Remington Center Welcome

It's a great pleasure to present the fall edition of our newsletter to friends and graduates of the Remington Center.

We want to begin by highlighting some changes in our newsletter. As you can see, we've adopted a new format. We hope that you enjoy the combination of text and photos that our new format allows. In addition, although we will continue to publish the newsletter twice a year, we are modifying our publication schedule. In the past, we've published newsletters at the end of the summer and again in December. We've decided that it makes more sense to publish in the fall and spring, to avoid the large gap between December and August. Thus, you can expect our next newsletter in the spring.

We also want to give you a heads-up that, in addition to this newsletter, the Remington Center will be reaching out to its graduates and friends in a couple of ways. First, as explained later in this newsletter, we are reaching out to those of you who are attorneys and who may be willing to take a case where we have a conflict of interest. Second, the Friends of the Remington Center, Inc. (FORCE) will be contacting you within the next few months, asking you to consider providing financial support for the work of the Remington Center. It has been ten years since FORCE conducted a serious fundraising effort, and we believe it's time to contact our new (and older) graduates to ask for their support.

This edition of our newsletter opens by outlining recent developments at the Remington Center. Then it's on to essays by current and former clinical students, as well as an essay by Barry Fitzgerald, an Irish barrister who spent the past summer working with the Wisconsin Innocence Project. We close with a thank-you letter from an inmate client.

We hope that you enjoy the mixture of information, opinions, and reflection in this edition of the Remington Center's newsletter. Remember, we'd love to hear from you. If you have questions, comments, or essays of your own, please email Meredith Ross at mjross1@wisc.edu.

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

remington center featured staff, from left: Kimberly Alderman, Mitch, Tricia Bushnell, Keith Findley, Amireh Gattinger, Adam Stevenson, Heather Kaufman, Byron Ulichstein, Sarah Orr

Remington Center Updates

Anyone who has been near the Remington Center in the past few months has noticed a number of significant changes in both our physical plant and our staff. We want to let you know what's up with our space, and also introduce you to our new faculty and staff.

To begin with, the Remington Center looks different. Recognizing that the Center was outgrowing its office space, the Dean's Office agreed to extensive remodeling of our 4th floor office space. As a result, we have freed up offices for supervising attorneys by creating two "modular" offices for support staff within the larger student areas. More importantly, we greatly increased the number of student desks (from 52 desks to 73 desks), providing capacity for the larger number of students who are enrolling in our clinical projects each year. The Economic Justice Institute's 1st-floor space has also been furnished with a full complement of student desks. If you are visiting the Law School, we encourage you to stop by and take a look at our new digs.

One reason that remodeling has been necessary is that we have, at least on a temporary basis, a significant number of additional faculty and staff. As reported in our last newsletter, the Wisconsin Innocence Project was awarded an 18-month, $647,000 grant from the National Institute of Justice to proactively identify cases where postconviction DNA testing could make a difference, and to seek testing and postconviction relief in those cases as appropriate.

Most of the NIJ grant supports 18-month positions for three attorneys and one staff person to implement the DNA project. Jon Meyn (J.D. UC-Hastings College of Law 2000), Peter Moreno (J.D. University of Washington Law School 2008), and Tricia Bushnell (J.D. New York
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Remington Center Reaches Out for Conflict Referrals
By Byron Lichstein
Clinical Association Professor

The Remington Center recently implemented a new procedure for conflicts screening. As part of that effort, we are creating a list of private attorneys who might be willing to act as pro bono counsel to prison inmates, in cases where our office has a conflict that prevents representation. We ask you to consider placing your name on our conflicts referral list.

If you agree to be on our conflicts list, you will receive periodic emails from us. Each email will provide a brief description of a request (or requests) for assistance where our office has a conflict, and ask if you are willing to take the request on a pro bono basis. If you accept a request, we will provide you with the inmate’s contact information so that you can contact the inmate directly. Having your name on our conflicts referral list would not obligate you to any specific referral. Furthermore, if you are willing to take a referral, we would not ask you to assist more than one inmate a year.

We have already sent an email about the conflicts referral list to those graduates and friends for whom we have email addresses, and we have received a gratifying response. However, there are many readers of this newsletter for whom we have no email address.

If you would like to provide us with your email address and receive periodic conflicts referral emails, please contact me at belichstein@wisc.edu. As you know, prison inmates have no right to counsel on most legal issues, so if the Remington Center can’t help them, nobody can. We hope that our dedicated graduates and friends will help fill that gap.

Wisconsin Innocence Project Updates
By John Pray
Clinical Professor

The Wisconsin Innocence Project has recently been collaborating with the Milwaukee County District Attorney’s Office an attempt to locate homicide cases where new DNA testing might be able to prove the innocence of defendants who were previously convicted.

By way of background, over the past year, DNA testing in two Milwaukee cases led to the exoneration WIP clients Chaunte Ott and Robert Lee Stinson, who were both convicted of first degree intentional homicide. In Mr. Ott’s case, the testing of vaginal swabs of the murder victim revealed the presence of DNA belonging to Walter Ellis, whose DNA was later found on the bodies of eight other women murdered in Milwaukee between 1986 and 2007 (Walter Ellis has been charged with homicide in seven of those cases). In Mr. Stinson’s case, both bite marks and DNA found on the body of the victim excluded him, leading to his release in 2009 after serving 23 years in prison. Following Mr. Stinson’s release, the DNA from the body was matched to another inmate who was serving time on unrelated charges. That inmate, Moses Price, subsequently confessed to the murder.

In light of these and other cases, Milwaukee County District Attorney John Chisholm announced in May, 2010, that his office would re-examine all Milwaukee County homicides since 1992, to determine whether new DNA testing is appropriate.

In the meantime, since January, 2010, WIP has been examining all Wisconsin cases of sexual assault and non-negligent homicide as part of a Bloodsworth grant from the National Institute of Justice. In this effort, WIP has contacted several thousand Wisconsin prisoners, and is reviewing each of those cases.

Since WIP and the Milwaukee DA share the same interest--ensuring that no innocent defendants are serving time in prison and that the true perpetrators are prosecuted--it made sense to combine efforts. As a result, WIP is referring a number of cases to the DA’s office, and is asking the State to voluntarily seek DNA testing. The DA is carefully examining those cases and will join WIP in seeking DNA testing on those cases in which there is agreement that testing is appropriate. The DA’s office has also agreed to cooperate in giving WIP access to its files and physical evidence. WIP welcomes the opportunity to join with the Milwaukee County DA’s office in making DNA technology available to inmates who may be in prison for a crime they did not commit.

In a related development, WIP client Chaunte Ott recently won an award from the Wisconsin State Claims Board for his wrongful incarceration. In June, the Claims Board granted Mr. Ott $25,000, which is the maximum the Claims Board could award. Obviously, this sum cannot begin to compensate Mr. Ott for the twelve years that he spent in prison for a crime he did not commit. For that reason, WIP has been working to draft legislation that will increase the amount of compensation that is available to innocent defendants.
Is This the Best We Can Do?

By Duncan Varda
Second Year Law Student

In 2004, John sold several hits of crack cocaine, totaling less than a gram, to an undercover federal agent. John was not arrested because the agent was targeting several other individuals, who were also selling stolen firearms. These individuals were eventually arrested and pled guilty to distribution of drugs and illegal possession of firearms.

John continued to live with his girlfriend in the neighborhood where the 2004 transaction took place. A year later, John didn’t properly disable the silent house alarm when he came home. The police arrived while John was asleep. Because the police were responding to a possible burglary and John was not the owner of the house, they did a sweep of the house to look for possible victims. The police found an unloaded handgun in a gym bag in a bedroom upstairs from where John was sleeping.

John, who had a felony record, was charged under federal law with distributing crack cocaine (based on the 2004 transaction) and also with being a felon in possession of a firearm (based on the gun in the gym bag).

John had many complaints about the work of his appointed attorney. He asserted that she did not attempt to suppress any evidence or energetically challenge witnesses. She tried to be removed as appointed counsel because John did not want to follow her advice to plead guilty.

Nevertheless, the attorney was probably right that a vigorous defense would have been fruitless, and that a plea was in John’s best interest. The case against John appeared concrete, and the evidence was probably insurmountable. The attorney tried to convince John to accept a plea offer to ten years in prison. However, John took his case to trial.

At trial, John was found guilty of distributing crack cocaine and being a felon with a handgun. The sentence for the crack offense was the controlling sentence, and was enhanced because he was considered a “career offender” due to his prior record. The judge sentenced John to 224 months (over 18-1/2 years) in prison, within the United States Sentencing Guidelines range.

Continued on page 6

A Different Story: Innocence and Images of Criminal Justice

By Barry Fitzgerald
Barrister at Law

The meter was stopped, the taxi was parked, but the driver was showing no sign yet of asking me for the fare. He had turned a puzzled face around to look at me in the back seat.

“Now tell me again, if you don’t do the crime, why do you confess?”

Last June, I temporarily left my practice as a barrister in Ireland to work for three months at the Wisconsin Innocence Project. I received a Continuing Professional Development from the Irish Bar Council to do this. I could not have predicted that one of the most interesting lessons I would learn would arise not from professional practice with the Innocence Project, but from reactions of family, friends and others.

I am deeply impressed by the work of the Remington Center, where the Wisconsin Innocence Project is based. The UW professors and attorneys who work there are exceptionally capable and approachable. The Center provides high-quality legal services to needy and marginalized clients. The students receive a practical and holistic legal education in a well-supported and dynamic environment.

While I was privileged to contribute in a small way to the work carried out by the Wisconsin Innocence Project, I learned a great deal. This was due to the excellence and commitment of colleagues and students and to the cooperative and egalitarian working atmosphere that prevails in the Remington Center. I was fortunate enough to experience at firsthand how humanitarian work can fire the spirit of those engaged in it.

Curiously though, one of the most interesting insights I acquired working in an innocence project was gained outside the office. Arising from my connection with the Wisconsin Innocence Project, I found myself having conversations about my work that were quite different from what I was used to. People who had never heard of innocence projects were generally intrigued by the idea of them. Others who had heard of innocence projects invariably had an opinion about them. Furthermore, in discussions about innocence projects, I found that police powers, rules of evidence, civil liberties—technical aspects of criminal justice—were transformed into topics of conversation that engaged a broad variety of people. Overnight, my job had gained popular appeal! I wondered what the broader value of innocence projects might be.

In politics, the success of an idea increasingly depends on the emotional content with which it is imbued. This trend is not new. Even as television and film supplanted text-based media as the primary conduit for political and civic discourse, it was observed that successful public communications had to be brief, simple and emotive in order to succeed. More recently, as traditional media have fragmented and the communications industry has become ever more competitive, many changes in public discourse associated with the information age have accelerated.

In an increasingly noisy and competitive communications marketplace, complexity and
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Dispassion are increasingly rare luxuries. Political discussion is pitched as an adversarial battle between conservative and liberal viewpoints. Conflict is emphasized. Consensus is underplayed. As the tone of political discourse becomes emotive and polarized, subtlety is lost. In the information age, simplification and polarization go hand-in-hand.

Crime has always generated strong emotions. It continues to do so. For this reason, criminal justice receives a lot of political attention. There is nothing inherently wrong with this. However, images of criminal justice often fail to reflect the true complexity of the causes and consequences of crime. It may be instructive, therefore, to examine what has changed and what has remained the same in the criminal justice system as the line between political debate and entertainment has become ever more faint.

In the last 25 years, the number of crimes in the statute books has exploded. Levels of incarceration have skyrocketed. Sentences have gotten markedly longer. Meanwhile, racial imbalances in the system and persistent re-offending remain depressingly constant. In terms of criminal justice reform, it could be argued that reforms that neatly accord with a simplistic and emotionally appealing narrative of villains, victims, and heroes are instituted. Meanwhile problems in the criminal justice system that are connected with complex social and systemic issues remain depressingly resistant to change.

Innocence projects provide compelling stories. Narratives of miscarriages of justice and exonerations pack a strong emotional punch. In this sense, innocence projects are well suited to our times. The impressive growth of innocence projects is testament to this. However, among the images of criminal justice that are well adapted to receive political attention, those evoked by the work of innocence projects are strikingly unusual.

The stories produced by innocence projects allow us to identify with the socially marginalized. They reveal the fallibility of authorities. They expose poor investigative and evidentiary practices. They highlight the tangible impact of cultural biases and procedural flaws on specific individuals. They invite us to consider criminal justice systemically. They undermine widely peddled, pernicious moral certainties. They portray the criminal justice system in something approaching its true complexity. And innocence projects achieve all this in a constructive way: working within the system, to the benefit of the system.

Innocence projects are novel and innovative. However, their core work is rooted in a basic foundation of criminal justice: finding out what actually happened. In this respect it cuts through a great deal of polarized partisan discourse on criminal justice. The work of innocence projects transcends jaded liberal versus conservative debates about values in the criminal justice system, by connecting with perhaps the most fundamental value of all: truth.

In 2001, a man called Chris Ochoa walked free from prison, having served 12 years of a life sentence imposed on him for a brutal murder he did not commit. This happened because of the determined efforts of a small group of people working in the Remington Center. Since then, the Wisconsin Innocence Project has exonerated many others in Wisconsin and elsewhere. Compelling and inspiring stories are incidental to the work of the Wisconsin Innocence Project. The primary goal after all, is to secure justice for wronged individuals. But the stories evoked in pursuit of this goal provide uniquely engaging illustrations of the true complexity of criminal justice. The value of these stories should not be underestimated.

Looking Back: My Remington Center Experience

By Peter Kind

My introduction to the UW Law School's clinical programs came in the second semester of my first year, while sitting in Criminal Procedure class. I remember that several students currently enrolled in clinical programs visited our class to talk about their experiences and answer any questions we might have. What stood out to me was their passion and enthusiasm for their individual projects.

I was drawn to the Criminal Appeals Project (CAP) for a number of reasons. In my first-year classes, we had it drilled into our heads that all the cases we had been studying were appellate cases and it was at that level that precedent was set. I thought I would need to be on top of my game as an appellate attorney and wanted to learn more about this practice area. I also knew that CAP would improve my writing skills. While the first year writing courses taught me a lot, I knew I would be motivated to work harder knowing my work would be read by several clinical professors and experienced judges. I knew if I made a mistake, it would not be me who paid the price, but our client. This raised the stakes significantly.

I enrolled in CAP at the start of my 2L year. The students are paired up, and each pair is given two appeals that are appointed by the Wisconsin State Public Defender. The clients are in prison or on probation, having been recently convicted of a felony in Wisconsin. I felt CAP program was a win-win program, because the burden on the public defender’s office was eased, the UW students received valuable education, and our clients’ cases received more time and scrutiny than most busy appointed counsel could have provided.

I enjoyed the collaborative aspects of the program. Having spent 22 years as a Navy fighter pilot, I was used to being part of a team and working in a group environment. CAP was designed to allow students to work together, share ideas, and critique each other’s work, free of the individual competition for grades present in other aspects of our law school education. Seeing how our fellow students
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approached their cases in the weekly "brainstorming" sessions contributed to a high level of representation for our clients.

My first client was convicted of an internet sex crime. Although ultimately we found no meritorious issues to appeal, my partner and I learned several important lessons. In criminal appeals work, not every client will be likable and many will be guilty. But they all have a right to justice and a full legal defense. We made a conscious effort to put our personal feelings aside and ensure that we stayed focused on giving our client the best representation we were capable of providing. This case was especially difficult because our client could not be convinced there were no meritorious issues to his appeal. Although my partner and I thought we did everything we could, I believe our client was not happy with his representation. It was a realization for us that we could do what we believed was an excellent job in reviewing his appeal, but yet leave him unsatisfied with our work.

Our second client was a teenager from a broken home who had committed numerous home burglaries. He had confessed and a plea agreement was negotiated in which the State would recommend 10 years initial confinement. The judge accepted the plea, but during sentencing chose to exceed the State's recommendation. Relying on information and a recommendation in the Pre-Sentence Investigation (PSI) report, the judge sentenced our client to nearly double the prosecutor's recommendation. We believed the judge's sentence was excessive and focused our efforts on trying to find a legitimate way to reduce the sentence. Ultimately, we discovered that the PSI contained information that should not have been in the report. We believed this information had influenced the PSI's recommendation, and we also believed the judge relied on this information during sentencing. We felt we had a legitimate issue for appeal.

Our first step in the process was to present our arguments, via a post-conviction motion, to the circuit court judge who sentenced our client. If the judge agreed with us, he would have the first opportunity to take action. In our case, the circuit court judge was not convinced by our arguments and denied our motion. Although we were disappointed, we knew it was not unusual to lose on a post-conviction motion even with a solid issue. While success at the post-conviction motion level would have been a bonus, I had enrolled in CAP because I wanted to advocate at the appellate level. Our next option was to present our case to the Wisconsin Court of Appeals.

What struck me most in writing our brief to the court of appeals was the number of specific rules and the rigidity of the format. The attention to detail required to draft a good appellate brief instills habits that translate to all aspects of legal practice. I also became much more aware of the need to produce a good record for a possible appeal. A good trial attorney must not only focus on winning the case, but also must see how his or her actions will affect a possible appeal. Even if I never work on another appeal, I know the CAP experience will have made me a better attorney.

The entire appeals process took over a year in the case we took forward. We ended up winning on appeal and our client's case was remanded for resentencing in front of a new judge. This stands out as one of the biggest highlights of my time in law school. It was a tremendous boost to my confidence when I realized that the court of appeals decided the case based on arguments I brought forward to my supervising attorney, Byron Lichstein, in one of our early meetings.

I ended up graduating from law school before our client was resentenced. I was honored when Byron approached me about representing our client at his resentencing hearing as a newly-minted attorney. Unfortunately, my new job precluded me from taking advantage of that opportunity.

Since graduation, I have been employed in a very small law office in a rural county. Our office does not typically do appeals. However, because my senior attorney knew I had completed CAP, he let me write the brief on an interlocutory appeal that came up in the process of a case he was involved in. The experience I gained in CAP was invaluable and undoubtedly helped us win the appeal. Although our office will never specialize in appellate work, I think we will continue to take on the smaller appeals and issues that arise out of our normal work. My experience in CAP prepared me well to take on this role in our office.

Thank You

Editor's Note: This letter was sent by an LAIP client to Clinical Assistant Professor Mary Prosser. Other than minor spelling corrections, the letter is included without editing.

Dear Mrs. Prosser:

I'm just writing to thank you for your help and for not forgetting about me. Hopefully, our request will be accepted, but it's very nice to know that you tried, your help is very appreciated, and if things go well, your help will have an effect not only on me, but others as well. I thank you and your staff for your help, and also intend to use all my life experiences to help others, because I feel it will bring justification to all the chaos and sadness that has thus far been my life. Ironically, I'm thankful for having the state of mind and the tools to go forth and succeed, because I know my success will be defined by those in trouble in which I'm able to help, whether it be a word of encouragement or just a shoulder to lean on, so I thank you sincerely.
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for a career offender.

However, John’s story is more complex than the outline above would suggest. John essentially raised himself from the age of 14, and the incriminating duffel bag contained all of his possessions on the night of his arrest. His formal education consists of a GED that he earned while previously in jail. John is a large black male, six feet tall and muscular. He has an aggressive demeanor that would intimidate many people. He worked as a day laborer and occasionally sold drugs to supplement his income.

Over twenty years before his federal offense, John was convicted of selling cocaine and sent to a prison work camp. He walked away from the unsupervised work camp and was caught soon afterward without any resistance. He spent five years in prison for that escape. About 12 years before the federal offense, John was arrested for selling drugs and spent 10 months in jail.

At sentencing in the federal case, the escape was considered a violent crime. Because John had a prior conviction for a “violent felony” and another prior conviction for a drug offense, he was considered a “career offender” under the Sentencing Guidelines. Moreover, because John had a previous drug conviction, the statutory maximum sentence for his federal drug offense was increased to 30 years. This statutory maximum was then put into a numerical table for “career offenders,” and resulted in a federal guideline range of 210-262 months in prison. Although the judge could depart from the Guidelines, staying within the Guidelines is generally reasonable. The judge sentenced John to 224 months in prison.

The sentence struck me as excessive, especially considering the lack of violence in John’s history. For over a year, John was living within a couple blocks of his 2004 drug transaction. Nobody came looking for him for over a year. The other individuals targeted in that transaction all pled guilty and received sentences of 60-180 months. They had significantly more drugs than John, and sold stolen firearms to the federal agent. In fact, the police crime lab destroyed the evidence of the drug transaction prior to John’s trial because they thought the case was over. The prosecutor felt that a plea deal for ten years was sufficient to protect the public. However, because John went to trial and received Guideline enhancements, he received an 18-1/2 year sentence.

To put John’s sentence in perspective, we can look at Wisconsin’s sentencing guidelines from 2005. If John were convicted of the crack offense under Wisconsin law, he would face a maximum of 10 years in prison, with a recommended range of 3-5 years. The gun offense would fall in the same state guideline category as the crack offense. Thus, John would face a statutory maximum sentence of 20 years for these two offenses in Wisconsin. But even with consecutive sentences, if the judge followed the state guideline recommendations, the total sentence would be in the range of 6-10 years rather than the 18-1/2 years he is serving. By way of comparison, aggravated armed robbery and second-degree sexual assault of a child both have recommended state sentencing ranges of 15-25 years. If the person is deemed to pose a low risk of repeating the crime, the recommended sentence range for either of those crimes is 5-14 years.

Federal law states that sentences of guilty individuals are supposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, and provide just punishment for the offense. Other goals include deterring criminal conduct, protecting the public, and providing the defendant with correctional treatment. Through Congress, we as a society have essentially decided that selling less than one gram of crack is as serious a crime as someone robbing you at gunpoint.

John committed crimes. Crack cocaine creates numerous social problems throughout America, especially among the urban poor. He also knew he wasn’t supposed to have a gun. However, John stands as an example of how the current federal sentencing regime can create long sentences that do not necessarily reflect the nature of a person’s actions.

Drug dealers often commit violent acts in connection with their trade. However, we can convict individuals of violent crime when they occur. It did not occur in connection to John’s individual crimes, but he is essentially being punished for the social ills that are connected to the drug trade.

Each year that John spends in prison costs the government approximately $27,000. The six years of supervision once John is released will cost about $4,000 each. The United States will spend approximately $528,000 dollars to keep John behind bars or under supervision.

There is little education inside the prison. John may complete some courses in pipefitting or culinary arts, but realistically he will emerge as a 55-year old male with little hope of finding a job. His child support arrears continue to add up; and with no income from John, his children may end up dependent on the state for financial assistance. John himself will likely be a ward of the state in one way or another for the rest of his life.

Congress has recently passed a law that makes the penalties for crack cocaine more proportional to powder cocaine. However, the penalties are still not even, and the law is not retroactive. Those men and women currently in federal prison will see no change in their sentences, even though those now convicted will face lower penalties. It will take more work to address the disparity for new and old offenders alike.

Pencil whipping a sentence into a term of years that is disproportionately long diminishes the legitimacy of the justice system and costs tax-paying citizens millions of dollars a year. Non-violent offenders must be handled in a more appropriate manner if we expect to see positive change. Programs that involve incarceration with day release for work or school may offer society more benefits for the cost of prison. Our current answer of locking up men like John through their primary earning years is not the productive solution that taxpayers should expect from their government.
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University School of Law 2007) have joined WIP as clinical faculty to work on the grant project. WIP was also fortunate in hiring an administrative assistant who is also an attorney. Amireh Oettinger (J.D. Marquette University Law School 2004) has contributed her considerable organizational skills to the implementation of the grant project.

In addition, after many years of filling faculty and staff vacancies with short-term hires, the Remington Center was authorized by the Dean's office to create and fill several permanent positions.

In the prison projects, we have hired two new clinical faculty members in long-term positions. In May, Clinical Instructor Katie Holtz accepted a position at the State Public Defender's Milwaukee Juvenile Office. With that opening, Adam Stevenson joined us in May as a Clinical Assistant Professor. Adam is a 2010 graduate of the UW Law School, where he earned top 10% grades and served as an articles editor for the Wisconsin Law Review. While in law school, Adam enrolled in the Oxford Federal Project as a 2L, and worked as a LAIP student project assistant as a 3L. In his new position, Adam has take over responsibility for supervising students in the Oxford Project.

Kimberly Alderman has also joined the Remington Center in August as a Clinical Assistant Professor. Kimberly is a 2005 cum laude graduate of the Howard University School of Law, after which she spent two years clerking for the Superior Court of the Virgin Islands, and then joined a private law firm in Taos, New Mexico. In these positions, Kimberly worked on a number of cases involving criminal law and prisoner litigation. Kimberly is also interested in archaeology, art crimes, and cultural property law: she has published several scholarly articles in these areas, and is in the process of earning an M.A. in International Art Crime Studies. At the Remington Center, Kimberly will be supervising students in the Criminal Appeals Project.

The Center has also had undergone a transition in its support staff. In July, Barbara Zahn retired. For the past half dozen years, Barb had handled both WIP administration and scheduling student interviews at the Wisconsin prisons. We had the good fortune to hire another attorney (and LAIP alum) as a permanent staff member to replace Barb. Heather Kaufman (J.D. UW Law School 1993) began working in June. A published author in her non-Remington Center time, Heather will handle our front desk responsibilities, administration for the Criminal Appeals Project, and scheduling interviews.

The Economic Justice Institute has also been able to do some long-term hiring of clinical faculty. In May, EJI was fortunate in being able to hire Mitch and Sarah Orr as Clinical Assistant Professors. Both had served as Clinical Instructors at EJI since 2008, and brought experience and continuity to their positions.

Mitch (yes, he only has one name) is a 2003 graduate of the UW Law School. After graduation, Mitch was a founding member of Community Justice, Inc., a non-profit law firm in Madison that represents low-income individuals in a variety of areas. Mitch brings his extensive knowledge of poverty law to his role as Director of EJI’s Neighborhood Law Project.

Sarah Orr is a 1991 graduate of the UW Law School, after which she served in senior attorney positions at The Family Center in New York City and the Coalition of Wisconsin Aging Groups in Madison. At EJI, Sarah serves as Director of the Consumer Law Clinic.

With these new hires, EJI now has a permanent roster of four clinical faculty members: Mitch, Sarah, Clinical Associate Professor Marsha Mansfield (Director of EJI and Director of the Family Court Assistance Project), and Clinical Assistant Professor Rosa Frazier (Director of the Domestic Violence Immigration Project).

Finally, the contributions of the Remington Center's clinical faculty have been recognized by the practicing bar, the legislature, and the judiciary. Clinical Associate Professor Byron Lichstein, Deputy Director of the Remington Center, was recently honored as an "Up and Coming Lawyer 2010" by the Wisconsin Law Journal. He is being recognized as a "...rising star of Wisconsin's law community... representing determination in legal work, in community betterment, and in improving their own law firms."

Clinical Professor Keith Findley, Co-Director of the Wisconsin Innocence Project, will serve on the Wisconsin Legislature's Special Committee for Record Access of Circuit Court Documents. Among other things, the Special Committee will consider the tensions between the public's right to view on-line court information and the harm to parties (for example, exonerated defendants) caused by misunderstanding or misuse of that information. He will be joined on the Special Committee by Lahny Silva, a William H. Hastie Fellow at the Law School whose scholarship explores the collateral consequences of criminal convictions.

Clinical Professor Ben Kempinen, Director of the Prosecution Project, will serve on the Special Committee for Criminal Justice Funding and Strategies. Over the past several years, Ben has conducted extensive research into collaborative efforts in county criminal justice systems throughout Wisconsin.

Clinical Associate Professor Marsha Mansfield will serve on the Special Committee for Spousal Maintenance Awards in Divorce Proceedings. Marsha, who directs EJI's Family Court Assistance Project, has served on the State Bar's Board of Governors since 2006, and is a member of the Bar's Legal Assistance Committee, Family Law Section, and Litigation Section.

Clinical Professor Meredith Ross, Director of the Remington Center, continues to serve on the Wisconsin Judicial Council's Appellate Procedure Subcommittee. This subcommittee considers issues as diverse as citation to unpublished appellate opinions, pre-sentence investigation reports, and the practice of attorneys "ghostwriting" client pleadings, and proposes legislation or Supreme Court Rules changes as appropriate.