

a good instructor in an interdisciplinary setting? Although a successful instructor does not need an advanced degree in every area taught in the class, he or she must have sufficient knowledge to work in depth with the relevant subject matter. The instructor needs to be comfortable with identifying and teaching abstract ideas, and should be able to see the big picture in order to help students see the patterns, connections and transferability of knowledge.

When designing an interdisciplinary course, the instructor(s) should make the course's goals explicit. In particular, the reason for interweaving a non-law curriculum into the course should be made clear. The goals need not be lofty. On the other hand, it is important to articulate an intent to train students for meaningful integration of work on behalf of clients or a cause. Either instructors or institutions should also incorporate evaluation devices capable of ensuring that the goals of the course are achieved.

Once the instructor is designated, and the goals for the class articulated, the actual course design becomes crucial to the success of the interdisciplinary class. Instructors should bear in mind the need to integrate 'outsiders' into the class and level the playing field without boring the law students or going too far off topic.

Interdisciplinary classes require institutional law school support. In general, the level of support will depend on the level of offerings. Resistance has been encountered, however, to efforts to broaden interdisciplinary offerings. Yet the growing number of interdisciplinary courses indicates that institutions increasingly support them.

Planning and assessing a good design depends on the particular institution that offers a specific interdisciplinary course. Such analysis should be performed regularly for all classes and, given the special nature of interdisciplinary work, the factors listed

above should help in these planning and assessment efforts.

Interdisciplinary classes are particularly valuable, and law schools should increase the opportunities for such beneficial educational experiences. In order to do so, we need to open the minds of both students and professors to the benefits that these classes provide. First and foremost, interdisciplinary education has tangible benefits which attach to future clients. On a larger scale, however, interdisciplinary nourishment vitally engages students in the continuous reconceptualisation of the relationships among themselves, the profession, the law, its users, and the broader social and moral order.

Many fields of law are integrally entangled with other disciplines. This fact alone may call for a wholesale overhaul of our legal education. Even practitioners are recognising the increasing importance of interdisciplinary efforts. Emerging job opportunities for law graduates call for significantly increased interdisciplinary competence. Perhaps it is time to stop falsely envisioning that the 'law' can exist separate and apart from other disciplines.

In any event, law schools must prepare their students for the 'elephants' that they will encounter in a life of practice. Perhaps more importantly, schools must support and expand interdisciplinary legal education to nurture the kind of alternative visions that can enrich the future of the entire profession.

Promoting justice through interdisciplinary teaching, practice and scholarship: An examination of transactional law clinics and interdisciplinary education

D Schlossberg

11 *Wash U J L & Polic*, 2003, pp 195–238

The mission of the Small Business Clinic (SBC) at the University of Pennsylvania Law School is twofold: (1)

to educate students through practice so they may acquire the skills and ethical consciousness necessary to become highly competent transactional law practitioners; and (2) to provide legal services to small businesses and nonprofit organisations that cannot afford to purchase these services in the commercial market. By all accounts the SBC meets these goals. Students repeatedly extol their participation in the SBC as the most relevant and valuable part of their law school experience. Similarly, clients regularly inform both the students and faculty supervisors that they are satisfied with the service they receive. Finally, the Dean and other administrative leaders of the law school appreciate the SBC's work, as well as the importance of the SBC's role in the education of students.

The SBC's legal services and student education are worthy of merit. Yet the SBC might better serve its mission if the school were to redesign its program and integrate its legal services and educational opportunities with other academic programs or professional services. In the author's experience as a transactional law attorney, collaboration with other professionals to work as a team in furthering the goals of clients sharpens the skills as an attorney and the understanding of the ethical obligations of the profession.

Contemporary law school education offers many opportunities for interdisciplinary education. Many law schools offer courses that reflect an interdisciplinary approach to either a substantive area of law or theory of law. In addition, a number of law schools offer dual degree programs. Interdisciplinary clinical education is also well established. Clinical programs in diverse practice areas, ranging from family and domestic violence to environmental advocacy, have developed models of interdisciplinary teaching and delivery of client services. Despite this growing interest in interdisciplinary pedagogy and schol-

arship, there appear to be few, if any, interdisciplinary live client legal clinics in the US that teach the skills, theory, and ethical tensions of a transactional law practice.

An interdisciplinary transactional law clinic could enhance the educational experience of law students in several aspects. These are all rooted in the realities of the world of contemporary transactional law practice. First, such a clinic would provide students with exposure to a kind of practice commonly experienced by a transactional lawyer. Second, it would offer a means of teaching collaborative skills as an effective form of problem solving. Third, this clinical experience would acknowledge the current debate over multidisciplinary practice (MDP) and the effect of MDP on the future practice of law.

The modern practice of transactional law is more complex than in the past. These business changes affect lawyers' relationships with their clients. Transactional law clients have become more sophisticated and expect lawyers to possess business acumen. Legal strategy now depends on a range of other factors which typically involve professionals from other fields. A lawyer's inability or unwillingness to understand her role as a member of a team which is working to achieve a client's goals thwarts her effectiveness as a counsellor and problem solver. Yet we are providing our students with a simplified and somewhat incomplete picture of the full role of a transactional attorney if we do not also expose them to transaction team lawyering.

Clinical educators strive to introduce students to the realities of the practice of law before they leave the security of law school. They prioritise the critical exploration of the fundamental lawyering relationship — the attorney-client relationship. As educators, we should also design programs that enable students to explore the relationship between lawyers and other

professionals, which is a very real and important part of the practice of transactional law.

While valued as a skill in the professional world, a good number of law students experience absolutely no collaborative engagement in law school. A student may go through her entire law school career without participating in either a group project or decision-making exercise, other than the voluntary study groups relied upon by many first year students. Yet from the moment they begin practising, lawyers spend much of their time working collaboratively with clients, other lawyers, legal assistants, and other professionals to address their client's problems. In order to creatively solve problems, attorneys must focus not only on a client's legal issues, but also the client's needs that can best be met through professional interdisciplinary collaboration.

While most clinical curricula place a strong emphasis on teaching effective client communication skills, many do not place the same focus on teaching collaborative lawyering skills. Clinical educators can reinforce these skills in transactional clinics through exercises, teaming students on cases, and providing opportunities for interdisciplinary learning. Collaborative problem solving to meet the complexity of clients' demands will generate ethical questions for students. Transactional law clinics can aid in this process by providing experiential learning in complex settings that resemble the ethical tensions that arise in the workplace. Law students and lawyers must learn how to understand the context in which they are operating, and to assess the possible consequences of different strategic choices.

The challenges of interdisciplinary clinical programs are similar regardless of a clinic's subject matter or target population. Interdisciplinary efforts face resistance when an academic department feels that such efforts unnecessarily deplete departmental and in-

stitutional resources. Furthermore, the administrative challenges of interdisciplinary collaborations are daunting in a university where each school and department is a quasi-independent institution. An interdisciplinary transactional law clinic involves a law school clinic partnering with one or more academic disciplines or professional service providers.

If we hope to create an interdisciplinary program, the potential for collaboration between the law school and the business school is the obvious place to start and the one that appears most natural for a number of reasons. First, the SBC's clients, even SBC's non-profit clients, frequently need business planning and technical assistance services. Second, the line between law and business is often blurred; it is sometimes difficult to determine where one profession ends and another takes over. Third, lawyers and business professionals frequently work together on behalf of their clients.

One major distinction between law school and graduate level business schools is in their respective pedagogical goals. The majority of law school instruction is spent on developing the analytic skills associated with 'thinking like a lawyer,' rather than other specific skills or professional values that are central to the role of lawyers in practice. There are certainly courses in every law school that teach students other important skills, and stress ethical values, including courses in negotiation, alternative dispute resolution, legal writing, clinical education, and so on. However, the dominant pedagogic value in most law school environments is still the analytical thought process. In contrast, many other graduate degree programs are designed to teach both the theoretical framework and fundamental skills of the profession so that the student can leave the academy ready to engage in the active practice of that profession.

Perhaps one reason that interdisciplinary transactional clinics are not

developing is that such a program is less compelling to business school faculty and students because the cornerstone of the business school curriculum is based upon problem solving, experiential learning, and group interaction between students to stress the value of team work in forming solutions. In contrast, a legal clinic may be the only course within a student's law school experience that integrates theory with skills, development and ethical considerations. A second reason may be that many MBA programs require students to have worked at least one year before entering graduate school and thus expect students to enter with some practical skills. In contrast, law schools do not impose a work requirement as a prerequisite to admission.

A transactional law clinic designed to include interdisciplinary collaborations can achieve several goals. For clients, it provides an opportunity to deliver a set of coordinated services that increase the client's opportunity for success. For students, an interdisciplinary transactional clinic provides an opportunity to participate in a sophisticated lawyering experience that is uncommon in a clinical program. Further, it provides an opportunity to engage in collaboration as a means of problem solving and an opportunity to prepare for potential multidisciplinary practices in the future.

Legal education in France and England: a comparative study

A Nollent

36 *Law Teacher* 3, 2002, pp 277–293

This article focuses upon what can be learnt from assessing the experience of students of different nationalities and cultures who study in the same educational context. The context in question is the study of law in the French and English university systems under a dual degree structure called the LLB/Maitrise en Droit Français. This degree operates as a partnership arrangement between the University of

Paris and XXII St. Maur and Sheffield Hallam University. Students on the LLB/Maitrise are recruited from each university and study together for four years, at the end of which, if they are successful, they will be awarded an LLB (Hons) from Sheffield Hallam University and a Maitrise en Droit from the University of Paris XXII.

The aim here is not to suggest changes within each system – this would be an abuse of the underlying purpose of the program, which is to expose students to diverse cultural and legal contexts in which they can enhance their intellectual, personal and professional experience and capacity. Rather the aim is to learn from the experience of these students how best to select and prepare students for the program and ensure that the diversity found within the systems can be met by the students with adequate forethought and reflection.

The first cohort of students graduated from this dual degree in July 2001. In May 2001, immediately after their final examinations in Paris, all of the final year students were interviewed and asked about their experiences and impressions of the course and studying law in the two systems.

As in England, the study of law at French universities is not exclusively aimed at training lawyers. Rather it aims to provide a more general education that will typically include history, philosophy, economics and languages, as well as law.

A maximum of 20 students are recruited onto the degree in year 1 (10 from Sheffield Hallam and 10 from the University of Paris XXII). All students begin the course together in year 1 in Sheffield and progress through the four years as a single cohort. In an increasingly competitive employment environment these students have a great deal to offer: fluency in French; dual qualification in two education systems; extensive knowledge of both common law and civil law systems; and the ex-

perience of two years living (often working) and studying in France.

The theoretical absence of the doctrine of legal precedent in France profoundly affects the way in which students are taught at university. When students have to resolve a sample problem question, they will be asked to explore only one avenue of the law (exceptionally two), on the understanding that each situation is governed by a sole corresponding rule. Students of English law, on the other hand, do not see any one legal solution as exclusive. They will attempt to stretch rules and apply them to the given situation in a utilitarian and pragmatic approach to law. This is a legal method rather than a legal theory. The student of English law will study fewer law subjects than the student of French law. English students learn a skill, and not a set of rules.

Academic writing and the presentation of legal work is fundamentally different in the French and English systems. This has posed serious problems for staff and students on the joint degree program. Clearly students must be trained in French legal method prior to their commencement of study in Paris in year 2. In year 1 therefore, in addition to studying French and French law, they must be given training in the writing of essays and case commentaries. It is therefore imperative to incorporate in the first year program visiting lecturers from the French partner institution to provide tuition in this method.

The students on the LLB/Maitrise program found the most striking difference between the two systems was the teaching method employed by lecturers and tutors. They found that the seminar tutors were 'gentler' in their approach in Sheffield. In Paris the seminar tutors were extremely rigorous in their questions in seminars.

There was a mixed response amongst the group when asked in which system/method they felt that they performed to the best of their abilities. The English students placed