

From the Editors

As the growth in regulated sectors continues, private law practice has become far more focused on statutes and regulations. Yet for the past 100 years, the traditional 1L curriculum has remained mired in court-based common law topics of property, contracts, torts, criminal law, and civil procedure. Six articles, from last year's AALS annual meeting panel "Leg-Reg courses and the Core Curriculum," focus attention on efforts by a growing number of law schools (at last count 27) to depart from the traditional first year template and require a 1L course in legislation and regulation.

James Brudney begins this packet with an argument for a 1L Leg-Reg course, pointing out the need for a methodological understanding of the legislative and regulatory process and its basic interpretive resources and tools. He also notes the lessons of consensus building and democratic responsiveness garnered from this process that may not be covered in traditional common law and court focused courses.

Kevin Stack, meanwhile, looks at the evolution of the Administrative Law course, noting that the past resistance toward its addition in the upper level curriculum may lend insight to today's reluctance to introduce Leg-Reg as a 1L course. Langdellian emphasis on finding the "objective" law, led some to doubt whether administrative law really was law. When finally the course was accepted for the upper-level, it was based on the case method with a focus on the law of judicial control over administration, excluding all the non-judicial materials. Thus, Stark argues for a 1L course that would focus more on primary "non-judicial materials" in the regulatory process—be it an entire statute, a prominent piece of legislative history, notice of proposed rulemaking, a final rule, an agency guidance and an agency adjudicative decision—in other words, a mapping of a lawyer's terrain that falls under the label of "compliance or regulatory."

John Manning and Matthew Stephenson share some of the lessons learned from the development of a Leg-Reg course as part of a 1L curriculum reform at Harvard in 2006. Not only do Professors Manning & Stephenson detail the delicate landscape of curriculum reform, they also discuss ways in which a 1L Leg-Reg course may be designed—such as how the familiar case-based method can be utilized in introducing challenging topics such as the intricacies of the legislative process; and how to sequence a Leg-Reg course beginning with legislative interpretation and ending with rule making process.

Dakota Rudesill, Christopher Walker and Daniel Tokaji, meanwhile, take a look at Legislation in the first year curriculum and as an introductory course in an integrated program on the legislative process. Two of the authors (Rudesill and Tokaji) incorporate the law of the political process to teach how and what

laws get made and the messiness of the democratic process. Deborah Widiss similarly zeroes in on the what, why and how to teach about legislative process in a Leg-Reg course. Outlining the areas of possible coverage as well as giving a careful survey of available texts and sources, Widiss ends her piece with a nice summary of several simulations that she utilizes in her class to bring the legislative drafting process to life. Finally, Abbe Gluck presents findings from an empirical study of schools that have implemented the Leg-Reg course to assess its adoption's overall impact on the first year and upper level curriculum.

Three other diverse articles round out this volume—Deborah Hussey Freeland's study takes a longitudinal look at law school application trends for the last 39 years. Her data reveals some interesting conclusions—while the ebb and flow of law school applications correlate to unemployment trends—the pace of applications does not correlate with increases in law school tuition nor, at least in recent years, does it correlate with the influx of female bachelor degree holders. Even more interestingly, while unmet needs for medical services led to an increase in medical school applications, the reverse appears to be true for the field of law. Professor Martha Davis examines an interesting new approach to legal education, adopted by a number of law schools (including Northeastern University) to establish “law labs.” Law labs, like their “lab” counterpart in the sciences, are places where law students and their clients collaborate to experiment and develop innovative solutions to legal problems. Finally, Stephen Newman returns us to the perennial question of how to integrate advocacy skills in traditional doctrinal courses.

A thoughtful *At the Lectern* essay by Melissa Marlow ponders the loss of authenticity in our teaching with the demands of large classes, growth of student evaluations, and the image of the unemotional, analytic lawyer. She reemphasizes the need to “be yourself” in your teaching and suggests ways to find our way back. Three book reviews complete this volume: Naomi Cahn and June Carbone review *What Works for Women at Work: Four Patterns Working Women Need to Know* (New York University Press 2014); Mary Mitchell reviews Kara Swanson's *Banking on the Body: The Market in Blood, Milk and Sperm in Modern America* (Harvard University Press 2014); and Alfred Brophy reviews Kirt von Daacke, *Freedom Has a Face: Race, Identity, and Community in Jefferson's Virginia*, (University of Virginia Press, 2012). Yet again, the Journal is filled with innovative, thoughtful and hopefully, useful pieces for law teachers and students alike. Enjoy!

Margaret Y. K. Woo
Jeremy R. Paul