VIII. COURSE OF STUDY

The Law School prides itself on a “Real World, Real Law” perspective. This commitment is reflected in both how we teach and what we teach. As explained more fully in the Profession Skills Education section, faculty members teaching doctrinal courses frequently integrate simulations, role play, and drafting exercises into their course materials. This is because our experience has shown that practice reinforces theory and, in turn, theory elucidates practice. In our view, legal theory is necessary but not sufficient for the education of attorneys.

We also seek balance in terms of the subject matter included in our curricular offerings. At a school known for its reputation in Trial Advocacy, we believe that it is important to develop a curriculum that meets the needs of all students, including those who do not intend to pursue a litigation-based practice. Since the last site visit, the Law School has made considerable gains in enhancing its specialized offerings in such areas as intellectual property, international law, business and tax law, and environmental law, without sacrificing its traditional areas of strength.

To earn a J.D. degree, a student must successfully complete 87 credit hours and attain a 2.0 cumulative average. The 87 hours include ten required courses that are traditionally referred to as the “first-year curriculum”: Civil Procedure I, Contracts I & II, Constitutional Law, Criminal Law I, Legal Decision Making: Judges, Legislators, and Regulators, Legal Research and Writing I & II, Torts, and Property. In addition to these foundational courses, students are required to take a two-credit course on Professional Responsibility and complete the Upper Level Writing Requirement, which includes a serial paper component and a research paper component, described below. Students must earn a grade of “C” or better in Professional Responsibility and the Upper Level Writing Requirements. Students satisfy the remaining credit requirements from our wide range of upper level course offerings, also described below.

A. First-Year Curriculum

The first-year curriculum is entirely mandatory. Due to our part-time and extended part-time programs, some students complete these required courses in their second year of legal study. The sequencing of the courses taken by part-time students in their second year differs slightly depending on whether the students are enrolled in the Day or Evening Division.

---

1 In the Spring of 2000, the faculty voted to increase the number of credits required for graduation from 86 to 87 for students entering the law school after August 1, 2000. In 1997 the faculty had increased the credits needed for graduation from 83 to 86.

2 Students are classified as full-time, part-time regular, or part-time extended. After the completion of the first-year curriculum, full-time students are required to complete four additional full-time semesters, which consist of not less than 12 credits and not more than 15 credits. Part-time students must then take four additional part-time semesters, which consist of not less than 8 and not more than 11 credits.
The following sets forth the required “first-year curriculum” for each category of students.

**Full-Time Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts I</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research &amp; Writing I</td>
<td>2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Decision Making</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15 credits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contracts II                  | 3 credits         |
| Legal Research & Writing II   | 2 credits         |
| Civil Procedure I             | 3 credits         |
| Constitutional Law            | 4 credits         |
| Property                      | 4 credits         |
| **Total**                     | **16 credits**    |

**First-Year Part-Time Regular - Day and Evening Divisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts I</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research &amp; Writing I</td>
<td>2 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Decision Making</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 credits</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contracts II                  | 3 credits         |
| Legal Research & Writing II   | 2 credits         |
| Civil Procedure I             | 3 credits         |
| Property                      | 4 credits         |
| **Total**                     | **12 credits**    |

**Second-Year Part-Time Regular - Day Division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Law I</td>
<td>3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitutional Law</strong></td>
<td>4 credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Since the last self-study, the faculty voted to increase the number of credits of Constitutional Law from 3 to 4 on the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee.
Second-Year Part-Time Regular - Evening Division

Fall Semester

Criminal Law I 3 credits
Constitutional Law 4 credits

Total 7 credits

First-Year Part-Time Extended - Day and Evening Divisions

Fall Semester  
Contracts I 3 credits
Legal Decision Making 3 credits
Torts 4 credits

Total 10 credits

Spring Semester

Contracts II 3 credits
Civil Procedure I 3 credits
Property 4 credits

Total 10 credits

Second-Year Part-Time Extended - Day Division

Fall Semester

Legal Research & Writing I 2 credits
Criminal Law 3 credits

Total 5 credits

Spring Semester

Legal Research & Writing II 2 credits
Constitutional Law 4 credits

Total 6 credits

Second-Year Part-Time Extended - Evening Division

Fall Semester

Legal Research & Writing I 2 credits
Criminal Law 3 credits
Constitutional Law 4 credits

Total 9 credits

Spring Semester

Legal Research & Writing II 2 credits

Total 2 credits

B. Ongoing First-Year Curricular Review

During the 2003-2004 academic year, the faculty began a comprehensive review of the first-
The Curriculum Committee undertook this review at the request of the Dean, who was concerned that it had been nearly ten years since the faculty had last revisited the first-year curriculum. The current review of the first-year offerings is expected to extend well into this academic year.

The Curriculum Committee first gathered information from over fifty law schools in order to get a sense of how other law schools approached the foundational courses. In particular, the Curriculum Committee was interested in the number of schools which offered two semesters of Contracts and whether Civil Procedure was a first semester course. It concluded that the Law School’s mandated course of study and credit allocation was generally consistent with that offered at the majority of law schools included in the study, with the exception of the Legal Decision Making course.

Members of the Curriculum Committee then met informally with faculty members to determine the level of satisfaction with the first-year curriculum and to generate a list of talking points for future faculty discussions. The Curriculum Committee met throughout the Fall 2003 semester to discuss the results of these informal meetings and to consider how best to proceed with a faculty-wide discussion. At the Self-Study Retreat in December 2003, the Curriculum Committee presented its initial findings regarding the survey of other law schools and led the faculty discussion. It had circulated the following questions in advance of the Retreat, along with a request for faculty input.

- Should we add a statutory course in the first year?
- Is it feasible to reintroduce small sections?
- What about first-year electives?
- What can we do to increase coordination within sections?
- Why do we teach six credits of Contracts?
- Should we add Civil Procedure II to the first semester?
- Is Legal Decision Making still a vital part of the first year?

The questions generated a lively discussion that confirmed the Curriculum Committee’s initial impressions that the talking points listed above represented the primary areas of faculty concern.

A group of faculty members who teach Legal Decision Making made a presentation at the March 2004 faculty meeting to explain their approach to the course and how the course contributes to the first-year curriculum. Faculty who teach Contracts also prepared a memorandum for distribution to the faculty outlining the rationale for retaining six credits of Contracts in the first year. In addition, the

---

4 As described in the last Self-Study Report, the faculty undertook a similar review of the first-year curriculum from 1992-1994. At that time, the faculty ultimately decided not to make any dramatic changes to the curriculum. However, the faculty did approve the restructuring of the predecessor of the current Legal Decision Making course to reflect the importance of statute-based law and regulatory authority. And the Legal Research and Writing Program was substantially changed with the addition of a core of full-time faculty in that discipline.
Curriculum Committee held an open meeting later in March 2004 to continue the discussion started during the Self-Study Retreat. The Curriculum Committee enlisted the assistance of the student members of the committee and the Student Bar Association to administer a survey to the student body designed to solicit student input regarding the first-year curriculum.

The Curriculum Committee worked over the summer to develop a concrete proposal for the first-year curriculum based on the collected views expressed at the various meetings.

C. Legal Research and Writing

At the time of the last site inspection, the Law School had just begun a new and expanded program of instruction in legal writing, investing heavily in experienced and committed legal writing professors, in an effort to better address the writing needs of our students. Since that time the law school writing program for J.D. students has been built around a full-time tenured Director of Legal Writing and five full-time experienced writing professors. The faculty for the writing program for J.D. students also includes, depending upon enrollment, five or six Graduate Fellows (lawyers in the Abraham Freedman Graduate Fellowship program) and approximately eight adjunct professors. Full-time writing faculty and Graduate Fellows also employ upper-division students as teaching assistants to help students who need extra assistance with writing or research, but the teaching assistants do not substitute their efforts for any of the faculty’s instructional responsibilities in or out of the classroom.

At the time of the last site inspection, writing courses for International LL.M. students were taught by three adjunct professors. But when the China LL.M. program was added, the Law School added a full-time writing professor, responsible for supervising writing by students enrolled in the International LL.M. Program and the China LL.M. program. The instructional support for the LL.M. writing programs also includes an adjunct professor and student assistants in the writing center.

The Law School’s writing program reflects a major undertaking to make significant and lasting improvements in one of the most important areas of the mandated curriculum. Since 1996-97, the Law School’s writing program has been directed by Professor Jan M. Levine. The Director and four full-time LRW professors teach approximately half of the students in the day division J.D. program, while the other half is taught by Graduate Fellows. The evening division students are taught by approximately eight adjunct professors and one senior Graduate Fellow.

The full-time staffing of the writing program has been very stable. The Director and three of the five full-time LRW professors have been with the program since its inception.  

5 The five full-time LRW Professors are: Associate Professors Susan DeJarnatt, Elena Margolis, and Kathryn Stanchi, and Assistant Professors Robin Nilon and Bonny Tavares. Professors DeJarnatt, Margolis, and Stanchi are in the fourth year of six-year contracts, and all were promoted to the rank of Associate Professor after internal and external reviews modeled on the procedures for promotion and tenure. All five non-tenure-track writing
The Law School’s writing program curriculum reflects the state-of-the-art in curricular design, and it has served as a model for many other schools which have adopted significant parts of Temple’s curriculum and research and writing assignments. All of the research and writing components of the program are based on open-ended library research projects leading to writing projects; Temple’s writing program does not use “closed-universe” writing assignments or stand-alone “treasure-hunt” library assignments. The writing program (along with the Legal Decision Making course) starts one week earlier than other Fall semester 1-L courses to permit the students an early opportunity to learn the fundamentals of print-based legal research, the sources of judicial and legislative law, and basics of reading appellate opinions and common law reasoning prior to the commencement of their other first-year courses. Electronic methods of legal research are integrated into the instruction as the term progresses; typically, students are given limited Westlaw and Lexis passwords and training a month or so after their initial print-based research, permitting them to retrieve cases and other materials for which they have citations, and to update materials using the online services.

Since the last site visit, the Director has instituted a “high tech” writing section, which has been highlighted at several national legal writing conferences. Students volunteer to be admitted to this section, and the course relies very heavily on the professor’s word-processor-based critiques of student work (with embedded audio comments, “pop-up” comments, highlighting, redline, and strikeout), electronic mail, in-class computer editing, and the Blackboard course website system. Several of the other writing professors and Graduate Fellows have experimented with this teaching method, and are incorporating elements into their own teaching.

The school’s writing program is justifiably regarded one of the true leaders in the field of legal writing: the legal writing faculty’s scholarly production about legal writing is simply unparalleled among other schools, and the Director’s and other full-time writing faculty members’ national service to the legal writing field has put our writing program in the forefront of modern legal education.

The Legal Research and Writing classes are relatively small, ranging from 10 or fewer students in the evening division adjunct-taught sections to 34 students in the day division sections taught by full-time writing faculty and Graduate Fellows. In addition to research and writing skills, the assignments used within the legal writing program course materials provide faculty and students with multiple opportunities to address related aspects of professionalism, involving a lawyer’s role in conducting research and preparing documents, as well as in communicating ideas and positions via oral

professors play a role in faculty self-governance virtually indistinguishable from that of the tenured and tenure-track faculty, and their contracts comply with ABA Standard 405(c). There is no cap on the number of years in which they can teach in the LRW program.

6At this time, the extended evening division students enrol in the legal writing course in their second year of school.
presentations, as addressed by the MacCrate Report and recognized in the ABA Accreditation Standards.

The writing faculty spend a great deal of time and energy on teaching students well beyond the normal classroom contact hours. As a leader in the implementation of state-of-the-art legal writing pedagogy, the program’s faculty view writing as a process of drafting and revision, with students acquiring new skills while simultaneously practicing previously acquired skills in a more difficult context. This “recursive loop” pedagogy requires the writing teacher to heavily critique the results of each writing assignment; two of the three Fall semester memoranda are rewritten by students following a required individual conference with the teacher after the receipt of the professor’s critique, and the Spring semester appellate brief is also revised after a conference with the teacher, following a critique of a partial draft of the argument section of the brief. Each student’s research forays into the library are also scrutinized by the professor, and for the first two research assignments the students receive extensive written comments on their own written reports about the sources consulted and the materials reviewed, as well as the research strategy used.

The Director and the full-time legal writing professors recognize that scholarship supports their teaching and they have consistently devoted their summers to scholarly work, producing over 25 scholarly pieces from the time they joined the Temple faculty until the spring of 2004. The bulk of the scholarship produced by the LRW professors is directly connected to their teaching. Moreover, the quantity as well as high quality of the scholarship has made Temple a national leader for LRW excellence. The publications of the director and full-time legal writing professors have been cited in more than 150 books, treatises, and law review articles (excluding self-references), and they have presented sessions dozens of times at national conferences of the Association of American Law Schools, the Legal Writing Institute, and the Association of Legal Writing Directors.

D. Upper-Level Writing Requirement

The upper level writing requirement was adopted by the faculty in 1992. It requires students to complete both a serial writing paper requirement and a research writing paper requirement and earn a grade of C or better in both. Students can satisfy the requirements through guided research, writing seminars, “hybrid” courses in which some students sit for an exam and others write, and participation on law journals or Moot Court. Faculty regulations limit the number of credits of guided research a student may take in a single semester to three and further limit the total number of guided research credits a student can take to 12.

Faculty members have expressed some concern regarding the level of oversight students receive while writing for the law journals, noting uneven products. Although all students writing law review notes or comments must have a faculty adviser approve the final product for writing credit, the primary editing responsibility has been shouldered by the editorial boards of the journals. In response to this concern, several journals have revamped their writing programs and instituted new review
procedures to insure the production of more professional papers.

A similar concern was expressed several years ago about the quality of the supervision of the briefs written by the members of the Moot Court Honor Society. To address this perceived deficiency, the faculty voted to require students elected to the Moot Court Honor Society to enroll in Appellate Advocacy in the Spring semester immediately following their election. The Appellate Advocacy course is taught by full-time members of the legal writing faculty. Students must earn a grade of C or better to receive academic credit and to be eligible to represent the Law School at Moot Court competitions.

**E. Reforms in Academic Standards**

Over the last several years, the faculty has taken a number of steps to maintain standards of excellence in the classroom. These include measures designed to counteract the tendency toward grade inflation and rules allowing faculty to consider class performance in otherwise anonymously graded exam courses.

The last Self-Study Report detailed the comprehensive reform in academic standards undertaken by the faculty in 1997. At that time, the faculty was concerned about perceptions of decreasing expectations of excellence in the classroom and adopted a suggested mean of 3.0 for all anonymously graded exam courses and Legal Research and Writing I and II. Since then, the faculty has revisited the issue of academic standards twice, once in 1998 and again in 2000.

Recognizing that the suggested mean does not apply to writing seminars and guided research projects, the faculty determined that the 3.0 suggested mean did not go far enough to stem grade inflation. As a result, the faculty voted to adopt a suggested mean of 2.85 for all anonymously graded exam courses and Legal Research and Writing I and II. It also adopted a suggested grade distribution providing that no more than 50% of the grades in the course should be within the B-, B, and B+ range. The faculty also voted to extend the grade point equivalents for letter grades from one decimal place to two decimal places, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Previous Point Value</th>
<th>Current Point Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+/A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the faculty voted to make permanent the two-year pilot program described in the previous Self-Study Report that allowed faculty to take class participation into account in calculating final grades in all exam courses, with the exception of required first-year courses. The intention to take class participation into account must be announced to the class during the drop-add period at the beginning of the semester. The faculty member individually evaluates the class participation of every student and then may lower or raise the final grade by one step if there is a substantial difference between the grade earned on the final examination and the quality of class participation.

F. Upper Level Elective Courses

After completing the required first-year courses and Professional Responsibility, students are free to choose from among a wide variety of upper level course offerings to satisfy their remaining credit requirements. Although curricular offerings are not driven solely by student demand, it is something that we try to monitor in order to keep up with emerging trends and expanding markets. Accordingly, in recent years, the curriculum has grown to include topical course offerings such as National Security Law, Gaming Law, and Business Immigration Law.

Beyond the addition of individual courses, however, the Law School has sought to deepen its curricular offerings in a number of practice areas, including Intellectual Property Law, International Law, Business and Tax Law, and Environmental Law. The growth in these areas has been achieved while maintaining our traditional strengths in Trial Advocacy, Criminal Law, and Public Interest/Political and Civil Rights Law. As explained below, the expansion of our faculty since the last site visit has been critical to our ability to develop these new areas of specialization, some of which had been staffed primarily by adjunct faculty members.

Intellectual Property. This is clearly an area of high student demand and interest. During the 2003-2004 academic year, 174 students took Introduction to Intellectual Property, which now serves as a prerequisite for all of our upper level intellectual property courses. The Law School now has two full-time faculty members whose primary area of expertise is intellectual property and who staff the introductory course: Professors David Post and Donald Harris. In addition to being great resources for our students, Professors Post and Harris, with the assistance of Assistant Dean for Technology Shyam Nair, have been instrumental in expanding the Law School’s intellectual property curriculum. They have worked closely work with a dedicated group of adjunct faculty to insure that our course offerings address cutting edge issues in the field.

International and Comparative Law. In recent years, the Law School’s international programs have expanded greatly, and the Law School has attracted an increasing number of students interested in
international law. Since the last site visit, the Law School has hired four new faculty members who have expertise in International and Comparative Law: Professors Salil Mehra, Mo Zhang, Duncan Hollis and Matthew Wilson. During the 2004-2005 academic year, the Law School will offer three sections of the introductory public International Law course instead of two. The Law School’s international initiatives are described in the section on International and Graduate Programs. Our international courses span the curriculum and include courses on environmental law, intellectual property, commercial transactions, arbitration and litigation, human rights, and foreign policy.

**Business and Tax Law.** We have continued to expand our offerings in the business and tax areas in an effort to meet student demand and achieve a balance in our curriculum between transactional and litigation-based course offerings. The greatest student demand in this area is for skills-based courses involving simulation and/or drafting exercises. The Integrated Transactional Program, which is described in the Professional Skills section, serves as the introductory course of study for students who wish to pursue a transactional practice. However, we would like to expand our advanced business and tax courses to include a greater emphasis on skills and drafting. The addition of a lateral hire, Professor Jonathan Lipson, will allow us to offer an advanced Transactional Practice Workshop in Spring 2005 that will serve as a third-year capstone course, similar to our existing course Business Acquisition Process taught by a visiting faculty member. Despite our best efforts, we have been unable to hire a needed additional full-time faculty member with expertise in Taxation. The LL.M. in Taxation Program alleviates some of this problem and makes a wide range of advanced tax courses available to motivated J.D. students. Our new Director of the Graduate Tax Program, Professor Kathy Mandelbaum, has also proven to be an excellent resource for students interested in taxation. Professor Mandelbaum teaches courses that are open to both J.D. and LL.M. students, serves as faculty advisor to the newly formed Tax Law Society, coached a tax moot court team that went on to win a national championship, and created an internship program with the Internal Revenue Service.

**Environmental Law and Policy.** Three years ago, the Law School hired an entry level faculty member with an extensive background in public interest environmental law, Professor Amy Sinden. This enabled us to offer two sections (Day and Evening) of Environmental Law, as well as a new writing seminar on Environmental Law and Policy. We also added a visiting professor on leave from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Marcia Mulkey. These faculty members have reinvigorated the environmental program of the Environmental Law and Technology Journal, culminating in a highly successful symposium on urban sprawl held in Spring 2004. In addition, the Law School added a public interest environmental law clinical offering to give students hands on experience in this area.

At the December 2003 Self-Study Retreat, the faculty urged the Curriculum Committee to extend its review beyond the first-year curriculum to include the upper-level electives. One concern is that in the past the Curriculum Committee was primarily reactive, rather than pro-active, in that it would consider course proposals presented by faculty members, but seldom initiated its own proposals for reform or innovation. The long-term goal is to institutionalize on-going curricular review as a central function of the Curriculum Committee.
G. Adjunct Faculty

Adjunct faculty members supplement the teaching of upper level courses and bring a level of expertise and specialization that greatly enhances the breadth of our upper level curricular offerings. Generally, adjunct faculty do not teach the “core” upper level courses that are required to provide a foundation for further in depth study, such as Introduction to Intellectual Property or Taxation.

The Law School has annual adjunct training programs, which include at least one meeting of the adjunct faculty each semester. For example, in Fall 2003, the Associate Deans for Academic Affairs met with the adjunct faculty and led a discussion on a wide range of topics, including the use of technology in the classroom, grading, and class participation. In Spring 2004, the Law School held a breakfast meeting for adjunct faculty which was attended by the Dean and both Associate Deans for Academic Affairs. Professor James Strazzella made a presentation concerning effective exam writing. These meetings were with the adjunct faculty who teach doctrinal courses. In addition, the adjunct faculty who teach in our Professional Skills programs (trial advocacy, the clinical program and legal research and writing) have periodic training and educational sessions.

We continue to examine ways to integrate the adjunct faculty into the academic life of the Law School. For example, we completed a comprehensive Adjunct Faculty Manual and centralized the administrative responsibility for the adjunct faculty. Numerous ideas have come out of our meetings with adjunct faculty, such as the creation of an adjunct listerv. Full-time faculty have visited the classes of adjunct faculty in order to provide feedback and maintain our standards for classroom instruction.

H. Class Scheduling

The Law School maintains a strong commitment to its Evening Division students in terms of the range of courses offered and the faculty who teach them. All full-time faculty members are expected to teach one course each academic year in the Evening Division. The number of courses available to Evening students is roughly proportional to the size of the Evening Division and generally meets student demand. In addition, during the 2003-2004 academic year, an unprecedented number of evening division students participated on law journals and Moot Court. For example, the editor-in-chief of the Environmental Law and Technology Journal was a fourth-year evening student who spent his daytime hours as a Philadelphia police officer.

The standard day division courses are scheduled to meet between 8:30 a.m. and 4 p.m. and the standard evening courses meet between 6 p.m. and 9:20 p.m. Evening students may register for day classes, assuming their schedules permit. Generally, day students may register for no more than one
evening course each semester in order to preserve sufficient slots for the evening students.\textsuperscript{7} In addition to the regular day and evening courses, the Law School offers classes during a 4 p.m. to 5:50 p.m. time slot that are open to both day and evening students. These are considered late day classes and early evening classes.

During the Fall 2003 semester, 21 electives were offered during the evening time slots and 32 electives were available during the day time slots.\textsuperscript{8} In addition, nine courses were offered during the day/evening time slot. There were writing opportunities in two regular evening courses, five day/evening courses, and nine day courses. During the Spring 2004 semester, 22 electives were offered during the evening time slots and 40 electives were available during the regular day time slots. In addition, 18 courses were offered during the day/evening time slot. There were writing opportunities in three evening courses, nine day/evening courses, and 15 day courses. This does not include the clinical offerings or the professional skills courses such as Introduction to Trial Advocacy, which are described in the Professional Skills Education section.

The Summer courses offered at the Law School’s main campus are geared primarily toward part-time (mostly evening) students. In the Summer of 2004, the Law School offered six courses, including one writing seminar and a new course on mediation skills.

\textsuperscript{7} Some courses are cross-registered as both day and evening courses even though they are offered during the standard evening hours. Cross-registered courses do not count for purposes of the one-evening-course limit.

\textsuperscript{8} The number of electives do not include multiple sections of core courses, such as Criminal Procedure I or Taxation.