 35 J. LEGAL EDUC. 1, 3 (1986). In 1900, Harvard Law School admission requirements included a college degree. *Id.* at 3 n.15.

5. See Fred Rodell, *Goodbye to Law Reviews*, 23 VA. L. REV. 38 (1936).

6. See generally Roger C. Cramton, *The Most Remarkable Institution: The American Law Review*, 36 J. LEGAL EDUC. 1 (1986); John G. Kester, *Faculty Participation in the Student-Edited Law Review*, 35 J. LEGAL EDUC. 14 (1986); Kenneth Lasson, *Scholarship Amok: Excesses in the Pursuit of Truth and Tenure*, 103 HARV. L. REV. 926 (1990); James Lindgren, *Fear of Writing*, 78 CAL. L. REV. 1677 (1990) [hereinafter Lindgren, *Fear of Writing*]; James Lindgren, *An Author's Manifesto*, 61 U. CHI. L. REV. 527 (Spring 1994) [hereinafter Lindgren, *An Author's Manifesto*]; James Lindgren, *Reforming the American Law Review*, 47 STAN. L. REV. 1123 (Summer 1995) [hereinafter Lindgren, *Reforming the American Law Review*]; Richard A. Posner, *The Future of the Student-Edited Law Review*, 47 STAN. L. REV. 1131 (1995); Fred Rodell, *Goodbye to Law Reviews-Revisited*, 48 VA. L. REV. 279 (1962).

7. See Wendy J. Gordon, *Counter Manifesto: Student-Edited Reviews and the Intellectual Properties of Scholarship*, 61 U. CHI. L. REV. 541, 543 (Spring 1994).

8. See generally Susan Swaim Daicoff, *Expanding the Lawyer's Toolkit of Skills and Competencies: Synthesizing Leadership, Professionalism, Emotional Intelligence, Conflict Resolution, and Comprehensive Law*, 52 SANTA CLARA L. REV. 795 (2012); Neil W. Hamilton, Verna E. Monson & Jerome M. Organ, *Empirical Evidence that Legal Education Can Foster Student Professionalism/Professional Formation to Become an Effective Lawyer*, 10 UNIV. ST. THOMAS L. REV. 11 (Fall 2012); Alison Donahue Kehner & Mary Ann Robinson, *Mission: Impossible, Mission:*

to manage their professional journals, including self-awareness, collaborative relationship-building, and reflective decision-making. The first step is to recognize these are the very skills critical to developing a professional identity and internalizing the values all attorneys must uphold.⁹

This article presents a solution for law schools trying to create opportunities for professional formation – a symposium-style training session for incoming student editors. Comprised of a half-day series of panel presentations by faculty, staff, and outgoing editors, the symposium is designed to ignite student self-investment by sharing outgoing editors' reflections and relating the lessons from these story-tellings to professional skills. The symposium demonstrates that law schools need not manufacture "realistic" learning simulations – they happen every day of service on an editorial board. Skill development is an iterative process that will grow over the course of the editor's year of service, especially when editors learn the professional value that comes from reflecting on, discussing, and ultimately memorializing their dynamic experiences in a handbook to be passed down to the next board.

Now that law schools are engaging in the formation of professional identity, we can advance the scholarly conversation about student-edited law reviews to focus on positive, professional values.¹⁰ The next part of this article will briefly summarize the need for law schools to provide experiential learning opportunities, followed by an unpacking of the

Accomplished or Mission: Underway? A Survey and Analysis of Current Trends in Professionalism Education in American Law Schools, 38 U. DAYTON L. REV. 57, 99 (2012); Nathalie Martin, *Think Like a (Mindful) Lawyer: Incorporating Mindfulness, Professional Identity, And Emotional Intelligence into the First Year Law Curriculum*, 36 U. ARK. L. REV. 1 (2014); Robin Slocum, *An Inconvenient Truth: The Need to Educate Emotionally Competent Lawyers*, 45 CREIGHTON L. REV. 827 (August 2012); Sophie Sparrow, *Practicing Civility in the Legal Writing Course: Helping Law Students Learn Professionalism*, 13 LEGAL WRITING: J. LEGAL WRITING INST. 113 (2007).

9. See LARRY O. NATT GANTT, II AND BENJAMIN V. MADISON, *Teaching Knowledge, Skills, and Valued of Professional Identity Formation*, in BUILDING ON BEST PRACTICES: TRANSFORMING LEGAL EDUCATION IN A CHANGING WORLD 8-9 (Deborah Maranville, et al. eds., Lexis 2015), available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2562507> (identifying these skills as necessary to developing a professional identity and forming professional values).

10. At The George Washington University Law School (GW Law), our Inns of Court Program is designed in part to create a sense of community for our students, while providing them tools to realize who they want to be as individual attorneys. A recent New York Times blog highlighted the work of GW Law's Inns program. Douglass Quenqua, N.Y. TIMES, *Lawyers With Lowest Pay Report More Happiness* (May 12, 2015), http://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/05/12/lawyers-with-lowest-pay-report-more-happiness/?_r=0. The program's Facebook page can be found at: https://www.facebook.com/InnsOfCourtGW/info/?tab=page_info ("The Inns of Court program offers GW Law students support and guidance from a diverse set of advisors dedicated to enriching their law school experience and enhancing their career opportunities. As 1Ls, students are assigned to one of six Inns of Court, named after former Supreme Court Justices, and take all 1L classes with their Inn. Their Inn remains their community for the next few years....Within each Inn, students are provided... [a] dynamic combination of support and career development from the first week of law school . . .").

criticisms that have been cast upon law reviews over the decades. The fourth part will describe a symposium-style training session that identifies and builds the leadership skills that foster the values the legal profession strives to uphold.

II. LAW SCHOOLS NEED TO TEACH CRITICAL PROFESSIONAL SKILLS

In the years since the Best Practices and Carnegie Reports of 2007,¹¹ numerous studies have shown effective lawyering requires more than analytical skills and legal knowledge. Marjorie Shultz and Sheldon Zedeck's oft-cited study shows certain professional values and emotional intelligence are just as important as analytical skills for a lawyer to succeed.¹² Recently, law schools have begun to address what employers and the ABA have sought for years, building professionalism training and cultivation of professional identity into the curriculum.¹³ Consistent with this thoughtful embrace of professional development, law schools can now encourage real change in the way law reviews get their job done—by bringing professionalism pedagogy to the journal office during the editorial board transition period and training students to cultivate their professional identity as editors.

This is also a time when we are realizing that law school is a breeding ground for depression and heightened anxiety among students who feel

11. See ROY STUCKEY ET AL., BEST PRACTICES FOR LEGAL EDUCATION: A VISION AND A ROAD MAP (2007) (study funded by the Clinical Legal Education Association); see also WILLIAM M. SULLIVAN, ET AL. EDUCATING LAWYERS: PREPARATION FOR THE PROFESSION OF LAW (2007) (study funded by the Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning). One interpretation of the studies is that law schools are not doing enough to foster professional identity development. See David Thomson, "Teaching" Formation of Professional Identity, 27 U. REGENT L. REV. 303, 315 (2015).

12. Marjorie M. Shultz and Sheldon Zedeck, *Predicting Lawyer Effectiveness: Broadening the Basis of Law School Admission Decisions*, 36 L. & SOC. INQUIRY 620 (2011) (hundreds of interviews, focus groups, and 2,000 alumni survey responses generated a list of 26 factors critical to lawyer effectiveness).

13. Some law schools have made this training mandatory, including Villanova University Law School and Wake Forest University Law School, while others, such as Valparaiso University Law School, offer a series of programs and require attendance at just one each semester. See, e.g., *Wake Forest Law Requires First-Year Students to take Inaugural Professional Development Course*, WAKE FOREST UNIV. SCH. OF LAW (last visited Mar. 1, 2016), <http://news.law.wfu.edu/2013/08/professional-development-course-for-first-year-students-required-for-first-time/>; *Villanova University School of Law Introduces New Mandatory, Credit-Bearing Professional Development Curriculum for all Students*, VILLANOVA UNIV. SCH. OF LAW (last visited Mar. 1, 2016), <https://www1.villanova.edu/villanova/law/newsroom/pressreleases/2014/1231.html>; *Louis F. Bartelt, Jr., Professionalism Series*, VALPARAISO UNIV. LAW SCH. (last visited Mar. 1, 2016), <http://www.valpo.edu/law/current-students/c-academics/professionalism-program>.

removed from a sense of community.¹⁴ With greater awareness, peer connection, and focus on professional values, journal leaders can find intrinsic motivation to overcome leadership challenges and create stronger relationships with authors and peer members.

III. STUDENT-EDITED LAW REVIEWS ARE AN EXPRESSION OF THE NEED FOR SKILLS TRAINING

The leading faculty perspective appears to be that “journals are in the hands of incompetents.”¹⁵ Each year, incoming editors are surprised to learn that they have been elevated to a status that garners such little respect from authors.¹⁶ The purpose here is not to condemn or defend law reviews. Instead, this article strives to bypass the now-familiar criticism of the article selection and editing process, and to focus, instead, on the professional skill-set that law schools have traditionally overlooked in their focus on theory and doctrine. The skills necessary to develop professional identity include self-awareness, collaborative relationship-building, and reflective decision-making.¹⁷ Accordingly, this article shows how law schools can transform the law review experience into an apprenticeship for professional practice where these skills are highly valued.

In the 80 years since Fred Rodell called for their demise, some have predicted they would fade away,¹⁸ and others bemoaned, “simply put, there are too many of them,” but law reviews and academic journals have in fact proliferated.¹⁹ According to the Washington & Lee University School of

14. Todd D. Peterson and Elizabeth W. Peterson offer a harrowing perspective on law student depression. “Of all professionals in the United States, lawyers suffer from the highest rate of depression after adjusting for socio-demographic factors, and they are 3.6 times more likely to suffer from major depressive disorder than the rest of the employed population Unfortunately, these problems afflict not only practicing lawyers, but law students as well [A] growing body of literature shows that they too exhibit signs of psychological distress, including elevated levels of depression, stress, and anxiety. One study found that 44% of law students meet the criteria for clinically significant levels of psychological distress.” *Stemming the Tide of Law Student Depression: What Law Schools Need to Learn from the Science of Positive Psychology*, 9 YALE J. HEALTH, POL’Y L. & ETHICS 357 (Summer 2009).

15. Lindgren, *An Author’s Manifesto*, *supra* note 6, at 528.

16. One *Duke Law Journal* editor began an essay reflecting on his service on the board by noting that before attending a non-traditional seminar for student editors, he had no idea how much disdain authors have for law reviews. See Nathan H. Saunders, *Student-Edited Law Reviews: Reflections and Responses of an Inmate*, 49 DUKE L.J. 1663, 1663 (April 2000). In his article describing student-edited journals as a case of “inmates truly running the asylum,” and arguing for greater faculty participation, John G. Kester noted during his own tenure on the *Harvard Law Review*, he and his colleagues often sought counsel from professors. Kester, *supra* note 6, at 14.

17. See NATT GANTT, II AND MADISON, *supra* note 9, at 8-9.

18. See Kester, *supra* note 6, at 14.

19. In 1937, there were 150 law-related journals in publication, the oldest being the *Harvard Law Review*. Lasson, *supra* note 6, at 926, 929. In 1990, there were over 800 law journals. *Id.* at 928.

Law, Law Journal Rankings Project, there are 986 law journals in the United States.²⁰ In the mid-1990s, Lindgren arranged a series of scholarly symposia that appear intended to vent author frustrations and offer suggestions for student editor improvement. Curbing the publication rate was surely not their purpose because the symposia generated 13 articles and inspired numerous others.²¹ Almost 20 years later, in 2013, a group of psychologists teamed with a law school dean to conduct a survey, published in the *Loyola Law Review*, of 1,325 law professors, 338 student editors, 215 attorneys, and 156 judges to address the same three criticisms Lindgren had identified in his symposia: article selection, article editing, and the “effect on legal scholarship, the law, and the legal community.”²² The suggestions offered by Richard Wise’s team were consistent with those of 20 years earlier: to improve article selection by instituting blind reviews, improve the quality of editing through peer review, and increase training of student editors.²³

Wise’s study results suggest no change has come from the reform recommendations Lindgren’s conversations generated nor is there evidence the study prompted much reaction among those who produce and publish scholarship. If there is any hope for improvement in the reputation of law reviews it will have to come from a fresh approach that focuses on the true source of editorial challenges—the professional skills and values needed to lead a publishing enterprise. Students need encouragement and direction to focus on growing their professional identity, relationships, and community, and as a result they will find greater meaning and satisfaction from the journal experience. While Lindgren and Wise assessed law review problems as rooted in article selection, editing, and management, the following analysis suggests we first focus on self-awareness, relationship-building, and reflection.

20. See WASH. & LEE LIBR., Law Journals: Submissions and Ranking, <http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/index.aspx> (last visited Feb. 27, 2016) (“The site currently ranks journals based on citation data from a 2007-2014 survey period. The site is updated annually. In February 2016 the site will be updated with data from a 2008-2015 survey period . . .”).

21. Between 1994-1996, three law schools hosted symposia on the issue of student-edited law reviews: *Symposium, Law Review Conference*, 47 STAN. L. REV. 1117 (1995); *Symposium, Law Review Editing: The Struggle Between Author and Editor Over Control of the Text*, 70 CHI-KENT L. REV. 71 (1994); *Symposium, Who Needs Law Reviews?: Legal Scholarship in the Age of Cyberspace*, 30 AKRON L. REV. 173 (1996); and one devoted space in its Spring 1994 issue for a three-way exchange. See Lindgren, *An Author’s Manifesto*, *supra* note 6; see also Wendy J. Gordon, *Counter-Manifesto: Student-Edited Reviews and the Intellectual Properties of Scholarship*, 61 U. CHI. L. REV. 541 (Spring 1994); The Articles Editors, *A Response*, 61 U. CHI. L. REV. 553 (Spring 1994).

22. Richard A. Wise, Lucy S. McGough, James W. Bowers, Douglas P. Peters, Joseph C. Miller, Heather K. Terrell, Brett Holfeld, Joe H. Neal, *Do Law Reviews Need Reform? A Survey of Law Professors, Student Editors, Attorneys, and Judges*, 59 LOY. L. REV. 1,2, 7-8 (Spring 2013) [hereinafter Wise et al.]. Criticisms are heavily footnoted in pages 9-24, nn. 24-95.

23. See *id.* at 2. See also Lindgren, *Reforming the American Law Review*, *supra* note 6, at 1123.

A. Self-awareness

No-one likes to be criticized, especially about her writing.²⁴ Even though most writers know their work is not perfect, they particularly resent student editing because, objectively, a 3L offers neither the training, experience, nor credentials that would typically permit an author to defer to such an editor. Incoming law review editors are “suddenly placed in positions of responsibility for which they are grossly unsuited” And Lindgren blames insecurity for editors’ “retreat to the safety” of rule-oriented editing.²⁵

Student editors have acknowledged, in all frankness, that excessive editing happens largely because of the hierarchical structure of the editorial board and a tendency to approach manuscripts as issue-spotting exams.²⁶ In the view of one *Duke Law Review* editor, the underlying problem of “serial editing” a manuscript at the various layers of an editorial board is in the “dominance of hierarchy” in our professional culture.²⁷ Granting faculty greater authority over law reviews, as critics suggest, would only increase this sense of hierarchy, and editors rightly fear the sacrifice of student autonomy would adversely impact student performance and the learning experience.²⁸

Editors who enrolled in an editing seminar established at Chicago-Kent College of Law describe learning much about the editing process when Professor Lindgren took manuscripts and went line by line to show how every sentence could be improved.²⁹ The more difficult question of whether

24. In an article about the various challenges of the writing process, Suzanne E. Rowe, Director of the Legal Research & Writing Program at the University of Oregon Law School, highlights the painfulness of receiving criticism during the editing process and quotes author and expert writing instructor, Anne Lamott, “My first response if they have a lot of suggestions is never profound relief that I have someone in my life who will be honest with me and help me do the very best work of which I am capable. No, my first thought is, ‘Well, I’m sorry, but I can’t be friends with you anymore, because you have too many problems. And you have a bad personality. And a bad character.’ Sometimes I can’t get the words to come out of my mouth because I am so disappointed. . . . Criticism is very hard to take.” *Painful Prose: The Difficulty of Writing*, OR. ST. B. J. (Jan. 2011), available at

<http://www.osbar.org/publications/bulletin/11jan/legalwriter.html> (citing ANNE LAMOTT, BIRD BY BIRD: SOME INSTRUCTIONS ON WRITING AND LIFE 166-67 (1995)).

25. Lindgren, *Fear of Writing*, *supra* note 6, at 1679. The darker view is that the root of rule-obsession is a “deeply held need for achievement,” a “transform[ation of] the pathologies of obsessive-compulsive disorder into virtues” J.C. Oleson, *You Make Me [Sic]: Confessions of a Sadistic Law Review Editor*, 37 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 1135, 1143 (2004).

26. See The Articles Editors, *supra* note 21, at 556.

27. Saunders, *supra* note 16, at 1669.

28. See *id.* at 1683, 1684.

29. See The Executive Board of the Chicago-Kent Law Review, *The Symposium Format as a Solution to Problems Inherent in Student-Edited Law Journals: A View from the Inside*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 141, 142-143, 145-148, 150-151 (As faculty advisor to the *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, James Lindgren provided editing training sessions to the editors. *The Law Review* then operated under a

a sentence *should* be disturbed was not answered, to the students' disappointment.³⁰ Lindgren did not teach them—and knew he could not teach them—to identify which of the edits would cross the fine line of being aggressive and disrespectful to the author.³¹ The editors felt the sort of character needed to identify and abide by that line is not a matter of education but of experience.³² The lasting need, even when faculty do provide increased supervision, is for editors to gain a sense of awareness of their authority and to learn how to employ that authority with measured judgment.

B. Relationship-building

Without self-awareness, successful relationship-building is very difficult. A collaborative relationship must be grounded in mutual and self-respect. Student editors are frequently criticized for selecting and publishing articles that are theoretical and removed from practice, thereby missing important opportunities to engage in and learn from collaborating in the production of practical, pertinent scholarship.³³

A faculty take-over, or even threat thereof, would have a demoralizing effect on students.³⁴ The real need is for journal editorial boards to

symposium format with three faculty members and two student editors composing an oversight committee to select topics for symposia. Anyone interested in editing a symposium issue puts forth a proposal, and if accepted by the committee, they become the symposium editor but still answer to the oversight committee. The faculty symposium editor solicits the articles and the student editor handles day-to-day efforts. Editors concede there are administrative challenges collecting symposium articles in a timely fashion, but largely the formula is successful, because faculty members exert expertise in selecting issues and authors, and the editors only edit heavily when the writing and reasoning are incomprehensible. This policy is similar to Chicago's; edit lightly and defer to the author).

30. See *id.* at 150-151.

31. See *id.*

32. See *id.* at 151.

33. See David Hricik & Victoria S. Salzmann, *Why There Should be Fewer Articles Like This One: Law Professors Should Write More for Legal Decision-Makers and Less for Themselves*, 38 SUFFOLK U. L. REV. 761, 774 (2005). In 1975, a University of Pennsylvania student wrote a note parody analogizing baseball's infield fly rule to the development of American common law. William S. Stevens, *The Common Law Origins of the Infield Fly Rule*, 123 U. PA. L. REV. 1474 (1975), available at http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5322&context=penn_law_review. "It encouraged a whole generation of law students, some of whom became law-review editors, to look at subjects previously beyond the pale," said Robert M. Jarvis, a law professor at the Nova Southeastern University . . . 'After Stevens, law reviews were never the same,' Professor Jarvis said. 'It was a cultural revolution. It cannot be overstated.'" William Grimes, *Williams S. Stevens, 60, Dies; Wrote Infield Fly Note*, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 11, 2008), http://www.nytimes.com/2008/12/12/us/12stevens.html?_r=2.

34. See *The Articles Editors*, *supra* note 21, at 555-557. The Articles Editors at Chicago responded to Lindgren's manifesto by rejecting the notion of greater faculty control and instead embracing a "market" of "law review services," where editors are more candid and authors can make better decisions about where they want to seek publication. They suggested journals publish a disclosure statement about their reasonable editing policy with author veto authority and advance notice of all

establish a process for engaging in a collaborative review process where editors can learn professional values and be empowered to practice them. There have been a handful of successful experiments where student editors have employed limited faculty peer review. One example of positive collaboration is a consortium called PRSM, the Peer Review Scholarship Marketplace.³⁵ This publishing experiment created by the *South Carolina Law Review* partners student editors with blind peer reviewers.³⁶ According to student editors, the PRSM approach has increased article quality and has taught them valuable lessons about scholarship and the legal profession.³⁷ The joint process capitalizes on the experience of faculty peer advisors, whom the student editors have invested effort to attract and retain.³⁸ As of Volume 62 (2008), the *Stanford Law Review* has also instituted a peer review process, seeking feedback from reviewers whom the editors consider better able to evaluate submissions for novelty, usefulness, and accuracy.³⁹

At GW Law, 2L note-writers from our eight journals enroll in a Scholarly Writing Course taught by practitioner adjuncts. Each is paired with a note editor to serve as a mentor and role model throughout the note-writing process.⁴⁰ After a year of work-in-progress meetings where they engage in peer review and learn to implement feedback, our 2L journal members are taught to listen and gain a sense of empathy for authors during the editing process. The relationships forged within the note team carry into

changes, which will make authors better consumers and journals with more popular policies will receive more desirable articles. Lindgren says faculty have failed in their responsibility to educate about legal scholarship: [Faculty] can be lazy, so students should press them harder.” Lindgren, *Reforming the American Law Review*, *supra* note 6, at 1126. Although there is no evidence the practice continues, at one time student editors on the Michigan International Journal registered for a 1-credit seminar run by the faculty advisor. When editors were unable to agree on whether to accept a piece for publication, they brought it to the seminar for discussion and on alternating weeks the editors took turns presenting manuscripts to fellow editors and invited faculty. International scholars posit this supervision could explain in part the journal’s turnaround in rankings, and the editor-in-chief called it “good for morale.” See Lindgren, *An Author’s Manifesto*, *supra* note 6, at 536.

35. See Wise et al., at 73-74, n.255, *supra* note 22.

36. See Richard A. Posner, *Foreword: The Peer Review Experiment*, 60 S.C. L. REV. 821 (2009).

37. See Wise et al., *supra* note 22, at 73-74; see also John Zimmer & Jason Luther, *Peer Review as an Aid to Article Selection in Student-Edited Legal Journals*, 60 S.C. L. REV. 959 (2009).

38. There are costs associated with this approach, however, including the time it takes to get two rounds of review on a manuscript, which can result in an author accepting another offer. See Zimmer & Luther *supra* note 37, at 969.

39. See *Stanford Law Review’s Peer Review Process*, PRAWFSBLAWG (Aug. 16, 2011), <http://prawfsblawg.blogs.com/prawfsblawg/2011/08/stanford-law-reviews-peer-review-process.html> (the blogpost seems to suggest the reviewers are members of the Stanford Law faculty).

40. See Karen D. Thornton, *Brutal Choices in Curricular Design ... It’s Not Purely Academic: Using Practitioners to Increase the Rigor and Practical Learning in Scholarly Writing*, 20 PERSPECTIVES: TEACHING LEGAL RES. & WRITING 87, 87 (2012), <https://info.legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.com/pdf/perspec/2012-winter-spring/2012-winter-spring-1.pdf>.

the 3L year when editors must rely on each other to meet tight deadlines. The practitioner adjuncts also provide valuable perspectives when it comes to selecting notes for publication. As we will discuss below, proper guidance and encouragement through a faculty-guided training session for incoming editors can teach student leaders to recognize and embody the skills needed to create positive collaboration opportunities with faculty and authors.

C. Reflection

Even the harshest critiques acknowledge students learn from their editorial experience, but that too soon it is time to turn over the reins to the next board.⁴¹ The wisdom editors gain through a year of experience that includes successful and failed attempts to manage and innovate must be passed on through a reliable process to incoming editors. Only by reflecting on their skills development throughout the year can editors become mentors to those who replace them.

Editors who make time to reflect on relationship-building within their staff are investing in the value of community. Student editors who feel a sense of pride as part of a supportive community are more likely to commit the time needed to establish the kind of respectful, collaborative author-editor relationships described above to improve the articles selection and editing process.

Unfortunately, many students are intensely unhappy in their law review experience due to feelings of being unqualified or ill-equipped.⁴² To achieve a supportive culture of community, journals must overcome what one scholar has called “the gladiator ethos.”⁴³ The coliseum environment of the first year of law school, and the competitive battle to make journal, breeds a culture of individuals who are unprepared for the collaborative, team-oriented endeavor of publishing a journal. For even the most successful, well-organized students, the isolating nature of editorial duties can be panic-inducing.⁴⁴ Other students, particularly women and people of

41. See Lindgren, *An Author's Manifesto*, *supra* note 6, at 534.

42. See O'Donnell, *supra* note 2, at 15, 17 (describing a “sickening awakening” to his own “professional shortcomings” as he transitioned into the position of Editor-in-Chief of the Boston College Third World Law Journal, and later commiserating with his future employer about the time demands of the job: “I can't wait until it's over.”).

43. Megan S. Knize, *The Pen is Mightier: Rethinking the “Gladiator” Ethos of Student-Edited Law Reviews*, 44 MCGEORGE L. REV. 309, 314-15 (2013) (citing Susan P. Sturm, *From Gladiators to Problem Solvers: Connecting Conversations about Women, the Academy, and the Legal Profession*, 4 DUKE J. GENDER L. & POL'Y 119, 121 (1997) (the analogy compares a 1L on-call in Property to a warrior, battling to the death, alone before a large gallery of spectators)).

44. See O'Donnell, *supra* note 2, at 18. In one particularly grim article about the law review process, the author describes the articles selection process as a shift in the power play, an opportunity

color, can feel dissociated in a culture where the skills of mediators and problem solvers are overlooked.⁴⁵

The gladiator ethos breaks down when students are intrinsically motivated to engage in a collegial effort. According to the reflections of one *Duke Law Review* editor, the greatest benefits of his journal experience came from “deep discussions” with fellow editors in making decisions affecting the journal.⁴⁶ He also found the interactions among students and authors promoted professionalism skills, such as empathy.⁴⁷ One *West Virginia Law Review* editor reflected that when editors practice ineffective communication techniques with journal members and authors those bad habits can translate into practice, where poor communication is a common client criticism of attorneys.⁴⁸ After a year of tremendous effort and stress, a *Boston College Third World Law Journal* editor-in-chief reflected that one of his most humanizing moments in law school came during a relaxed, post-symposium dinner with faculty authors whom he discovered were gracious and friendly in person.⁴⁹

Institutional memory and lessons in professionalism are lost every time a class graduates.⁵⁰ When editors engage in self-reflection and implement lessons learned as part of their leadership, their management improves. If these lessons can be shared in an organized forum, each subsequent board gains from the experiences of the previous.⁵¹

IV. A SYMPOSIUM-STYLE TRAINING SESSION FOR INCOMING EDITORS CAN TEACH CRITICAL PROFESSIONAL SKILLS AND IMPROVE THE EXPERIENCE OF BOTH EDITORS AND AUTHORS

As law schools expand their embrace of professional development, we see that, rather than reflexively increasing faculty supervision, they must first identify and teach the critical professional skills that ensure strong

for the law student who “has inevitably endured humiliation and embarrassment at the hands of his or her professors . . . to reclaim some of the personhood that has been stripped from [him or her] throughout the first-year curriculum and to punish those who have humiliated them.” J.C. Oleson, *supra* note 25, at 1145.

45. See Knize, *supra* note 43, at 316 (citing Sturm, *supra* note 43, at 137).

46. Saunders, *supra* note 16, at 1671-72.

47. See *id.* at 1672, 1685-86.

48. See Joshua Baker, *Relics or Relevant?: The Value of the Modern Law Review*, 111 W. VA. L. REV. 919, 932 (2009).

49. See O'Donnell, *supra* note 2, at 19.

50. Lindsey P. Gustafson, *Blawgs Can't Do it All: Let's Save Short, Student-Authored Scholarship*, 38 U. DAYTON L. REV. 33, 36 (Fall 2012).

51. At GW Law we have eight journals and I am frequently surprised to find students have no idea what their peers on other journals are doing, nor do they take the initiative to find out. Gustafson points out that The National Conference of Law Reviews offers basic training for new law review editors, but they rarely learn from one another. See Gustafson, *supra* note 50, at 36.

relationships between authors and student staff members. The half-day symposium for incoming student editors on GW Law's journals assembles outgoing editors, select journal faculty advisors, and legal writing faculty to introduce new editors to the leadership challenges they will face and the professional skills they will use to overcome them. The symposium's storytelling format creates an opportunity to sharpen listening skills and build self-motivation by preparing new editors to write their own leadership narrative.⁵² The GW Law symposium schedule of presentations, each of which targets a specialized editorial audience, is attached at the Appendix.

A. Awareness Builds Empathy and Positive Collaboration

A symposium environment can foster awareness and understanding by joining authors and editors together in conversation. To help student editors appreciate the author perspective, faculty can model professional skills by sharing anecdotes of how they have learned to strike a balance of "simultaneous detachment from and proximity to" a writing project.⁵³ These stories are best told with a hint of humor to show the humility of well-adjusted and successful professionals. An author's character, her pride and humility, has much to do with the success of the author-editor "struggle."⁵⁴ This "struggle" is the noble pursuit of making a piece of writing the best it can be.⁵⁵

Pulling back the curtain to reveal the dynamics of a healthy author-editor relationship demands intellectual honesty and self-awareness.⁵⁶ Individuals do not always take well to the exercise of authority.⁵⁷ Emeritus Professor Chip Lupu's best publishing experiences were those with editors who started with the big picture, an approach that enabled him to detach himself from the existing text.⁵⁸ In Lupu's ideal, the editor sends the author a memo to further discussion about the proportions, order, and substance of

52. In 2008, *The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute* devoted an entire volume to publishing articles from a variety of legal disciplines to demonstrate the power of storytelling across the legal field. 14 *Legal Writing: The Journal of the Legal Writing Institute* (2008), <http://www.legalwritingjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/volume-14.pdf>.

53. Chip Lupu, *Six Authors in Search of A Character*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 71, 75 (1994).

54. Lupu, *supra* note 53, at 73-74.

55. *Id.* at 71. Lupu calls Lindgren's criticism of law reviews a description of character flaws on both sides of the struggle. *Id.* at 73-74. Lupu was ahead of his time when he noted in that 1994 essay introducing a symposium on student-edited law reviews: "[I]t is incumbent upon those of us who care about the law's integrity to reflect that quality in our professional lives." *Id.* at 71.

56. *Id.* at 71.

57. Interview with Emeritus Prof. Chip Lupu, The George Washington University Law School, in Washington D.C. (February 2, 2015) (notes on file with the author).

58. *See id.*

the manuscript, before reviewing the sentences.⁵⁹ This approach contributes to honesty. The editor can say, “I don’t know more than you” and still create for the author the necessary detachment from the prose. Together they can collaborate to make the manuscript the best it can be.⁶⁰ A symposium presentation that reveals the human side of editing can be refreshing and educational for new editors.

Another GW Law faculty member, Professor Greg Maggs has written a plea for editors and authors to start from the position that each party is reasonable and has reasonable requests.⁶¹ We present Maggs’ advice at the symposium, urging students to avoid quick assumptions and sit down face-to-face with the author. Encouraging new editors to have the courage and tenacity to form a personal rapport with authors will help them gain empathy and see that non-negotiable editorial policies can destroy a collaborative author-editor experience.⁶² The symposium includes an exercise to identify one’s communication style and then learn to flex and adapt to form positive dialogue with others.⁶³

Journal members write a note and work on technical, below-the-line substantiation in their 2L year, but unless their supervising editors engage them in the collaborative process with the author, rising 3Ls are rarely able to translate their personal experience into the collaborative work of enhancing clarity, efficiency, and economy of communication. Professor Lindgren has begged student editors for empathy:

Imagine that as a law student, you had spent many months writing what you believed would be a fine student note, a note that you hoped would land you a managing board position, a good clerkship, and ultimately perhaps a job. Then imagine that before you could submit this note, you had to give it to a group of bright high-school students who rewrote almost every sentence . . . This is what it feels like.⁶⁴

In symposium conversations we can make explicit the connection between the struggles a 2L endures through the note-writing process and those of an author.

The *Duke Law Review* editor demonstrated his own self-awareness when he explained that penning his own note instilled him with a sense of

59. *See id.*

60. *See id.*

61. *See* Greg Maggs, *Just Say No?*, 70 CHI.-KENT L. REV. 101, 102-3 (1994).

62. *See* Maggs, *supra* note 61, at 104.

63. The exercise is borrowed from Jackie L. Hartman and Jim McCambridge, *Optimizing Millennials’ Communication Styles*, 74 BUS. COMM. Q. 22, 37-39 (2011).

64. Lindgren, *An Author’s Manifesto*, *supra* note 6, at 540.

empathy and led him to conclude that authors should have final authority in the editing process.⁶⁵ Learning to take criticism as a 2L from a peer and editor, and then transforming into an editor who can give feedback “that is both tactful and constructive,” is also an example of the small group skills essential in law practice.⁶⁶

The publishing experience is a “joint venture” between authors and student editors.⁶⁷ Both parties have the shared interest in publishing a highly refined product and doing so through reasonable, non-adversarial conversations.⁶⁸ Once the student editor and author have achieved a sense of shared empathy and balance, they are better able to focus on self-discipline and collaboration. Then, student editors are more likely to make only those edits they are both willing and able to explain in person, abide by author-preferred style and grammar preferences, pick up the phone for a friendly conversation about any text they are unsure about (rather than changing it), and limiting themselves to one round of edits before returning the draft to the author to save time and frustration.⁶⁹ The value of the symposium is that it helps students recognize the source of their empathy and then learn how to use it to achieve the best results for the journal.

In the symposium, outgoing editors are invited to share reflections on their duty to mentor and hold accountable their 2L members. This generation of journal members is comprised of Millennial students, who tend to see themselves as confident, team-oriented, and ambitious.⁷⁰ Millennial students value collaborative learning environments, and it is important to them to be part of decision-making and receive praise for their accomplishments.⁷¹ Valuing these traits is an important first step for editors who seek to motivate and hold student members accountable for assignment deadlines. Individually, each student is entirely capable of fulfilling her responsibilities, but no one wants to feel as though other members are pulling less than their weight.

To maintain a positive sense of community within the journal, student editors have learned through experience to give members the flexibility and independence they need for a sense of achievement.⁷² While clear rules

65. See Saunders, *supra* note 16, at 1685-86.

66. Dolores K. Sloviter, *In Praise of Law Reviews*, 75 TEMP. L. REV. 7, 7 (2002).

67. See Harvey Gilmore, *Defending the Law Review – A Response to Judge Posner and Professor Lindgren*, 4 CHARLOTTE L. REV. 323, 335 (Winter 2013).

68. See Gilmore, *supra* note 67.

69. Josephine R. Potuto, *Whose Article Is It Anyway? Student Editors and the Law Review Process* 15-17 (Aug. 6, 2014), available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2477228>.

70. See Emily A. Benfer and Colleen F. Shanahan, *Educating the Invincibles: Strategies for Teaching the Millennial Generation in Law School*, 20 CLINICAL L. R. 1, 8 (Fall 2013).

71. *Id.* at 10-11.

72. *Id.* at 13.

and explicit responsibilities are important to complete the mission, it cannot stop there. A healthy team is built from seeking suggestions and improving efficiencies. Therefore, the symposium includes a session with presentations by librarians who share the latest trends and databases for substantiating footnotes with efficiency. Once outgoing editors reveal leadership values through lessons learned, new editors can continue to model these skills throughout the year by setting expectations and conducting self-reflection and offering peer-to-peer feedback.⁷³

After self-awareness comes empathy, in which an individual demonstrates ethical sensitivity when making decisions.⁷⁴ Specific teaching methods such as active listening exercises, role playing, and identifying diverse communication styles are used in the symposium to teach empathy and relational skills.⁷⁵ The transition into leadership presents an exceptional opportunity for faculty mentors to teach editors about different communication styles and strengths and how to be a good listener when difficult management issues arise. Editing involves a complex bundle of skills, and often the people skills helpful with forging relationships with an author do not translate to good line editors.⁷⁶ Relational skills involve using listening and nonverbal communication to identify different strengths, respect those differences, and assign responsibilities that play to each team member's strengths.⁷⁷ The symposium prepares editors for practice where an empathetic manager knows her decisions will impact others and carefully weighs options that will avoid unnecessary harm to others.⁷⁸

B. Reflecting to Lead Forward

A symposium that teaches new editors to appreciate the value of self-reflection empowers them to identify and use leadership skills to create a collaborative, professionally rewarding experience for their members. The symposium challenges new editors to think more critically about the enterprise they are about to lead and relate the skills they will develop through the leadership experience to the emotional intelligence traits employers value.

A self-aware, empathetic lawyer must be able to reflect on the complex issues that arise in practice and make ethical decisions.⁷⁹ Aristotle called

73. See generally *id.* at 25-29.

74. See NATT GANTT, II AND MADISON, *supra* note 9, at 8.

75. See *id.* at 11-12. See generally Jonathan R. Cohen, *Open-Minded Listening*, 5 CHARLOTTE L. REV. 139, 158 (Spring 2014).

76. See Carol Sanger, *Editing*, 82 GEO. L. J. 513, 518 (1993).

77. See NATT GANTT, II AND MADISON, *supra* note 9, at 9.

78. See *id.* at 8-9.

79. See *id.* at 9.

this the wisdom to “deliberate well.”⁸⁰ The symposium fosters dialogue to analyze lessons learned from actual decisions and use those lessons to teach reflective, ethical decision-making skills.⁸¹

The symposium also channels the power of conversation to turn angry voices into reflection on why we read and write law reviews at all.⁸² Editors and faculty advisors across all eight GW Law journals can talk about our shared goals to make law review editing standards more practical, a close match to those in the publishing world outside law school.⁸³ Student editors have a professional responsibility to maintain the integrity of an author’s intellectual work product,⁸⁴ and a symposium is the perfect forum for such reflection and conversation.

The peer education presented in the symposium teaches students to “exchange ideas . . . argue for ideas, and point out to others the logical implications, the missing factual foundations, and the underlying assumptions of their ideas.”⁸⁵ The experience of an editor managing her peers on the journal is the closest a student can get to the management dilemmas she will face in practice.⁸⁶ When the *Duke Law Review* editor wrote that some of the most “intense and rigorous” debates he had in law school were over whether to extend an offer of publication,⁸⁷ he was describing the development of the wisdom needed to make ethical decisions.

Peers play an important role in forming a student’s professional identity when they learn to work together to resolve sensitive issues with moral and ethical consequences.⁸⁸ At the symposium, faculty and administration mentors meet with small groups of incoming and outgoing editors to open a dialogue about the difficult decisions editors will need to make on issues such as preventing reckless plagiarism and enforcing penalties for late or incomplete assignments. Throughout the year, the editors can seek counsel from these mentors to continue the dialogue. These ongoing relationships will foster among staff members a sense of ethics and accountability, which will translate into a better final product.

80. *Id.*

81. *See id.* at 13-14.

82. Sanger, *supra* note 76, at 514-15 (Sanger describes her article as a “plea for a revival of common sense”).

83. *Id.* at 527.

84. *See id.*

85. Wise et. al, *supra* note 22, at n.105 (citing John T. Noonan, Jr., *Law Reviews*, 47 STAN. L. REV., 1117, 1118 (1995)).

86. *See* Kathryn Feldman, *Remarks about the Value of Student-Run Law Journals: Opening Address and the First Annual Banquet of the Windsor Review of Legal And Social Issues*, 17 W.R.L.S.I. 1, 4 (2004).

87. Saunders, *supra* note 16, at 1671-72.

88. *See* NATT GANTT, II AND MADISON, *supra* note 9, at 16.

The symposium is intended to lay the foundation for faculty to be available as mentors to help editors build the skills that foster the normative values we expect professionals to demonstrate.⁸⁹ In this apprenticeship setting, faculty teach and editors practice key leadership skills during their tenure on the editorial board, and beyond. As such, the editorial symposium can earn acknowledgement from the ABA that faculty are developing critical professional skills among their students.

V. CONCLUSION

The skills students need to forge the professional identity of an editor can and should be taught in law school. Even the strongest critics agree law reviews are a fundamental aspect of legal education.⁹⁰ Law review membership has been called “one of the few forms of apprenticeship left in our profession.”⁹¹ The greatest opportunity for law review reform comes from recognizing journal membership as a skills apprenticeship.⁹² Specifically, the journal experience ought to be elevated into an apprenticeship in professionalism.⁹³ There is no other place in law school (not even in clinics where students are closely supervised by faculty and fellows), where students learn to write, collaborate, and manage in the same way they will in a legal office.⁹⁴ We should not allow this unique experiential learning environment to be disturbed by the critics who call for an increase in peer-reviewed journals or increased faculty supervision, particularly the all-too-common *laissez-faire* fashion of supervision. Instead, faculty can participate in a symposium emphasizing self-awareness, relationship-building, and reflective decision-making to help journal editors learn their craft and become professionals. Ultimately, the symposium provides a roadmap for journal leaders to produce not just high quality publications with satisfied authors, but a positive, experiential learning environment for their community members.

89. *See id.* at 8.

90. *See* Cramton, *supra* note 6, at 4.

91. Gordon, *supra* note 7, at 543.

92. *See* Baker, *supra* note 48, at 923 (noting that law reviews originated as a method for teaching students).

93. *See id.* at 932.

94. *See* Gilmore, *supra* note 67, at 326.

APPENDIX

Journal E-Board Transition Symposium Schedule
(Friday, March 13, 2015)

9:00 am	Welcoming Remarks by Dean Morant – Student Conference Center		
Breakout Sessions	<i>Student Conference Center</i>	<i>Stuart 101</i>	<i>Stuart 201</i>
9:15 – 9:50 am	<p align="center">Maximizing Journal Office Space, Technology, & Law School Staff Carolyn Harris</p> <p>3L Managing Editors from the Federal Communication Law Journal (FCLJ) & Public Contract Law Journal (PCLJ)</p>	<p align="center">Thinking Creatively about Editing & Source-Collecting Prof. Wherry & Librarian Germaine Leahy</p> <p>3L Senior Articles Editors from FCLJ & the Journal of Environmental & Energy Law (JEEL)</p>	<p align="center">Updating the SW Syllabus, JA Relationships, & Selecting Notes for Publication Prof. Thornton</p> <p>3L Articles Editors from the American IP Lawyers Association Quarterly Journal (AIPLA) & JEEL</p>
10 – 10:35 am	<p align="center">Maintaining a Journal Budget & Billing System for Subscriptions & Special Events Dean Molinengo</p> <p>3L Executive Editors from the Federal Circuit Bar Journal & FCLJ</p>	<p align="center">Selecting Articles & Maintaining Author Relationships and Attracting Articles & Maintaining Bar Association Relationships Prof. Schooner</p> <p>3L Articles Editors from PCLJ and JEEL</p>	<p align="center">Providing Effective Feedback to Note Writers Prof. Gambert</p> <p>3L Articles Editors (also trained as Writing Fellows) from AIPLA & the International Law Review (ILR)</p>

10:45 – 11:20 am	Dean of Students Office Presentation on Complex Student Issues Deans Monroe/Chernack 3L Note Editors from PCLJ and the International Law in Domestic Courts (ILDC) Journal	Motivating and Managing 3L Production Work Prof. Thornton 3L Editors in Chief from JEEL and AIPLA	How to Plan and Run a Symposium Prof. Gambert 3L Symposium Editor from ILR
11:30 am - 12:05 pm	Capstone: Managing a Team & Maintaining Effective Communication Student Conference Center (seated at tables by journal) Prof. Thornton & 3L EICs		

12:15 -1:00 pm Pizza Lunch – Student Conference Center

Symposium Description

At GW Law our symposium brings together editors from our eight journals to create a community that emphasizes integrity and character. Through a series of conversations, facilitated by a faculty member and a small group of outgoing editors, we place explicit attention on the self-awareness and the relational and reflective skills needed to foster the professional identity of a successful editor. Below is a brief description of each interactive, group learning modules (three sessions run concurrently, each focused on a different type of editor):

For managing, executive, and special projects editors-

- Maximizing Journal Office Space, Technology, & Law School Staff
 - Training from the journal office administrative assistant about how to maintain files, stock supplies, and share office equipment.
- Maintaining a Journal Budget & Billing System for Subscriptions & Special Events
 - A conversation with the associate dean about budgeting, and the rules and responsibilities associated with using the law school credit card to pay for community building social events.
- How to Plan and Run a Symposium
 - Lessons learned from an outgoing editor and the law school event coordinator about setting timelines, budgets, catering menus, and navigating unwritten etiquette protocols.

For articles editors and Editors in Chief (EIC)s-

- Thinking Creatively about Editing & Source-Collecting
 - A conversation with a legal writing professor and research librarian about flexibility with regard to establishing a user-friendly journal style guide and source collection protocols.

- Selecting Articles & Maintaining Author Relationships
 - A conversation with faculty advisors and outgoing editors about how to build a trusting relationship with authors.
- Dean of Students Office Presentation on Complex Student Issues
 - A presentation by the Dean of Students and outgoing editors about how and when to refer issues regarding academic integrity and student members in distress to the Dean of Students.
- Motivating and Managing 3L Production Work
 - A conversation with outgoing articles and managing editors about management and balance: when to be flexible, when to give praise, when to hold fast on deadlines, and how to communicate effectively to bring out the best in each individual to create a successful team.

For notes editors-

- Updating the SW Syllabus, Journal Adjunct Relationships, & Selecting Notes for Publication
 - A presentation by a legal writing professor and outgoing senior note editors about how to set a timeline for note draft deadlines, foster strong relationships with the adjuncts who lead work-in-progress meetings with note writers, and decide what makes a note publishable.
- Providing Effective Feedback to Note Writers
 - A conversation with a legal writing professor and outgoing note editors who are also trained Writing Fellows about the art of critiquing.
- Dean of Students Office Presentation on Complex Student Issues
 - (see above)

Capstone Session for All Editors: Managing a Team & Maintaining Effective Communication-

- In advance of this session, each editor will complete a survey to identify his or her personal communication style. In small groups led by outgoing EICs, the editors collaborate in a series of role playing exercises (based on real journal management issues) and learn how to flex their communication styles to reach a positive result.

Effective Communication Exercise for the Capstone Session

Before coming to today's symposium you were asked to read a brief excerpt from the "Optimizing Millennials' Communication Styles" article and complete the questionnaire in the appendix.⁹⁵ The questionnaire is designed to help you evaluate your personal communication style, so you should now have a sense of whether your dominant style category is analytical, driver, amiable, or expressive.

Successful communication is an interactive process – a two-way sharing and understanding of information. Today's exercise is intended to demonstrate style typing and style flexing, which are considered the key to successful communication. Once you know your own style and appreciate other individuals' communication processes, you can modify your style to achieve reciprocity and understanding.⁹⁶

Editors in Chief: Gather your editorial board around a table and introduce yourselves according to dominant communication style. Together discuss the five questions below and after 15 minutes, report out your answers to the larger group of editors.

- 1) When you are a team member, what things are most important to you and how do you like to be treated as a member of that team?
- 2) When your team is first created, how do you get the team to begin its work?
- 3) How do you manage the team member that does not pull his or her weight?
- 4) How do you handle a dominant/take control team member?
- 5) Discuss how would you build a team that has a well-rounded/balanced membership?

95. Hartman and McCambridge, *supra* note 63, at 37-39.

96. Benfer and Shanahan, *supra* note 70, at 35.