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SCHOOL:   ○ LAW   ○ MSB   ○ CAS   ○ CPA

CONTACT NAME: Laurie Harow  PHONE: x4457

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION: School of Law  DATE PREPARED: 3/21/14

PROPOSED SEMESTER OF IMPLEMENTATION:   ○ fall   ○ spring  YEAR: 2014

TYPE OF ACTION:   ○ add (new)   ○ deactivate   ○ modify   ○ other

LEVEL OF ACTION:   ○ noncredit   ○ undergraduate   ○ graduate   ○ other

ACTION BEING REQUESTED (select one category, either Course Actions or Program Actions):

**COURSE ACTIONS**

Original Subject Code/Course Number:

LAW 800V

Original Course Title:

Veterans Advocacy Clinic

**PROGRAM ACTIONS**

Original Program Title:

Select one or multiple actions from one of the lists below (review the list of necessary documents and signatures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ACTIONS</th>
<th>PROGRAM ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experimental Course</td>
<td>10. Program Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course Title</td>
<td>11a. Undergraduate Specialization (Fewer than 24 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Credits</td>
<td>11b. Master’s Specialization (Fewer than 12 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Course Number</td>
<td>11c. Doctoral Specialization (Fewer than 18 credits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Course Level</td>
<td>12. Minor (add or delete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pre- and Co-Requisite</td>
<td>13. Closed Site Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Course Description</td>
<td>14. Program Suspension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New Course</td>
<td>15. Program Reactivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deactivate Course</td>
<td>16a. Certificate Program (UG/G) exclusively within existing degree program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other</td>
<td>16b. Certificate Program (UG/G) outside of or across degree programs (12 or more credits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION (check all appropriate boxes of documents included; review the list of necessary documents):

- □ summary proposal (O)
- □ course definition document (P)
- □ full five-page MHEC proposal (Q)
- □ financial tables (MHEC) (R)
- □ other documents as may be required by MHEC/USM (S)
- □ other (T)
### IMPACT REVIEW (review the list of necessary signatures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacted Entity</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. OTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. University Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Admissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPROVAL SEQUENCE (review the list of necessary signatures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Level</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Department/Division (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. General Education (for No. 7, 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Final Faculty Review Body Within Each School (Chair)</td>
<td>Michele Williams</td>
<td>3-25-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-31-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. University Faculty Senate (Chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. University Council (Chair)¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-2-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Board of Regents (notification only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Board of Regents (approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. MHEC (notification only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. MHEC (approval)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Middle States Association notification</td>
<td>Required only if the University's mission is changed by the action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ University Council review (for recommendation to the president or back to the provost) shall be limited to curricular or academic policy issues that may potentially affect the University's mission and strategic planning, or have a significant impact on the generation or allocation of its financial resources.
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SCHOOL: LAW MSB CAS CPA

CONTACT NAME: Laurie Harow PHONE: x4457

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION: School of Law DATE PREPARED: 3/21/14

PROPOSED SEMESTER OF IMPLEMENTATION: fall spring YEAR: 2014

ACTION BEING REQUESTED (select one category, either Course Actions or Program Actions):

- **COURSE ACTIONS**
- **PROGRAM ACTIONS**

Original Subject Code/Course Number: LAW 800V

Original Course Title: Veterans Advocacy Clinic

Select one or multiple actions from one of the lists below (review the list of necessary documents and signatures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Experimental Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Course Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Course Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pre- and Co-Requisite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Course Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New Course ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deactivate Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For changes to existing courses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD TITLE</th>
<th>SUBJECT CODE/COURSE NO.</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW TITLE</td>
<td>SUBJECT CODE/COURSE NO.</td>
<td>CREDITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creation of the Veterans Advocacy Clinic requires the creation of course for student to enroll in when taking part in the clinical experience.

1. Course title: Veterans Advocacy Clinic
2. Credit hours: 6 credits
3. Course prerequisites or co-requisites: Evidence and Professional Responsibility
4. Catalog Description: Students enrolled in the Veterans Advocacy Clinic will represent indigent veterans before courts and administrative agencies in diverse civil and veterans benefits matters. Students may also engage in community education, legislative projects, and other systemic efforts at law reform. Under the supervision of a faculty member, students are responsible for all aspects of representing clients, including interviewing clients and witnesses, counseling clients, engaging in fact investigation and discovery, drafting pleadings and motions, negotiating with adversaries, and conducting hearings and trials. Students are expected to devote approximately 20 hours per week to clinic activity. Prerequisite: First-year day courses, Evidence. Corequisite: Professional Responsibility. Recommended: Trial Advocacy. [Admission by permission only]
5. Type of Course: Clinic
6. Limited Enrollment. Students will be selected through the Clinic lottery.

SET FORTH THE RATIONALE FOR THIS PROPOSAL:

The clinical program at the University of Baltimore School of Law is a central part of the school’s academic mission. The Veterans Advocacy Clinic would not only further the goal of the gift that Bob Parsons gave to UB to serve veterans, but it also will assist the law school in meeting student demand for clinical opportunities and in expanding capacity to meet the school’s newly adopted experiential requirement. UB law students have also expressed interest in legal issues facing veterans, and the Clinic will both offer the possibility of a clinic in this area and demonstrate a commitment to a population in the community that is in substantial need for legal services.
Students enrolled in the Veterans Advocacy Clinic will represent indigent veterans before courts and administrative agencies in diverse civil and veterans benefits matters. Students may also engage in community education, legislative projects, and other systemic efforts at law reform. Under the supervision of a faculty member, students are responsible for all aspects of representing clients, including interviewing clients and witnesses, counseling clients, engaging in fact investigation and discovery, drafting pleadings and motions, negotiating with adversaries, and conducting hearings and trials. Students are expected to devote approximately 20 hours per week to clinic activity. **Prerequisite:** First-year day courses, Evidence. **Corequisite:** Professional Responsibility. **Recommended:** Trial Advocacy [Admission by permission only]
11. COURSE TYPE/COMPONENT (clinical, continuance, discussion, field studies, independent study, laboratory, lecture, practicum, research, seminar, supervision, thesis research, tutorial or workshop; this must match PeopleSoft 9.0 coding, so check with your dean’s office if you are unsure of the correct entry)
Clinic

12. FACULTY QUALIFIED TO TEACH COURSE
Hugh McClean

13. CONTENT OUTLINE
In the seminar portion of the class, students will learn lawyering skills (such as interviewing, counseling, and negotiation); trial skills; substantive law governing veterans benefits; and interdisciplinary theories and approaches to the challenges facing veterans.

14. LEARNING GOALS
Learning goals:
   a. Undertaking a lawyering role through a live-client clinic.
   b. Understanding and reflecting upon lawyering skills and values and one’s own performance as a lawyer.
   c. Learning how to think systematically about complex, unstructured problems and about how to choose appropriate action and alternatives.
   d. Understanding and exploring the role of a client-centered lawyer.
   e. Preparing and delivering work of professional quality.
   f. Learning and carrying out lawyering skills such as interviewing, negotiating, counseling, fact investigation, legal research, drafting, oral advocacy, communication skills, case management, and time management.
   g. Recognizing and resolving issues of professional roles and responsibilities.
   h. Understanding the legal and non-legal challenges facing veterans and how those challenges are interrelated.
   i. Understanding the relationship between theory and practice.
   j. Engaging in effective collaborative learning.
   k. Reflecting upon the larger contexts and systems of the legal profession and society.

15. ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
Students will be graded upon the quality of the work performed in the classroom portion of the course, in handling their cases, and in performing other activities within the clinic, such as legislative advocacy. Students will be given clear evaluative criteria at the start of the course. Students will assess their own performance at mid-semester, followed by a detailed assessment by the professor. Students will be given a final grade based on the evaluative criteria. (See Attachment B for sample evaluative criteria).

16. SUGGESTED TEXT(S) and MATERIALS (e.g. textbooks, equipment, software, etc., that students must purchase)
Texts may include a book on trial skills, such as Trial Techniques by Thomas A. Mauet, and a book on lawyering skills, such as Stefan H. Krieger & Richard K. Neumann, Jr., Essential Lawyering Skills. Additional
readings relevant to a veterans practice will be posted to TWEN as appropriate. The Clinic will also build a library of treatises and practice manuals for veterans practice.

17. SPECIAL GRADING OPTIONS (if applicable)

n/a

18. SUGGESTED CLASS SIZE

Class size hinges on number of faculty to teach the Clinic and other variables, but ratios will be comparable to other 6 credit clinics.

19. LAB FEES (if applicable)

n/a
MEMORANDUM

TO: Curriculum Committee
FROM: Professor Michele Gilman
DATE: February 6, 2014
RE: New Course Proposal – Veterans Advocacy Clinic

I am submitting a proposal for a new course entitled the Veterans Advocacy Clinic. The course will be taught by Visiting Assistant Professor Hugh McClean, and he has contributed to this proposal. His CV is attached.

1. Course title: Veterans Advocacy Clinic
2. Credit hours: 6 credits
3. Course prerequisites or co-requisites: Evidence and Professional Responsibility
4. Catalog Description: Students enrolled in the Veterans Advocacy Clinic will represent indigent veterans before courts and administrative agencies in diverse civil and veterans benefits matters. Students may also engage in community education, legislative projects, and other systemic efforts at law reform. Under the supervision of a faculty member, students are responsible for all aspects of representing clients, including interviewing clients and witnesses, counseling clients, engaging in fact investigation and discovery, drafting pleadings and motions, negotiating with adversaries, and conducting hearings and trials. Students are expected to devote approximately 20 hours per week to clinic activity. Prerequisite: First-year day courses, Evidence. Corequisite: Professional Responsibility. Recommended: Trial Advocacy [Admission by permission only]
5. Type of Course: Clinic
6. Limited Enrollment. Students will be selected through the Clinic lottery.
7. Class size hinges on number of faculty to teach the Clinic and other variables, but ratios will be comparable to other 6 credit clinics.
8. Content outline: In the seminar portion of the class, students will learn lawyering skills (such as interviewing, counseling, and negotiation); trial skills; substantive law governing veterans benefits; and interdisciplinary theories and approaches to the challenges facing veterans.
9. Learning goals:
   a. Undertaking a lawyering role through a live-client clinic.
   b. Understanding and reflecting upon lawyering skills and values and one's own performance as a lawyer.
   c. Learning how to think systematically about complex, unstructured problems and about how to choose appropriate action and alternatives.
d. Understanding and exploring the role of a client-centered lawyer.

e. Preparing and delivering work of professional quality.

f. Learning and carrying out lawyering skills such as interviewing, negotiating, counseling, fact investigation, legal research, drafting, oral advocacy, communication skills, case management, and time management.

g. Recognizing and resolving issues of professional roles and responsibilities.

h. Understanding the legal and non-legal challenges facing veterans and how those challenges are interrelated.

i. Understanding the relationship between theory and practice.

j. Engaging in effective collaborative learning.

k. Reflecting upon the larger contexts and systems of the legal profession and society.

10. Assessment Strategies: Students will be graded upon the quality of the work performed in the classroom portion of the course, in handling their cases, and in performing other activities within the clinic, such as legislative advocacy. Students will be given clear evaluative criteria at the start of the course. Students will assess their own performance at mid-semester, followed by a detailed assessment by the professor. Students will be given a final grade based on the evaluative criteria. (See Attachment B for sample evaluative criteria).

11. Texts: Texts may include a book on trial skills, such as Trial Techniques by Thomas A. Mauet, and a book on lawyering skills, such as Stefan H. Krieger & Richard K. Neumann, Jr., Essential Lawyering Skills. Additional readings relevant to a veterans practice will be posted to TWEN as appropriate. The Clinic will also build a library of treatises and practice manuals for veterans practice.

12. Suggested concentrations: Public Interest and Public Service Concentration; Litigation and Advocacy

13. Rational for the proposed course: The clinical program at the University of Baltimore School of Law is a central part of the school’s academic mission. The Veterans Advocacy Clinic would not only further the goal of the gift that Bob Parsons gave to UB to serve veterans, but it also will assist the law school in meeting student demand for clinical opportunities and in expanding capacity to meet the school’s newly adopted experiential requirement. UB law students have also expressed interest in legal issues facing veterans, and the Clinic will both offer the possibility of a clinic in this area and demonstrate a commitment to a population in the community that is in substantial need for legal services.
SAMPLE CLINIC Criteria for Mid-Semester Self-Evaluation and for Faculty Evaluation and Grading

As part of the mid-semester evaluation conference, students are required to write a detailed self-evaluation memorandum. The areas to be addressed in this memorandum are the same that faculty use in evaluating student performance in the course.

In determining final grades and in evaluating performance, faculty review students’ work file, the case files on which students worked, and notes and agendas from weekly team meetings. Faculty will also consider personal observations of student performance in the seminar, in the trial advocacy class, on cases, and in other Clinic activities. In grading, faculty place particular emphasis on any improvements in student performance over the course of the semester.

The specific self-evaluation and grading criteria with percentage allocations are as follows:

1. **Attorney-Client Relationship 15%**

   Fostered active participation of clients in cases; recognized the client as ultimate decision-maker in the attorney-client relationship; identified and evaluated client goals through effective interviewing techniques; effectively counseled clients on available options; advised clients of significant developments in their cases; and was attentive to the political and social contexts in which individual cases arise.

2. **Case Development and Planning 15%**

   Conducted thorough fact investigation and reliable, comprehensive legal research; engaged in creative and thorough issue identification and legal analysis; anticipated legal and factual arguments from adversaries; demonstrated initiative and creativity in developing and implementing case strategy; used procedural and evidentiary rules to the client’s advantage.

3. **Time and Case Management 15%**

   Maintained and managed work load in order to meet obligations to clients and the Clinic; met deadlines for case preparation; punctually attended all client meetings, court appearances and supervision meetings; meticulously recorded case activity and maintained case files with documentation of interviews, telephone conversations, correspondence, memoranda, pleadings and orders both in paper case file and in electronic version.

4. **Oral and Written Advocacy in Cases 10%**

   Meticulously and timely prepared all written correspondence, pleadings and other documents; thoroughly researched drafts of memoranda and briefs; expressed thoughts orally and in writing with precision, clarity and economy; responded to faculty comments to improve
THOMAS F. KING, CULTURAL RESOURCE LAWS & PRACTICE (1998)

NOTE: Students will receive extensive supplementary materials on CD-ROM and electronically.

Suggested Concentration: Real Estate Practice

Course Rationale: Historic Preservation Law would offer the University of Baltimore the opportunity to teach one of the few preservation law courses in the nation and the only preservation law course at a law school in Maryland. It would complement the School of Law’s existing concentration in Real Estate Practice by teaching students practical applications of preservation law and theory: navigating the permitting process for complex development projects in regulated historic districts, showing students how to combine and structure allocations of financial incentives such as preservation easement deductions and historic rehabilitation tax credits, and demonstrating how to represent clients before federal agencies, state regulatory boards, and local commissions with jurisdiction over preservation matters. Finally, the course would have direct relevance to the School of Law’s position within the Baltimore City community, where preservation legal tools are being used in conjunction with developers and property owners to help revitalize the city’s urban core.

Instructor: William J. Cook is an associate general counsel at the National Trust for Historic Preservation. His primary area of responsibility includes litigation advocacy on behalf of the National Trust in courts across the United States. Recent projects include defending the use of historic tax credits and preservation easements, challenging federal agency approval of the world’s largest wind farm in the middle of Nantucket Sound, securing boundaries for a traditional cultural landscape in New Mexico, and supporting historic property owners against the harmful effects of massive cruise ships in the Port of Charleston. He also serves as a board member on the Lawyers’ Committee for Cultural Heritage Preservation. Prior to joining the National Trust, Will taught as an assistant professor for six years at the Charleston School of Law in the areas of property law, constitutional law, historic preservation, and art and cultural heritage law. Will has also worked at a nationally recognized law firm and for an international auction house in New York City. While in Charleston, Will served as a member of the Board of Directors of the Preservation Society, the oldest preservation advocacy group in the nation. He lectures regularly to national audiences on issues related to property, land use, and historic preservation law, and teaches a preservation law course at Columbia University. In addition, Will is frequently invited to lecture on preservation law topics at the Georgetown Law Center and University of Pennsylvania.

Syllabus: A representative syllabus is attached (Spring 2010, Charleston School of Law). NOTE: This course was taught once a week in a 3-hour format, to allow for incorporation of nearby field visits within walking distance of the law school. The format also facilitated panel discussions that built on topics covered in weekly lectures.

What topics in course overlap with other courses in curriculum? Historic Preservation Law would not overlap in any substantial way with any course offered at the University of Baltimore School of Law. Historic preservation legal issues tend to be introduced briefly, if at all, in land use or environmental law courses, but not comprehensively.

Statement of marketability of the course: Historic Preservation Law has had sufficient enrollment at other schools where the course has been taught which would tend to support a similar level of interest.
drafts; thoroughly prepared all moots, all direct and cross-examinations, and all oral arguments; demonstrated an ability to be understood by and to persuade the tribunal.

5. Professionalism 15%

Collaborated effectively as a member of a team with other student attorneys and supervising faculty members, including participation in and/or observation of teammate’s client interviews, court appearances, case planning, pleadings, etc.; professionally interacted with adversaries, court personnel, witnesses, and Clinic staff; secured the necessary approval from the supervisor before acting; consulted with the supervisor in the event of a suspected mistake; demonstrated an ability to identify and address ethical, ideological, or personal considerations bearing on a case or the attorney-client relationship.

6. Self-Evaluation and Self-Reflection 15%

Engaged in goal-setting and strategic planning before each lawyering activity; employed comprehensive and rigorous self-critique of all clinic performances; identified individual strengths and weaknesses to improve as an attorney during the course of the semester and beyond. During or shortly after a lawyering experience, commented on feelings or reactions toward that experience; articulated how successes or challenges from that experience relate to one personally, to the role of lawyer, to the legal system, and to broader society; identified and implemented steps in order to apply lessons learned in the future.

7. Trial Advocacy 10%

Punctually attended all trial advocacy sessions; thoughtfully prepared all trial advocacy exercises; reviewed videotapes and critically evaluated performance of self and other student attorneys; employed feedback to improve performance; suggested issues for class discussion; participated in class critiques.

8. Seminar Participations 5%

Punctually attended all class meetings; completed all seminar assignments on time; thoroughly prepared for and participated in firm meetings, individual presentations, simulations and class discussions; suggested issues and cases for class discussion; thoughtfully prepared and completed trial advocacy assignments; reviewed videotapes and critically evaluated performance of self and other student attorneys; employed feedback to improve performance.