February 2003 Newsletter

Welcome to the February, 2003 edition of our semiannual newsletter, provided to the Remington Center's graduates and friends. We hoped to get the newsletter out before the new year, but got tied up with amicus briefs and other projects (more on those inside); in any event, we hope it will brighten a dreary February day.

Our newsletter opens with some updates on the work we've been doing, on staff comings and goings at the Center, and on the status of our endowment fund. We continue with essays by students enrolled in the Consumer Law Litigation Project, the Restorative Justice Project, the Family Law Project, and the Criminal Appeals Project. As always, our goal is to convey a sense of the richness and variety of activities fulfilling the Remington Center's educational, research, and service missions.

We'd love to hear from our readers; comments, questions, suggestions, and editorial contributions are welcome. Please feel free to email Meredith Ross at mjross1@facstaff.wisc.edu or you can write to:

Frank J. Remington Center
UW Law School
975 Bascom Mall,
Madison WI, 53706

Walter J. Dickey, Faculty Director, Remington Center
Meredith J. Ross, Director, Remington Center

The Remington Center and the "Wisconsin Idea"

In December of 2002, the University of Wisconsin-Madison published a volume entitled The Wisconsin Idea in Action: The University of Wisconsin-Madison and Its Partners. The Remington Center was among several UW-Madison programs featured in the volume as demonstrating "the Wisconsin Idea in Action." Recently, the Center's students and staff have had even more opportunities to embody the "Wisconsin Idea" by contributing to the quality of the justice system in Wisconsin and around the nation, including the following:

- In a recent criminal case, the Wisconsin Supreme Court adopted the position suggested by the Remington Center in its amicus brief. See State v. Debra Head, 2002 WI 99, 255 Wis.2d 194, 648 N.W.2d 413. In Head, the Court examined when a defendant is entitled to a jury instruction on an "imperfect self-defense" claim. The Court based its ruling on an argument raised only in the amicus brief, and not by either party in the case. A majority of the Court agreed with the Remington Center that the Court had erred in State v. Camacho, 176 Wis.2d 860, 869, 501 N.W.2d 380 (1993), when it applied a restrictive definition of "imperfect self-defense" to the revised homicide statutes passed in 1988. Law Students Molly
Caprez and Molly McKeegney, under the supervision of Clinical Associate Professor Kate Kruse and Professor Walter Dickey, drafted the amicus brief.

- The Remington Center has also submitted amicus briefs in two other cases, State v. Lo (in the Wisconsin Supreme Court) and State v. McDowell (in the Wisconsin Court of Appeals). In Lo, the Center's brief, authored by Clinical Professor Meredith Ross, addresses the procedural complexities of Wisconsin's postconviction scheme that have developed in the years since the Court's ruling in State v. Escalona-Naranjo, 185 Wis.2d 168, 517 N.W.2d 157 (1994).

In McDowell, the amicus brief, authored by Clinical Associate Professors Keith Findley and John Pray, addresses the difficult ethical and legal issues involved in determining what standard should govern how certain an attorney must be of a client's intent to commit perjury, before the attorney can (or must) breach confidentiality and refrain from assisting the client in presenting testimony. The brief also addresses the question of whether, if the attorney unjustifiably refuses to assist in assisting the client in presenting testimony, "prejudice" to the client must be proved to support a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. Both issues are present in the McDowell case, but were not briefed by the parties.

- Since the spring of 2002, Clinical Associate Professor Ken Streit has been overseeing implementation of the settlement agreement in the "Supermax" class action suit. See Jones'El v. Berge, 164 F.Supp.2d 1096 (W.D. Wis. 2001). In Jones'El, the inmate plaintiffs and the Wisconsin Department of Corrections entered into a settlement agreement regarding conditions at the prison (now called the Wisconsin Secure Program Facility). U.S. District Judge Barbara Crabb appointed Prof. Streit and Madison Attorney Steve Hurley as co-Special Monitors to work with the plaintiffs' attorneys and the DOC to ensure that the provisions of the settlement agreement are implemented. Ken plans to report in more detail on his work as a co-Special Monitor in a future edition of this newsletter.

- Clinical Associate Professors John Pray and Keith Findley, co-directors of the Wisconsin Innocence Project, were presented with an award January 25, 2003 by the Madison Civics Club in recognition of the Innocence Project's work in promoting justice. The Project was founded in 1998 to address cases of claimed wrongful conviction. Since then, the Project has received 2,054 requests for assistance. Of these, 1,471 cases have been closed, either after working on the cases or screening them and determining that the Project could not be of assistance. Currently the Project has 40 open cases, with others waiting to be reviewed or assigned to students.

- Clinical Associate Professor Keith Findley participated in the National Conference on Preventing the Conviction of Innocent Persons. Sponsored by the American Judicature Society (AJS), the conference brought together teams of criminal justice professionals from eleven states to discuss appropriate responses to problems in the criminal justice system highlighted by the recent spate of DNA exonerations. Wisconsin was one of the states invited to send a delegation. The Wisconsin team also included Judge Fred Fleishauer of Stevens Point, Dane County Deputy District Attorney Judy Schwaemle, Madison Police Captain Cheri Maples, and the Director of the State Crime Laboratory at Madison, Jerry Geurts.
The theory of the conference was to break through the polarizing influences inherent in an adversarial system in an attempt to find ways to meet a goal that all participants share: ensuring that the system reliably acquits or exonerates the innocent and convicts the guilty.

- On February 7, 2003, Clinical Associate Professor Pete DeWind, on behalf of the Remington Center's Restorative Justice Project, accepted a 2003 "Certificate of Recognition" from the Madison-Area Urban Ministry "for outstanding restorative justice work in Wisconsin." Since Pete took over as director of the Restorative Justice Project in 2000, the project has facilitated 19 victim-offender conferences.

- Clinical Associate Professors Ken Streit and Ben Kempinen have been appointed by Wisconsin Supreme Court Chief Justice Shirley Abrahamson as members of the Ethics 2000 Committee. Prof. Streit will also serve as Associate Reporter for the committee. This past fall the American Bar Association completed its Ethics 2000 review of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct, making several changes in the original rules. The Wisconsin committee, comprised of both attorneys and non-attorneys, will do the same, seeking to identify areas in which modifications or improvements of the rules would be appropriate.

- Last but not least: three of the Remington Center's clinical faculty members were honored by Madison magazine as being among the "best of Madison" lawyers: Clinical Associate Professor Juliet Brodie (Director of the Neighborhood Law Project), in the area of public interest law; Clinical Associate Professor Steve Meili (Director of the Consumer Law Litigation Clinic), in the areas of consumer law and public interest law; and Clinical Assistant Professor Marsha Mansfield (our newest clinical faculty member, working in both the Neighborhood Law Project and the Consumer Law Litigation Clinic), in the area of consumer law.

**Good News for the Economic Justice Institute**

The Remington Center's Economic Justice Institute (EJI) has recently received two grants that will greatly enhance its staff and its capacity ability to serve clients and educate students.

First, Vicky Selkowe, a former student of the EJI's Neighborhood Law Project who will graduate from the Law School in June 2003, was awarded a nationally competitive and highly prestigious Skadden Fellowship to join the Institute as an attorney. The Fellowship funds Ms. Selkowe's position for two full years. She will work with the Institute's Neighborhood Law Project, specifically in its collaboration with the Workers' Rights Center to serve low-wage workers. Before coming to law school, Vicky was a policy analyst at the Institute for Wisconsin's Future, a non-profit organization that does research and advocacy for the working and non-working poor; she is an expert in Wisconsin's implementation of welfare reform and in the challenges and gaps that it poses for low-income people. With NLP, she will represent these people in employment matters and public benefits, as well as conducting community education, legislative, and other advocacy projects. Having Vicky on staff will greatly improve NLP's impact on these issues, and students' education on the creative role of law and lawyers can play in them.
Second, in January EJI received a $100,000 grant from the UW's Baldwin Wisconsin Idea Endowment. The Endowment, which was established by Ira and Ineva Baldwin to support service learning and other community-oriented projects at the UW-Madison, made its first grants in January 2003, and EJI/NLP is proud to be one of the 8 recipients. The grant will fund provide partial salary support for EJI clinical professor, Marsha Mansfield, who divides her time between the Institute's Neighborhood Law Project and Consumer Law Litigation Clinic, as well as stipends for full-time summer students, and computers for NLP's community office.

EJI is proud to have garnered this institutional support, and is excited about continuing its work in housing, workers' rights, public benefits, consumer, and other areas of law to enhance economic for the poor. For more information about EJI, please contact Juliet Brodie, 608-662-4013 , jmbrodie@wisc.edu or Steve Meili, 608-265-2058 , semeili@wisc.edu.

Update on the Friends of the Remington Center Endowment (FORCE)

In the past couple of years, over $170,000 has been raised by the Friends of the Remington Center Endowment (FORCE). FORCE is a private non-profit organization created to raise an endowment fund to help support summer stipends for students enrolled in Remington Center Clinical projects. In light of Wisconsin's state budget woes, it is particularly helpful to know that we have a fund to draw on to support our students if necessary.

We thank all those who have donated so generously, and note that FORCE is still happy to accept donations and pledges from those interested in giving.

All donations will go directly to support stipends for our future summer students. If you would like to make a tax-deductible donation to FORCE, please send a check or money order to:

Friends of the Remington Center Endowment
975 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53706

Remington Center Staff Updates

- Clinical Associate Professor Kate Kruse accepted a tenure-track position at the Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, which began in September of 2002. At UNLV, Kate will be teaching professional responsibilities and criminal law, as well as working in a juvenile justice clinic. Kate began working at the Remington Center in 1990, where she helped develop clinical projects in a variety of areas, including LAIP, mental health law, elder law, family law, and criminal appeals. She left the Center in 2001 to take a visiting
professorship at American University in Washington, D.C., before moving on to UNLV.

- Clinical Instructor Wendy Paul has accepted a position in the Racine Trial Office of the Wisconsin State Public Defender. During her 4-1/2 years at the Center, Wendy provided invaluable clinical supervision in LAIP, the Innocence Project, and the Criminal Appeals Project.

- Clinical Associate Professor Paul LaZotte has accepted a position in the Madison appellate office of the Wisconsin State Public Defender, effective August of 2003. Paul is currently working at the appellate office as part of a one-year interagency exchange with First Assistant State Public Defender Don Lang, who is teaching in our Criminal Appeals Project. In his twelve years at the Remington Center, Paul supervised the work of countless students in LAIP and the Criminal Appeals Project.

- We are pleased to announce that Mary Prosser will be joining the Remington Center on March 1, 2003 as a Clinical Assistant Professor. A former LAIP student and clinical instructor, Mary has over twenty years of experience in criminal law and postconviction litigation. Mary joins us from Harvard Law School's Criminal Justice Institute, where she spent the last several years as Deputy Director. Mary will be supervising students enrolled in LAIP.

- Peggy Hacker, the Remington Center's administrative assistant, is the proud mother of a baby girl, Jenna Mary Elizabeth Hacker, born on October 1, 2002.

**Consumer Law Litigation Clinic Helps Mentally Disabled Consumer Avoid Foreclosure**

Jeff LaValle, 2L

Recently, the Consumer Law Litigation Clinic (CLLC) helped a 62-year-old man with a mental disability (we'll call him "Joe") avoid losing his home in a foreclosure action. Joe lives a modest life in Dodge County, Wisconsin, and his sole source of income is the $600 Social Security check he receives each month.

In 1998, Joe decided he wanted to buy a car. He went to various banks trying to secure an auto loan, but because of his meager income, he was rejected each time. Eventually, Joe found a bank willing to give him the money he needed to buy a car. But instead of a traditional auto loan, the bank offered Joe a home equity line of credit. A home equity line of credit allows a borrower to use his home equity as collateral to secure a line of credit.

Realizing this was a bad idea, Joe's brother (who is Joe's current legal guardian) asked the bank not to finalize the loan. He tried to explain that Joe was not capable of managing money and that his income barely covered his living expenses. Despite these objections, the bank offered Joe a $39,800 line of credit. The bank later increased Joe's credit line to $50,000. After this extension, Joe's monthly payment ballooned to $375; but his monthly income remained $600. It shouldn't take a banker to figure out that Joe would not be able
to make these payments. Nevertheless, the bank authorized the extension. When Joe fell behind on his payments, the bank brought a foreclosure action on Joe's house.

At that point, Joe and his brother turned for help to the CLLC, working in conjunction with Madison attorney James Youngerman. The students who initially worked on the case drafted an answer to the bank's complaint, asserting three affirmative defenses. By the time I got involved with the case in the Fall of 2002, the parties were preparing to go to trial.

I completed various projects—some that emphasized standard legal research skills and one that emphasized the creative side of lawyering. My first assignment was to find out whether Joe was entitled to a jury trial in a foreclosure (equitable) action. I also wrote a memo that analyzed Joe's prospects in the event of trial. I evaluated the bank's claims and Joe's affirmative defenses, the risks that trial posed to each party, and the damages available in different circumstances. Finally, I investigated the possibility of a reverse mortgage between Joe and the bank. This option would have allowed Joe stay in his home and receive monthly payments from the bank for the rest of his life. In exchange, the bank would own the home when Joe sold it or passed away. This was an especially interesting assignment because it involved non-legal research that could directly benefit the client.

As I completed these assignments, I realized that this case was more complicated than I initially thought. There was also an emotional component, which added to the case's complexity. Joe's brother was justifiably angry with the bank. He insisted that the bank was completely irresponsible when it offered a $50,000 line of credit to a mentally incompetent person. He said that he tried to prevent the whole problem by asking the bank not to extend the loan. For a while, he was so angry that he was unwilling to discuss a settlement with the bank. The case seemed destined for trial.

However, as the parties became more aware of the risks involved with trial, serious settlement negotiations began. I participated in several meetings with our client, CLLC's supervising attorneys (Steve Meili and Marsha Mansfield), and Attorney Youngerman during which we discussed various settlement proposals. Eventually, the bank agreed to refinance the loan with monthly payments that Joe could afford. Joe was able to keep his house and the car that he purchased with the proceeds of the loan. More importantly, he was able to put this problem behind him and get on with his life.

Partly because of the happy ending and partly because of what I learned, Joe's case is the highlight of my law school experiences to date. I enjoyed doing legal analysis in a practical setting and completing projects that would affect real people. I was not merely jumping through academic hoops. Rather, the things I did actually mattered outside of 975 Bascom Mall. I was able to put the tools I learned in the classroom to good use as I researched and wrote memos that helped develop our strategy and gauge the strength of our case.
More importantly, I learned how to be a good, compassionate lawyer and how to effectively deal with clients—even when they seem uncooperative. I got a behind-the-scenes look at successful lawyering: I saw good lawyers thinking on their feet, reacting to unpredictable situations, and employing creative tactics to resolve a case. I learned the delicate art of breaking bad news to a client. I also learned how to empower the client and how to give him a chance to tell his story—two skills that can go a long way in successfully resolving a case.

Perhaps the most beneficial aspects of this case—from a pedagogical perspective—were the meetings with our client regarding the various settlement proposals. These meetings reiterated that good lawyers must be creative and compassionate—not just knowledgeable about legal principles. After one such meeting, Attorney Youngerman said to me, "Jeff, you just learned more in the last two hours than you will learn in three years of law school." Although this was a bold statement, I have yet to be able to disprove it.

Victim-Offender Conferencing in the Restorative Justice Project

Betsy Givhan, 2L

Late last fall, I witnessed an extraordinary conversation. A young woman met with her father for the first time in over six years. The young woman is a victim of incest perpetrated by her father and the conversation took place at a medium-security prison. I am a law student working in LAIP and the Restorative Justice Project. I assisted the director of RJP, Pete DeWind, with a victim-offender conference initiated by the daughter.

The offense occurred over seven years ago. Prior to the conference, the offender and the victim each met with Pete, former students, and me. The amount of preparation varies in each case; here it took over a year.

The conference took place in a small meeting room at the prison. Before it began, I waited with the victim and staff person from the prison (whose presence was required by the institution). The victim was nervous, yet anxious to see her father. The only individuals in the room during the conference were the victim, the offender, Pete, the prison's staff person and me. Often, victims and offenders will desire the presence of a support person at the conference. Ultimately, neither of the individuals in this case chose to exercise this option.

The offender wanted to meet with the victim because he wished to help her heal. He also wanted to begin repairing the relationship that he had destroyed. The victim had similar goals. However, she also wanted an explanation. She told Pete and me several times that the substance of the explanation did not matter as much as the existence of one.
I am not sure what I expected to happen when the offender entered the room, but it lacked
the emotional fireworks I anticipated. The victim and offender said hello and seated
themselves at a conference table directly across from each other.

The meeting began with Pete introducing the parties and establishing a few guidelines.
The victim immediately asked her father why. This moment seemed to be the culmination
of all that had come before and all that would come after. Following the victim's question
were a few shaky, tension-filled minutes. Then, the offender offered his daughter an
explanation and an apology. The victim accepted his explanation and felt that his apology
was quite sincere. The two also established that even though the offender could explain
his actions, the explanation was not an excuse. The victim accepted his apology and his
explanation. Although forgiveness may not necessarily be a goal of victim-offender
conferences, many participants feel it is important.

The father and daughter spent the next two hours discussing various issues relating to the
offense and to the past in general. One of the practical benefits that came out of this
meeting was that the victim learned of her father's release plans. The victim wanted to
maintain contact with her father, but was afraid of not knowing where he would be. This
fear was compounded because the victim has a two-year old daughter. The victim told
her father that contact after release was a possibility, but he needs to be in counseling if
the two are to have any sort of relationship. The meeting ended as quietly as it had begun.
The father and daughter hugged and it was over.

Both the victim and the offender felt that the meeting was successful. In subsequent
meetings with them individually, each expressed an interest in meeting again and were
positive about repairing the father-daughter relationship. Both parties accomplished their
stated goals.

The Restorative Justice Project provides diversity to the offender-centered environment
of the Remington Center. Victim-offender conferences are a way to fill the gaps often left
by the criminal justice system. After a crime occurs, the sentencing of the offender often
does not make the victim whole again. Many victims want to know why the crime
happened to them and many want to express the pain and anger they may not have been
able to during the court proceedings. Likewise, offenders are not always able to express
their remorse or provide explanations throughout court proceedings. The Restorative
Justice Project provides an outlet for victims and offenders that is lacking in the criminal
justice system. It allows the parties to connect on a personal level without any of the
constraints of the legal system. There are no actors from the criminal justice system to
interfere with this important dialogue between victim and offender.

Assisting with this conference was a unique experience. I gained a new respect for the
difficulties offenders confront when faced with their actions. It is easy to understand and
empathize with the victim's plight. However, witnessing a victim-offender conference
enriches one's knowledge of the pain an offender confronts. The acknowledgment of an
offense and the willingness to meet with the person one has wronged takes a great
amount of courage. There are few opportunities to see this side of an inmate while working in LAIP.

Each participant walks away from a victim-offender conference with something different. It may be forgiveness, a better understanding of the other party, relief, closure, anger or any of a number of other emotions. Ultimately, a victim-offender conference is what each individual makes it.

7th Circuit Appeal: A Lesson in Collaboration

David Friebus, 3L

Like many students, I suppose, who join the Remington Center's Criminal Appeals Project, I was drawn to the opportunity to litigate a case in a federal court of appeal. In addition to the values of service and advocacy that the program maintains, I admit that there was a large part of me that simply wanted to be able to say that I had argued a case before a panel of Seventh Circuit judges. Having completed the appeal, I'll try to articulate what about the experience was most problematic, and what aspects of the experience were most valuable to me. Hopefully, by sharing my own impressions, I can do something to illustrate the enormous value of the federal component of the project.

The case was difficult in many respects. Everything about procedure regarding federal prisoners and life in the Seventh Circuit was new both to me and to my supervising attorney, Wendy Paul. From arranging telephone interviews with our client to formatting and submitting motions, everything had a fairly steep learning curve. The price for this experience, of course, is time and effort, but the rewards were enormous. Not only is there a great deal of confidence to be gained in this sort of first-hand learning, but the lessons last much longer than those passed on from others.

Additionally, our client was a Chinese national who was incarcerated in Pennsylvania, so there were some language and distance problems that had to be overcome. For the most part we conversed in English, but when it came down to his critical decisions regarding the appeal, a translator was necessary. Luckily, the East Asian Legal Studies Center was very accommodating in securing the services of a student who volunteered to help us with this aspect of the representation.

Now, the easy aspects. The experience was overwhelmingly collaborative, not only in terms of the amount of support offered by the staff of the Remington Center, but also in terms of the U.S. Attorney's office and the court itself. The staff of the Center acted as an invaluable sounding board for various theories that my supervising attorney and I constructed over the course of the appeal about the legal issues involved (it was a complex credit card fraud case). They also helped enormously with both the drafting of the briefs and preparation for oral argument. I really have to thank all of the attorneys in the Center, as they listened numerous times to awkward arguments and constantly offered constructive feedback and support. Perhaps the best piece of advice I received was to enjoy the experience, as it was fairly rare to get such an opportunity.
When I showed up in Chicago for oral argument, the panel had more of the look of benevolent attorneys who were watching a student take his first steps in court rather than a group of intimidating or hostile judges. They were attentive, considerate and very conversational—I was surprised at how informal the whole process felt when it came right down to it—and my time at the podium flew by. When it was all over, one member of the panel thanked Wendy and me for our service to the court before the gavel came down and the judges exited the courtroom.

But the experience didn't end there. As it turns out, the Assistant U.S. Attorney was a former graduate of the LAIP program, and the insight he shared with me after the case was argued provided me with a rare opportunity to have my approach and development of the case critiqued by someone in the position of being on the "other side," yet invested in what I was taking away from the experience. It showed me that litigation, despite being adversarial, could still be a cooperative process. Overall, it set a very high standard for things to come.

The federal appellate work in the Remington Center is important work and should be continued. It brings students into substantial contact with an important part of the court system, and allows them to learn to navigate what can be an intimidating forum. It allows students to interact with different facets of appellate work that are not accessible through the state program—the most notable difference being oral argument—but also by learning a new criminal justice system with its own rules and players. I encourage the Remington Center to continue to accept these appointments and expose students to practice in the federal courts.

**Family Law Project Benefits Inmates and Students**

*Chris Isackson, 2L*

It is easy to overlook the fact that the incarcerated have personal lives outside of their correctional existence. Like the rest of us, they wear many hats. They are not simply inmates; often they are husbands, wives, fathers and mothers facing the same relationship difficulties as those in the "outside world." Imprisonment certainly does not lessen the anxiety that accompanies the breakdown of family relationships. In fact, often times it presents a large obstacle to resolving these conflicts.

The Family Law Project strives to provide legal assistance to Wisconsin inmates with family law concerns. Students participating in FLP assist their clients with a variety of issues, including: divorce, child support, child custody and placement, and paternity determinations. This assistance comes in a variety of forms. Some cases involve informal negotiations with another party, while other clients simply request information or *pro se* forms and proceed on their own. In many cases, however, these less intrusive measures fail and court action is needed.

While FLP does a great service to its clients, the benefits enjoyed by the student interns are numerous as well. Most of the courses experienced by 1Ls are academic in their
focus. After my first year, I was anxious to gain some hands-on, practical experience. After joining the Family Law Project, I didn't have to wait long to get it. Within the first week on the job, my summer colleagues and I were meeting with clients in the correctional facilities, becoming familiar with their cases, and discussing courses of action with them.

During the first few weeks, our greenness must have been apparent. In the clinical arena, however, the learning curve is intense. In these initial weeks, we were flooded with family law doctrine, information from our clients, and tasks to be completed. It wasn't long before we were familiar with prison procedures, plowing through legal research, and drafting pleadings with increased confidence.

Through my experience with FLP, I have acquired knowledge that will be invaluable when I enter the practice. For example, one of my cases involved two parties in a perpetual love-hate relationship and the physical placement of their child. Early in the summer, I had invested countless hours of work putting together a stipulation that was agreeable to both parties. At the eleventh hour, the opposing party changed her mind, and just like that, we were back to square one. I dispensed of my frustration in due time…lesson learned.

As often as I wish that case had been resolved by the stipulation, its continuation has resulted in additional learning opportunities. I've drafted discovery requests, proposed judgments and parenting plans, and a motion to compel discovery, among other documents.

The Project presented me with another rare learning experience – appealing a decision to the Wisconsin Court of Appeals. Not only did we initiate the appeal, but we also litigated the issue of our client's indigency in order to proceed with the appeal. So far, it's been a demanding undertaking, and although much work awaits us on this appeal, the return will be impressive as well.

Although inmates are generally regarded as an unsympathetic population, family relations are as important to them as they are to you and me. FLP serves a legitimate and valuable purpose by creating access to legal assistance for those who might not otherwise enjoy the benefit of counsel. At the same time, an equally important objective is achieved – providing invaluable first-hand experience to the students.

My clients and their cases have exposed me to areas of law and life with which I was previously unfamiliar. Reflecting on the past several months spent with the Family Law Project, I realize not only how much I have already learned, but how much remains to be learned as well.