

Law & Courts

NEWSLETTER OF THE LAW & COURTS SECTION OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION



A Letter from the Section Chair:

Wendy L. Martinek

Binghamton University (SUNY)

martinek@binghamtom.edu

My year of service as the chair of the Law and Courts Section will soon come to a close and the incomparable Gordon Silverstein will assume the chairmanship at the close of the 2013 APSA annual meeting. It has been a very satisfying experience for many reasons, not the least of which is because of all of the very fine people with whom I have had the privilege to work over the course of my tenure.

This includes, of course, all of the executive board officers and members as well as folks such as the webmaster (Art Ward), the Law and Courts listmaster (Paul Collins), the editor of the *Journal of Law and Courts* (Dave Klein), the editor of the *Law and Politics Book Review* (Paul Parker), and the editor of the *Law and Courts Newsletter* (Kirk Randazzo).

It also includes the members of the search committee for the new editor of the Law and Courts Newsletter. Kirk Randazzo has provided exemplary service as the Newsletter editor but was ready to turn the reins over to a new editor. As luck would have it, the search committee (chaired by Gordon Silverstein with Justin Dyer, Kirk Randazzo, Amy Steigerwalt, and Teena Wilhelm as members) was able to persuade Todd Collins to assume the editorship. Like Kirk, Todd is a consummate professional with a demonstrated commitment to service to the profession. The Section is very fortunate to have Todd serve in this capacity. And, I would be remiss if I did not also note that I had the pleasure of working with past list mistress Nancy Maveety and she, too, personified the good fortune the Section has in terms of its members.



Inside this issue:

Martha Humphries Ginn and
Craig Douglas Albert, Todd
Collins

Books to Watch For

Announcements: Call for
Papers, SPSA

Table of Contents

Letter from the Section Chair <i>By Wendy L. Martinek</i>	<i>pages 1, 4—5</i>
May it Please the Administration: Why Mock Trial Programs Should Impact Student Persistence <i>By Martha Humphries Ginn and Craig Douglas Albert</i>	<i>pages 5—12</i>
From the Incoming Editor <i>By Todd Collins</i>	<i>pages 12—13</i>
Books to Watch For	<i>page 14—15</i>
Announcements: Call for Papers, SPSA	<i>page 16</i>

Officers: Law and Courts Section

Chair: Wendy Martinek (2012-2013) Binghamton University	Executive Committee: Tom Clark, Emory University (2011-2013)
Chair-Elect: Gordon Silverstein (2013-2014) Yale University	James Gibson, Washington University (2011-2013)
Treasurer: Chris Bonneau (2012-2014) University of Pittsburgh	Matthew Hall, Saint Louis University (2012-2014)
Secretary: Kevin McMahan (2011-2013) Trinity College	Todd Peppers, Roanoke College (2011-2013)
	George Thomas, Claremont McKenna College (2012-'14)

Editor

Kirk Randazzo

University of South Carolina

E-Mail: randazzo@mailbox.sc.edu

Assistant Editor

Rebecca Reid

University of South Carolina

Books to Watch For Editor

Drew Lanier

University of Central Florida

E-Mail: drew.lanier@ucf.edu

Editorial Board

Vanessa Baird

University of Colorado

Rhonda Evans Case

East Carolina University

Martha Ginn

Augusta State University

Tom Hansford

University of California at Merced

Erin Kaheny

University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee

Jeff Staton

Emory University

Michael Tolley

Northeastern University

Law and Politics Book Review Editor

Paul Parker

Truman State University

E-Mail: parker@truman.edu

Law and Courts Listserv Moderator

Paul Collins

University of North Texas

E-Mail: pmcollins@unt.edu

General Information

Law and Courts publishes articles, notes, news items, announcements, commentaries, and features of interest to members of the Law and Courts Section of the APSA. **Law and Courts** is published three times a year in Winter, Summer, and Fall. Deadlines for submission of materials are: February 1 (Winter), May 1 (Spring), and October 1 (Fall). Contributions to **Law and Courts** should be sent to the editor:

Kirk Randazzo, Editor

Law and Courts

Department of Political Science

University of South Carolina

329 Gambrell Hall

Columbia, SC 29208

randazzo@mailbox.sc.edu or kirk.randazzo@gmail.com

Articles, Notes, and Commentary

We will be glad to consider articles and notes concerning matters of interest to readers of **Law and Courts**. Research findings, teaching innovations, or commentary on developments in the field are encouraged.

Footnote and reference style should follow that of the *American Political Science Review*. Please submit your manuscript electronically in MS Word (.doc) or Rich Text Format (.rtf). Contact the editor or assistant editor if you wish to submit in a different format. Graphics are best submitted as separate files. In addition to bibliography and notes, a listing of website addresses cited in the article with the accompanying page number should be included.

Symposia

Collections of related articles or notes are especially welcome. Please contact the Editor if you have ideas for symposia or if you are interested in editing a collection of common articles. Symposia submissions should follow the guidelines for other manuscripts.

Announcements

Announcements and section news will be included in **Law and Courts**, as well as information regarding upcoming conferences. Organizers of panels are encouraged to inform the Editor so that papers and participants may be reported. Developments in the field such as fellowships, grants, and awards will be announced when possible. Finally, authors should notify **BOOKS TO WATCH FOR EDITOR**:

Drew Lanier, of publication of manuscripts or works soon to be completed.

(Continued from page 1)

That good fortune is also reflected in the slate of candidates identified by the Nominations Committee. The Committee (chaired by Susan Haire with Jennifer Bowie, Renee Cramer, Howard Gillman, and Mark McKenzie as members) has put forward the following slate:

Chair Elect:	Cornell Clayton, Washington State University
Secretary:	Carol Nackenoff, Swarthmore College
Board Members (2013-15):	Anna Law, Brooklyn College (CUNY) Ryan Owens, University of Wisconsin-Madison Amy Steigerwalt, Georgia State University

The Nominations Committee did an excellent job and this is clearly an impressive slate.

Our good fortune continues in our 2013 and 2014 APSA section program chairs. Sara Benesh and Corey Brettschneider have done a fantastic job putting together the 2013 panels for the Law and Courts Section and the Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence Section, respectively. Jointly, Sara and Corey have put together 22 unique panels: 12 sponsored by the Law and Courts Section, six sponsored by the Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence Section, and four jointly sponsored by the Law and Courts Section and the Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence Section. Nine of these 22 panels were co-sponsored by other sections, including Women and Politics, Comparative Politics of Developing Countries, State Politics and Policy, Presidents and Executive Policy, Human Rights, and Normative Political Theory. This kind of co-sponsorship—between Law and Courts and Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence as well as with other sections—reflects the rich and interconnected nature of what our community of scholars studies. (It also has the practical benefit of stretching the limited panel allocations Sara and Corey received so kudos to them for being proactive and reaching out to other sections.) For the 2014 APSA meeting, I have asked Virginia Hettinger to serve as the Law and Courts Section program chair. Happily, she agreed to take on this important task. When the co-program chairs for the 2014 APSA meeting asked for a suggestion to serve as the Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence Section program chair, I had no hesitation in suggesting Anna Law. Happily, the co-program chairs asked her and, even more happily, Anna agreed. I am quite certain Virginia and Anna will put together an outstanding line-up of panels for APSA 2014.

I have already thanked them ad nauseum but, given the enormity of the service provided, I want to thank, again, publicly, all those who agreed to serve on the various award committees. There are a lot of moving parts and different dimensions to try to balance when it comes to constructing award panels. It becomes only more complicated when you throw in the folks who have already provided yeoman's service, are on sabbatical or conducting field work, or might have conflicts of interest (something that is high impossible to fully anticipate in advance when constructing award panels but is, of course, of utmost importance for the integrity of the process). In some ways, service on an award committee is where Section members really shine. To put it bluntly, the work involved is often very time-consuming and it usually falls in the oh-that's-nice-but-not-extraordinary category for home departments evaluating faculty service records. But, with rare exceptions and only for very good reasons, no one I asked to serve on an award committee declined and some came to the rescue when there were conflicts of interest that became evident late and had to be remedied, even though it meant they were pinch-hitting with very little notice.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Though I mentioned him earlier, Dave Klein (and his most excellent group of associate editors) merits an additional thanks for what he has accomplished as the inaugural editor of the Section's new journal: *Journal of Law and Courts*. Editorial service is not exactly a thankless job but it certainly is an underappreciated one. Editors have what amounts to a jigsaw puzzle within a jigsaw puzzle within a jigsaw puzzle. First, Dave has to identify and successfully solicit appropriate reviewers who are sensitive to the mission and goals of the journal. Thankfully, he has an accomplished set of associate editors to help with this task but it is still a task that is made more and more difficult by the increasing number of reviews individuals are being asked to do. I am by no means in the tail end of the distribution but I still have manuscripts from five different journals in my cue for review right now. It is hard to say "no" but saying "yes" gets harder and harder and I know I am not alone in this. Next, Dave (aided by his hardy band of associate editors) has to read through the reviews (and manuscripts themselves) to hone in on the key strengths and weaknesses of each submission. He has to make sense of what can often be very conflicting evaluations of the same manuscript by different reviewers. Finally, once that task is accomplished, Dave has to move the pieces of the final puzzle around to actually pull together each issue. This is really not as simple as it may seem. Volume 1, issue 1 came out earlier this year and it is a gem. But virtually all of the "polish" required to get to the gem stage takes place behind the scenes. The effort required is enormous but often quite invisible to the naked eye (not to mention to the eye of home departments and deans who might not appreciate the extent of the effort and the value of that effort). So, in short, Dave deserves the Section's deepest thanks.

In closing, let me encourage you to attend the Lifetime Achievement Panel to honor Professor Robert Kagan (and co-sponsored by the Law and Courts Section and the Constitutional Law and Jurisprudence Section). It will be held on Friday August 30 from 4:15 to 6:00 (room assignment pending) and will be followed by the Law and Courts Section business meeting from 6:16 to 7:15 (Hilton Chicago Williford C) and reception from 7:30 to 9:00 (Hilton Chicago Williford B). As a section, we always have a lot to celebrate at our business meeting and reception but we have even more this year as we will be recognizing both last year's and this year's winners of the various section-sponsored awards!

May it Please the Administration: Why Mock Trial Programs Should Impact Student Persistence

Martha Humphries Ginn

Georgia Regents University Augusta

mginn@gru.edu

Craig Douglas Albert

Georgia Regents University Augusta

calbert@gru.edu

The skyrocketing cost of higher education and increasing student loan debt have spawned an increased emphasis on college retention rates as measures of whether universities are being good

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

stewards of student and taxpayer dollars.¹ This reality led many state governments to put pressure on schools to document the effectiveness of their funding dollars. Schools are responding by creating various initiatives targeted at increasing student persistence and insisting that these programs be routinely evaluated to document how they are contributing to students successfully completing college within six years. Scholars and policy analysts agree that strategic planning and effective teaching methods are factors in students persisting in education. In this essay, we suggest that active learning programs like Mock Trial can increase both the academic experience of the student as well as persistence rates. Thus, faculty who supervise Mock Trial programs can respond to calls from the administration for innovative teaching methods to improve student persistence by documenting the success of existing initiatives. In the end, this will hopefully lead to more recognition and prestige for our efforts, and potentially increased funding for these programs if we can document their role in student success.

Founded in 1985 by Dean Richard Calkins of Drake Law School, the American Mock Trial Association (AMTA) hosts 24 regional tournaments, eight opening round championship tournaments and a national championship tournament each season with around 600 teams from over 350 universities and colleges participating.² The proliferation of programs in the past decade is outstanding; in 1994, there were an estimated 200 teams from 115 colleges and universities participating (Van Dervort and Vile 1994). The AMTA asserts on its website that students will develop critical thinking and public speaking skills by engaging in trial simulation competitions with teams from across the country. We do not doubt that is the case, but we argue that you can potentially take the benefits gained through participation to another level by establishing a link to student success and persistence in college.

What is student persistence and what positively impacts it?

Metrics for student success in college include retention, persistence, and attrition rates. Retention rates are measured at the university level and reflect the percentage of students who continue in their education from year to year at the school (Wild and Ebbers 2002). In other words, retention is the ability of an institution to retain a student from admission through graduation (Berger, Ramírez, and Lyons 2012). Persistence measures the desire and action of the student to stay at the school from initial enrollment until degree completion (Berger, Ramírez, and Lyons 2012; Seidman 2005). Hagedorn (2012, 85) helps to clarify the distinction between the two terms by stating “institutions retain and students persist.” Attrition measures the decrease of the student body as a result of low retention rates (Hagedorn 2005).

Theories of student success in college agree that the students and institution form a social and academic community, and students’ ability to integrate into this community plays a significant role in retention. Tinto’s (1975; 1987) Student Integration Model places responsibility for success with individual students and academic institutions, arguing that both academic and social integration determines attrition. Measures of academic integration can include grades, a student’s sense of intellectual and academic development, a student’s perception of faculty concern, the frequency of social contact or conversations with faculty and advisors about academic and career matters outside the classroom,

¹ For example, the state of Georgia has created the Complete College Georgia plan that emphasizes the importance of raising college graduation rates and requires University System of Georgia schools to create institutional metrics to measure success. For more information, see:

http://www.usg.edu/educational_access/documents/GaHigherEducationCompletionPlan2012.pdf

² Participation numbers provided on the American Mock Trial Association website at <http://www.collegemocktrial.org/>

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

participation in study groups, time spent on homework, and enrollment in freshman seminars (Deil-Amen 2011, 87). Measures of social integration include students' interaction with peers and involvement in extracurricular activities like participation in school clubs, sports, and fine arts events, the frequency with which students go out with friends from school, and informal interaction with university faculty (Deil-Amen 2011, 87). Although these measures are diverse, they represent a larger point: both academic and social integration foster student retention, and we assert that both of these components are developed through participation on a Mock Trial team that actively participates in regional conferences.

A common theme in the retention literature is that academic integration and academic success are impacted by teaching methods. More and more, the "sage on the stage" method is being eschewed in favor of active learning strategies which run the gamut from short problem based learning exercises in class to extended simulations. This shift is due to the findings that students engaged in active learning perform much better than those in lecture only classes in terms of grades on exams, critical thinking, problem solving, and motivation to learn (Frederking 2005; McKeachie et al. 1987; Shellman and Turan 2006). In fact, Stice (1987, 293) finds that students will remember 10% of what they read, 20% of what they hear, and 90% of what they say while doing something. Thus, to foster student retention of material, active learning encourages more direct participation such as discussions, debate, and class polling. Further, students engaged in active learning are more likely to view classwork as rewarding and perceive themselves as gaining knowledge and understanding from their courses, thereby increasing their self-efficacy (Braxton, Milem, and Sullivan 2000). Chemers, Hu, and Garcia (2001) find that self-efficacy directly influences students' academic expectations and academic performance. Highly efficacious students are more likely to view academic work as a challenge to overcome than as a threat. Thus, programs that increase students' academic integration and self-efficacy have a high chance of also encouraging those students' persistence.

While studies on the effectiveness of Mock Trial programs are limited, there is literature on the importance of court simulations in general that recognizes the benefits of participation in the simulation as an active and problem-based learning technique (Ahmadov 2011; Ambrosio 2006; Beck 1999; Carlson and Skaggs 2000; Hernandez 1998; Ringel 2004). Documented benefits to students participating in Mock Trial or moot court exercises include: an enhanced understanding of the law and legal process; improved research skills as well as a sharpening of their critical and analytical abilities in preparing robust legal arguments; strengthening of presentation, debate, and public speaking skills; the development of leadership skills; and the ability to work as a team (Ahmadov 2011; Hernandez 1988; Knerr and Sommerman 2001; Ringel 2004; Van Dervort and Vile 1994). It is clear that court simulations deepened students' understanding of the material covered (Ambrosio 2006), but the competition element for Mock Trial programs provides additional benefits in terms of academic integration and self-efficacy. According to Van Dervort and Vile (1994), when students are judged by outsiders, often professionals in the legal field, it puts their own preparation and skills to the test in a unique way. Thus, being critiqued by outsiders provides extra motivation to exceed and increases students' perceptions of their abilities.

Mock Trial programs also encourage student persistence by providing out of the classroom contact with the supervising professor(s). Interaction with faculty facilitates both academic and social integration. In fact, contact with faculty outside of class is important for student academic development and the decision to remain in college (Endo and Harpel 1982). Additionally, Graunke and Woosley (2005) find that greater satisfaction with the opportunities to interact with faculty had a significant impact on sophomore students' academic performance, increasing persistence toward a degree. Given the extensive hours spent in practice preparing for competitions, Mock Trial programs provide abundant opportunities

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

to interact with faculty members outside of class, thereby increasingly the likelihood of influencing the student's decision to persist.

Another additional benefit of Mock Trial programs and their potential impact on student persistence is that participation in competitions typically involves overnight travel with peers and supervising faculty. There is a growing literature that suggests that out-of-the-classroom trips, such as study abroad, integrate students socially with close living arrangements and opportunities to get to know both students and faculty better. These programs are also known to facilitate academic integration, as students are shown to be more intellectually developed and academically curious. Further, recent work finds direct links between retention and study abroad programs (Hamir 2011; Metzger 2006; Posey 2003; Younes and Asay 2003; Young 2003). Hamir (2011,4) concludes that students who participated in a study abroad program increased their graduation prospects by 64% in five years and 200% in six years. Young (2003) finds that students who participated in one study abroad program stayed enrolled a full semester longer, on average, than students who did not. A decade-long project tracking students who studied abroad in the University System of Georgia found that participants had higher GPAs after returning and had higher graduation rates than those that did not study abroad (Sutton and Rubin 2010).

While study abroad programs have been successful at increasing retention, not all students can participate because of financial and time constraints. We posit that any program that involves extended travel outside the classroom can serve the same functions and meets the same goals as a study abroad trip. In fact, utilizing demographic data combined with students' reflective essays, we found that a study away Model United Nations program met many of the factors identified in the study abroad literature as having a positive impact on student persistence in college (Ginn, Albert, and Phillips 2011). After finding this initial evidence that a study away program could impact students' decision to remain at our institution, we designed a more sophisticated way to measure academic and social integration and assess whether participation in the program enhanced these elements found to positively related to persistence. Specifically, for the past two years, we utilized pre-test and post-test skills audits where students rated themselves on the first and last day of class in nine general areas including ability to: think critically, work as a team, problem solve, communicate effectively, examine personal development, work autonomously, influence change, effectively manage time, and creatively apply knowledge.³ We aggregated the individual measures to create indices for each skill and then conducted matched pairs difference of means analysis and found a statistically significant positive difference for each index from pre-test to post-test. Our ability to document and quantify the benefits of our Model United Nations program in relation to retention efforts has elevated the program's esteem in the eyes of administrators and has led to increased administrative support. We posit that Mock Trial programs potentially offer the same benefits as study away and study abroad trips but more research and program assessment is necessary to establish this connection.

Conclusion

Universities concerned about retention rates tend to look to student affairs programs first to solve the student persistence problem. We suggest that raising awareness of the importance of academic integration, in addition to social integration, in retention efforts is critical to help direct resources toward successful academic programs like Mock Trial. We feel that establishing an empirical link between these

³ The instrument was a modified version of a skills audit utilized at the University of Sheffield (Sheffield Graduate Development Programme, 2012) and is available for your use upon request.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

programs and retention will be vital to elevating their importance and attracting resources. By reviewing various strands of pedagogical literature, we have attempted to make the case that Mock Trial programs are a form of problem based learning that encourages academic success and integration. Further, the outside-of-class preparation and practices, as well as the trip component of most Mock Trial programs enhance social integration by facilitating greater contact with professors and peers, both of which foster a stronger sense of attachment to the school and desire to continue towards degree completion. Given that Mock Trial enhances both academic and social integration, it is reasonable to assume that students who participate in such programs are more likely to persist at their college or university. What remains to be done is the empirical validation of this assumption.

While literature exists on the utility of Mock Trial and Moot Court simulations, the work is more of how to guides (e.g. Ringel 2004) or self reported qualitative measures of success (e.g. Carlson and Skaggs 2000; Van Dervort and Vile 1994). Although Perry et al. (1996) and Shepelak (1996) do use quantitative data to document the importance of Mock Trial, neither work links the programs to student persistence. How do we go about establishing this link and documenting the success of our efforts? One obvious route is to track students who participate and monitor their progression towards degree completion. To control for selection bias, one can generate a control group cohort with similar backgrounds in GPAs, SAT scores, and demographic factors and then compare the treatment group (those participating in Mock Trial) to the control to see if participants progress towards degrees at faster and greater rates than non-participants.

If lack of access to student records limits the utility of the previously discussed approach, the documentation of the skills gained in Mock Trial that are related to student persistence is another viable option. If you use a pre-test and post-test method, you can also control for selection bias because you are comparing the student's skills and abilities only to themselves at differing time points. While one could argue that students who choose to participate are more likely to persist anyway, documenting that the program increases their skill set which positively impacts the likelihood of degree completion is still of utility. Ultimately, we all have anecdotal evidence of how these programs empower students to achieve their goals or else we would not be putting our time and effort into these endeavors. However, if we can systematically document the importance of these programs, we can enhance their prestige and hopefully support and resources will follow to expand such programs to positively impact more students.

REFERENCES

- Ahmadov, Anar. 2011. "When Great Minds Don't Think Alike: Using Mock Trials in Teaching Political Thought." *PS: Political Science and Politics*: 44(3):625-28.
- Ambrosio, Thomas. 2006. "Trying Saddam Hussein: Teaching international law Through an Undergraduate Mock Trial." *International Studies Perspectives* 7(2):159-171.
- Beck, Charles R. 1999. "Conducting Mock Trials and Debates in the Classroom." *The Social Studies* 90 (2):78-83.
- Berger, Joseph B., Geraldo B. Ramírez, and Susan C. Lyons. 2012. "Past to Present: A Historical Look at Retention." In *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success, 2nd edition*. ed. Alan Seidman. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

- Braxton, John M., Jeffrey F. Milem, and Anna S. Sullivan. 2000. The Influence of Active Learning on the College Student Departure Process: Toward a Revision of Tinto's Theory. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(5): 569-590.
- Carlson, J. Lon, and Neil T. Skaggs. 2000. "Learning by Trial and Error: A Case for Moot Courts." *The Journal of Economic Education* 31 (Spring):145-55.
- Chemers, Martin M., Li-tzeHu, and Ben F. Garcia.2001. "Academic Self-efficacy and First-year College Student Performance and Adjustment." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93(1): 55-64.
- Deil-Amen, Regina. 2011. "Socio-Academic Integrative Moments: Rethinking Academic and Social Integration Among Two-Year College Students in Career-Related Programs." *The Journal of Higher Education* 82(1): 54-91.
- Endo, Jean J., and Richard L. Harpel. 1982. "The Effect of Student-Faculty Interaction on Students' Educational Outcomes." *Research in Higher Education* 16(2): 115-138.
- Frederking, Brian. 2005. "Simulations and Student Learning." *Journal of Political Science Education* 1 (3): 385-393.
- Ginn, Martha Humphries, Craig Douglas Albert and Andrew Phillips. 2011. "Leaving the Classroom to Stay in College: Investigating the Relationship Between Model UN Study Away and Retention" *Proceedings of the Georgia Political Science Association*.
- Graunke, Steven S., and Sherry A. Woosley. 2005. "An Exploration of the Factors that Affect the Academic Success of College Sophomores. *College Student Journal* 39(2): 367-377.
- Hagedorn, Linda S. 2005. "How to Define Retention: A New Look at an Old Problem." In *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success*, ed. Alan Seidman. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- _____. 2012. "How to Define Retention: A New Look at an Old Problem." In *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success, 2nd edition*. ed. Alan Seidman. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hamir, Heather. B. (2011). Go Abroad and Graduate On-time: Study Abroad Participation, Degree Completion, and Time-to-degree. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1065&context=cehsedaddiss>
- Hernandez, Michael. 1998. "In Defense of Moot Court: A Response to "In Praise of Moot Court—Not!" *The Review of Litigation* 17: 69-89.
- Knerr, Charles R., and Andrew B. Sommerman. 2001. "Bringing the Court into the Classroom: Appellate Simulation in American College." *Laws and Courts* 11:4-8.
- McKeachie, Wilbert James, Paul R. Pintrich, Yi-Guang Lin, and David A.F. Smith. 1987. *Teaching and Learning in the College Classroom: A Review of the Research Literature*. National Center on Post-secondary Teaching, Learning and Assessment. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 314 999.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

- Metzger, Christy A. 2006. "Study Abroad Programming: A 21st Century Retention Strategy?" *College Student Affairs Journal*, 25(2): 164-175.
- Posey, James T. 2003. Study Abroad: Educational and Employment Outcomes of Participants Versus Non Participants. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://etd.lib.fsu.edu/theses/submitted/etd-11142003-213320/unrestricted/JPDissertation.pdf>
- Perry, Nancy W., Matthew T. Huss, Bradley D. McAuliff, Julie M. Galas. 1996. "An Active- Learning Approach to Teaching the Undergraduate Psychology and Law Course." *Teaching of Psychology* 23 (2):76-81.
- Ringel, Lewis S. 2004. "Designing a Moot Court: What to Do, What Not to Do, and Suggestions for How to Do It." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37 (3):459-65.
- Shepelak, Norma J. 1996. "Employing a Mock Trial in a Criminology Course: An Applied Learning Experience." *Teaching Sociology* 24:395-400.
- Seidman, Alan, ed. 2005. *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- _____. 2012. *College Student Retention: Formula for Student Success* 2nd edition Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sheffield Graduate Development Programme. 2012. Self-Assessed Skills Audit for Students. Retrieved from http://www.shef.ac.uk/polopoly_fs/1.98183!/file/self-assessed-skills-audit.doc
- Shellman, Stephen M., and Kursad Turan. 2006. "Do Simulations Enhance Student Learning? An Empirical Evaluation of an IR simulation." *Journal of Political Science Education* 2(1): 19-32.
- Sutton, Richard C., and Donald L. Rubin. 2004. "The GLOSSARI Project: Initial Findings from System-Wide Research Initiative on Study Abroad Learning Outcomes." *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad* 10 (Fall): 65-82.
- Stice, James E. 1987. "Using Kolb's Learning Cycle to Improve Student Learning." *Engineering Education* 77 (5): 291-296.
- Tinto, Vincent. 1975. "Dropout from Higher Education: A Theoretical Synthesis of Recent Research." *Review of Educational Research* 45(1): 89-125.
- _____. 1987. *Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Van Dervort, Thomas R. and John R. Vile. 1994. "Revitalizing Undergraduate Programs Through Intercollegiate Mock Trial Competition." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 27 (4): 712-715.
- Wild, Linda, and Larry Ebbers. 2002. "Rethinking Student Retention in Community Colleges." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 26(6): 503-19.

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Younes, Maha N., and Sylvia M. 2003. "The World as a Classroom: The Impact of International Study Experiences on College Students." *College Teaching* 51(4): 141-147.

Young, Denise Y. 2003. Participation in a Study-Abroad Program and Persistence at a Liberal Arts University. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc4373/m2/1/high_res_d/dissertation.pdf

From the Incoming Editor

Todd Collins

Associate Professor

Western Carolina University

tcollins@email.wcu.edu

I am very excited about the opportunity to serve our section as the next editor of the *Law and Courts Newsletter*. I believe, as I am sure you do, that the newsletter provides a great service to our discipline, and I hope to continue the fine work of a long line of dedicated editors. I am sure that all of you will also join me in thanking Kirk for his great leadership as our most recent editor.

A bit about me - I earned my undergraduate and law degrees from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. After several years as a practicing attorney, I "saw the light" and returned to academics, earning my PhD from the University of Georgia. I am currently an associate professor in the beautiful mountains of North Carolina at Western Carolina University, in Cullowhee. I also serve as Director of the Public Policy Institute, a small unit within our university that provides policy analysis and consulting, mainly for local governments and non-profits in our region. For the 98% of you that do not know where Cullowhee is, let's just call it Asheville, North Carolina. For those that may not know where Asheville is, it is where President Obama occasionally vacations and stops in for barbecue.

My experience and training in both law and political science provide a wide and diverse background from which I draw upon in both my research and teaching. My recent research includes articles on attorneys' use of precedent in the federal circuit courts, judicial efficiency, and media coverage of the courts. I hope that my professional experiences and broad training will help me relate to the many varying scholars in our field. And, as we have an ever-growing number of "recovering" attorneys in our section that have moved into academics, I believe that I can relate to those with professional degrees as well as the more traditional scholars. I look forward to building relationships with many of you over the next few years.

My vision for the newsletter is to build upon what has made it so useful over the past years. We will continue to publish three times a year and most of the sections will be familiar to you. I hope to continue the "Books to Watch For" section, letters from the chair, and important announcements. For many that may not be able to go to conferences and are sometimes overwhelmed by the many emails on our

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

listserv, I believe these sections provide important news about our subfield. Like many of you, I also enjoy the symposiums, a series of short articles focused on one aspect of the discipline or research, and I hope to continue occasional newsletters with a unifying central theme.

While I think the focus of the newsletter should continue to be on important announcements and research issues, I would also like to include an occasional article, perhaps one per newsletter, on issues of teaching and advising. Past newsletters included a “teaching notes” section and symposiums on teaching issues, such as a previous symposium on mock trials with undergraduate students. While teaching and advising issues are sometimes discussed on our listserv and may not be as relevant to all readers, I believe that some of these topics are worthy of coverage. I would also like to start a regular section highlighting unique and interesting web pages and apps that could be helpful in our research and teaching, possibly in a “technology notes” portion.

While these are a few of my thoughts, I am also open to suggestions and comments about how to make the newsletter more useful to our section members. My hope is to send out an email survey early this fall through our listserv asking about your opinions on the current newsletter and what you believe would make it more useful. Please be on the lookout for this through the listserv and please share your thoughts. I promise it will be very short. However, before the survey if you would like to contact me directly to share your thoughts on improvements or changes to the newsletter, I would be happy to hear from you (tcollins@email.wcu.edu).

We will also begin to develop an editorial board very soon. While I will be calling on a few people that owe me favors (don’t try to hide), I am also open to anyone that would like to volunteer. Specifically, if anyone is interested in taking the lead on a “teaching notes” or “technology” section, please let me know, as those may be two areas that easily lend themselves to a regular organizer or contributor. The workload will not be extensive and you will be providing a great service to your fellow judicial scholars.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve as editor. I look forward to serving and making our newsletter a valuable resource in the future.

Todd Collins

BOOKS TO WATCH FOR

Drew Lanier, Editor

University of Central Florida

drew.lanier@ucf.edu

Ryan C. Black (Michigan State University), **Timothy R. Johnson** (University of Minnesota), and **Justin Wedeking** (University of Kentucky) have co-authored *Oral Arguments and Coalition Formation on the U.S. Supreme Court* (University of Michigan Press 2012, 978-0-472-11846-5). The U.S. Supreme Court, with its controlled, highly institutionalized decision-making practices, provides an ideal environment for studying coalition formation. The process begins during the oral argument stage, which provides the justices with their first opportunity to hear one another's attitudes and concerns specific to a case. This information gathering allows them eventually to form a coalition. In order to uncover the workings of this process, the authors analyze oral argument transcripts from every case decided from 1998 through 2007, as well as the complete collection of notes kept during oral arguments by Justice Lewis F. Powell and Justice Harry A. Blackmun. Both justices clearly monitored their fellow justices' participation in the discussion and used their observations to craft opinions their colleagues would be likely to support. This study represents a major step forward in the understanding of coalition formation, which is a crucial aspect of many areas of political debate and decision making.

Paul M. Collins, Jr. (University of North Texas) and **Lori A. Ringhand** (University of Georgia School of Law) have co-published *Supreme Court Confirmation Hearings and Constitutional Change* (Cambridge University Press 2013, 978-1-107-03970-4). Before Supreme Court nominees are allowed take their place on the high Court, they must face a moment of democratic reckoning by appearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Despite the potential this holds for public input into the direction of legal change, the hearings are routinely derided as nothing but empty rituals and political grandstanding. In this book, Collins and Ringhand present a different view. Using both empirical data and stories culled from more than seventy years of transcripts, they demonstrate that the hearings are a vibrant and democratic forum for the discussion and ratification of constitutional change. As such, they are one of the ways in which "We the People" take ownership of the Constitution by examining the core constitutional values of those permitted to interpret it on our behalf.

Rachel L. Ellett (Beloit College) has published *Pathways to Judicial Power in Transitional States: Perspectives from African Courts* (Routledge 2013, 978-0-4-156-9390-5). This book examines the complex relationship that exists between the construction of judicial power, and the institutional characteristics of the courts and their regime setting. It examines the intriguing connection between the construction of judicial power on the one hand, and the institutional characteristics of the courts and regime setting on the other. The book asks whether courts are rendered powerful by virtue of their institutional characteristics or by a supportive, perhaps acquiescent, regime setting. By analyzing the historical pathways of courts in Uganda, Tanzania and Malawi, this book argues that the emergence of judicial power since the colonial period, though fraught with many challenges, presents a unique opportunity for consolidating democracy. The book examines in detail the significant political decisions of the upper-level courts in Uganda,

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from previous page)

Tanzania, and Malawi from the colonial period to the present day, analyzing them in relation to changes in the political environment over time. Analysis of these decisions is also supplemented by in-depth interviews with judges, lawyers and other important stakeholders in the judicial processes. This book demonstrates that even in the most challenging regime environments, effective institutions and determined individuals can push back against interference and issue politically powerful, independent decisions but the way in which judiciaries respond to this regime pressure varies enormously across countries and regions.

Announcements

Call for Papers for the Southern Political Science Association from Erin Kaheny, Judicial Politics Section Chair

The next meeting of the Southern Political Science Association will be held in New Orleans, Louisiana on **January 9-11, 2014**. The deadline for paper proposals is **August 16, 2013**. Proposals may be submitted at the following Web site: <http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/spsa/spsa14/>.