

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

MAX HUFFMAN

The contributors to this teaching and learning symposium sound a common theme in their otherwise highly diverse contributions. Each primary author (or pair of authors) offers an innovative approach to law teaching that combines (1) a need to produce a product that is relevant for a new and diverse student body with (2) a recognition of the trade-offs inherent in any productive enterprise. For example, Adams and I together reflect on the importance of lifelike experience in learning, and on making that experience available through modern and accessible pedagogical techniques. We draw the lesson that there can be too much of a good thing. Sullivan observes a primary outcome for teaching international students is preparing them to engage with their peers and their new learning—but balances that against concerns for embarrassment of, or unfairness toward, students working in a non-native language and a novel educational system.

Similar trade-offs and solutions are found in each of the contributions. The Indiana Law Review editors' thoughtfulness in bringing in reactions to the primary contributions, from full-time faculty colleagues, part-time faculty who are in law practice, and law students, gives a broad set of perspectives on how well the challenges were met in each case. Walters (a student contributor) echoes Sullivan's observation that cultural norms influence classroom behavior. He continues with the suggestion that incorporating international students may call for change in the broader profession, "communicating complex ideas in common words and not rely purely on our terms-of-art or legal jargon." Ryznar comments on Shope's contribution, echoing his conclusions about the ability to produce practice-like experiences in the online classroom and even extending it. Connection to law practice, Ryznar concludes, is "a guaranteed course outcome" in Shope's online course. Boyne, reacting to Ryznar's contribution, challenges the law school and its faculty to "double down" on data-driven outcomes assessment, ensuring the effectiveness of our teaching and our students' learning. Boyne's comment on the need for data-driven outcomes assessment serves as an important asterisk on any report on the law school's work.

The larger lesson is in the importance of continually innovating, and evaluating those innovations, to address the dynamism in student demographics, the education market, and the professional environment. We learn these are not necessarily competing demands: online offerings meets student demand *and*, paraphrasing Professor Ryznar's comment on Shope, prepares students for the tasks they will encounter on entering the profession.

This compilation shows how an aggressively innovating faculty can keep itself ahead of the curve, always maintaining the educational mission at the front-and-center of its work.