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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Administrative Law A1
PROFESSOR: Dean Elena Kagan
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 119
RESPONSES: 27

Workload
A. 3.7% (Light)
B. 51.9% (Reasonable)
C. 40.7% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 3.7% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 48.1% (Average)
C. 48.1% (More challenging than average)
D. 3.7% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 85.2% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 14.8% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 92.6% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 74.1% (Clear about expectations)
D. 3.7% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 77.8% (Organized)
F. 3.7% (Disorganized)
G. 70.4% (Practical)
H. 70.4% (Theoretical)
I. 85.2% (Engaging)
J. 3.7% (Boring)
K. 3.7% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 85.2% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 22.2% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 66.7% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 22.2% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 77.8% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 7.4% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 96.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 11.1% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 96.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 70.4% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 7.4% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 48.100002% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 22.2% (Available during office hours)
C. 11.1% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 22.2% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 40.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 7.4% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 22.2% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 44.4% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 25.9% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 85.200005% (Yes)
B. 14.8% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 59.3% (2L)
C. 37.0% (3L)
D. 3.7% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| Having some constitutional law before this class would probably be a plus. Dean Kagan is a difficult but very interesting teacher. I wouldn't take the class again because I did not enjoy the material and I don't think I would have really liked the material with any professor. |
| Dean Kagan's reputation for being tough on students is undeserved. She's no joker, but the only times she is harsh is when someone has really stepped over the line--asking to pass several times in a row, or obstinately arguing a point that is clearly wrong and does not advance the class discussion. |
| This class was clear and straightforward, but I liked it a lot less than my other 2L classes which gave me a broader picture of legal practice/theory: it was too Socratic for my liking and a bit of a boring rehash of the first year experience. |
| Workload was reasonable but you really had to do it before class; she would chastise people she called on who hadn't done the reading. |
| n/r |
| n/r |
Kagan is pretty spectacular. I got out of bed before 8 every single Friday in the semester just for her. She's incredibly engaging and funny, and really helps you understand the material. I'd recommend this class to everyone.

Rather boring teaching style if you are a 3L... feels like a 1L course, with the cold-calling, Socratic style, lots of rehashing of classic pro-and-con "on the one hand, on the other hand," law-school argument sound bytes...

Must read before going to class or will be called out for not having read. Great professor with the exception of the fact that she brings up the same issues over and over again (e.g., what are pros and cons of executive agencies).

Dean Kagan is--surprisingly--an excellent teacher. Probably the best at the law school and definitely the best I have had so far.

If you have an interest/desire to take administrative law, this is a good choice.

Excellent course, Dean Kagan is very clear and uses a socratic style that is very effective--not intimidating, and basically just focuses on the logic of the cases rather than random facts.

Con law for sure

She is not kidding about being prepared for class. She says she "tries" not to embarrass people who are not prepared, but she does not leave people who are not prepared nor does she allow passing. You really only need to go to every other class because she starts every class with a recap of the previous class. She moves the reading very slowly.

Constitutional law would be a useful prerequisite. Dean Kagan is by far the best teacher I have had at the law school - everyone should take this class before graduating.
COURSE: Administrative Law A2
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor David Super
SEMESTER: Fall 2007
CLASS SIZE: 36
RESPONSES: 11

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 18.2% (Reasonable)
C. 54.5% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 27.300001% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 45.5% (Average)
C. 36.4% (More challenging than average)
D. 18.2% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 45.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 54.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 36.4% (Clear about content)
B. 54.5% (Unclear about content)
C. 45.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 36.4% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 27.300001% (Organized)
F. 36.4% (Disorganized)
G. 72.700005% (Practical)
H. 54.5% (Theoretical)
I. 18.2% (Engaging)
J. 54.5% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 36.4% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 27.300001% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 72.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 18.2% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 72.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 90.9% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 63.600002% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 80.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 10.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 63.600002% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 90.9% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 72.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 9.1% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 54.5% (Yes)
B. 45.5% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 45.5% (2L)
C. 54.5% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Super was pretty terrible in class (often confusing reading that had seemed clear prior to class) but he gave killer, world-class performances at the review sessions.

Despite Super's knowledge and enthusiasm for the material and for teaching, he was unfortunately not a very coherent lecturer.

Administrative law is a very difficult subject, and Prof. Super probably did as well as anyone could to make sense out of it. The exam was fiendishly difficult, though.

The workload was completely unreasonable, sometimes with random 50 page supplements given the night before class. One third of the exam was based on a 60 page supplement assigned for the last day of class, but only given to us at 11 pm the night before. Basically we read the whole case book and about 200 pages of additional material. The final was an 8 hour take home with an 18 page double space limit, and pretty much incorporated every single thing covered in the class.
I was a lot of material, which seemed overwhelming at first, but it all came together nicely in the end.
COURSE: Analytical Methods for Lawyers A  
PROFESSOR: Mr. David Cope  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  
CLASS SIZE: 91  
RESPONSES: 11

Workload  
A. 45.5% (Light)  
B. 45.5% (Reasonable)  
C. 9.1% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 45.5% (Easy)  
B. 54.5% (Average)  
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 9.1% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 27.300001% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 18.2% (Volunteers only)  
E. 45.5% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 72.70005% (Clear about content)  
B. 18.2% (Unclear about content)  
C. 63.60002% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 36.4% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 54.5% (Organized)  
F. 18.2% (Disorganized)  
G. 63.60002% (Practical)  
H. 18.2% (Theoretical)  
I. 36.4% (Engaging)  
J. 18.2% (Boring)  
K. 18.2% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 45.5% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 54.5% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 18.2% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 54.5% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 18.2% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 90.9% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 36.4% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 45.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 45.5% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 81.8% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 81.8% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 54.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 90.9% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 36.4% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 9.1% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 63.600002% (Yes)
B. 36.4% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 45.5% (2L)
C. 45.5% (3L)
D. 9.1% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Cope is very clear, friendly and approachable. Unfortunately, one student who for whatever reason seemed personally offended by the basic principles of economics, decided it was appropriate to take advantage of Prof. Cope's kind manner and drag several class discussions down to a ridiculously elementary level. At those times I wished Prof. Cope were not so nice. The class provides a very useful (although necessarily limited) general background to law &amp; econ &amp; business issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reading is pretty pointless-almost all based on class material. He can be pretty racist and nativist at times, which may be attributed to his strictly economics based outlook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is offered as a three credit course in the fall and then as a four credit course in the spring. Judging by the content, I doubt there will be much difference between the classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope is a super nice guy; very eager to help. Very practical course. Everybody w/o a analytical background should take it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course was incredibly boring at times, and the midterm did not comport with Prof. Cope’s low-key approach to the course. I sincerely regret taking this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very easy for anyone with a quantitative background. This course should be labeled as remedial. That said, if you haven’t taken any quantitative class since high school, you probably should take this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent class! i would recommend to all!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cope cares about the students!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Antitrust Law
PROFESSOR: Professor Einer Elhauge
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 56
RESPONSES: 8

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 37.5% (Reasonable)
C. 62.5% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 12.5% (Average)
C. 75.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 12.5% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 37.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 62.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 87.5% (Clear about content)
B. 12.5% (Unclear about content)
C. 62.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 87.5% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 37.5% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 25.0% (Engaging)
J. 12.5% (Boring)
K. 12.5% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 62.5% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 12.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 37.5% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 87.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 12.5% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 37.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 37.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 25.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 37.5% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 12.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 25.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 37.5% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 25.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 87.5% (Yes)
B. 12.5% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 12.5% (2L)
C. 62.5% (3L)
D. 25.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having an affinity for economics will help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can opt to write a paper instead of taking the final.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good to know something about microecon before taking this course choice between 3 hour exam and final paper (20-25 pp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading was too heavy, even for a 4-credit class--the sheer amount sometimes swamped the important points we were supposed to be taking away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROFESSOR: Professor Elizabeth Bartholet and Ms. Jessica Budnitz
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 59
RESPONSES: 6

Workload
A. 66.700005% (Light)
B. 33.3% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 16.7% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 33.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor - Professor Elizabeth Bartholet (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 16.7% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 16.7% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 66.700005% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 16.7% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 33.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 16.7% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 16.7% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 16.7% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 83.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 16.7% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Ms. Jessica Budnitz (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 75.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 25.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 25.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 75.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.7% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.7% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability - Professor Elizabeth Bartholet (check all that apply)
A. 16.7% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Professor Ms. Jessica Budnitz (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 16.7% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 83.3% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 83.3% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 16.7% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

```
This class consists primarily of visiting lecturers coming to speak about their areas of expertise within the area of child advocacy. It explores areas beyond the traditional legal fields of litigation, etc, and brought in mental health, education, social work, and economic experts. The classes usually consisted of about an hour of guest lecture, followed by question and answer with students.

This is by far Bartholet's best class - free food every night, and every night has a different leading expert in some element of child advocacy.
```

n/r
n/r
n/r
n/r
COURSE: Bankruptcy A
PROFESSOR: Professor George Triantis
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 57
RESPONSES: 8

Workload
A. 12.5% (Light)
B. 87.5% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 12.5% (Easy)
B. 75.0% (Average)
C. 12.5% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 12.5% (Panel)
B. 12.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 62.5% (Volunteers only)
E. 12.5% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 75.0% (Clear about content)
B. 12.5% (Unclear about content)
C. 87.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 87.5% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 75.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 12.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 75.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 37.5% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 87.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 62.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 62.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 62.5% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 62.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 12.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 37.5% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 12.5% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Professor Triantis pretty much stopped the socratic method about half way through the semester. After that, he only called on volunteers (perhaps because there were always a lot of volunteers). I thought the class was good, but I wish he would have stuck to the syllabus more. Whenever students had questions, even if those questions were only tangentially related to the reading, he would spend a lot of time addressing those questions, which meant that we fell behind on the syllabus. I would have preferred more even coverage over a wider range of topics instead of going into a lot of depth whenever someone in the class asked a random question. Professor Triantis is great. He isn't at all intimidating, and he seemed genuinely interested in what students had to say. He also seemed to be more accessible outside of class than most of the other professors I had. He really seemed to care about the students. If you don't plan to go to class, I wouldn't take this course. He takes his own perspective on the reading during class, so you'd probably come away with a different/incomplete understanding of bankruptcy if you only read the book or a study guide.

n/r
I wish I had taken Corps before taking this class. However, Professor Triantis was so great that I was able to manage even without this background.

Triantis really is a great teacher.
COURSE: Child, Family, and State
PROFESSOR: Professor Elizabeth Bartholet
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 39
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Clear about content)
B. 33.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 33.3% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 66.700005% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 33.3% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 33.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 33.3% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 100.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 33.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 100.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Great class, highly recommended for anyone interested in this critical subject matter, whether you have experience or not, and whether you plan to actively practice in this area or not. Professor is engaging and open to all students. Highly recommended.
Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 100.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 100.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 100.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 100.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Yes)
B. 100.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
n/r
COURSE: Citizenship and Globalization
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Ayelet Shachar
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 31
RESPONSES: 10

Workload
A. 20.0% (Light)
B. 80.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 30.0% (Easy)
B. 70.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 30.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 70.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 90.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 90.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 10.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 80.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 60.0% (Practical)
H. 60.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 10.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 70.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 80.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 20.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 30.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 80.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 20.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 60.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 90.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 40.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 50.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 10.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 90.0% (Yes)
B. 10.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 33.3% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| I liked Prof. Shachar a lot. She's really nice and very knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Unfortunately I felt the class was taught at an undergraduate level and moved very slowly. I did not feel I got enough out of it to justify three credits of my time. Her expectations of us were too low, in the complexity of readings and theories and legal doctrines she expected us to deal with. I'm not sure why it was so easy. Based on her published work, I thought it would be harder. |
| n/r |
| This class was more fun than most I have taken here. Prof Shachar is very approachable and easy to talk to. My criticism would be that she is a little too open to student comments and concerns, so sometimes the class got sidetracked a lot. I think the readings were on a deeper level of engagement than the class discussion. That being said, I very much enjoyed the class. I would recommend this class to anyone. |
| Best class I've taken at HLS |
| n/r |
The only thing I missed was an overall framework for the class, though whether such a thing can exist in the domain of citizenship is open to debate. Nevertheless, I felt that without this framework the individual topics (naturalization, migrant workers, asylum, global citizenship, multiculturalism etc.) fell slightly apart and we did not even really try to establish links between them.

This was a great course and anyone interested in international law citizenship, immigration law etc should definitely take this course. She offers a wide range of perspectives and is truly a remarkable professor.
COURSE: Civil Procedure 1
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Jonathan Molot
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 82
RESPONSES: 26

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 34.600002% (Reasonable)
C. 57.7% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 7.7000003% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 19.2% (Average)
C. 76.9% (More challenging than average)
D. 3.8% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 46.2% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 53.8% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 76.9% (Clear about expectations)
D. 3.8% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 88.5% (Practical)
H. 15.400001% (Theoretical)
I. 92.3% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 96.200005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 34.600002% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 15.400001% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 38.5% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 92.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 96.200005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 3.8% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 38.5% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 3.8% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 70.8% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 79.200005% (Available during office hours)
C. 58.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 12.5% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 11.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 23.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 38.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 26.9% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 96.200005% (Yes)
B. 3.8% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<p>| Molot was extremely clear and engaging. A wonderful teacher of a difficult subject. |
| Molot is terrific and is willing to participate in snowball fights if you catch him at the right time. |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| Amazing Prof! |
| Strong class covering the basics of CivPro. Not extremely engaging, but given the material, about as well-taught as one could reasonably expect. |
| professor Molot was the best professor I have had on any level |
| the man's a prophet |
| Professor Molot was simply outstanding. His effectiveness as a teacher, his preparation for class meetings, and his organization were far superior to any other professor we had this semester. He also respected the students' by arriving on time to classes and not holding beyond time. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>molot is fantastic and makes civ pro understandable and bearable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Molot was SO fantastic. If HLS does not steal him from Georgetown it is making an enormous mistake! Cannot say enough positive things about this professor!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molot was an excellent teacher. The Glannon book works nicely as a review for the material covered in the course. I found Molot's structuring of the material in class discussions more helpful than the structure provided by the casebook. The last day of class was a comprehensive review session, which was very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molot is incredible- makes so much sense, makes a boring subject enjoyable, overall nice guy. Goes a little fast at times, but it's nothing a little Glannon can't fix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molot is amazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A truly fantastic professor. I find civil procedure to be exceedingly dry as a subject when reading the casebook on my own, yet find myself very much enjoying class with Prof. Molot. I very much hope he is offered tenure and comes to HLS full-time; I would take any class he taught, regardless of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Molot takes difficult, often frustrating material, and makes it understandable and clear. He is very engaging and personable, and students would be lucky to have him as their professor!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civ Pro isn't exactly the most exciting of topics, but Professor Molot has such enthusiasm and gets so worked up about the issues that class is not only engaging, but also entertaining. Our section has his class on Thursday and Friday, two hours at a time (with an unusually heavy reading load as a result), and his class is the very last class of our week, yet we all still love him. That speaks more highly to his skill as an instructor than anything else I can think of. Aside from his classroom capabilities, Professor Molot is also incredibly personable and loves talking with his students outside of class, whether it's about the classroom material or about anything else that comes up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molot is an AMAZING professor who really makes perhaps the most dry subject incredibly engaging and enjoyable. This is by far my favorite 1L class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Civil Procedure 2
PROFESSOR: Assistant Professor Jim Greiner
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 16

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 25.0% (Reasonable)
C. 68.8% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 6.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 6.3% (Average)
C. 56.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 37.5% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 100.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Clear about content)
B. 68.8% (Unclear about content)
C. 37.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 43.8% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 50.0% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 62.5% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 31.300001% (Engaging)
J. 6.3% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 37.5% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 12.5% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 43.8% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 62.5% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 81.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 18.800001% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 31.300001% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
### Class time (check all that apply)
- A. 68.8% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
- B. 31.300001% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
- C. 75.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
- D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

### Instructor availability (check all that apply)
- A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
- B. 87.5% (Available during office hours)
- C. 81.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
- D. 6.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
- E. 6.3% (No basis for judgment)

### Exam (choose one)
- A. 6.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
- B. 6.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
- C. 37.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
- D. 31.300001% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
- E. 18.800001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
- F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

### All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
- A. 68.8% (Yes)
- B. 31.300001% (No)

### Your year/program in school (choose one)
- A. 100.0% (1L)
- B. 0.0% (2L)
- C. 0.0% (3L)
- D. 0.0% (LLM)
- E. 0.0% (SJD)

### Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Greiner really improved over the course of the semester but the beginning of the class was really confusing. The exam question focused on more obscure topics discussed in class with little focus on topics normally discussed in an introductory civil procedure. I am not sure that a new professor is the best choice for civil procedure. He went into topics that most of the other 1L civpro classes seemed not to cover. Overall he is a really nice professor. It was sometimes difficult to get into office hours as so many students had questions. I think he could be a great professor but he needs to teach the basics first rather than jumping in to more difficult topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At first I thought the problems with this class were just due to the fact that Professor Greiner is a new professor, but the class did not improve at all over the semester. He seemed unable to comprehend the low level of knowledge of a 1L student, presuming a great deal of basic knowledge about Civil Procedure that we did not have. The only students that I know who had a positive impression of this class did substantial amounts of independent study or had previous experience working in a law firm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The professor is enthusiastic and seems genuinely interested in relating to the students. However, he often seemed to focus excessively on the details of individual cases at the expense of clarifying the broader themes and issues that they represented. More often than not, I left class unsure of what I was supposed to have taken away from it.

He is a young professor, so he needs to do a lot of research. As a result his office hours are condensed to 20 minute slots. This is a detriment, because he is a great guy, but it will change when he gets tenure.

First time teacher. Painful class, but the professor will probably get better with experience.

He can be very disorganized. The real issue is that he spends all the time talking about what makes the case idiosyncratic/what's wrong with it/why it doesn't make sense, rather than actually talking about what it teaches about procedure. He can be very very detail-oriented. He also readily admits that he doesn't really realize what he's asking in assignments until too late and asks lots of trick questions (i.e. you say you don't know, he says neither does he). In a way, though, he grows on you, idiosyncrasies and all.

Though knowledgeable, he went too quickly & did not make the black letter law clear enough before moving on to more intricate subject matter.

Greiner will need a few more semesters to learn how to finesse the Socratic method. He is much better in office hours than he was in class discussions.

Sometimes Greiner's explanations are difficult to follow and complex, but he really cares about the students and wants you to learn the material. We filled out an informal survey part way through the course, and he took a lot of our suggestions into account, including explaining black letter law better.

I took this course when Greiner had just begun teaching. Thus, he was somewhat disorganized and didn't always convey the complexities of the material in class. He also tried to connect with the students during class, but sometimes ended up getting sidetracked, wasting class time.

Prof. Greiner was my favorite professor this semester. He is a little rough around the edges with his teaching style, but we were his first class and I am certain that he will be an HLS favorite with a little more experience. He definitely give you a challenge, but he is extremely engaging, and I enjoyed going to class everyday.

The practice assignments, which are all the evidence we have about assessment, since he's a brand-new professor, were often frustrating and unclear. He tries to focus on problems we might hypothetically face in practice, but their relation to what we've studied and even their internal consistency is pretty... inconsistent.

I think Griener made a lot of first year teacher mistakes but overall he really understands the material and works hard to make sure we learned it. Right now, he is okay, but I think in a few years he'll turn into a very good prof.

Greiner is a fun and warm professor. He is very excited and that makes class fun - he will be a much better professor a few years from now when he's had more practice explaining concepts and organizing and expressing his thoughts and the reading. Until then, Glannon will need to be your best friend.
COURSE: Civil Procedure 3
PROFESSOR: Professor William Rubenstein
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 81
RESPONSES: 24

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 54.2% (Reasonable)
C. 45.8% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 52.2% (Average)
C. 47.8% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 95.8% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 4.2000003% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 12.5% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 87.5% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 4.2000003% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 45.8% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 37.5% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 4.2000003% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 79.200005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 4.2000003% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 29.2% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 54.2% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 62.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 29.2% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 8.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 29.2% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 12.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 8.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 29.2% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 20.8% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 29.2% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 95.8% (Yes)
B. 4.2% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic professor - definitely take a class with him if you can. Feel lucky if you are a 1L assigned to his Civ Pro course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot recommend Professor Rubenstein highly enough. His teaching was engaging, brought otherwise dry material to life, and helped us all think deeper about the rationale behind the FRCP and the American civil litigation system in general. I was dreading Civ Pro and it instead was my favorite course by far. In addition to being a fabulous teacher, Professor Rubenstein is also consistently inspiring and hilarious -- think civil procedure with a hint of Steven Colbert. Professor Rubenstein's experience as a practitioner for 10 years informed his teaching, and I found this especially helpful in a practice-oriented subject. I will definitely be taking future courses with Prof Rubenstein. HLS made a wise choice in luring him here from sunny California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubenstein is one of the best teachers I've ever had and one of the funniest/smarest people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I've ever met.

Professor Rubenstein is one of the most talented, engaging professors I have had. It's too bad that he's not teaching all of our courses!

He was great, but the exam was impossible! Don't take his word for it that if you look at old exams you will be fine. You need to know everything, including things/cases he didn't really focus on in class.

n/r

The exam was rather intimidating. The class, though, is great. Rubenstein is an amazing instructor.

Professor Rubenstein is amazing. This was my favorite class!

Prof. Rubenstein was, hands down, our section's best professor this semester. Not only is he wickedly, sarcastically entertaining, smart, engaging, and grounded in a decent, moral conception of the law, but he excelled at teaching the black letter law we would need to know in the most efficient, effective manner possible. A model teacher.

n/r

He's an amazing lecturer. You won't be disappointed.

n/r

Exam came out of no where - not at all like past exams, and COMPLETELY different from practice question given midway through term.

Fantastic professor. By far our best this semester. Extremely organized and knowledgeable about the material. Clearly explains material and answers complicated student questions. Exam was a bit more tricky than expected. Make sure to study everything in the course, including the stuff that was only covered for part of a day and didn't seem important. He didn't test alot of the big stuff and part of the exam focused on some things we weren't really prepared for.

Prof Rubenstein was by far the favorite professor in his course and I will take another course he teaches just to have him again. There are no classes you need to take before it and the course is engaging.

Prof. Rubenstein is amazing. Class at 830 am is no problem and everyone is focused. He was a dynamite addition to the faculty.

Fantastic professor and elucidating style of teaching.

Rubenstein is a terrific professor. He always takes time at the beginning of class to orient us to where we are in the syllabus and how different topics relate to each other. He brings concepts together more than in any other class. He's also great about making students' comments sound smarter than they were and always being encouraging.

Professor Rubenstein is amazing; clear, organized, witty, cares about students. Who'd have thought that an 8:30 class on procedure would be everyone's favorite class?

Rubenstein is fantastic; Clear, organized, and funny. He obviously cares deeply about teaching and it shows.
COURSE: Civil Procedure 4
PROFESSOR: Professor Christine Desan
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 81
RESPONSES: 26

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 11.5% (Reasonable)
C. 69.200005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 19.2% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 28.0% (Average)
C. 64.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 8.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 92.3% (Panel)
B. 7.7000003% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 80.8% (Clear about content)
B. 3.8% (Unclear about content)
C. 73.1% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 38.5% (Practical)
H. 69.200005% (Theoretical)
I. 80.8% (Engaging)
J. 3.8% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 84.6% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 7.7000003% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 84.6% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 76.9% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 3.8% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 84.6% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 7.7000003% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 53.8% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 3.8% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 65.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 76.9% (Available during office hours)
C. 73.1% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 15.400001% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 23.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 46.2% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 11.5% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 19.2% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 92.3% (Yes)
B. 7.7000003% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor Desan summarizes the previous class at the beginning of each day. Take careful note of those summaries! Careful lecture notes are a MUST for the exam; careful reading is a must to get by when on panel. The course will seem a bit disorienting at the beginning, but by the end she does a wonderful job of tying together all the parts of the system.
Really excellent professor, brilliant, interesting, cares about the students/teaching and just exceptionally nice!

Great teacher, boring material and a bit too much reading

She does a nice job with inherently boring material!

A substantial amount of time was spent learning the technical aspects of the rules of procedure, and practicing their use, but these elements were hardly tested on the exam. As someone who mostly studied in proportion to what was discussed in class, I didn't feel the exam gave me a full opportunity to demonstrate the type and amount of material I had mastered.

Desan was my favorite professor this semester. She is an excellent teacher!

Prof. Desan was well-prepared for class and always seemingly enthusiastic about the material. She had a good sense of humor and got along well with the students. Nonetheless, I did not enjoy the class. This is surely in large part because of the material. Probably even the best teacher would have trouble making civil procedure exciting. But, beyond this, I think I myself had some kind of intellectual disconnect with Prof. Desan that made it difficult for me to follow her. It may just be a matter of personal style, but I found that her preferred ways of putting things often made them more obscure than they needed to be. This made it extremely difficult, somehow, to keep my attention fixed on the class discussion. Also, Prof. Desan still needs to cut down on the readings she assigns in light of the fact that 1Ls are now taking 4.5 courses per semester rather than 3.5. Less material, explored in greater depth with greater clarity---that's what this course most needs.
COURSE: Civil Procedure 5
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Amanda Tyler
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 17

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 58.8% (Reasonable)
C. 35.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 5.9% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 29.4% (Average)
C. 70.6% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 88.2% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 11.8% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 88.2% (Clear about expectations)
D. 5.9% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 82.4% (Practical)
H. 17.6% (Theoretical)
I. 88.2% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 94.1% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 29.4% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 35.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 5.9% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 76.5% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
**Class time (check all that apply)**
- A. 94.1% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
- B. 5.9% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
- C. 52.9% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
- D. 17.6% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

**Instructor availability (check all that apply)**
- A. 76.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
- B. 82.4% (Available during office hours)
- C. 82.4% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
- D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
- E. 17.6% (No basis for judgment)

**Exam (choose one)**
- A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
- B. 35.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
- C. 35.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
- D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
- E. 29.4% (I have not yet taken the exam)
- F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

**All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)**
- A. 100.0% (Yes)
- B. 0.0% (No)

**Your year/program in school (choose one)**
- A. 94.1% (1L)
- B. 0.0% (2L)
- C. 0.0% (3L)
- D. 5.9% (LLM)
- E. 0.0% (SJD)

**Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This class was great because Professor Tyler is a phenomenally talented professor. I very sincerely hope that she gets a permanent job at Harvard, not just because she deserves it, but because I would love to have her as a professor again.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic Professor, wish she was here full time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tyler is absolutely fantastic. I loved her and would be so lucky as to have a professor like her teach all of my classes. HLS should hire her!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exam not that difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Tyler is demanding, but awesome!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler was fantastic, and she made Civil Procedure come alive! I felt that her exam was also</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46
the most comprehensive, yet representative one of all our classes. My only criticism is that the syllabus would frequently be updated on the course webpage without students' knowledge. Other than this minor inconvenience, I have to say that this was a fantastic class!

n/a

Exam did not cover all of the material. It was very focused on a few topics and did touch major concepts. Very well organized and focused use of class time.

n/r

Professor Tyler is one of the best professors at Harvard Law School. She genuinely cares about her students and truly wants them to learn. She is demanding, but not overly so. She is fair-minded, enthusiastic, extremely intelligent, and makes the class one that students want to attend. If she is offered a permanent position, I will eagerly take more courses from her. If she is not offered a permanent position, it will truly be Harvard's loss (and a significant one at that).

Amanda Tyler is great. She made civil procedure (a seemingly boring class) actually very interesting. I would highly recommend it.

Professor Tyler is amazing. She seems to know everything and truly makes civil procedure come alive. She honestly believes that procedure influences substance & her passion for the subject is very welcome for a traditionally 'dull' first-year class.
COURSE: Civil Procedure 6
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Amanda Frost
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 79
RESPONSES: 24

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 45.8% (Reasonable)
C. 45.8% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 8.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 54.2% (Average)
C. 45.8% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 62.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 37.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 95.8% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 87.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 91.700005% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 91.700005% (Practical)
H. 25.0% (Theoretical)
I. 87.5% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 91.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 41.7% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 20.800001% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 4.2000003% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 79.200005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 95.8% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 8.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 43.5% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 17.4% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 62.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 70.8% (Available during office hours)
C. 79.200005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 16.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 16.7% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 8.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 54.2% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 20.800001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| I felt really lucky to study civ. pro. with Prof. Frost. She was always engaging in class & approachable outside of class. I also really appreciated the way she responded to midterm evaluations & student comments. |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |

Fantastic instructor, great use of hypotheticals, exam exactly as expected.
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
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Professor is GREAT.

Very good and well organized class. Civ pro is not a particularly interesting topic, but I was never really bored in this class and think it was taught very effectively.

Frost was visiting. We would be lucky to have her permanently. I highly recommend her to anyone looking for an accessible, engaging, and stimulating professor.

good class

Professor Frost is great. I didn't feel this way at the beginning of the semester, when I thought she was too exacting, too challenging, too unforgiving in her use of the Socratic Method and her endlessly long reading assignments. Now that I've gotten used to the (fast) pace of the course and law school in general, I've grown to understand that she is the kind of professor that ultimately helps students learn and understand the most. She's awesome.
COURSE: Civil Procedure 7
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Bradford Clark
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 79
RESPONSES: 13

Workload
A. 15.400001% (Light)
B. 84.6% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 84.6% (Average)
C. 15.400001% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 76.9% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 23.1% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 76.9% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 92.3% (Organized)
F. 7.7000003% (Disorganized)
G. 92.3% (Practical)
H. 7.7000003% (Theoretical)
I. 92.3% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 92.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 53.8% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 7.7000003% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 7.7000003% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 69.200005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 7.7000003% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 92.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 15.400001% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 7.7000003% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 15.400001% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 61.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 61.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 53.8% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 38.5% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 7.7000003% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 76.9% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 15.400001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It's Civ Pro, so not the most riveting class, but Prof. Clark did a good job of making it interesting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Clark was easy to understand, responsive to questions, and engaging with a good sense of humor. He did call on people but was friendly and easygoing. I found him easy to talk to in office hours, and he was willing to give advice on choosing electives even though that wasn't relevant to the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The teacher is absolutely amazing. He's very funny and witty and friendly.
| n/r | n/r | NA | n/r |
COURSE: Commercial Law: Secured Transactions A
PROFESSOR: Professor Andrew L. Kaufman
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 92
RESPONSES: 8

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 75.0% (Reasonable)
C. 12.5% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 12.5% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 50.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 37.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 62.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 37.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 25.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 62.5% (Organized)
F. 12.5% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 37.5% (Theoretical)
I. 25.0% (Engaging)
J. 62.5% (Boring)
K. 37.5% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 62.5% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 12.5% (Does not use the reading)
N. 25.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 25.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 12.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 12.5% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 12.5% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 62.5% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 42.9% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 28.6% (Available during office hours)
C. 71.4% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 14.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 12.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 37.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 12.5% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 37.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 85.700005% (Yes)
B. 14.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The textbook for this class was very clear and well-organized. To prepare for each class, we read one assignment from the book (approximately 15 pages) and then in class, we discussed the questions at the end of the assignment. The subject matter is difficult but the reading was relatively light, so it was easy to keep up. Professor Kaufman calls on people randomly, but allows students to pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman can be really confusing. Do the problem sets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recommend the course, but not necessarily the professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professor can be hard to follow, and don’t expect him to talk about more than 3-4 cases during the term, but if you do the problem sets before class (work them out, really think about them) you’ll do just fine in class and on the final.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/r
COURSE: Comparative Constitutional Law and Politics
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Ran Hirschl
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 32
RESPONSES: 6

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 16.7% (Easy)
B. 66.700005% (Average)
C. 16.7% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 33.3% (Volunteers only)
E. 66.700005% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 83.3% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 16.7% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 66.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 16.7% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 16.7% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This class is really interesting and so much more realistic and fascinating than any other law school class I have taken. However, it really should have been more than 2 credit hours and it is a lot of work for just 2 credits. I don't regret it because I liked it so much, but I wish I could have gotten another 1 or 2 credits out of what I put into it.

This class is not too in-depth but is an amazing introduction/survey course to comparative con law. Highly recommended.

n/r
COURSE: Comparative Corporate Law: Governance in the U.S. and Western Europe: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Reinier H. Kraakman and Visiting Professor Peter Mulbert
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 13
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 100.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% ( Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor - Professor Reinier H. Kraakman (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Visiting Professor Peter Mulbert (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 100.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 100.0% (Boring)
K. 100.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 100.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 100.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 100.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability - Professor Reinier H. Kraakman (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Visiting Professor Peter Mulbert (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 100.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
COURSE: Comparative Law: Globalization of Law in Historical Perspective: 1850-2000
PROFESSOR: Professor Duncan Kennedy
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 40
RESPONSES: 5

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 60.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 40.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 80.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 20.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 20.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 80.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 80.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 40.0% (Organized)
F. 20.0% (Disorganized)
G. 20.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 60.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 80.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 40.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 40.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 20.0% (2L)
C. 40.0% (3L)
D. 40.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Awesome class. Kennedy is a fantastic and engaging teacher, inspiring and approachable. The class is basically an exploration of his theory on how law globalized so it is largely about his own interpretation of a particular phenomenon. Although it is theory-based, it is supplemented with lots of case studies from different countries, so that theory is 'brought to the ground' and its practical consequences are made clear. The reading is out of control. There's tons of it, but it's not crucial to do all of it as long as you read the key works (which he highlights in class) and take good notes in class. Class attendance and good note-taking is key. Also, the exam is a last day of class take home so you have some time to do targeted reading if need be. This is by far the best class I've taken in law school, I'd highly recommend it.

Possibly my favourite course in three years of law school. Mind-expanding and deeply, profoundly, exceptionally educational.

n/r

This was by far the most amazing course I have ever taken! Prof. Duncan Kennedy is without doubt a super genius. He is able to engage in a discussion and analyse an issue not only from
the perspective of law, but also history, economics, politics and sociology. Since the course touches almost all aspects of law (international law, family, contract, tort law, contracts, constitutional law) it would be advisable to have some background in these subjects. If you are interested in history, in the evolution of law or simply to understand the world that we live in today and why and how we think what we think today, please do not leave HLS without taking this course! Simply an amazing experience! If I had to mention one downside of the course, it would be that Prof. Kennedy is not very organised with the time he takes in addressing issues, as a result of which we get behind schedule and then have to rush in some classes to catch up! But thats a minor hiccup.

Professor Kennedy is a brilliant and engaging teacher. This course is a very interesting survey of the evolution of legal thought throughout history. Students will find it very informative.
COURSE: Congress and the Courts: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Amanda Frost
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 11
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/buils usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
PROFESSOR: Professor Gerald Neuman
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 14
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 50.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 100.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 50.0% (Organized)
F. 50.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 50.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 50.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
n/r
COURSE: Constitutional Law: First Amendment A1
PROFESSOR: Professor Charles Fried
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 93
RESPONSES: 9

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 11.1% (Reasonable)
C. 66.700005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 22.2% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 44.4% (Average)
C. 44.4% (More challenging than average)
D. 11.1% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 55.600002% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 44.4% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 55.600002% (Clear about content)
B. 22.2% (Unclear about content)
C. 44.4% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 55.600002% (Organized)
F. 11.1% (Disorganized)
G. 11.1% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 77.8% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 88.9% (Adds meaningfully to/bulds usefully on the reading)
M. 11.1% (Does not use the reading)
N. 33.3% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 55.600002% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 55.600002% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 88.9% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 22.2% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 88.9% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 11.1% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.7% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 11.1% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 44.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 55.6% (Available during office hours)
C. 44.4% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 44.4% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 11.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 11.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 77.8% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 88.9% (Yes)
B. 11.1% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 88.9% (2L)
C. 11.1% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professor Fried has a tendency to ramble and to go off on theoretical tangents, but he knows the material backwards and forwards and is an expert at making connections between seemingly disparate doctrines.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Great class; the class itself is very useful & fun to attend.

Excellent class! Material is interesting, casebook is very dense but easily readable, Fried is intellectually fun. He also has lots of great stories since he was involved in litigating a number of the cases in the casebook, and he likes to talk about the nuances and personalities behind the written opinions. Keep an ear out for what he says about the Justices (which Justices think what and why) throughout the term - that will help you keep all the law and theory straight.

This is the second Fried class that I've taken, and he's much better at this than contracts.
Some people find him offensive, but I find him utterly entertaining. And he has a very theatrical presence that give you this great "yes, I am taking a class at Harvard" feeling.

n/r
COURSE: Constitutional Law: Separation of Powers, Federalism, and Fourteenth Amendment

PROFESSOR: Professor Martha Field

SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 61

RESPONSES: 9

Workload
A. 11.1% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 22.2% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 88.9% (Average)
C. 11.1% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 22.2% (Clear about content)
B. 66.700005% (Unclear about content)
C. 33.3% (Clear about expectations)
D. 33.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 88.9% (Disorganized)
G. 22.2% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 33.3% (Engaging)
J. 33.3% (Boring)
K. 22.2% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 44.4% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 22.2% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 11.1% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 66.700005% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 88.9% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 11.1% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 55.600002% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 44.4% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 55.600002% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 44.4% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 11.1% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 44.4% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 11.1% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 22.2% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 11.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 11.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 33.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 33.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 11.1% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 88.9% (Yes)
B. 11.1% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would take Field rather than no Con Law, but she is not very good. She is very nice, but her class consists of going straight through the casebook and commenting on cases in the book seemingly at random.

I found it helpful to take notes directly from the reading because the book was well organized, clear, infused with policy, and relatively easy to understand. I simply supplemented my reading notes with comments from Prof. Field, which is useful because she sometimes asks for you to agree with/disagree with her opinion on the exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professor Field is incredibly knowledgeable and insightful, but is noticeably disorganized and at times unclear. I really enjoyed her class, but I know some students would have preferred a
more structured, clearer presentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you are particularly interested in constitutional issues revolving around discrimination, this would be an ok class to take. My primary frustrations were how disorganized the lectures were and the professor's disinterest in subject areas outside of her immediate areas of interest/research.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

COURSE: Constitutional Law: Separation of Powers, Federalism, and Fourteenth Amendment

PROFESSOR: Professor Richard Parker

SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 108
RESPONSES: 16

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 81.3% (Reasonable)
C. 18.800001% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 75.0% (Average)
C. 25.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 6.3% (Panel)
B. 56.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 12.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 25.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 18.800001% (Clear about expectations)
D. 37.5% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 43.8% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 25.0% (Practical)
H. 75.0% (Theoretical)
I. 62.5% (Engaging)
J. 12.5% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 68.8% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 12.5% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 81.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 87.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 25.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 75.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 6.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 73.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 20.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 25.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 25.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 56.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 50.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 12.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 6.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 31.300001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 68.8% (Yes)
B. 31.300001% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 81.3% (2L)
C. 12.5% (3L)
D. 6.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Professor Parker provided a different 'twist' to learning American Constitutional Law. His focus is not on 'doctrines' or 'tests' which can be applied in a given factual circumstance, but is on the nature and evolution of constitutional argument. I found this approach helpful as it provided a different lens through which constitutional law can be looked at. It was refreshing! I would however have liked it better if there was also some focus on 'doctrines' and 'tests'. All in all, I would rate Professor Parker's course highly.

Professor Parker has a distinctive take on conlaw, and it comes through in his lectures. Some students seemed to caricature his approach, but I found it valuable. I did learn a little less doctrine than I expected to (perhaps there is less to learn than I thought), but that owed partly to the division of the conlaw course. I recommend the class.

I would recommend this only for people really interested in Constitutional law on a theoretical or academic level. Anyone looking to learn blackletter Constitutional law should look elsewhere - that is not the focus of this course.

n/r
Take this class if and ONLY if:  1) You believe that constitutional law should not be something above and better than ordinary politics, but rather should be closely tied to popular opinion. You want to hear this view reinforced, and other views ridiculed, in every lecture.  2) You dislike judges because they are self-important and grandiloquent. You think jokes on this topic are very funny, especially when delivered without any hint of irony by someone who is also self-important and grandiloquent.  3) You like class discussion dominated by a few gunners, because the professor implicitly discourages other students’ comments with prompts like, “This court's reasoning would get a D in a con law class. Would anyone like to defend it?”  4) You love Richard Parker.

Parker is a great teacher, but his views are unique. You'll never look at the Constitution the same way again.

enthusiastic teacher; inspiring course

This is an excellent class, and a great take on ConLaw. The focus is NOT learning the doctrine carefully, however, but rather placing the doctrine in the context of a story about the development of ConLaw. I think that's the better option, because you can always learn the Equal Protection Strict Scrutiny test from a hornbook -- this is a one-time opportunity to get a richer picture.

I had heard that this class was good because you learn the doctrine, but also go beyond that. However, I was disappointed because I didn't think we learned the doctrine solidly enough. Instead, Parker claims there really is no solid doctrine. The class focused on how to make constitutional arguments by playing off of common "fears" and how to read cases to uncover these fears. It also focused on Parker's ideas about populism. I thought the historical readings and background were interesting, and thought talking a bit about politics was interesting, but would have liked more solid lessons on doctrine.

Professor Parker would be great for a seminar, but his teaching style doesn't really work well in a huge lecture class. He's obviously incredibly brilliant, but he does have some trouble making his higher-level ideas about constitutional law clear and digestible for students.
COURSE: Constitutional Law: Separation of Powers, Federalism, and Fourteenth Amendment
PROFESSOR: Professor Daryl Levinson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007
CLASS SIZE: 118
RESPONSES: 20

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 40.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 10.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 65.0% (Average)
C. 35.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 90.0% (Clear about content)
B. 10.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 55.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 15.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 90.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 40.0% (Practical)
H. 80.0% (Theoretical)
I. 90.0% (Engaging)
J. 10.0% (Boring)
K. 25.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 75.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 10.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 80.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 15.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 90.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 85.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 5.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 70.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 35.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 40.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 35.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 5.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 40.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 10.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 15.8% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 63.2% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 95.0% (Yes)
B. 5.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 90.0% (2L)
C. 10.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levinson is my favorite professor I have ever had. I hope to take more classes from him while I am here. Do whatever it takes to take his course!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Levinson has a really great sense of humor, really smart guy. It was a pleasure to take this class - I felt like I was constantly entertained. I think very few people would regret ranking this as top choice for con law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best lecturer I have ever had! This class was wonderful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students should know that this class is very theory heavy. In contrast to what I've heard about Tribe, who connects doctrine together in neat ways, Levinson's ultimately arguing that every doctrine is incoherent, which is a little dissatisfying. Still, he was engaging and entertaining day in and day out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Levinson is fantastic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prof. Levinson is simply fantastic -- and this is coming from someone who might very well have skipped con law entirely. The wait list is not a mistake. He is clear, interesting and a pleasure to listen to. His self-deprecation is refreshing and hilarious. He also manages the look-at-me-I'm-so-brilliant types so well that you forget they are there. In fact, they probably don't like the class because he sticks to awesome lectures and gives the gunners almost no opportunities to elicit groans from the rest of us. I would take anything with Levinson.

Reading is heavy and could be better edited. Unfortunately, class time is 99% lecture. Luckily though, Prof. Levinson is highly entertaining, funny, and very likable.

Levinson is great. He had a ton of hype to live up to, and I think he almost did. Lecture was interesting and everyone could follow it almost completely without having done the reading (which was really overwhelming in quantity if you read it before hearing lecture and knowing what parts were important -- maybe that's an aspect of all conlaw classes). He doesn't really lead discussion well -- he asks the group easy basic questions that no one wants to look silly by raising their hand and answering. In terms of answering questions, he seemed most enthusiastic about hearing esoteric academic questions about material outside of what we read, so the only people asking questions in lecture were clueless LLM's and law review gunners asking about something no one else had ever heard of. Q&A was the only time in the class when you'd see everyone not on law review checking their email; otherwise everyone really enjoyed lecture. He hid the ball quite a bit with the exam -- he doesn't let the registrar post his old exams and several times sorta publicly mocked the idea of wanting to look at old exams as if that would make us big dorks. We ended up not really knowing what we'd be tested on. He focuses in lecture on larger ideas and approaches -- big picture Constitutional structure and big picture interpretative views. Great stuff. But the exam ended up dealing somewhat with doctrinal stuff from the readings ("is this a valid equal protection violation claim?"). Not a reason not to take the class, but just something that caused stress for those who didn't do the reading. But maybe those folks deserve it as the reading was really great. It was the best class I took this semester by far.

There is a lot of theoretical law review reading that is in the assignments, and this can make the reading quite tedious and exceedingly long. While it could add to your overall perspective, it does also add about an hour per assignment on average if you actually read the whole law review articles. Levinson is a straight shooter lecturer. He speaks quite fast, so consider trying to record the lectures. He doesn't do much as far as doctrinal stuff goes, and most of what you need to know if you actually want to litigate a case, for example, you will definitely not learn in class. On the other hand, he is entertaining and engaging in class. He is relatively funny, as far as law professors go. He does have a tendency to make things more complicated than they need to be. Finally, he will tell you that none of the court's decisions really make any sense and that he can't understand them. He doesn't have some coherent vision of the constitution that is all encompassing and brilliant, but he is pretty good at critiquing decisions. This can be entertaining, but overall leaves you frustrated and dejected about constitutional law.

Fantastic! Best professor in school.
COURSE: Contemporary Issues in Law and Politics: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Nathaniel Persily
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 9
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 100.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

a fun and engaging reading group with an enthusiastic, knowledgeable prof. would love to have him as full-time faculty! reading was a bit heavy for a 1 credit class but very easily skim-able
COURSE: Contracts 1
PROFESSOR: Professor Scott Brewer
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 81
RESPONSES: 22

Workload
A. 13.6% (Light)
B. 72.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 9.1% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 4.5% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 77.3% (Average)
C. 22.7% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 81.8% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 18.2% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 4.5% (Clear about content)
B. 86.4% (Unclear about content)
C. 18.2% (Clear about expectations)
D. 68.200005% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 4.5% (Organized)
F. 77.3% (Disorganized)
G. 4.5% (Practical)
H. 86.4% (Theoretical)
I. 9.1% (Engaging)
J. 50.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 13.6% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 59.100002% (Does not use the reading)
N. 4.5% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 27.300001% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 77.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 9.1% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 45.5% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 50.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 22.7% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 68.200005% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 19.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 76.200005% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 38.100002% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 9.5% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 38.100002% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 47.600002% (Available during office hours)
C. 28.6% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 4.8% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 47.600002% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 18.2% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 9.1% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 36.4% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 27.300001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 22.7% (Yes)
B. 77.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|Very scattered class, very concerned with logic, doesn't teach in a way that works for most students.|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|n/r|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|This professor should not be allowed to teach 1Ls, and should not be teaching a course that is so fundamental to law school in a way that has no material bearing on the subject matter.|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|n/r|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|n/r|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|n/r|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|While the professor was often difficult to work with, he has an honest interest in instructing students and offers a valuable enough tool (understanding law as a function of pure logical analysis) that it's worth taking a class from him. But doing it twice is probably overkill. I'd consider what others have to say about Evidence if you have a choice. Oh wait, you're a 1L - you don't.|
|______________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________|
|don't take brewer|

83
this is just a terrible class. get a good outline and follow it, don't expect to learn anything about contracts.

I wish I had known in advance that we would be covering the last 1/3 of the syllabus in the final week of classes--I would have bought a horn book much earlier and just taught that material to myself. (which I ended up doing anyway--I just had less time to do it)

This class was poorly taught, and highly disorganized. Brewer mentioned at one point that he tried to keep all of the material from the 5 credit course in the 4 credit version. He is not respectful of students. We had not yet gotten to breach and damages with only two weeks remaining in the semester, but he didn't really cut back on the reading, so we had about twice as much reading per class at the very end of the course as we had for the first 3/4 of the course.

Sitting through Brewer's class is basically the equivalent of hell on earth, and his exam basically felt like a big "fuck you" to the class for not paying attention to a word he said during the last few weeks. He is rude, only cares about promoting his own views, and really just has no clue how to teach.

We covered the final 1/3 of the syllabus in the last 2 weeks of the class, including 35 minutes total on Damages. We spent 2 weeks learning formal symbolic logic. This was the single worst-taught class I've taken since 6th grade, and the teacher for that class was fired the following year. Unfortunately, tenure can not be retroactively revoked. There is simply no excuse that the HLS administration continue subjecting 1Ls to the egregious incompetence and incoherence that Prof. Brewer provides. If the school must insist on letting him continue to teach, it could at least restrict him to small upper-level seminars where only a small number of students would voluntarily subject themselves to rambling lessons in formal logic and Latin. To any future 1Ls who find themselves assigned to a Brewer-taught sections: I suggest you immediately find a reason to convince the administration to transfer you into a different section.
COURSE: Contracts 3
PROFESSOR: Professor Robert Mnookin
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 83
RESPONSES: 20

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 20.0% (Reasonable)
C. 55.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 25.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 5.0% (Easy)
B. 75.0% (Average)
C. 20.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 60.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 40.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 65.0% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 65.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 20.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 50.0% (Organized)
F. 45.0% (Disorganized)
G. 65.0% (Practical)
H. 10.0% (Theoretical)
I. 30.0% (Engaging)
J. 40.0% (Boring)
K. 70.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 10.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 55.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 15.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 10.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 35.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 75.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 15.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 15.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 36.8% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 57.9% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 26.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 21.1% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 20.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 10.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 70.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 35.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 15.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 25.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 65.0% (Yes)
B. 35.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Talk a lot early in the course, and you can basically get away with not being called on again.

Profs were supposed to reduce the workload for their 1L courses this year; judging by outlines from previous years, Mnookin seemed to ADD readings, not reduce them. Overall, Mnookin seemed more focused on intimidating students by asking them about irrelevant and immaterial facts rather than teaching contract law. Often, students would give correct answers and Mnookin would yell "NO!" and proceed to give an incorrect account of the facts.

Contracts is not exactly thrilling material, but the syllabus from this course lacked any shred of imagination. We plowed straight through the book and there was little added value to classroom sessions. Furthermore, the exam format -- a long essay question with a long, complicated contract to interpret -- was not closely related to the skills we developed in the class. There was little "practice" at working up these skills because we basically just recited cases and facts without really applying them. There was undue emphasis on nitty-gritty facts and specifics and we often lost the forest for the trees in the classroom. The UCC was covered the very last day.
of class in a semi-cohesive way and it was in turn an important part of the exam. In this course, I read the book and figured it out myself. The classroom time was, on the whole, a disappointment, though there were some good days. I liked Professor Mnookin, but I hated his class.

Professor Mnookin is well-intentioned, but he is not on top of his game. He demands that we "know the facts," but often he gets fundamental facts wrong. He also calls on the same 5-6 people constantly without realizing it. The class would be improved if he required that we read the U.C.C. and Restatement instead of forcing us to cram it in during finals studying.

Some of us disliked Mnookin at the start because he seemed to be a bully -- he was the most "socratic" of all our section's teachers. But as time went on, we realized that there was no malice in his approach, and he was in fact perhaps partially senile. By the end, we found him charming like a slightly erratic, charming, belligerent uncle.

Read the supplement throughout the course- annotate UCC and restatement as you go

Class discussion was definitely not worth the time. Reading was very reasonable, even light at times, at the beginning. But, it got heavier as the semester went on. After Thanksgiving, it got really heavy (sometimes as much as 70-100 pages split between casebook reading and relevant articles). Exam was also much less clear than expected.

Prof Mnookin knows the material well, but doesn't seem to know or care who he calls on, so a couple students got called on often and others never were called on.

Prof. Mnookin has great days and days where class doesn't move with the same decisive force and he seems to not have a great grasp on what he wants to do or what he wants to focus on.

Mnookin is very aggressive in his questioning. He has no qualms about yelling "WRONG" when a student doesn't give the answer he expected. He often has trouble understanding a student's response if it's not exactly what he expected, and he often has trouble with student questions. He has high expectations of the class (giving the answer in his head all the time) and gets aggravated if the class moves more slowly than he'd like. He did not bring together disparate concepts as much as I would have liked.
COURSE: Contracts 5
PROFESSOR: Professor Gerald E. Frug
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 79
RESPONSES: 16

Workload
A. 6.3% (Light)
B. 43.8% (Reasonable)
C. 31.300001% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 18.800001% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 93.8% (Average)
C. 6.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 6.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 12.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 56.3% (Volunteers only)
E. 25.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 37.5% (Unclear about content)
C. 43.8% (Clear about expectations)
D. 25.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 37.5% (Organized)
F. 37.5% (Disorganized)
G. 37.5% (Practical)
H. 37.5% (Theoretical)
I. 56.3% (Engaging)
J. 18.800001% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 43.8% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 37.5% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 25.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 12.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 68.8% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 6.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 87.5% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 18.800001% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 37.5% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 18.8% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 62.5% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 12.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 18.8% (Available during office hours)
C. 6.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 6.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 68.8% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 18.8% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 31.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 6.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 18.8% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 81.3% (Yes)
B. 18.8% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

I've heard that Professor Frug is a great local government law teacher, and while I respect his teaching style in that he really wanted us to always see both sides of an issue and not tell us what was right or wrong, I was extremely disappointed and frustrated with his teaching of this course. I regret to say that I have rarely had a professor that I felt like frankly did not teach us the material the way Professor Frug failed to teach us the material. I left the class feeling like I had to teach contracts to myself, and that Professor Frug was neither interested in the material nor invested in us learning it. He assigned more reading than any of other professors, yet we did not explore or probe the material effectively in class. Though I did my best to learn as much as I could, discuss with other students, and look at commercial aids, I feel that my (and the rest of section 5's) understanding of contracts is most likely deficient compared to most other Harvard law students.
Frug is brilliant!!! He is engaging, knowledgeable, and quite entertaining. He helped make Contracts my favorite class this semester, and I appreciate the way he challenged us to argue both sides of every issue. I highly recommend this class and this instructor!

Professor Frug is engaging, humorous, and seems happy. He makes class lively, however he often leaves students a bit confused. His intentions are to help students see the complexities in contract law, and to be able to see an issue equally clearly from both sides. However in focusing so much on the complexities and the equality of the two sides of each issue, a student often leaves class wondering whether there is any certainty at all to be found in a given situation.

Really liked the class. Frug is great.
COURSE: Contracts 7
PROFESSOR: Professor Todd D. Rakoff
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 82
RESPONSES: 11

Workload
A. 9.1% (Light)
B. 27.3% (Reasonable)
C. 63.6% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 9.1% (Easy)
B. 54.5% (Average)
C. 36.4% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 36.4% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 27.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 9.1% (Volunteers only)
E. 27.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 81.8% (Clear about content)
B. 18.2% (Unclear about content)
C. 63.6% (Clear about expectations)
D. 18.2% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 63.6% (Practical)
H. 81.8% (Theoretical)
I. 72.7% (Engaging)
J. 9.1% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 90.9% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 27.3% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 81.8% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 18.2% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 63.600002% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 18.2% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 81.8% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 72.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 54.5% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 18.2% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 27.300001% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 54.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 9.1% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 90.9% (Yes)
B. 9.1% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- likes to keep students after class time is up.
- You always walked out knowing a lot more about contracts after class.
- Even though there is a lot of reading, the exam and the class discussion require that you always keep up and keep detailed notes on all the readings.
- Class started with Rakoff calling on someone to discuss a case, but would then turn into discussions about the reading, the cases, and our own views. It was usually engaging, and probably would have been more so had it not been at 8:30 am.
- None
Wonderful instructor - Rakoff rocks. He is both very knowledgeable and friendly, a great combination. Sometimes it would be helpful for students at the back if he spoke louder.
Workload
A. 10.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 30.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 10.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 70.0% (Average)
C. 30.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 90.0% (Panel)
B. 10.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 60.0% (Clear about content)
B. 30.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 10.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 60.0% (Organized)
F. 30.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 40.0% (Theoretical)
I. 60.0% (Engaging)
J. 40.0% (Boring)
K. 20.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 30.0% (Adds meaningfully to/buils usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 40.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 30.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 10.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 40.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 10.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 80.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 10.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 60.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 40.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 80.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 10.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 10.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 30.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 10.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 10.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 70.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 10.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 60.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Yes)
B. 50.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 70.0% (2L)
C. 30.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great class. Prof. Samuelson knows absolutely everything there is to know about copyright and is eager to share the knowledge. Nice lady. She sometimes mumbles and can be a little boring at times in lecture, but the lectures are very well-organized and will come in handy for the exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class did not spend much time fruitful discussion of some of the really interesting issues underlying copyright law. Instead, we just read all the big cases, not even spending much time dissecting the opinions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Copyright Reform: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Pamela Samuelson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 10
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Corporate Governance Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Professor Lucian Bebchuk
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 12
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 100.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 100.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 100.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 100.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
**Class time (check all that apply)**
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

**Instructor availability (check all that apply)**
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

**Exam (choose one)**
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

**All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)**
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

**Your year/program in school (choose one)**
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

**Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)**

Professor Bebchuk is an extremely smart person and very kind and thoughtful in class. Classes are an open-ended discussion of the week's assigned article. Bebchuk does not control the flow of the discussion nearly as much as I would like; what is discussed is largely dictated by what the more vocal students were interested in. The class is very interesting for people interested in corporate government but could be considerably improved with more direction -- such as a list of discussion questions assigned along with each article that would be discussed during class time.
COURSE: Corporations A1
PROFESSOR: Professor Reiner H. Kraakman
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 106
RESPONSES: 18

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 77.8% (Reasonable)
C. 16.7% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 5.6% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 61.100002% (Average)
C. 38.9% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 61.100002% (Clear about content)
B. 22.2% (Unclear about content)
C. 44.4% (Clear about expectations)
D. 27.800001% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 77.8% (Organized)
F. 11.1% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 27.800001% (Theoretical)
I. 22.2% (Engaging)
J. 38.9% (Boring)
K. 55.600002% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 22.2% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 38.9% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 11.1% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 22.2% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 88.9% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 11.1% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 37.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 43.8% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 68.8% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 31.300001% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 29.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 29.4% (Available during office hours)
C. 23.5% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 58.8% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 11.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 5.6% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 44.4% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 22.2% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 16.7% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 61.100002% (Yes)
B. 38.9% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This class seemed easy at first -- it seemed like all the rules were very straightforward, and the professor seemed to repeat in class what was in the book so it was easy to follow. However, as the exam approached, it started to seem like what we'd done in class hadn't really prepared us for the exam. Practice exams seemed especially hard given what we'd covered in class. The exam material wasn't totally unrelated, but I was just surprised that the exams (practice exams and the real final) weren't easier given how straightforward the class seemed at first. Although the exam reflected the reading and class discussion, it was very difficult and demanding for a 3 hour in-class exam.

I would take the course again but with a different instructor.
| Instructor uses powerpoint slides for lecture material (which are available afterwards) |
| The coursebook is good, but Prof. Subramanian is working with the same book. |
| n/r |
| This course is a good basic introduction to corporations. It is not particularly engaging - and the readings/lectures/slides are essentially identical - but it is worthwhile and the professor is friendly and organized. |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| n/r |
COURSE: Corporations A2
PROFESSOR: Professor J. Mark Ramseyer
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 108
RESPONSES: 15

Workload
A. 20.0% (Light)
B. 73.3% (Reasonable)
C. 6.7000003% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 26.7% (Easy)
B. 73.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 40.0% (Panel)
B. 60.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 93.3% (Clear about content)
B. 6.7000003% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.70005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 20.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 6.7000003% (Theoretical)
I. 53.3% (Engaging)
J. 20.0% (Boring)
K. 46.7% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 26.7% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 46.7% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 20.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 13.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 13.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 20.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 86.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 6.7000003% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 20.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 21.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 14.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 28.6% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 7.1% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 64.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 33.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 13.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 20.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 33.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 80.0% (Yes)
B. 20.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 86.700005% (2L)
C. 6.7000003% (3L)
D. 6.7000003% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Engaging, good lecturer, but doesn’t really say anything you couldn’t learn from a good hornbook.

I would highly recommend his course.

Prof. Ramseyer is perhaps the laziest professor I’ve ever encountered. The first half of his two-hour class was usually a rambling re-cap of everything that had come in the class before. His lectures are very easy to follow as he delivers them, but looking back on my notes, I realized that he was not very well organized, and did not provide us with a very good overview of corporate law. His exam was rather obnoxious; he asked us about only two or three aspects of the material we covered in class, and, as for the rest, he seemed to expect a feel for the "real world" of business, which we could not have garnered from his class. The exam is part multiple choice, and part "short" answer (100-200 words), which is not a fair way of assessing students' knowledge about the law, and which I think reflects his laziness.

The class was early (8-10am), but Prof. Ramseyer made it worth it. He was clear and kept a great pace on the content covered. His brief recaps at the start of each class and the many
problem examples were very helpful and he was always willing to go over any topic in more detail. The exam was tough but fair and reasonably predictable in form and content.

Prof. Ramseyer is a simply a star! If you do the readings and attend class, you learn the subject matter without even noticing it.

Ramseyer teaches a very straightforward corporations class, but in my opinion made little or no effort to go beyond the blackletter and make it interesting. You'd learn just as much, just as well, by reading a couple of commercial outlines.

This is a very basic doctrinal Corps class, but adds nothing in terms of theory or broader understanding of Corporations. Ramseyer is very nice and clear during class, but the class was uninspiring. The exam is also a little stupid -- instead of questions that encourage you to integrate all of the knowledge from the class, his exam is a better test of whether you were paying attention to what he said at 4:07 on Dec 3rd, or whether you read footnote 4 on page 336 - it tests discrete and specific information that never coalesces into a more profound whole.

This class is a good "Corporations for Beginners." I did not feel I needed to have much outside business knowledge to enjoy and understand the course. This was average. Prof. Ramseyer doesn't seem terribly interested in his students, but he teaches well and if you go to class you'll pick up what you need to know.

This course was fantastic. Ramseyer is extremely clear and engaging, and the reading was pretty much unnecessary (which is always nice). The only two negative things I could say about the course are: too often we focused on cases where the relevant rule was misapplied or ignored for some reason (though Ramseyer was very good about flagging that); and it was very frustrating that Ramseyer only listed the reading for the whole course, not for any given day. But, on the whole, great course. Wish it had been earlier in the morning though.

Ramseyer is very clear and organized. The material is boring but that's not his fault. Also, I did not attend some classes and wish I would have because he actually teaches the material in class. 8 am is way too early for class and perhaps that's why I missed so many.
COURSE: Corporations A3
PROFESSOR: Professor Guhan Subramanian
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 122
RESPONSES: 10

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 40.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 10.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 40.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 10.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Panel)
B. 20.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 30.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 90.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 60.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 20.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 80.0% (Engaging)
J. 10.0% (Boring)
K. 10.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 90.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 40.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 40.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 10.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 70.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 90.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 10.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 90.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 70.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 10.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 70.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 10.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 20.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 60.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 10.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 90.0% (Yes)
B. 10.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 30.0% (3L)
D. 20.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| Fantastic professor; quite possibly the best at HLS. Take Subramanian for Corporations, no questions asked! |
| He's really great, but sometimes he praises wrong ideas about doctrine just to be nice. When he says "I like it" that doesn't mean it's correct law. I appreciated his attention to gender issues. |
| n/r |
| I think this is the most 'engaging' corporations can get, but it is still not a very interesting subject. |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| This is a great class. Prof. Subramanian is incredibly smart and knows this stuff inside out; lectures can sometimes move fast, but overall I think the course was well paced and very well taught |
| A great class for those interested in corporate/transactional law, geared towards understanding |
the culture, history, m.o., and, of course, law of the business world. Probably not for those who are just taking Corporations because they feel they have to. This is very much a class designed for students interested in more than just the law, but also the practice of deal-making. In other words, those who consider bankers "wankers" need not apply.

Great Professor, Great course. Highly Recommended!!
COURSE: Criminal Law 1
PROFESSOR: Professor Carol Steiker
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 82
RESPONSES: 17

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 5.9% (Easy)
B. 94.1% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 5.9% (Panel)
B. 64.700005% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 23.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 5.9% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 94.1% (Clear about content)
B. 5.9% (Unclear about content)
C. 70.6% (Clear about expectations)
D. 11.8% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 88.200005% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 76.5% (Practical)
H. 47.100002% (Theoretical)
I. 82.4% (Engaging)
J. 5.9% (Boring)
K. 5.9% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 76.5% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 11.8% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 52.9% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 11.8% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 88.200005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 88.200005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 88.200005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 5.9% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 5.9% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 52.9% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 68.8% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 75.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 68.8% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 6.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 12.5% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 17.6% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 47.100002% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 35.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 94.1% (Yes)
B. 5.9% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 94.1% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 5.9% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic introduction to Criminal Law, informed by the professor's personal experience. Occasionally run a bit like a high school class - dividing into groups talking amongst themselves - a welcome break from the standard law class but a little childish. The rest of the time, divided between engaging lecture and well-used Socratic questioning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steiker is very helpful and very willing to talk outside of class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not my favorite, but at least Steiker is fair and easy to follow. The exam was basically what you would expect and her old exams are a pretty good indication of what she's going to ask. Classroom discussions could have been a little more volatile but she tends to keep things calmer, which makes things a little less fun than they could have been otherwise.

Aside from a slight tendency to sometimes belabor rather obvious points & continue asking students how they feel about an issue after both sides of an argument are clear, Prof. Steiker is an excellent professor -- very friendly & knowledgeable, and does a great job of bringing her prior professional experience into the classroom.
COURSE: Criminal Law 2
PROFESSOR: Professor Daniel Meltzer
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 14

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 64.3% (Average)
C. 28.6% (More challenging than average)
D. 7.1% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 50.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 21.4% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 14.3% (Volunteers only)
E. 14.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 78.6% (Clear about content)
B. 28.6% (Unclear about content)
C. 42.9% (Clear about expectations)
D. 21.4% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 85.700005% (Organized)
F. 7.1% (Disorganized)
G. 21.4% (Practical)
H. 78.6% (Theoretical)
I. 71.4% (Engaging)
J. 14.3% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 78.6% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 7.1% (Does not use the reading)
N. 7.1% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 64.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 14.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 57.100002% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 7.1% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 78.6% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 14.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 42.9% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 28.6% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 78.6% (Available during office hours)
C. 57.100002% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 14.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 21.4% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 14.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 50.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 14.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 78.6% (Yes)
B. 21.4% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meltzer was excellent. Really challenged students to think.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This class was excellent, but covered a bit too much material. Judging from outlines from students in past years, Meltzer covered a very similar amount of material, even though the course was reduced from 4 hours to 3 hours per week this year. He cut a substantial criminal procedure section, but also added more material on discretion. Overall, Meltzer has a mastery of the material, and conducts the class in a productive and engaging way. I was happy that he did not allow laptops, which are distracting. My only recommendation is to cut back the material a little bit for next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only problem with the class was that Professor Meltzer tended to call on a few particular students very often and neglected others. He also sometimes seems very unsympathetic toward students. He is definitely not approachable and sometimes comes off as a little mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professor is incredibly knowledgeable about the subject matter and often presents clever hypotheticals that enhance understanding of the issues. However, his tendency to make condescending comments to the class and to belittle individual students seemed entirely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

113
unnecessary and created a source of needless anxiety in an environment that is already saturated with it. While the basic material was not excessively challenging, the professor's expectations of the students' level of mastery were intimidatingly high.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tough. His exams arelegendarily difficult and he plays hide the ball far too much. Surely old school, but after the fact you realize that you've been pushed and that you have learned a lot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meltzer does a pretty straightforward crim class. There were some times when it would have been nice to actually have a discussion rather than having him just lecture the whole time, ostensibly to avoid divisiveness (death penalty and rape come to mind). He focuses a lot on the justifications for punishment and emphasizes policy/thinking about bigger social issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n/r

| Some people did not like Meltzer, but I enjoyed his teaching style, although he often posed difficult theoretical questions without real practical importance. |
| Class focuses a lot on theoretical discussions or students' opinions. Very little time is spent acutally discussing the cases or black letter law. Meltzer assumes you already know these and uses the readings as a springboard for theoretical discussion. |
| Prof. Meltzer focused much more on theory than blackletter law. His exam reflected this. Meltzer's teaching style best reflects the "old-school" Harvard way, but the class eventually moves from Socratic to class discussion as the semester goes on. That being said, he can be rather condescending when employing the Socratic method. Meltzer generally has a polarizing personality: you either love the class or strongly dislike it. |
| Prof. Meltzer knows this subject like the back of his hand. He expects a lot from his students and borders on confrontational in his Socratic methods. |

n/r

| great prof |
| Prof. Meltzer was my favorite instructor this year. His approach to the socratic method can be harsh - he is less forgiving than other professors in that regard and definitely scares some of his students initially. That being said, he actually uses the socratic method to it's greatest potential - he really asks the right kinds of questions so that you find the answer. This class was difficult but fascinating. Meltzer conducts great discussions, allows everyone's opinion and really knows the material. Don't be scared - he's really quite nice and warms up as the semester progresses! |
COURSE: Criminal Law 4
PROFESSOR: Assistant Professor Jeannie Suk
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 20

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 80.0% (Reasonable)
C. 20.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 10.5% (Easy)
B. 52.6% (Average)
C. 36.8% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 20.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 80.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 70.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 15.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 75.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 30.0% (Practical)
H. 85.0% (Theoretical)
I. 65.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 5.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 45.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 10.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 85.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 5.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 70.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 5.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 90.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 10.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 89.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 47.4% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 15.8% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 55.6% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 94.4% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.7% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 15.8% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 52.6% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 10.5% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 21.1% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 95.0% (Yes)
B. 5.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year at HLS. Improved leaps and bounds as the semester progressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More about gender, race, sex and family than law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She held us to very high standards, making this a great class!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The exam was well-balanced, in that there were two theory questions and two issue spotters. I appreciated the mid-term practice exercise, and I think the final gave the students ample opportunity to demonstrate their respective levels of mastery.

Prof. Suk is an amazing professor. She can be intimidating at first and makes you work very hard. We engaged many of the difficult moral issues behind the social problems that crim law is supposed to address. Strong theoretical bent to this class, but we still had many pragmatic discussions.

On the whole, this was my favorite class this semester. Of course, the course material was a big part of that, but Prof. Suk definitely did her part too. She was knowledgeable, well-prepared for class, and an engaging speaker (when she could be heard), and she pressed us to think about the broader, more theoretical issues underlying the class materials. Large groups would always gather outside Pound after class to continue discussing the course material, which is as good of a sign as you could ask for that the professor is doing her job to make the material provocative and interesting. Though she seemed uncomfortable in front of the classroom at first, Prof. Suk seemed to get used to it over the course of the semester, and we could tell that she liked teaching the class and wanted us to like taking the class. She was still awkward at the end of the semester, but I think most students had come to find that endearing. A couple of relatively minor points about pedagogy (related to the awkwardness): One is that Prof. Suk liked to lighten things up with anecdotes that related only loosely to the class discussion. I actually found this distracting and unnecessary. The material is interesting enough that I would have preferred to spend that class time talking about it. Second, Prof. Suk has a tendency (it got better over the course of the semester, but it was still there even at the end) to ask questions where it's clear that she wants a very specific answer but it's not clear what answer (or even what kind of answer) that is. Professors should either ask questions that are open-ended enough so that students have free rein to give a variety of different but equally reasonable answers, or else give enough information to make clear what they're getting at with their questions. Prof. Suk asked a number of questions where we could tell that she was getting at something specific - asking us to draw a particular connection, say - but we couldn't tell what. I imagine asking the right questions is something that comes with practice.
COURSE: Criminal Law 5
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor David Sklansky
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 16

Workload
A. 50.0% (Light)
B. 43.8% (Reasonable)
C. 6.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 25.0% (Easy)
B. 62.5% (Average)
C. 12.5% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 12.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 25.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 18.800001% (Volunteers only)
E. 43.8% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 87.5% (Clear about content)
B. 6.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 68.8% (Clear about expectations)
D. 18.80001% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 93.8% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 62.5% (Practical)
H. 62.5% (Theoretical)
I. 87.5% (Engaging)
J. 6.3% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 81.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 68.8% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 12.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 81.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 6.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 93.8% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 37.5% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 81.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 12.5% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 31.300001% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 43.8% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 68.8% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 62.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 68.8% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 6.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 62.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 6.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 25.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 87.5% (Yes)
B. 12.5% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 93.8% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 6.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Professor Sklansky is a marvelous professor, and he is what made this class so good. He obviously selected our reading with great care and thought, and brought true enthusiasm to class every single day. He was particularly good at probing different policies and laws so that we would really understand the differences between them and the effect of a jurisdiction choosing one statutory construction or judicial rule over another. Two thumbs up for him and his class, and I would love to take criminal procedure or evidence with him at a later time, so I really hope he becomes a permanent fixture at Harvard Law!

n/r

Exam was much more difficult than class would lead you to believe.

n/r

Sklansky is a great professor!
mediocre

n/r

n/r
I got more out of the first half of the course - particularly from the professor's teaching. During the second half of the course too much time was given to student discussions which were sometimes repetitive or meandering. I would have appreciated it if we knew the exam format earlier. It helps students in their exam preparations.

Professor Sklansky is a very skilled teacher. He is able to direct class discussion through the concepts of the reading like a sea captain navigating a narrow channel. He knows the material and is eager to help his students learn. One complaint students have had is that we sometimes focus so much on the "why" for each topic, that the "what" and "how" of the concepts are not always fully addressed.

Prof. Sklansky is great. Crim was probably my favorite class of the semester. He does a great job of tying the class material to relevant issues. I really liked the class and would highly recommend it.
COURSE: Criminal Law 6
PROFESSOR: Professor Lloyd L. Weinreb
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 19

Workload
A. 5.3% (Light)
B. 36.8% (Reasonable)
C. 47.4% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 10.5% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 73.7% (Average)
C. 21.1% (More challenging than average)
D. 5.3% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 73.7% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 10.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 10.5% (Volunteers only)
E. 5.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 94.7% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 47.4% (Clear about expectations)
D. 21.1% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 89.5% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 89.5% (Practical)
H. 89.5% (Theoretical)
I. 89.5% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 10.5% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 84.2% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 36.8% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 52.6% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 31.6% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 78.9% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 94.7% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 5.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 94.4% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 44.4% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 22.2% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 47.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 52.6% (Available during office hours)
C. 31.6% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 5.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 31.6% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 5.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 15.8% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 63.2% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 5.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 94.7% (Yes)
B. 5.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| I enjoyed Prof. Weinreb’s class a lot & I enjoyed hearing him talk about the materials. I did sometimes feel that the class too rehearsed or that the prof. had covered the material in a very similar way in previous years. |
| Weinreb is a great instructor. Always had me on the edge of my seat even though it was 8:30 in the morning! |
| n/r |
| We all loved Weinreb. |
| n/r |
| n/r |
| Large amount of reading, extremely broad scope (both procedural and substantive criminal law covered in detail). Difficult course but very rewarding as professor focused on the real-world application of the law. |
| n/r |
| tremendous professor. highly recommended. |
Weinreb is amazing. The exam was difficult, but the format was as expected. Absolutely wonderful.

n/r

n/r

n/r

An excellent and very well organized class--I feel like I effectively learned substantive and procedural criminal law in a class where most people are only taught substantive law. Weinreb is a great prof.

n/r

Weinreb is the best. Take any class you can with him.

Prof. Weinreb is awesome, very well-liked by the class. We did have a huge amount of complex material to master (Crim Substantive and Crim Procedure) for a 4-credit class, which made it hard. I would recommend reviewing your class notes and readings thoroughly at least at a few points during the semester. I didn't start reviewing until before the exam, and wish I had started earlier because I would have benefitted much more from class discussion. My one critique of the course is that we covered too much material, and I would have liked to spend more time on some of the more complex general crim stuff like attempt, conspiracy, impossibility, aiding+abetting rather than learning the substantive crimes of rape and theft. But overall, I really enjoyed the class. Prof. W. does share his political leanings and criticism of the law (not excessively), but he is extremely open to different points of view and encourages us to think for ourselves. He stimulates great class discussion and debate and is a very caring professor. I feel lucky to have taken the course.

n/r

Professor Weinreb is very knowledgeable in the practical sense because he has actually practiced as a criminal prosecutor. This adds a lot of value to our discussions. Plus, he's very funny without meaning to be. His lectures and our class discussions are very engaging and informative though it's hard to get a hold of him to speak to him individually outside of class. Other than that, the course was very organized and very interesting (to a person like me who would normally have no interest in criminal law).
COURSE: CyberOne: Law in the Court of Public Opinion
PROFESSOR: Professor Charles R. Nesson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 19
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 100.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 100.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
COURSE: Democracy and Legal Theory: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Allan Hutchinson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 11
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Dispute Systems Design Seminar
PROFESSOR: Assistant Clinical Professor Robert Bordone
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 20
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 50.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 75.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 25.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 75.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 25.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 75.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 75.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 75.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 75.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 75.0% (Yes)
B. 25.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 25.0% (2L)
C. 75.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make sure you are interested in the theoretics of dispute systems design. Sometimes the length of the seminar could be tedious if you weren’t as interested as everyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Ethics Biotechnology and Law Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Michael Sandel
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 13
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 50.0% (Light)
B. 25.0% (Reasonable)
C. 25.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 25.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 75.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 25.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 25.0% (Practical)
H. 75.0% (Theoretical)
I. 75.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| In lieu of an exam there is a final paper (12-15 pages double spaced). There are also weekly 1-2 page reaction papers |
| Good to have some background or interest in biotechnology and bioethics. Great prof, great class. It's probably the best class I've ever taken at the law school. |
| n/r |
| One of the most interesting classes at HLS. This course is essentially a philosophy course taught in law school, which I enjoyed as a philosophy major. The workload is extremely light: 1-4 hours of reading a week, a 1-2 page weekly reaction paper, and a 7-10 page reaction paper at the end. |
COURSE: Evidence A1
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Peter Murray
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 136
RESPONSES: 18

Workload
A. 16.7% (Light)
B. 72.200005% (Reasonable)
C. 11.1% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 33.3% (Easy)
B. 66.700005% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 11.1% (Panel)
B. 27.800001% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 61.100002% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 88.9% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 72.200005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 5.6% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 94.4% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 94.4% (Practical)
H. 22.2% (Theoretical)
I. 77.8% (Engaging)
J. 5.6% (Boring)
K. 27.800001% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 55.600002% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 66.700005% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 16.7% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 11.1% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 11.1% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 94.4% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 16.7% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 16.7% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 72.200005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 27.800001% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 27.800001% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 61.100002% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 27.800001% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 50.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 22.2% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 88.9% (Yes)
B. 11.1% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 83.3% (2L)
C. 16.7% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Prof. Murray is engaging, warm, and clearly interested in the material and his students. Most people in the class seemed to love him, but his teaching style didn't work very well for me. The class was taught too fast and there was too much media -- I found it distracting. I had a hard time concentrating. That said, I didn't keep up with the reading and skipped several classes -- although I did so in part because I found the lectures hard to follow. A slower, more deliberative analysis of fewer problems would have worked better for me ... but again, I know others found it perfectly acceptable. You can prepare for the exam adequately by reading a hornbook during the reading period. I might not take this class if I had to do it over again, but that has to do more with the material and my frustration with evidence law than with the professor himself. I find the rules quite silly and useless -- a set of tangled, complicated rules designed to meet lofty principles, and all we learn as lawyers is how to circumvent them. Sounds like a ploy to make trials complicated and ensure that lawyers are well paid. That said, if you want to be a litigator and need evidence, Prof. Murray is entertaining, never boring, and very dynamic.
Can't imagine Evidence getting any better than with Prof. Murray. At least he was entertaining and had great stories.

Very good, very helpful course, though I might have preferred less use of Powerpoint.

n/r

Fantastic professor, but he's retiring! Too bad for all those who haven't taken this class. Take TAW with him before he retires! Don't miss a chance to meet Professor Murray!

Great class

n/r

n/r

n/r

Sad to hear he's leaving, HLS is much poorer without him.

Very useful and practical course.

Much of the material for the class is not ultimately used for the final, which tests on the Rules alone. The cases do not come in handy at all except perhaps in helping you understand the Rules.

n/r

n/r

Very good practical course. Hardly theoretic at all, but the practitioner viewpoint suits the subject matter well.

n/r

If you actually want to learn Evidence, take this class. Lots of focus on black letter and Prof. Murray's personal experiences during many years in the courtroom. He's very organized, with powerpoint slides available before class. I found that if I went to class and paid attention, I didn't need to do the caselaw reading. If I could do it over again, I would only read the problems and the rules. He allows passing.

This course doesn't require any prior knowledge and is extremely well taught. The only reason I didn't recommend it was that I found the subject matter dull. But I couldn't imagine anybody teaching it better than Murray. He'll be missed.
COURSE: Evidence A2
PROFESSOR: Professor Bruce Hay
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 23
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 33.3% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 33.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 66.700005% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 33.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 66.700005% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 66.700005% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 66.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 66.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 33.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| Exam (and optional midterm) were collaborative. You could work with up to 2 other people and hand in a joint answer. Students were also required to contribute to a blog. |
| Hay does a great job of distilling out the important concepts from the cases and readings. He has a practitioner's eye for the material, which is really helpful for those of us who are going into litigation. As for the final exam, he allowed students to write a paper in place of the exam. |
| This was the most enjoyable class I have taken at HLS. Prof. Hay is incredibly engaging, hilarious, insightful, good at getting points across to students in interesting ways... We didn't learn much black letter law during class (he expects you to come in having done the reading and already knowing the rules and case holdings), but class greatly added to the experience. There was a lot of "role playing" during class, where he would have different students extemporaneously play different roles in hypothetical trials that he would make up on the spot. He would guide these mini mock-trials along and a lot of interesting points would come across. He showed several films which were very interesting and impactful. the class this semester ended up with a low enrollment because it was added so late, and so it ended up being more |
like a seminar. not sure if this teaching style is how he also does bigger classes. either way, im sure his bigger classes are a blast as well.
COURSE: Federal Courts and the Federal System A
PROFESSOR: Professor Richard Fallon
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 116
RESPONSES: 17

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 17.6% (Reasonable)
C. 64.700005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 17.6% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 5.9% (Average)
C. 35.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 58.8% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 88.200005% (Clear about content)
B. 17.6% (Unclear about content)
C. 82.4% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 47.100002% (Practical)
H. 76.5% (Theoretical)
I. 76.5% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 5.9% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 82.4% (Adds meaningfully to/builts usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 17.6% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 35.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 23.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 82.4% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 5.9% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 11.8% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 35.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 41.2% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 76.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 76.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 76.5% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 5.9% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 11.8% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 64.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 23.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 94.1% (Yes)
B. 5.9% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 5.9% (2L)
C. 94.1% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If only every law school professor were like Professor Fallon! His kind and respectful manner and low-key sense of humor made difficult and dry material bearable. This class is very hard but WELL worth it for understanding federal courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law would be very helpful. This is a difficult but terrific course, as Professor Fallon does a wonderful job examining the overall structure of the federal courts system. I was happy to have taken it late in my law school career, so that many of the other topics I've studied (e.g., admin law) could &quot;click&quot; into place in the bigger picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Fallon is extremely knowledgeable but he often goes off into very esoteric discussions that aren't helpful re: understanding the material. On the surface, he seems very clear (makes outline on chalkboard before each class) but he often flies through material. Once you go back over it, it isn't as clear as it initially seemed, which is frustrating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an extremely challenging class that should be taken only if the student is willing to put in the time and effort to understand the material. It is a lot of work. Professor Fallon is a very good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A professor who did the best he could with very conflicting doctrines.

Prof. Fallon may be the best teacher I've ever had, and this class is extremely important. But know that you're getting yourself into probably the most difficult course you'll ever take.

Need to take Con Law, Civ Pro, and Admin.

Best option for fed courts. Excellent professor.

Admin and con law probably helpful but not required.

If you want to take Fed Courts, take it with Fallon. But think very carefully about whether you want to take fed courts. It is hard. It is time consuming. It is complicated. YOU DO NOT NEED TO TAKE IT. Fallon will tell you this on the first day, and if you are like me, you will say, "Oh please, of course I need to take it, I'm not dropping. I might clerk." And then you will regret, regret, regret. It's very interesting if you care a lot about federal jurisdiction and like to dig deep into cases and really engage in academic thinking. If you're just taking it because you think you have to, though, get out! Fallon, however, was fantastic. He really clarified the reading (when I did it), he really made sense of things for me even when I didn't do it, he is engaging, he is brilliant, he knows the stuff he is teaching, he listens to student questions and responds to them but mostly keeps the class on track, he is available for one on one, he is nice...so. And the book is good. The exam is hard but fair, no tricks--but you have to know the material.
COURSE: Federal Criminal Law
PROFESSOR: Professor William Stuntz
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 104
RESPONSES: 12

Workload
A. 25.0% (Light)
B. 58.3% (Reasonable)
C. 16.7% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 41.7% (Average)
C. 58.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 100.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 58.3% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.7% (Clear about expectations)
D. 8.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 41.7% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 91.7% (Theoretical)
I. 91.7% (Engaging)
J. 8.3% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 91.7% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 25.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 75.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 41.7% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 75.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 91.7% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 41.7% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 91.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 8.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 16.7% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 41.7% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 41.7% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 8.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 33.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 41.7% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 8.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 8.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 91.700005% (Yes)
B. 8.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stuntz is pretty awful. His approach to this class is extremely theoretical and incredibly far removed from the actual practice of federal criminal law (maybe I'd call it meta-removed). He interrupts student comments and tries to finish them himself, trying to prove that he already knows what everyone is going to say. His exam is impossible to prepare for. Awful class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very highly recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a fantastic class and one of the few where the professor is engaging and actively builds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
on the understanding and thinking developed by the students in doing the reading to create a broader discussion of the issues. I highly recommend it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stuntz is one of the smartest professors at the law school. It's a treat to watch him think.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Federal Public Land and Resources Law
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor John Leshy
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 18
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 33.3% (Reasonable)
C. 66.700005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 66.700005% (Average)
C. 33.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 100.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 66.700005% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 66.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 33.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 33.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 33.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I really loved this class. Prof. Leshy assigns interesting readings and is a great guy. However, the exam was extremely difficult. It was very policy based, which we focused on some, but not as much as it was covered. The exam also tried to elicit too much in 3 hours. But the class was great.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Leshy was a wonderful instructor and I fully recommend him to anyone thinking about taking a course of his. He made a potentially very dry subject interesting, had a wealth of knowledge in both the academic sense and in first-hand experience, and was a very easy going and non-intimidating instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class was practical and informative, and Leshy is knowledgeable and engaging. But don't expect anything deep or revolutionary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Gaming Law
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Kevin Washburn
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 46
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 66.700005% (Light)
B. 33.3% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 66.700005% (Volunteers only)
E. 33.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 66.700005% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 66.700005% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 66.700005% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 33.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 66.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
n/r
n/r
COURSE: Government Lawyer (The) A  
PROFESSOR: Assistant Clinical Professor Alex Whiting  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 34  
RESPONSES: 10  

Workload  
A. 20.0% (Light)  
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)  
C. 10.0% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 20.0% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 40.0% (Easy)  
B. 50.0% (Average)  
C. 10.0% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 40.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 60.0% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 60.0% (Clear about content)  
B. 30.0% (Unclear about content)  
C. 20.0% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 60.0% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 40.0% (Organized)  
F. 20.0% (Disorganized)  
G. 60.0% (Practical)  
H. 40.0% (Theoretical)  
I. 80.0% (Engaging)  
J. 20.0% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 80.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 40.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 30.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 80.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 10.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 90.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 50.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 70.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 30.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 70.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 90.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 70.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 80.0% (Yes)
B. 20.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 60.0% (2L)
C. 40.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

I did not take the clinical component associated with this class, since I'd already worked at a US Attorney's office during my 1L summer. Still, the topics were interesting, and Professor Whiting was very engaging. Well worthwhile for anyone with an interest in government law.

Professor Whiting does as good a job of leading a discussion-based class as one would expect.

Most boring class discussion ever. What I learned from this class can be summarized in one paragraph. Because credit is given for class participation, people just speak in order to say something, not because they actually have something to say.

I thought too much to take class and do a clinical

Professor Whiting is great. Funny, smart, with a lot of interesting experiences. Because he told us that participation would be 25% of the grade, people were often tempted to chime in with comments even when the topic was not very interesting, or when they didn't really have much to say, which did lead to some boring discussions or sidetracks. If you can convince him to cut that to 10% or something, the class would be even better. But in general, really interesting
I took the class so that I could do the clinical at the US Attorneys Office.

The class was supposed to be tied to clinicals in either DOJ or the MA AG’s office, but the class catered exclusively to students working at DOJ. It was completely useless for the AG’s office clinical students.

I loved the class and the professor. My only other comment is that students need to know a bit about what it means to be a government lawyer before taking the class (or at least be pretty familiar w/ politics, criminal procedure, con law, and DOJ policies and procedures); I felt like I was taking an advanced Gov. Lawyer class on some days when what I really wanted to learn about was more of the basics (but to be fair, there were a number of 3L's who had taken various other courses, such as con law, fed. courts, and other relevant classes that they seemed to draw on).
COURSE: Health Care Law
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor William Sage
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 38
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 33.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 33.3% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 33.3% (Clear about expectations)
D. 66.700005% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 66.700005% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 33.3% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 33.3% (Engaging)
J. 33.3% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 33.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 66.700005% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Professor Sage seems to know an incredible amount about a wide variety of law, even areas not particularly related to health care. Within health care law, he seems to know just about everything. One criticism I'd have is that he was never totally clear on what was expected, saying, I don't expect you to know X, but I do expect you to know Y, with little discernible difference between X and Y to an average law student. That made me think the exam was pretty hard, even though I studied pretty hard for it.

The problem with health care law is that there's no unifying principle, so it's hard to "get" it. The doctrine is all over the place, the statutes are poorly drafted, and the law frequently doesn't evince any discernible policy. Sage doesn't do much to alleviate the confusion, though that may be a Herculean task. That said, if you're willing to put in the hours, can tolerate frustration, and are interested in health care, it's an extremely interesting course. I'm not sure it's worth the time unless you're really interested, though. Some background in antitrust, health care, economics, tax, and tort law is helpful, but not strictly necessary.

You have to be interested in health care, but if you are, Professor Sage is the person to take it
with. His vast personal and professional experience enhances the course.
COURSE: Health Law Policy Workshop: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Einer R. Elhauge and Visiting Professor Russell Korobkin
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 10
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Human Rights Advocacy: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Clinical Professor James Cavallaro and Ms. Binaifer Nowrojee
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 22
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor - Clinical Professor James Cavallaro (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 100.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 100.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Ms. Binaifer Nowrojee (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability - Clinical Professor James Cavallaro (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Ms. Binaifer Nowrojee (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
n/r
COURSE: Human Rights and the Environment: Advocacy Seminar A
PROFESSOR: Mr. Tyler Giannini
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 14
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/buils usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 100.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 100.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Excellent class with really interesting readings. But the students and the class discussion can make the experience pretty painful. Discussion would not add anything meaningful to the readings. Instructor is not good about bringing the discussion back on track and does not interject with his opinion nearly enough.
COURSE: Human Rights Practice in Latin America: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Clinical Professor James Cavallaro
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 4
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Immigration Law
PROFESSOR: Professor Gerald Neuman
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 43
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 50.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Panel)
B. 25.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 25.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 25.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 25.0% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 75.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 75.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 75.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 25.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 75.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 75.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 50.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 50.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 75.0% (Yes)
B. 25.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 25.0% (3L)
D. 25.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend Constitutional Law. You should spend more time reading the immigration code (supplement) rather than only focus on assigned readings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuman is brilliant. Very impressed at his ability to answer tough questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was a great course. There was a panel system, but he tried only to call on volunteers. The material was interesting and he assigned reasonable amounts. It was my favorite class this semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Innovative Contracting: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor George Triantis
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 10
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: International Childhood, Rights, and Globalization
PROFESSOR: Jacqueline Bhabha
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 16
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: International Law A  
PROFESSOR: Professor David Kennedy  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 90  
RESPONSES: 12  

Workload  
A. 0.0% (Light)  
B. 16.7% (Reasonable)  
C. 16.7% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 66.700005% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Easy)  
B. 8.3% (Average)  
C. 75.0% (More challenging than average)  
D. 16.7% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 16.7% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 8.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 58.3% (Volunteers only)  
E. 16.7% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)  
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)  
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 16.7% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 58.3% (Organized)  
F. 16.7% (Disorganized)  
G. 8.3% (Practical)  
H. 91.700005% (Theoretical)  
I. 58.3% (Engaging)  
J. 25.0% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 25.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 91.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 41.7% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 75.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 91.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 25.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 58.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 25.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.7% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 16.7% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 16.7% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 58.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 16.7% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 8.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 75.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 16.7% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 58.3% (Yes)
B. 41.7% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 58.3% (2L)
C. 16.7% (3L)
D. 25.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

This is a great theoretical and historical grounding in the discipline and profession of international law that is a little more interesting if one has a background studying or working with public international law.

Worst class I've taken in law school. The class is all a bunch of BS philosophy with a smattering of policy here and there. When all is said and done, all you will have accomplished in this class is getting through 2 books and a bunch of articles written by the professor.

There are three reflection papers due during the school year and one final paper at the close of the semester. I would recommend latching on to the professor's favorite topics during the school year and truly developing ideas for the final papers through his lectures. This makes writing the final paper a whole lot more manageable.

n/r

Unless you really, really like theory and legal history, don't take this class.

The course covers a tremendous amount of reading and then utilizes essentially none of it on the final paper. But the quality of the readings is so fantastic they are (almost) worth doing.
anyway. The professor has a very clear message about international law, but in each individual class the message is very unclear and disorganized.

This class was particularly awful, even for Harvard Law. I’m sure some people enjoyed it and it was simply my fault when I would obviously hate this type of class. It made me realize how important it is to vet professors before choosing the class going forward. I had no idea what he was talking about at any time in the class. I had no idea just how stupid I was until I sat through one of the lectures. I don’t think the reading or lecture was helpful because I don’t know any more now than I did before (or do I??). Standard crit style of teaching: you have no idea walking away if you have actually gained knowledge of any sort at all.

Kennedy is a great writer, but is not good in big lecture courses. I like him a lot, but not teaching in this format.

The class is, I think, very difficult to follow if one has not yet had previous experience in international law.

Kennedy focuses heavily on theory. Themes are big part of this course which is an historical discourse on the evolution of thinking about international law. People who are interested in learning about rules and institutions will be disappointed. Expect to ask a lot of questions (rhetorically, not necessarily in class), but do not expect to receive many answers. This is a course for those who enjoy open-ended discussion. Professor Kennedy is extremely knowledgeable and very open to alternative view points. He tries hard to remain agnostic about issues and actively solicits alternate view points. I really enjoyed his pedagogical style. He treats his students with maturity and respect. He assigns a lot of reading but does not expect that everyone reads every article. He operates on the assumption that people are in his class because they are actually interested in international law and are self-motivated to do reading that interests them. He assigned 3 response papers and a very open-ended final exam (2000-word essay covering broad themes of the course).
COURSE: International Negotiation
PROFESSOR: Assistant Professor Gabriella Blum
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 32
RESPONSES: 7

Workload
A. 14.3% (Light)
B. 85.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 28.6% (Easy)
B. 71.4% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 14.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 14.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 71.4% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 57.100002% (Clear about expectations)
D. 14.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 85.700005% (Practical)
H. 28.6% (Theoretical)
I. 71.4% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 14.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 71.4% (Adds meaningfully to/builderusefully on the reading)
M. 14.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 71.4% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 28.6% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 71.4% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 28.6% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 85.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 42.9% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 85.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 14.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 28.6% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 42.9% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 71.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 85.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 42.9% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 28.6% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 28.6% (2L)
C. 28.6% (3L)
D. 42.9% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>classes i will recommend will be to have basic knowledge in negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriella Blum is an excellent instructor. She is young, smart, and energetic. She brings her youth and enthusiasm to an aging subset of professors. I had taken an earlier course with her and decided to take her again based on the strength of her teaching. The class is highly practical and most of the simulations are very fun and engaging. Depending on the topic that students chose for their final paper, not all reading is necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Different from most classes in the law school- highly recommended. The instructor is very engaging, driven and direct. A great introduction to international negotiations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: International Trade Law
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Seung Wha Chang
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 54
RESPONSES: 10

Workload
A. 10.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 20.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 20.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 10.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 40.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 70.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 30.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 40.0% (Clear about content)
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 40.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 60.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 50.0% (Organized)
F. 40.0% (Disorganized)
G. 70.0% (Practical)
H. 40.0% (Theoretical)
I. 10.0% (Engaging)
J. 60.0% (Boring)
K. 30.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 20.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 20.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 20.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 30.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 60.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 20.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 70.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 20.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 30.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 70.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 80.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 30.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 30.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 40.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 40.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 10.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 40.0% (Yes)
B. 60.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 40.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 60.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Professor Chang came across as extremely knowledgeable. His practical experience on WTO panels provided a unique insight into how the WTO functions. However, on occasions, Prof. Chang was unable to communicate his ideas effectively to the class. I would however term this as an exception. Also, his teaching style is not the most gripping and it is easy for students to switch off easily. However, if one were to pay close attention, it would be interesting. All in all, this was a good class and did enhance my knowledge on WTO law, but was certainly not the best class I have taken.

Take this class if you are interested in knowing the law of the World Trade Organization. There is very little else that gets covered in the class. I found the subject matter dry, but the professor was very knowledgeable, nice, and interested in helping the students.
This class ties policy and the letter of the law very tightly. The professor sends out reading questions each week that help the student focus on where the law intersects with policy considerations. I would have reviewed those more closely as the course progressed rather than crammed at the end.

Although some students did not like professor’s teaching style, I enjoyed it.

The fact that English was not the first language of Professor Chang or a number of students in the class often made it difficult to follow class discussions. Also, the class was very focused on the WTO and more global issues, as opposed to U.S. trade practices and trade law or other regional free trade agreements like NAFTA, the EU, and Mercosur (not necessarily a bad thing, just something that should have been noted in the course name and/or course description).
COURSE: Introduction to American Law (An)
PROFESSOR: Ms. Dena Sacco
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 24
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 50.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 50.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 50.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 100.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
I really enjoyed when we compared different legal institutions in different legal systems. This class is a unique opportunity to get to know a little bit about different legal systems.
COURSE: Introduction to Patents, Copyrights, and Similar Exclusive Rights Regimes
PROFESSOR: Professor Yochai Benkler
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 70
RESPONSES: 11

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 100.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 90.9% (More challenging than average)
D. 9.1% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 90.9% (Volunteers only)
E. 9.1% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 27.300001% (Clear about content)
B. 54.5% (Unclear about content)
C. 18.2% (Clear about expectations)
D. 63.600002% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 45.5% (Organized)
F. 18.2% (Disorganized)
G. 27.300001% (Practical)
H. 81.8% (Theoretical)
I. 54.5% (Engaging)
J. 27.300001% (Boring)
K. 9.1% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 72.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 9.1% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 81.8% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 63.600002% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 72.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 9.1% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 81.8% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 54.5% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 45.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 27.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 54.5% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 36.4% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 30.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 20.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 10.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 40.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 18.2% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 18.2% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 45.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 36.4% (Yes)
B. 63.6% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 45.5% (2L)
C. 45.5% (3L)
D. 9.1% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Need a new category to describe how burdensome the reading was; several students speculated that it was not actually possible to complete it all. Tries to introduce advanced seminar-style analysis and critique of &quot;very&quot; broad range of law, while purporting to be an introductory course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The workload is heavy - though it's not really compulsory to do all the readings in order to follow the class. The workload this year was probably close to a 5-credit course; hopefully it will be a 5-credit next year or the readings reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This class is terrible. Don't take it. The amount of reading is unmanageable. Benkler focuses only on his own personal views / analysis of the &quot;Networked Information Economy&quot; and fails to teach any of the black letter law --even though students are expected to know the black letter law for the final exam. Even though the course is entitled &quot;Introduction to Patents,&quot; there were numerous former patent examiners in the class. Benkler also presumes that students have an unreasonable amount of knowledge about the workings of software and the Internet. Unless you are interested in a theoretical analysis of why there should be no patent law, stay far away from this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This was not an introductory course. Most of the readings came from secondary literature; the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
law was largely confined to a hornbook, long stretches of which were assigned each week. The hornbook material received very little discussion in class (although there was a lot of it), and at the end of the semester, it was unclear how much it would figure in the exam. Many of the readings were much longer than they needed to be: a 70-page article would be assigned to convey a page's worth of ideas. I fell behind on the readings, and this made me reluctant to participate in class. My reluctance was compounded by the fact that several other students already knew or practiced IP law and seemed to treat the class as something like an advanced seminar. Professor Benkler knows a lot about the field and his approach to it is worth learning. But I thought he could have been more effective. He was often sidetracked by student questions, which he was willing to discuss for long periods of time. I noticed that several other students would tune out and turn to the internet the moment he began engaging with a student. This is only partly his fault (some HLS students only care about what will be on the exam), but I think there were some students who would have been reader to engage with the material had they not been so overwhelmed by the amount of it and by the sometimes opaque presentation of it. Finally, I thought the exam was handled poorly. Prof. Benkler told us to expect a word limit of around 2500 words, but then assigned a 10 page limit, which translates into roughly 3500 words. He also discouraged us from treating any questions as issue spotters, but then made 40% of the exam very difficult to treat as anything else.

This course would be better if viewed as a seminar or upper-level class for people who already know a bit about IP law, rather than as a survey course. Professor Benkler does not spend much time at all discussing current IP doctrine. He assigned a hornbook, not a casebook, for the doctrine. He doesn't seem very interested in the doctrine, to be frank. When discussing it in class, he seemed bored by it, regurgitating from the book. When discussing his theories critiquing exclusive rights, on the other hand, he was dynamic and interesting. He makes his views clear, but doesn't force them on anyone. Very interesting stuff, just, like I said, better for someone who already knows the doctrine and is in a better position to understand a substantial critique and alternatives. Likewise, the nature of the class is such that there are going to be a lot of people who are really interested in IP and know a lot about it (like former patent examiners), and if you're not one of those people, you might feel very behind the curve. (There is also a RIDICULOUS amount of reading. Like, 125 pages from the hornbook and 4 articles for a 2-hour class.)

Although this was billed as an intro IP course, it wasn't an intro course at all. There was almost no class time spent on the actual law of copyrights, patents, and trademarks... instead, it seemed to be expected that you would teach it to yourself from the enormous textbook (from which every page was assigned). It seemed like the people who got the most out of the class were the ones who independently had a background in at least one of the areas (from having taken a previous class in copyright, worked as a patent examiner, etc.). I think this class would have been great as an advanced IP theory class, AFTER learning the actual law. But the way it was structured, those of us without a background in the area were less able to engage with the theoretical issues, as we were absorbed with trying to learn the basics at the same time. The professor also seemed to assume a basic fluency in and familiarity with software/cyberlaw policy, architecture, acronyms, history, etc. While some of the class had this background and could follow along, it became apparent that others were very lost with regard to this material.

A lot of people in the class are already practicing IP pre-attorneys or used to be patent examiners or software engineers. Prof. Benkler and those people used jargon during the class and made huge assumptions about the knowledge the rest of us had. Prof. Benkler seems to be something of a cult personality: he is well-known in the "free and open source software"/counter-IP movement, so people in the school who idolize him and already agree with his views took his class. The rest of us were just looking for an introductory class on IP and ended up not knowing what was going on. It was a disaster.
COURSE: Islamic Family Law
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Hossein Modarressi
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 3
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Israel/Palestine Legal Issues: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Duncan Kennedy
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 21
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 100.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 100.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

A great eyeopening course altogether, one of my best experiences at HLS.
COURSE: Japanese Intellectual Property
PROFESSORS: Professor J. Mark Ramseyer, Visiting Professors Hidetaka Aizawa, and Masakazu Iwakura
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 12
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor – Professor J. Mark Ramseyer (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
Characteristics of instructor – Visiting Professor Hidetaka Aizawa (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 100.0% (Boring)
K. 100.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Characteristics of instructor – Visiting Professor Masakazu Iwakura (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 100.0% (Boring)
K. 100.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability – Professor J. Mark Ramseyer (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability – Visiting Professor Hidetaka Aizawa (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability – Visiting Professor Masakazu Iwakura (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 100.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)
Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

N/R
COURSE: Japanese Law Film Series: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor J. Mark Ramseyer
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 17
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

N/R
COURSE: Jurisprudence: Legal Ideals
PROFESSOR: Professor Lewis D. Sargentich
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 26
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 33.3% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 66.700005% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 33.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 33.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 100.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
This is the best course I've taken at HLS. Sarge makes everything easy and clear, but it's still extremely interesting. I can't recommend this highly enough. Take it!
COURSE: Labor Law
PROFESSOR: Ms. Dahlia Rudavsky
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 22
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 66.700005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 33.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 33.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 66.700005% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 33.3% (Organized)
F. 66.700005% (Disorganized)
G. 33.3% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 66.700005% (Boring)
K. 66.700005% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 33.3% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 33.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 66.700005% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 66.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 33.3% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 33.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 33.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 66.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 33.3% (2L)
C. 66.700005% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this is not the most exciting class or professor, but rudavsky's a nice knowledgeable woman with a practical sense of the law (even if it is somewhat one sided). i'd take it again b/c i wanted to understand labor law - it was definitely helpful for that at least. nothing life-transforming, to say the least.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class is very boring. Class time is mostly spent going over problems in the book. There is very little doctrinal discussion and it is mostly just people stating their opinions. The class covers an old, not very usual, version of Labor Law and not any of the new challenges facing the Labor movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The professor organizes the class by assigning cases or hypotheticals to individual students, and then allowing those individual students to take over instruction. This was a terribly inefficient way to teach the class. We could have covered much more material, and much more effectively--if she would have taught all of the material itself. Besides this, it was a well-organized class with a knowledgeable professor. But, if I could have taken labor law with a different professor, I would have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Law and Economics: Seminar A
PROFESSOR: Professors Louis Kaplow and Steven M. Shavell
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 23
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Law and Existentialism
PROFESSOR: Professor Bruce Hay
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 10
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 50.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 50.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 50.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builder usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 100.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 50.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Yes)
B. 50.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoyed this semester so much more because of this class. This is the only class I've taken at HLS where, on the last day, after the professor left, the entire class was truly, deeply sad that the class was over. Don't take this course because you think it will be easy or because you've heard the professor gives easy As. This was a deeply difficult and enriching and insightful course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Law and Finance
PROFESSOR: Professor Lucian A. Bebchuk
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 29
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 66.700005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 33.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 33.3% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 33.3% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 66.700005% (Volunteers only)
E. 33.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 33.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 33.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 33.3% (Practical)
H. 66.700005% (Theoretical)
I. 33.3% (Engaging)
J. 66.700005% (Boring)
K. 33.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 33.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 33.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 66.700005% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 66.700005% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 33.3% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>understanding of corporations and securities is a big help in order to get through the readings, especially in the initial part of the course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This class is not for students who are interested in learning about the intersection of law and finance from any kind of practical perspective. Rather, it is essentially a theory seminar. In fact, the class is not about Law and Finance, at least not in the broad sense that the course description conveyed. Instead, it is almost exclusively a discourse on Bebchuk's theories of corporate governance. Each of the reading materials is a different take on minute details of corporate governance theories, mainly consisting of quantitative studies. Both the readings and the class discussions were extremely redundant, as each session seems concerned with the same fundamental question - namely, how corporate control should be divided among shareholders, officers and directors. As many of my classmates, I wish I had known all of this in advance. The workload is most certainly on the high end for a 3 credit class, often involving 200 pages of reading per session. Submitting meaningful written comments on the readings becomes increasingly difficult throughout the semester, due to the redundancy of the materials.
COURSE: Law and Religion in India: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor John H. Mansfield
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 11
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 100.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 100.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 100.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 100.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Yes)
B. 100.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 100.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Only if you really care about religious theories in India.
COURSE: Law and Retaliation: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor John Goldberg
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 11
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 33.3% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 33.3% (Easy)
B. 66.700005% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 33.3% (Volunteers only)
E. 66.700005% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 33.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 66.700005% (Practical)
H. 66.700005% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 66.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 66.700005% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Law and the Political Process A
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Nathaniel Persily
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 38
RESPONSES: 7

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 57.100002% (Reasonable)
C. 28.6% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 14.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 28.6% (Average)
C. 71.4% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 42.9% (Panel)
B. 14.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 42.9% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 85.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 14.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 57.100002% (Clear about expectations)
D. 14.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 57.100002% (Organized)
F. 14.3% (Disorganized)
G. 71.4% (Practical)
H. 28.6% (Theoretical)
I. 57.100002% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 14.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 57.100002% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 14.3% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 28.6% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 28.6% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 57.100002% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 14.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 71.4% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 14.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 71.4% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 57.100002% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 42.9% (Available during office hours)
C. 85.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 28.6% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 14.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 42.9% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 42.9% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 85.700005% (Yes)
B. 14.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 42.9% (2L)
C. 57.100002% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Prof. Persily knows a lot about the subject matter and is enthusiastic about it. However, his lectures sometimes skipped the basics and went right to the complicated questions, such that the classroom discussion was limited to people who had prior experience/background in politics. When it came time to do a review before finals, it was clear that a substantial portion of the class (myself included) was struggling with the fundamentals. This was frustrating. Plus, classroom discussions were dominated by several (very knowledgable) students. There was little participation by people who hadn't "worked on the Hill", etc. and also little participation by women in the class. With that said, the subject matter is interesting, and Persily's readings provide a solid overview of election law. I would take the class again, but I would recommend that Prof. Persily slow down his lectures or limit the class to people with prior experience in politics.

This class is like drinking from a fire hose. There is so much doctrine and it is such a confused subject that it is difficult to string everything together into a coherent whole. Professor Persily did an excellent job of connecting the dots.
He is so enthusiastic! It's helpful to have con law, but not necessary.
COURSE: Legal History: Roman Law
PROFESSORS: Professor Charles Donahue and Assistant Professor Adriaan Lanni
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 25
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 33.3% (Reasonable)
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 33.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 66.7% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor – Professor Charles Donahue (check all that apply)
A. 66.7% (Clear about content)
B. 66.7% (Unclear about content)
C. 33.3% (Clear about expectations)
D. 66.7% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 33.3% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 66.7% (Theoretical)
I. 33.3% (Engaging)
J. 33.3% (Boring)
K. 33.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 33.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor – Assistant Professor Adriaan Lanni (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 33.3% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 66.700005% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 33.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability – Professor Charles Donahue (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability – Assistant Professor Adriaan Lanni (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 33.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 33.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 33.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/R</th>
<th>This class, at least the portion taught by Professor Donahue, appears to assume some level of fluency in Latin; the class can be terribly confusing if you don't have much of a background in the language.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Legal History: The Political Economy of Modern Capitalism: Seminar
PROFESSORS: Professor Christine Desan
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 6
RESPONSES: 0

This is a Fall/Spring course, so information may be available in Spring 2008.
COURSE: Legal Needs of Moderate Income Households
PROFESSOR: Ms. Jeanne Charn
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 34
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 50.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 50.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 50.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Yes)
B. 50.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

I found the subject matter of this course very interesting and Prof. Charn is really friendly, but the class time was painful. If I had it to do over again, I would take her other course since I hear the same material is covered and students can get their professionalism credits as well (which students do not get for this course).

Professor Charn is wonderfully committed to the topic and to her students. This class enhanced my knowledge of the current issues affecting Americans - social security, mortgages, credit card debt, etc. It is an incredible relevant and instructive course.
COURSE: Legal Profession A2
PROFESSOR: Professor Andrew L. Kaufman
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 52
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 25.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 25.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 50.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 25.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 25.0% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 25.0% (Engaging)
J. 25.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 25.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 25.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 25.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 25.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 25.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 25.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 75.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 25.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 50.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Yes)
B. 50.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaufman is extremely nice, and extremely boring. This course is a requirement, and taking it with Kaufman is very boring, but relatively easy as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/R
N/R
COURSE: Legal Profession A3
PROFESSOR: Professor David B. Wilkins
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 67
RESPONSES: 7

Workload
A. 14.3% (Light)
B. 42.9% (Reasonable)
C. 42.9% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 28.6% (Easy)
B. 42.9% (Average)
C. 28.6% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 14.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 57.100002% (Volunteers only)
E. 28.6% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 85.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 71.4% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 57.100002% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 85.700005% (Practical)
H. 71.4% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 85.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 28.6% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 57.100002% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 14.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 85.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 28.6% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 71.4% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 83.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 83.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 83.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 16.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 14.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 42.9% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 42.9% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 85.70005% (3L)
D. 14.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| I still can't believe the pilot of LA Law was on the syllabus. Wilkins is a friendly and engaging professor. |
| The instructor is very enthusiastic and encourages different points of view. He covers topics that are very important in the legal profession even if the students do not yet know it as they have not practiced in the real world yet (summer associate positions and internships are not the real legal world). |
| One of the best professors I have had at HLS, and possibly the MOST enthusiastic and caring teachers I have ever met. Truly dedicated to teaching and with tremendous integrity - he gives new meaning to the word "wisdom." Focuses on practical situations, but always with a thoughtful discussion of deeper philosophical and theoretical issues involved. Understands students and the current practice of law so well - and is obviously constantly learning and keeping abreast of the latest trends. |
| Fabulous instructor! |
| N/R |
One of the most practical classes at HLS, especially if you'll be at a firm. Wilkins (or David, as he insists on being called) is witty, engaging, and really interested in students.

Wilkins is fantastic - he shares excellent stories, asks thoughtful questions and brings in interesting speakers. It's fun to talk about the "real world" of law firms, general counsel, politics of pro bono, etc...
COURSE: Legal Profession: Comparing Ethics and Practice in Law and Medicine A4
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor William Sage
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 36
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 100.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 100.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Add meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 100.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 100.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 100.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 100.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Yes)
B. 100.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
awful
COURSE: Legal Profession: Delivery of Legal Services A5
PROFESSOR: Ms. Jeanne Charn
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 63
RESPONSES: 7

Workload
A. 42.9% (Light)
B. 42.9% (Reasonable)
C. 14.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 85.700005% (Easy)
B. 14.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 57.100002% (Volunteers only)
E. 42.9% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 71.4% (Clear about content)
B. 14.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 71.4% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 42.9% (Organized)
F. 42.9% (Disorganized)
G. 42.9% (Practical)
H. 14.3% (Theoretical)
I. 14.3% (Engaging)
J. 42.9% (Boring)
K. 14.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 28.6% (Adds meaningfully to/buils usefully on the reading)
M. 14.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 71.4% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 42.9% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 57.100002% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 14.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 28.6% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 16.7% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.7% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 57.1% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 71.4% (Available during office hours)
C. 57.1% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 71.4% (Yes)
B. 28.6% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This class was very easy. It is not necessary to attend more than a few classes or do reading. Lectures are haphazard, stream-of-consciousness style talks. I think she is very knowledgeable about the subject but not great in the classroom. Timely answers to email were also a problem. It's too bad because it's an interesting topic, but I felt the poor lectures made it seem like a less serious area of inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good way to satisfy legal profession requirement, and the course can be quite interesting if you get into it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class has a lot of reading, but no one really does the reading. Charn is a very nice person, but basically tells stories for the entire class period. The class is usually painfully boring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT take this class unless you feel passionately about delivery of legal professions. As far as I could tell, she gave the exact same lecture, without changes, every week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Legal Profession: Tactics and Ethics in Criminal Litigation A1
PROFESSOR: Professor Alan Dershowitz
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 64
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 66.700005% (Light)
B. 33.3% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 33.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 66.700005% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Clear about content)
B. 66.700005% (Unclear about content)
C. 33.3% (Clear about expectations)
D. 66.700005% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 66.700005% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 66.700005% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 66.700005% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 66.700005% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 66.7% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 33.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 66.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 33.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 33.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 33.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.7% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0% (1L)
B. 0% (2L)
C. 100% (3L)
D. 0% (LLM)
E. 0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

This is a great class - Dershowitz stories, and a generally clear set of things he wants to get across, but without a ton of work.
COURSE: Legal Profession: The Lawyering Process A
PROFESSOR: Ms. Jeanne Charn
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 18
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 33.3% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 33.3% (Volunteers only)
E. 66.700005% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Clear about content)
B. 66.700005% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 66.700005% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 66.700005% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 33.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 66.700005% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 66.700005% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 33.3% (2L)
C. 66.700005% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. is really nice and knowledgable, but was not the most organized in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this class. both lecture and discussions had a tendency to wander randomly. but i appreciate that as a legal professions class, it looked at legal services to low/moderate income groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This legal profession course requires prior of concurrent clinical work. i would have liked to spend more time in class discussing our clinical work and tying it in with the reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COURSE: Legal Research: Advanced  
PROFESSOR: Ms. Virginia J. Wise  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  
CLASS SIZE: 42  
RESPONSES: 7  

**Workload**  
A. 14.3% (Light)  
B. 42.9% (Reasonable)  
C. 14.3% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 28.6% (Extremely time-consuming)  

**Difficulty of material (choose one)**  
A. 28.6% (Easy)  
B. 57.10% (Average)  
C. 14.3% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)  

**Primary questioning style (choose one)**  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)  

**Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)**  
A. 42.9% (Clear about content)  
B. 42.9% (Unclear about content)  
C. 28.6% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 71.4% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 14.3% (Organized)  
F. 71.4% (Disorganized)  
G. 71.4% (Practical)  
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)  
I. 14.3% (Engaging)  
J. 42.9% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 14.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 57.10% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 42.9% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 14.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 42.9% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
### Class time (check all that apply)
- A. 71.4% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
- B. 14.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
- C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
- D. 85.700005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

### Instructor availability (check all that apply)
- A. 14.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
- B. 42.9% (Available during office hours)
- C. 28.6% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
- D. 28.6% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
- E. 28.6% (No basis for judgment)

### Exam (choose one)
- A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
- B. 14.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
- C. 14.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
- D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
- E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
- F. 71.4% (No exam in this class)

### All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
- A. 71.4% (Yes)
- B. 28.6% (No)

### Your year/program in school (choose one)
- A. 0.0% (1L)
- B. 28.6% (2L)
- C. 71.4% (3L)
- D. 0.0% (LLM)
- E. 0.0% (SJD)

### Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The information we learned in this class could have easily been covered in a packet or handout. We did not learn how to effectively conduct searches in Westlaw or Lexis, which is what I thought would be most valuable to law students. The information she gave us is useful but the class is very tedious. Professor Wise can be rude and condescending to students, and she tends to be disorganized. The weekly homework assignments were excruciating busywork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is by far the worst class I've taken at HLS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While this class was at times tedious and the quizzes did little to add to the experience, the class is practical and necessary and the lab format accompanied by some lecture works well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought that the closed book quizzes unfairly required students to engage in rote memorization. In the real world, we will be able to consult our materials when engaging in a research project, so I thought it would have been fairer to have quizzes that reflected the demands of the real world. Also, Professor Wise tried very hard to be available for students, but her teaching load seemed too high to allow her to be available as much as she would have liked. But she does care about being available for the students, so this semester was probably</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
an aberration.

| This is an extremely useful class and should be taken by anyone who will be doing legal research, though if anyone other than Wise teaches it, take it from that person. She seemed borderline irresponsible, the assignments were a bit of a waste of time (the quizzes were entirely pointless), and even though she would take weeks to respond to a time sensitive, assignment based question, she was completely unyielding about when our final project would be due. I'm sure she's a good person, but she was very irritating as a teacher. |
| The class material is incredibly useful. The instructor was atrocious. There was absolutely no organization of the class materials. There was no indication of what information was important. Quizzes tested insignificant details instead of concepts. Quizzes were closed book. In a research class. You know, for all those times when you do closed-book research. Take this class. Just take it from someone - anyone - else. |

N/R
COURSE: Legal Research: International, Foreign, and Comparative
PROFESSOR: Ms. Virginia J. Wise
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 22
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 25.0% (Light)
B. 75.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 75.0% (Easy)
B. 25.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 50.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 25.0% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 100.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 50.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 25.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 25.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 50.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 25.0% (Yes)
B. 75.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She was all over the place, the assignments were a mess, and I have no idea whether my paper was remotely what she wanted or not. Also, the extra-credit paper is a lot more work than the normal paper (it's 40-60 single spaced pages!), which is not mentioned in the syllabus!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| This class is pretty bad, but in a way that you feel bad for the teacher more than you hate her for wasting your time. There are no readings or any outside resources - that means if you miss class, there is NO way to figure out what you missed except by getting notes from other students. The homework assignments and quizzes test for things that don't ultimately matter, like what link you should click on to find a particular resource or the layout of different databases (why would you have to memorize that?!). Professor is frustrating and has double standards - will be snippety about students coming in late, but will repeatedly come in late herself. In the end, I did come out knowing about a few more resources than I did before, but the class did not give me any useful skills. Very disappointing. |

N/R
COURSE: Legal Research: Introduction to American and International Law Research: Module
PROFESSOR: Ms. Virginia J. Wise
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 16
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Legal Writing: Advanced A
PROFESSOR: Mr. Philip Burling
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 10
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 50.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 50.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully/to builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
**Class time (check all that apply)**
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

**Instructor availability (check all that apply)**
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

**Exam (choose one)**
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

**All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)**
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

**Your year/program in school (choose one)**
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

**Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very practical class. Provided an opportunity for practicing legal writing and introduced me to various kinds of legal writing that I hadn't tried before. Professor Burling is a very interested professor who offers a lot of firsthand advice and knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Workload
A. 62.5% (Light)
B. 37.5% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 18.800001% (Average)
C. 75.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 6.3% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 12.5% (Panel)
B. 37.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 50.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 56.3% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 25.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 68.8% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 62.5% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 18.800001% (Practical)
H. 75.0% (Theoretical)
I. 43.8% (Engaging)
J. 25.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 81.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 12.5% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 56.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 62.5% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 31.300001% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 37.5% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 12.5% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Professor Vermeule made me think in new and interesting ways about the political process and institutional capacities of the courts and Congress. Though he did not explicitly discourage the expression of differing views, he seemed unwilling to draw out the best arguments from students who were trying to challenge his well-developed and theoretically cohesive perspective -- not an easy thing to do for anyone, much less first semester 1L students, as Professor Vermeule is a more than formidable 'opponent.' I found that the best approach to the class was to sit and listen, take it in, and mull it over. At times, I felt as though we were being talked down to, and the classroom environment was not one in which I felt comfortable voicing my opinions or actively contributing; that said, I am appreciative of the course and I think V’s perspective will provide food for thought throughout my legal education and future career. Finally -- I do wish V would have talked more about his experience as a Supreme Court clerk, even if not explicitly; I also wish he would have offered up more compelling positions on the use of legislative history -- his contempt for it made it difficult to see the virtues of the arguments on
It is almost impossible to succeed in this class without going to lecture. The class would have been better had we spent less time on Congress and more on administrative law. It also would have been nice had Professor Vermeule not so obviously been sympathetic to Justice Scalia (for whom he clerked). That said, the class is valuable because of the tools of statutory interpretation and the introduction to administrative law, even if Vermeule is often acerbic.

When I made my initial evaluation of the class (scantrons on the last day) I didn't rank it so highly, but that was before I started studying. After that, I realized how much the class made sense. I felt I learned an incredible amount and could easily apply statutory interpretation when I was asked to do so in another class' exam. Prof. Vermuele gave a fair exam for which I felt studying was actually worthwhile.

Very, very challenging, esoteric professor who is not open to students disagreeing with him, but it was a very helpful class in terms of expanding my understanding of the subject.

The class would have been great as a seminar, where it would have been possible to argue in depth with Prof. Vermeule's interesting, clever, slightly eccentric, rigidly ideological fixed ideas about legislation and administrative law. As a lecture class in which Vermeule narrowly framed the parameters of discussion to support his predetermined views, and did not allow students to respond to his often unnecessarily, deceptively uncharitable critiques of their comments, the class was ultimately very frustrating. Also, Vermeule never explained, week by week, what we were being taught to do -- I didn't understand, in the most general terms, the basic subject of the course until it was over and I began reading treatises. One wishes the class could have been taught by both Vermeule and one of his ideological opponents, so that we could have gotten a less wildly biased and blindered overview of the subject. Still, he's hilarious and the class is entertaining and intellectually thrilling.

He's extremely knowledgeable and engaging.

Extremely knowledgeable about material and very analytical. Learned a lot about critiquing opinions and reading critically. Class was very entertaining and engaging. He definitely has an ideological bias that comes out in class, but I did not find it as bad as some of my classmates. Overall, I would say this was a perfect L&R class. Light on the reading (which was nice since it was our new 4th class), great on the basics of statutory interpretation and Administrative Law.

Prof Vermeule is very knowledgeable about the material, but he was often hard to follow and the material became very complex.

Prof. Vermeule's class is my favorite class. It always draws out distinctions which I had not seen in the reading and asks me to question my assumptions about the law and courts.

This class was extremely confusing. I wasn't sure what we were supposed to learn or how the topics we studied related to the general themes of the course or to each other. The professor brought up many topics/ideas/theories that weren't in the reading, and I have no idea whether it's his personal view or a standard view of the subject. It was impossible to determine what would be covered in class based on the reading -- even when the readings seemed clear, the class would go in a totally new direction and get confusing. It was never clear what the professor expected us to get out of the reading -- the important takeaways weren't made apparent from the text. He seems to think that the students aren't very bright and often gets flustered if he senses that we're not getting his points. He speaks quietly so often it's hard for students in the back of the room to hear/understand what's going on. The great thing about this class was that there were only 10-15 pages of reading a night.

Professor Vermeule's lecture style is meandering but highly entertaining. The man is brilliant. It's hard to know from lecture, though, what the most important points are.

He goes through the rows rather than calling on people randomly.
Workload
A. 70.0% (Light)
B. 30.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 10.5% (Easy)
B. 68.4% (Average)
C. 21.1% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 90.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 10.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 85.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 5.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 75.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 65.0% (Practical)
H. 45.0% (Theoretical)
I. 95.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 95.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 15.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 5.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 80.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 90.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 30.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 35.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 60.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 85.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 80.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 5.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 5.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 10.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 47.4% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 5.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 31.6% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 95.0% (Yes)
B. 5.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This class is beneficial, and complemented the traditional first year courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Manning is an amazing professor. He is extremely smart, understands the material very well, and can make it very accessible to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing for this class throughout the semester will pay off when you reach the final. Other than that, my advice is to savor every minute of this class! It's absolutely fantastic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Manning loves history and background. He is a very good natured professor and wants to make sure that students feel comfortable with the material. Toward the end of the semester class started to drag a little...Prof Manning does not have a fast-paced teaching style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Probably the best professor at HLS, perhaps in the world. Brilliant, ultra-nice and exceptionally talented at teaching. I can't think of enough good stuff to say about Prof Manning!

One of the best professors I've ever had.

great class, but he did handle us with kid gloves

While the exam tested appropriate and important concepts which were discussed thoroughly in class, it did not test enough material to allow us to adequately differentiate ourselves. I think this is because Professor Manning underestimated our ability when he formulated the questions. He taught, in my opinion, a good amount of various topics without shortchanging any of them. As such, he should have been more willing to sort us using a tougher exam. One more subquestion would have been adequate, I think.

John Manning is amazing. He seems to subject his own views to constant, unforgiving reexamination and, as a result, has developed a really admirably principled judicial philosophy. Plus, he is one of the nicest people you could meet. So brilliant he would be terrifying if he didn't also have such a great sense of humor.

Best professor I've ever had at any level

The best instructor I have ever had. A genuinely interesting, engaging, and helpful professor.

John Manning is a fabulous teacher!

Prof. Manning was the best professor we had this semester. Some people thought he went too slowly, but I appreciated the slow pace and the thorough treatment of the material we did get around to. Some of the admin law material that we did at the end of the semester was heavy going, and it would have been nice to have been given a clearer sense, before we started reading those cases, just what we should be looking for. I often found that I got hung up on the wrong details that weren't especially relevant to the lesson we wanted to draw for the purposes of the course. It would have been nice, for instance, if the course packet contained some introductory remarks on those difficult cases that gave a better sense going in of what to pay attention to and what to ignore. Other than that, I can't think of much to criticize. Prof. Manning was always engaging, approachable, responsive to student concerns, and amazingly knowledgeable. He managed to move with remarkable ease from talking about the history and political motivations behind a particular case or statute to talking about the practical details of implementation to talking about high-level theoretical questions about how we should want the legal system to work. And he managed to present a variety of different perspectives clearly and charitably. Really a spectacular mind and a fantastic teacher.
COURSE: Legislation and Regulation 6  
PROFESSOR: Professor Mark Tushnet  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 79  
RESPONSES: 15  

Workload  
A. 6.7000003% (Light)  
B. 53.3% (Reasonable)  
C. 40.0% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 6.7000003% (Easy)  
B. 26.7% (Average)  
C. 46.7% (More challenging than average)  
D. 20.0% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 46.7% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 6.7000003% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 13.3% (Volunteers only)  
E. 33.3% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 33.3% (Clear about content)  
B. 60.0% (Unclear about content)  
C. 20.0% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 66.700005% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 33.3% (Organized)  
F. 40.0% (Disorganized)  
G. 66.700005% (Practical)  
H. 73.3% (Theoretical)  
I. 26.7% (Engaging)  
J. 20.0% (Boring)  
K. 6.7000003% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 80.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 20.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 86.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 80.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 93.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 53.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 20.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 53.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 26.7% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 26.7% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 53.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 46.7% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 26.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 13.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 60.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 6.7000003% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 60.0% (Yes)
B. 40.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel the course was overly confusing for the first half of the semester. The prof. did not present the material in a way that was conducive to to an introductory course on regulatory &amp; administrative law. In the end I really enjoyed the class &amp; appreciated the material that we covered but the beginning in particular was presented in a confusing manner. But Prof. Tushnet really knows this stuff &amp; class was often very interesting.</td>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tushnet is brilliant, the material is interesting, but his presentation of it lacks a coherent presentation that I would have preferred.</td>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to know basic econ before taking this class</td>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-structure of course initially rather unclear, and class discussions generally not well- organized, but instructor was extremely competent with the material and very willing to help work through tough topics.</td>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was not a particularly organized class, and while it addressed topics that do seem useful, a lot of it did not seem particularly useful for those not writing policy.

This was one of my favorite classes. It covered material about administrative law, the justifications for regulation, comparative aspects of various regulating options, statutory interpretation, and more. Because this was the first year the course was taught to 1Ls, it was difficult for us to understand what we were supposed to be learning and what the class itself was actually ABOUT. But that never bothered me, even though I know many of my classmates struggled with grasping where we were going with all this! Prof. T. is incredibly knowledgable and thoughtful about the material. He clearly put a lot of work into helping us understand the readings. He expected us to do the readings, but understood they were complex, so he designed class discussion to help us make sense of the readings. I think if you actually did the readings, the class discussions were very helpful. I think some students felt that the class discussion was unorganized, but in my opinion, that is because Prof. T. is not exactly polished or elegant, so sometimes it appears that he is disorganized but that's just because he's trying to think thru the clearest way to express something. And I think he succeeded at that! It is also possible ppl felt he was disorganized because he would allow student questions and comments to get the discussion off-track and it seemed like he wasn't controlling the discussion enough. I always took the perspective that his allowing students to ask questions and encouraging us to participate was a reflection of how much he cared for us to work through problems ourselves. I thought he struck an excellent balance between asking provocative questions to help students work thru difficult analyses and then summarizing what we worked out in a more eloquent and concise manner to keep the class on track. He also incorporated occasional creative activities and examples and assignments (1 1-2 page paper and one 6 page statutory interpretation ungraded midterm). I really enjoyed the class. He also was very welcoming about taking students out to dinner and talking to us after class. Overall, I am really glad to have taken this class my first year and to get the chance to see more of the law outside of the focus on courts in all the other traditional 1L classes. Last, Prof. T. was extremely open about all political perspectives. He addressed arguments on the merits and not based on what side it was on. Even though we know from his Wikipedia that he is almost a socialist, he honestly critiqued all sides of arguments and encouraged us to think of all sides of an argument.

Unfortunately for us 1Ls, this class is now required. If it weren't, I wouldn't take it. Don't get me wrong, Professor Tushnet is a very nice person. It's just that the material is extremely boring, and it seems that he just doesn't know how to teach it. Perhaps his other courses, which he may have been teaching for longer, would be different. But this class is new to him, too, in the sense that it's his first year teaching 1Ls this required course, so the course was very disorganized and hard to follow. I still don't understand exactly what the point of that class was. Maybe I will later, who knows.
COURSE: Legislation and Regulation 7  
PROFESSOR: Professor Jody Freeman  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 79  
RESPONSES: 12  

Workload  
A. 41.7% (Light)  
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)  
C. 8.3% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 18.2% (Easy)  
B. 72.70005% (Average)  
C. 9.1% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 25.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 16.7% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 25.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 33.3% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 83.3% (Clear about content)  
B. 16.7% (Unclear about content)  
C. 66.70005% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 16.7% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 75.0% (Organized)  
F. 16.7% (Disorganized)  
G. 66.70005% (Practical)  
H. 41.7% (Theoretical)  
I. 91.70005% (Engaging)  
J. 8.3% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 83.3% (Adds meaningfully to/buils usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 25.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 58.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 25.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 83.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 8.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 25.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 83.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 16.7% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 41.7% (Available during office hours)
C. 25.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 8.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 16.7% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 8.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 66.700005% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 8.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 83.3% (Yes)
B. 16.7% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seemed like 2 distinct classes - first half on legislation, second half on administrative law. Class discussion sometimes spun wildly out of control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a class from Professor Freeman. You're missing out if you never get to have her as a professor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was the first year Leg Reg was offered, and that was evident, but Prof. Freeman did a good job in keeping class interesting and relevant, and I felt like we really got to the meat of cases in a way we didn't always in other classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first few months of the course material seem very muddled and confusing, but it will be made clearer near the end of each unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This was my favorite class until I took the exam, which I thought was not what we had been led to expect. Freeman is very engaging, and the readings and class were easy enough to follow if you paid attention. She was always willing to answer questions after class and in office hours, but I found her difficult to talk to. Overall a great course.

n/r

None
COURSE: Letters of Thomas Jefferson (The): Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Professor Alan Dershowitz
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 13
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Litigation Risk Management: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Jonathan Molot
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 13
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 100.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 100.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Professor Molot is a great guy, and I hope he receives a tenure-track offer from HLS.
COURSE: Mergers, Acquisitions, and Split-ups
PROFESSOR: Professor Robert C. Clark and Chancellor Leo E. Strine, Jr.
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 107
RESPONSES: 18

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 5.6% (Reasonable)
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 61.100002% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 16.7% (Average)
C. 72.200005% (More challenging than average)
D. 11.1% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 77.8% (Panel)
B. 22.2% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor - Professor Robert C. Clark (check all that apply)
A. 77.8% (Clear about content)
B. 11.1% (Unclear about content)
C. 61.100002% (Clear about expectations)
D. 22.2% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 83.3% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 44.4% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 44.4% (Boring)
K. 5.6% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 55.600002% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 11.1% (Does not use the reading)
N. 44.4% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 38.9% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 44.4% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 5.6% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 88.9% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 5.6% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Chancellor Leo E. Strine, Jr. (check all that apply)
A. 61.100002% (Clear about content)
B. 33.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 33.3% (Clear about expectations)
D. 27.800001% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 33.3% (Organized)
F. 38.9% (Disorganized)
G. 77.8% (Practical)
H. 22.2% (Theoretical)
I. 61.100002% (Engaging)
J. 11.1% (Boring)
K. 11.1% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 5.6% (Does not use the reading)
N. 22.2% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 22.2% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 61.100002% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 38.9% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 11.1% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 83.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 22.2% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 76.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 17.6% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 58.8% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 5.9% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability - Professor Robert C. Clark (check all that apply)
A. 29.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 23.5% (Available during office hours)
C. 23.5% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 64.700005% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Chancellor Leo E. Strine, Jr. (check all that apply)
A. 23.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 11.8% (Available during office hours)
C. 17.6% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 5.9% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 70.6% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 5.9% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 17.6% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 35.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 11.8% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 29.4% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 83.3% (Yes)
B. 16.7% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 38.9% (2L)
C. 38.9% (3L)
D. 22.2% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This class had a closed-book exam, announced in mid-November. The huge amount of material meant that it took up a grossly disproportionate amount of study time, leaving me unprepared for my other exams. It was truly the definition of not caring about your students. Securities regulation and corporate taxation should be prerequisites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend taking corporations before or simultaneously.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take this class only if you enjoyed the M&amp;A section of the basic corporations class. It has an insane amount of reading (all of which is covered in detail during class). I would recommend taking it during a semester when you don’t have another class with a very heavy course load that demands your primary attention. It is much more practical than other law courses I have taken, which keeps it interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class is one of the few (actually, the only) that I have taken that qualifies as &quot;advanced.&quot; Don't dream of taking it without taking Corporations first (or at least concurrently). Tax and SEC Reg would have been good to know, as well. But they should not be considered prerequisites by any means.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ABSURD amount of reading. Cases are complete and unedited. And when you're on panel, Strine expects you to know every minute detail. Sprung a closed book final exam on us about 2/3 through the course (as opposed to putting it in the course description or telling us during add/drop period). Turned the exam into a memorization exercise. Justification offered was that last year some people used commercial materials or other peoples' outlines (who cares?!). I believe the decision would fail a Unocal analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take corps and probably tax before taking this class. Also, Prof. Clark does not usually post his slides, so copy the content when you can!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guest speakers were great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were some terrible, dry, pull-out-your hair moments in this class, particularly when covering things like securities and tax. And there were several utterly engaging days with panel speakers. Plus, there was always Vice-Chancellor Strine to inject a little comic relief. In short, a little bit of all extremes, but on balance, worth it. The readings were long from a 3L perspective, although I suppose I would have done them all as a 1L. Don't take this class because you feel like you should - take it only if you're actually interested in M&amp;A. Or it will be painful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class was fantastic. I loved both Professors and their different styles were a great</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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complement to each other. The panelists were also terrific.

The class, I believe, necessitates previous knowledge not only in corporate law, but also tax law, securities law, business studies, and the American/common law case method. It is extremely difficult for foreign students without significant practical experience in M&A to follow.

The worst class I've taken since middle school. The reading is dense, unedited, ridiculously long, and utterly pointless. We were assigned hundreds of pages for every class, when the salient points could be distilled into less than 10 pages. Class discussions frequently went off on tangents and when Strine was speaking, I never had any idea where he was going with anything he said. He talked a lot about his experiences, but from a heavy judicial angle, so it isn't really that useful unless you're going to be a judge. Truly an awful class.

Corporations is very useful.

Great class, amazing professors, definitely one of the best classes I've taken at HLS.
COURSE: Moral Order and the Irrational: Readings in Nietzsche and Freud: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professors Richard Parker and Alan Stone
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 17
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 100.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor - Professor Richard Parker (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Professor Alan Stone (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability - Professor Richard Parker (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Professor Alan Stone (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 100.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 100.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
n/r
COURSE: Multiculturalism and the Law: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Ayelet Shachar
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 16
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 50.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 50.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

I would recommend this course to anyone.
n/r
COURSE: Mumbai: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Professor Gerald Frug
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 14
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 50.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
Interesting topic. Wish people participated more in class.
n/r
COURSE: National Security Investigations and Litigation: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Jack Landman Goldsmith III and Mr. James Baker
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 21
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 66.700005% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 33.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 33.3% (Easy)
B. 66.700005% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 66.700005% (Volunteers only)
E. 33.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor - Professor Jack Landman Goldsmith III (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 50.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 50.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Mr. James Baker (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 50.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability – Prof. Jack Landman Goldsmith III (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 50.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Mr. James Baker (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are going to take this class to sit next to Goldsmith no matter the content. They're right to. He's a remarkable guy. On the downside, the reading list was very long and quite difficult to justify given that it is a 2-credit class. They need to be more disciplined with the readings -- assign excerpts of cases or highlight what is important or assign less cases. The readings were distributed each week in double-sided photocopies and at the end of the semester I had a huge stack of papers that proved impossible to organize. By huge I mean more than could fit in my backpack. There was more reading for this 2-credit class each week than for both of my 4-credit classes combined. But given the lack of coursebook or detailed syllabus it was difficult to come out of the class with an outline or a clear sense of what I learned. Perhaps that's a flaw of all seminar classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very interesting &amp; exciting class, especially with the background and experiences of the instructors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun class. Both professors have been in government and are thoroughly knowledgeable about their subject. They use the class as a vehicle for discussion, for telling stories about their experiences in government, and for career advice (slanted toward those wanting to be in national security law, but helpful for any aspiring government lawyer). Baker is especially interested in helping with career questions, but both professors are actively involved with student advising. Plus, because of their Washington contacts, they bring in some really neat guest speakers!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Negotiation Workshop A
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Russell Korobkin
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 24
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 50.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 100.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 50.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 50.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 50.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This class is quite different from the other negotiations courses offered. The focus is less on the personal/emotional aspects of negotiation and more on theory. It seemed slightly less engaging than Mnookin or Bordone's classes are rumored to be. But Korobkin is super nice and sweet and the material is very, very easy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Negotiation: Dealing With Emotions: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Daniel L. Shapiro
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 21
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 50.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 50.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
Best Prof. at HLS
COURSE: Perspectives on International Human Rights: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Ms. Mindy Jane Roseman
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 8
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Power, Beauty, Sex and Violence: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Ms. Diane Rosenfeld
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 15
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 100.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 100.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 100.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
Interesting reading group! Ms. Rosenfeld was engaging and I enjoyed her class discussions. However, she could use some improvement on her organization, primarily with respect to making the readings available in a more timely manner. It was frustrating not to have the reading available until a day or two before class. I would recommend the class for anyone interested in the topic, but I would also recommend for the professor to work on her organization.
COURSE: Practical Lawyering in Cyberspace: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor John Palfrey, Mr. Jeffrey Cunard, Mr. Phillip R. Malone
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 17
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 66.700005% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 66.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 66.700005% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This was the absolute best course I have taken during my three years here. I can't believe how available and involved all three professors were, including the partner at Debevoise! It taught practical approaches to the practice of law through the lens of fascinating and current cyberlaw courses. The legal strategies we discussed will give me a great head-start when I become a lawyer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great course to take - the instructors are really pleasant. Highly recommend it!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Cunard is not very receptive of opposing viewpoints, but Phil Malone and John Palfrey are wonderful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Preventive State - In Search of Jurisprudence (The): Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Alan Dershowitz
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 23
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 33.3% (Easy)
B. 66.700005% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)
B. 33.3% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 66.700005% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 33.3% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 66.700005% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 33.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 66.700005% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 33.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 66.700005% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 33.3% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

There is a course paper at the end, and it takes quite a bit of time. If I had to do it over, I would spread my research out through the semester rather than try to cram it in during the mayhem of finals.

I heard a lot of great story's about Dersh's life, but that's about all I got out of the class.

n/r
COURSE: Prison Law and Policy
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Sharon Dolovich
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 47
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 25.0% (Light)
B. 75.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 25.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 75.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 75.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 75.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 75.0% (Practical)
H. 25.0% (Theoretical)
I. 75.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 75.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 75.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 25.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 25.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 75.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 75.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 25.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 75.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 50.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 25.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 75.0% (Yes)
B. 25.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Prof. Dolovich is an excellent teacher. She is impeccably prepared, well organized, and skilled at bringing out lively class discussion. She assigns the perfect amount of reading -- very manageable -- and goes over it in detail so that I left the class with a crystal clear understanding of the basic jurisprudence (and its limitations). In that sense, it's been the most effective black-letter law class that I've taken. She knows the material cold, is clearly interested in it, and is happy to engage with students outside of class. Understanding our prison system is crucial for anyone who will be involved in criminal law and policy, as well as for anyone interested in race and class. I think this should be a permanent offering in the curriculum, and that Prof. Dolovich would be a valuable addition to the faculty. That said, I sometimes felt frustrated by the class' excessive focus on the minutiae of jurisprudence. This is no different than most HLS courses, but it would have been refreshing to engage in these issues with a more critical perspective on the law, one that acknowledges the role that politics play in the formation of judge-made law, and that explores more effective ways in
which those with legal training can effect change -- ways that stretch beyond the limited tool of litigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The professor takes it personally if you do anything that she dislikes, such as use the internet during class, miss a class, pass on a question. At times she seemed kind of unstable. She was also very biased in her discussion of most topics. I think the subject matter of the class is very interesting but would never take it with this professor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely engaging class, but at times the discussions were purely one-sided. Some familiarity with Constitutional law would make the class easier, but none is required or necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dolovich is very, very good. She is very enthusiastic, and works to involve much of the class in discussion. She is also very accessible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Professional Services
PROFESSOR: Professor Ashish Nanda
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 41
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 100.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 100.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 66.700005% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 100.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 33.3% (2L)
C. 66.700005% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Hands down best class I've taken at the law school. It doesn't matter what type of law you are interested in - you will love this class. He is one of those professors you take regardless of what he is teaching. There is both a paper and an exam, but the work load is very light during the course of the semester and the exam involves responding to business case studies, so just requires having been engaged during the semester, not major studying at the end.
COURSE: Property 2
PROFESSOR: Professor Mary Ann Glendon
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 81
RESPONSES: 14

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 14.3% (Reasonable)
C. 21.4% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 64.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 35.7% (Average)
C. 57.100002% (More challenging than average)
D. 7.1% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 78.6% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 14.3% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 7.1% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 42.9% (Clear about expectations)
D. 35.7% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 57.100002% (Organized)
F. 21.4% (Disorganized)
G. 28.6% (Practical)
H. 71.4% (Theoretical)
I. 21.4% (Engaging)
J. 57.100002% (Boring)
K. 14.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 14.3% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 85.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 35.7% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 14.3% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 85.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 14.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 57.100002% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 21.4% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 46.2% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 46.2% (Available during office hours)
C. 30.800001% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 15.400001% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 30.800001% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 28.6% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 7.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 35.7% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 7.1% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 21.4% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 35.7% (Yes)
B. 64.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

This class had an unbelievable amount of work. A lot of times we were reading 30-50 pages a night, sometimes as many as 80 to over 100. We discussed many topics much more in depth than were covered in the textbook. In fact the supplement was as thick as the textbook and none of the cases were edited. It was way too much work which made it difficult to absorb everything we were learning. On the other side, Professor Glendon was engaging and animated in lecture. She seemed really excited about what she was teaching. I liked her personally as a professor and lecturer but thought there was too much work for a 1L class especially considering we have 3 other classes to worry about.

The professor’s system of alerting students as to when they would be on call was very helpful and appreciated; however, beyond this, she seemed to call on the same group of students throughout the semester. Class discussions were often confusing - it was rarely clear what she hoped to extract from open-ended questions to the class, and she often grew obviously frustrated as a result. As far as the exam, we
were told us the day before that it would cover only material that we had focused on in class; however, the actual exam contained several questions to which she had given only passing treatment, and material that we had spent a fair amount of time on was omitted.

Assigns far too much theoretical reading, but she demands some of it on the exam. However, she focuses too much on black letter law that she thinks is boring and doesn't really test that often.

She was not popular with many students, but if you enjoy political philosophy and/or constitutional law you'll have a lot of fun. Her exam was very fairly calibrated to the material covered in class.

I liked Prof. Glendon's class a lot. She had a habit of picking on a couple of people, which at some point got kind of old, but in general she's very personable and engaging with the material. She is all about the constitutional element and spends a lot of (fun) time on it (both in class and on the exam). She was definitely one of our better profs.

Beware of the reading load in this course for two reasons. First, it's simply a lot of material; almost double that assigned in other classes. Second, the exam covered not only major topics we discussed in class, but smaller issues that were found in the reading; issues which we spent little class time on.

I did not think she was a good professor or an effective communicator of the material, despite her knowledge of the subject matter.

Very knowledgeable professor, but can be quite patronizing towards students. Gets frustrated/irritated easily if students don't come up with the answer she wants. Readings are often repetitive, unnecessarily long, and imbalanced from week to week.

This class was my least favorite this term. Extremely boring, too much reading, and hard to follow. That being said, the exam was extremely fair and reflected what we had actually covered in class.

She's really nice and knows the material extremely well. Unfortunately, she gets sidetracked incredibly easy and is not very organized in how she teaches. Also she overestimates how interested the students are in class which can affect the overall class atmosphere.

I really loved Prof. Glendon as a person. She is eerily knowledgeable about the information in the class, is funny, has amazing experiences and has a better memory at 70 than I had at 20! Classtime, however, is not great. I often leave more confused than I was entering - the way she conveys the material lacks structure making it more difficult to understand than it should be. She assigned far more reading than other classes and it was near impossible to keep up. I would still recommend this class, but you should get a hornbook and an outline.
COURSE: Property 3
PROFESSOR: Professor Joseph Singer
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 16

Workload
A. 6.3% (Light)
B. 12.5% (Reasonable)
C. 68.8% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 12.5% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 87.5% (Average)
C. 12.5% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 25.0% (Panel)
B. 37.5% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 12.5% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 25.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 56.3% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 62.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 12.5% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 25.0% (Organized)
F. 62.5% (Disorganized)
G. 6.3% (Practical)
H. 62.5% (Theoretical)
I. 12.5% (Engaging)
J. 56.3% (Boring)
K. 37.5% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 18.800001% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 6.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 43.8% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 56.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 43.8% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 12.5% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 81.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 18.800001% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 37.5% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 50.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 25.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 62.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 56.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 87.5% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 12.5% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 12.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 6.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 43.8% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 37.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Yes)
B. 50.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish
you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other
miscellaneous comments)

Professor Singer cares deeply about teaching and his students and this was clearly
demonstrated throughout the course. His class was hit or miss -- sometimes
refreshingly interesting and sometimes dragging on and on without moving the ball
forward. He had a tendency to dwell on a single point in his lectures for way too
long, and though the point would be interesting, it went on for far too long and the
class would lose interest by the time he moved ahead. The Notes section of the text
was sometimes bewildering; major points of law were hidden among a sea of text
and it wasn't always clear what was important. Prof Singer involves students in his
course; we split into panels and argued for or against positions and learned how to
make good, nuanced arguments along multiple themes. This was unique and not a
focus in other courses, and I appreciated it. His exam asked students to do the kinds
of arguments that we've been doing all semester. It was very fair, and when it came

n/r


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to respond to the exam questions, I felt very capable of rising to the challenge.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singer is unconscionably boring - the only reason many people went to class is that we already had to be awake for Civ Pro. It's also unfortunate that he focuses almost exclusively on real property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class is WAY too focused on real property (hardly anything else is covered); There is far too much reading (I don't think he adjusted much for the heavier course load, based on comparisons with outlines from previous years, we actually covered more); It feels very disorganized, he spends far too much time lecturing, is inconsiderate of student time (consistently going past the end of class), and very rarely focused on the cases/issues/debates that actually interested students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I began the semester deeply sympathetic to Singer's approach. By the end, I agreed with everyone else that he was by far our worst professor, and that this was by far our worst class. In my entire life, no one has wasted as much of my time as Prof. Singer, except perhaps my fourth-grade teacher Ms. Noyes. I would recommend never going to class once you get a hang of his &quot;give me four types of arguments&quot; strategy. Everything after that will be a complete waste, hours and hours and hours of your time and the time of eighty other potentially productive Harvard Law students squandered for no apparent reason, except the professor's evident inability to understand the source of his years and years of negative student reviews. The cruellest moment of the course comes when he casually mentions, at the end, that he likes to throw in issues on the exam drawn from notes in the book that we didn't discuss -- meaning that attending class was not even useful for determining what would be on the exam. Singer's heart is in the right place, but he simply does not understand how to be an effective teacher, much less a minimally engaging one. Avoid this class by whatever means you can.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class definitely tainted my feelings for Property Law. We spent a lot of time on some topics that were not interesting (at least to me), while skipping some of the basics (like real estate transactions, wills, trusts, personal property). Course jumped around unrelated topics a lot. Professor was very nice however and very approachable. Good guy. But very boring in class. He rambled a lot and always went late (even though our class was 2 hours long already). Definitely learned a lot about making different styles of arguments. Just be prepared to focus more on the different types of arguments you could make on both sides of an issue rather than on what the actual law is. Also focused pretty heavily on minority rules in the cases we read. Prof Singer was ver friendly and always welcomed student concerns and questions, but class often dragged and students were generally not engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class was at least 90% lecture each day, and it was a two-hour class, which meant it got very boring. The professor would give us a 10-minute break in the middle, which would often run to 15 minutes, but then he would hold us 5-10 minutes after class, which students resented. Because he wrote the textbook, the lectures were exactly the same as the previous night's reading. Each topic was totally unrelated to each other topic, so the class never really came together as a whole. On the plus side, the professor truly cared about his students doing well, and often offered advice. He also made us practice making arguments, a more practical skill than in most classes. He meant well but the lecture style and the material were</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
just too boring to make the class enjoyable.

This class is heavy on policy arguments and light on black-letter law. Builds useful skills in making those arguments, but you feel like you don't really learn what the law is. Definite liberal bias in both the content itself and the delivery, but Professor Singer is open to other viewpoints if you're brave enough to express them.

Prof. Singer lectures a lot. He does a good job of getting students to argue both sides of an issue.
COURSE: Property 5
PROFESSOR: Professor Charles Donahue
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 79
RESPONSES: 19

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 5.3% (Reasonable)
C. 84.2\% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 10.5% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 5.3% (Average)
C. 57.9% (More challenging than average)
D. 36.8% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 5.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 94.7\% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 5.3% (Clear about content)
B. 84.2\% (Unclear about content)
C. 21.1% (Clear about expectations)
D. 52.6\% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 36.8% (Organized)
F. 31.6% (Disorganized)
G. 21.1% (Practical)
H. 89.5% (Theoretical)
I. 42.1\% (Engaging)
J. 21.1% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 52.6\% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 10.5% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 94.7\% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 42.1\% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 31.6% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 26.3\% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 94.7\% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 21.1% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 42.100002% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 47.4% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 78.9% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 5.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 47.4% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 57.9% (Available during office hours)
C. 52.600002% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 21.1% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 10.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 21.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 36.8% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 21.1% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 52.600002% (Yes)
B. 47.4% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
I would choose to take this class again because I felt like Professor Donahue really challenged me to learn Property law. However, I did have to learn a lot of it myself. I very much appreciated Professor Donahue's dedication to teaching and his enthusiasm, but I also felt that he was very often not good at explaining concepts - he would explain things in very convoluted ways without defining his terms, and would seem unable to rephrase or clarify when students didn't understand. In fact, he often was snarky and testy with students who didn't understand, which I believe limited people's willingness to ask questions in his class, even though when they did so, everyone was relieved (because often everyone was confused). All that being said, however, I would take the class again. Despite the criticisms I have of Professor Donahue's teaching style, he put tons of effort into the class, and there were many topics and cases that we covered for which he really did raise my understanding and thought process about the issues to another level. Furthermore,
the challenging problems he posed to us forced people to really push their knowledge and apply it in novel and creative ways.

An incredible learning experience! A true intellectual challenge, a tough exam, but worth taking.

Lecture/discussion is nearly impossible to follow whether or not you have done the reading.

Prof. Donahue makes double-effort to make sure the students can understand the material. I was impressed by his dedication and availability for us.

Donahue is amazing

Donahue is a brilliant scholar. However, he is horrible at explaining concepts that are really not all that difficult — it is the way he teaches the material that makes it more complicated and confusing than it actually is.

You won't realize how much you learned in Property until you read the Gilbert's Outline for the course. This supplement is KEY to getting the big picture of all the concepts covered, and it helps give you a newfound appreciation for class discussions. I wish I had read Gilbert's all along, instead of waiting until the exam reading period. That said, Donahue is very knowledgeable and engaging (in an eccentric way), and you'll enjoy the class more and more as the semester progresses.

Book is totally incomprehensible mess. Socratic method, but questions posed in class are often so contrived that the answers are only obvious to Donahue. He tries really hard to make himself available to students and is always willing to answer questions.

Professor Donahue has a brilliant mind. He truly cares about his students and wants them to learn the material. One concern shared by several students is that because he knows so much he sometimes takes for granted that his students know more than they actually do. The result is that he uses allusions and references of which students are wholly unaware. This sometimes causes confusion in class. He is however cognizant of this, often pausing in the middle of class when he sees glazed looks in his students’ eyes. Over the course of the semester, I have developed a great deal of respect for professor Donahue.

Prof. Donahue is a great guy and is really entertaining during class. He is interesting and really knows the material and it is easy to tell he enjoys teaching. The problem I had is that he is very theoretical and is a legal historian so often focused on concepts that I found irrelevant and/or confusing. If legal history is your thing though, this would probably be a great class.
COURSE: Redesigning the Constitution: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Sanford Levinson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 11
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Refugee and Asylum Advocacy: Seminar A
PROFESSOR: Clinical Professor Deborah Anker
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 14
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

n/r
**COURSE:** Securities Regulation A  
**PROFESSOR:** Professor Howell Jackson  
**SEMESTER:** Fall 2007

**CLASS SIZE:** 76  
**RESPONSES:** 15

**Workload**  
A. 0.0% (Light)  
B. 13.3% (Reasonable)  
C. 66.700005% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 20.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

**Difficulty of material (choose one)**  
A. 0.0% (Easy)  
B. 13.3% (Average)  
C. 53.3% (More challenging than average)  
D. 33.3% (Very difficult)

**Primary questioning style (choose one)**  
A. 100.0% (Panel)  
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

**Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)**  
A. 60.0% (Clear about content)  
B. 33.3% (Unclear about content)  
C. 53.3% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 20.0% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 60.0% (Organized)  
F. 26.7% (Disorganized)  
G. 80.0% (Practical)  
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)  
I. 60.0% (Engaging)  
J. 20.0% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 60.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 20.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 26.7% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 53.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)  
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Class time (check all that apply)
A. 86.700005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 6.7000003% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 13.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 53.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 26.7% (Available during office hours)
C. 53.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 6.7000003% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 26.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 6.7000003% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 53.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 13.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 13.3% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 13.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 73.3% (Yes)
B. 26.7% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 26.7% (2L)
C. 53.3% (3L)
D. 20.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Really smart, thoughtful, nice guy. This course is hard and I'm not sure it could have been taught in an easier way. The exam was difficult to prepare for and unlike any other exam I have ever taken. If you take this class and are willing to work hard, you will learn A LOT. Otherwise, you are going to be steamrolled by information and quickly get overwhelmed.

Professor Jackson seems to focus more on getting through the material rather than on whether his students are understanding the material. He needs to omit some material and do a better job of checking in with students to see if he is going at the right speed.

Exam was multiple choice with the option of explaining your answers.
There was a lot of reading assigned every day (though I doubt many people kept up with it). The book seemed to be very poorly organized, and class discussion didn't seem to make it more clear. Jackson is a very nice guy, but it was often hard to follow the class discussion.

Exam is unusual - multiple choice with room to explain. Jackson opens each class with current events (article from WSJ or NYT etc.) which is very cool.

Highly useful class for corporate attorneys. Boring and complicated material, but Jackson does a good job making it accessible. The kind of class where you'd be better off skipping the casebook reading and buying a commercial outline instead.
COURSE: Sex Equality
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Catherine MacKinnon
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 73
RESPONSES: 11

Workload
A. 9.1% (Light)
B. 81.8% (Reasonable)
C. 9.1% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 18.2% (Easy)
B. 72.700005% (Average)
C. 9.1% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 81.8% (Volunteers only)
E. 18.2% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 90.9% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 72.700005% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 72.700005% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 63.600002% (Practical)
H. 72.700005% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 72.700005% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 81.8% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 36.4% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 36.4% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 18.2% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 27.300001% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 36.4% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 45.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 63.600002% (Available during office hours)
C. 72.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 9.1% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 9.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 9.1% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 9.1% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 72.700005% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 90.9% (Yes)
B. 9.1% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 81.8% (2L)
C. 18.2% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There was an exam but I chose to do three papers instead (there was a choice). She is open to disagreement from students along only certain lines; you certainly can’t disagree that women are equal to men, for instance. But you can take her premises and argue that they lead to different conclusions and she welcomes that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This class is about MacKinnon and what MacKinnon thinks, but what she has to say is very different and interesting, and certainly worth hearing even if you don't agree. Instead of a test, we wrote papers which could NOT total more than 4000 words COMBINED, so it was the least work I've ever had to spend to get 4 class credits. Excellent class. Best class I've taken at HLS, though not completely relevant to my career.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fantastic class--would recommend to everyone! Didn't always agree with her, but she made me think about the law differently, and I learned a huge amount.

There was a paper option in lieu of an exam -- we could write three short papers over the course of the semester.

This was a life changing class. Professor MacKinnon is incredibly engaging, knows the material better than probably anyone on earth, and cares only that we LEARN and are engaged. It was pedagogically the best experience I have had here. It was challenging in that it forced us all to begin looking at the law and law school and life in an entirely new, difficult, but accurate way. It should be a required class for every human being, let alone every law student. It was the reason I came to school every day. It reminded me why I came to law school in the first place. Thank goodness for it, and thank goodness for Professor MacKinnon, who inspired and challenged us every day. The last class, we all wanted to yell "encore!" We didn't want it to end.

Best professor I've had here. Awesome and engaging class. Paper option or a final.
COURSE: Shareholder Activism
PROFESSOR: Professor Lucian Bebchuk and Beth Young
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 28
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Sports Law: Examining the Legal History and Evolution of America's Three "Major League" Sports: MLB, NFL and NBA.

PROFESSOR: Mr. Peter A. Carfagna

SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 49
RESPONSES: 5

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 20.0% (Reasonable)
C. 40.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 40.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 40.0% (Easy)
B. 20.0% (Average)
C. 40.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 20.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 40.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 40.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 80.0% (Clear about content)
B. 20.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 40.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 40.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 80.0% (Organized)
F. 20.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 20.0% (Theoretical)
I. 80.0% (Engaging)
J. 20.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 80.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 20.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 20.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 20.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 80.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 40.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 60.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 40.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 80.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 20.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 20.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 60.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 80.0% (Yes)
B. 20.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 80.0% (2L)
C. 20.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
The class meets for one 3 hour block each week. We usually had about an hour of class discussion of the readings, sometimes a guest lecturer, and usually spent at least an hour working in small groups on our weekly assignments. Each week we had a fairly substantial written assignment (in our group), ranging from a re-negotiation of the standard player's contract to oral argument questions for the supreme court to a settlement agreement over steroid use. Prof. Carfagna is great! I wish I had known how bad this casebook was before taking the class. The casebook is horribly disorganized, badly edited, lacks any meaningful table of contents or index, and is generally a terrible read. This problem was exacerbated by the disorganization of the syllabus (no page #s!) and weekly assignments and the fact that we didn't actually follow the syllabus, except on a few occasions. If you're not a
huge sports nerd who wants to work for the Red Sox, don't take this class. I thought I was interested enough in sports to make it worthwhile, but I'm wasn't, and I found myself bored and at a loose end, wishing I had taken a more interesting class. The biggest problem is that the caselaw is just very shallow--there aren't that many cases, so you study most of what's been decided in sports law, which means you read a lot of badly written opinions. It's like taking contract law and randomly choosing thirty cases that have to do with contracts, rather than studying the most important / interesting / influential ones. Be forewarned: the professor is charming, but this course probably isn't for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group work constituted 80% of the grade in this class. This class had time-consuming weekly written assignments that required extensive group work outside of class time. The professor would set page limits and then reward students that blatantly violated them.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Excellent class, especially for sports fans. Helps to know about and follow sports. Be aware that there is a lot of writing and in class exercises, but these are actually extremely helpful, both for understanding the material and preparing for practice. Highly recommended.

If you take antitrust, you'll find this course a breeze.
COURSE: Statutory Interpretation: Reading Group
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Amanda Tyler
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 8
RESPONSES: 1

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 100.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 100.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

This was a great way to get the basics of statutory interpretation, in an enjoyable seminar atmosphere and for only one credit. I thought Prof. Tyler was terrific. She's very good at her topic and her classroom management was great. She really managed the seminar well and brought out some excellent discussions. She's very clear and rigorous in her statements to the class, and makes complicated ideas understandable without becoming reductive. I appreciated her high expectations and she made me wish I had more of a talent for this kind of legal thought. I think she would be an excellent addition to the faculty here.
COURSE: Stem Cell Research: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Russell Korobkin
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 15
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 50.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Easy)
B. 50.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 100.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 100.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
Really interesting discussion seminar.
n/r
COURSE: Taxation A1  
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Mark Gergen  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 97  
RESPONSES: 14  

Workload  
A. 0.0% (Light)  
B. 71.4% (Reasonable)  
C. 21.4% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 7.1% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Easy)  
B. 14.3% (Average)  
C. 50.0% (More challenging than average)  
D. 35.7% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 64.3% (Panel)  
B. 7.1% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 28.6% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 35.7% (Clear about content)  
B. 42.9% (Unclear about content)  
C. 42.9% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 35.7% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 78.6% (Organized)  
F. 14.3% (Disorganized)  
G. 57.100002% (Practical)  
H. 21.4% (Theoretical)  
I. 14.3% (Engaging)  
J. 85.700005% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 57.100002% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 64.3% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 28.6% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 21.4% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 57.100002% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 7.1% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 71.4% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 42.9% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 42.9% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 78.6% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 14.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 42.9% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 42.9% (Available during office hours)
C. 35.7% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 42.9% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 7.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 7.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 7.1% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 35.7% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 42.9% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 28.6% (Yes)
B. 71.4% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 42.9% (3L)
D. 7.1% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

I like tax, but I did not like this class taught by Professor Gergen. The big thing: he was extremely inarticulate/inaudible. No one could understand him. He told us that he mumbles when he's nervous, but this was over the top. I couldn't take decent notes because they were full of brackets with question marks where I missed words, phrases, or whole sentences. People sitting in front of me were doing the same thing. Also, there were a couple times in the semester when I e-mailed him and he never responded. I know I was using the right e-mail address because he did respond one time I e-mailed him.

Prof. Gergen is knowledgeable but his mumbling delivery is difficult to comprehend, and he breezes through the material without making sure everyone understands.

n/r

n/r

good professor but taught the class for a higher level exam was extremely difficult
Light course with heavy expectations for the final exam. Focus on the readings more than the class lectures because in the end, the readings really do matter more.

n/r

Gergen seems nervous in class. He mumbles constantly and is difficult to follow. He also put class notes online, but they were not particularly helpful. In at least one case there was a typo that changed a substantive point of law.

Gergen really grew on me throughout the semester and I really liked him by the end--though at times he could be unclear (and literally hard to hear) and sometimes moved a bit too quickly through certain issues, I thought he did a good job of conveying what we should be taking away from the materials.

n/r

The material can be very difficult for people with no analytical/math background, and Prof. Gergen goes very quickly through some things. Using study guides and asking questions helps. Prof. Gergen is smart, but condescends to students when they answer questions incorrectly or ask easy questions. That made class less enjoyable.

I wish I had taken Tax with Warren or some other professor. Gergen was difficult to understand and terribly unenthusiastic.

I personally find taxation very interesting, but really disliked this course. The professor took difficult but fascinating material and made it REALLY difficult and boring besides. Since taxation is difficult to understand by all accounts, I would recommend taking it with a clear and engaging professor. Gergen was neither.

Hard to hear despite microphone. Use of document camera instead of powerpoint distracted from his presentation and was far harder to read. Refuses to learn powerpoint and admits this
COURSE: Taxation A2
PROFESSOR: Professor Alvin C. Warren
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 122
RESPONSES: 21

Workload
A. 23.800001% (Light)
B. 71.4% (Reasonable)
C. 4.8% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 4.8% (Easy)
B. 19.0% (Average)
C. 71.4% (More challenging than average)
D. 4.8% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 38.100002% (Panel)
B. 14.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 47.600002% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 90.5% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 100.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 95.200005% (Practical)
H. 71.4% (Theoretical)
I. 90.5% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 85.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 42.9% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 52.4% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 61.9% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 4.8% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 90.5% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 95.200005% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 28.6% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 38.100002% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 23.800001% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 38.100002% (Available during office hours)
C. 42.9% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 42.9% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 52.4% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 33.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 14.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 71.4% (2L)
C. 19.0% (3L)
D. 9.5% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
<th>I still can't believe he made tax law funny.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a lot of reading, but it takes longer than average for the amount assigned because it is complicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the best professors I've ever had. Clear, engaging, fantastic. I didn't do most of the reading as we went along, as the textbook was terrible, but just from his lectures and sometimes doing the reading as a follow-up to class, I was able to learn tax law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
<td>Very good class. Warren has been teaching this for a while and knows what he's doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best professor I've had at HLS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great! The only guy to take Tax from. If you want to do well, study the old exam answers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Everyone loves Warren and I agree. I ranked him #1 in my lottery list and was happy to get him. Tax feels like sorta a useless class in retrospect but is supposed to help you learn how to read statutes. That's why I took it. I assume there are other statutory classes that would teach these same skills if you have more interest in that content (e.g., environmental law). Warren is a great teacher for leading you through learning to read statutes if you choose to do it through tax. You should sit in the front if you take the class. He is entirely socratic/discussion (although very gentle and supportive and non-threatening etc) so if when it's time for one of your shy and soft-spoken classmates (approximately 20% of our class) to answer his questions and describe the case and law then you won't be able to understand what's going on if you're sitting in the back like I was. I took notes all semester only to see old outlines from HL Central before the exam that looked like my notes verbatim. He teaches mostly the same material, using identical examples, each year. So you should download an outline at the beginning of the semester and have it open in lecture. Saves you the trouble of trying to quickly format charts and grids and copy down his (very important!) examples and answers that he writes on the board.

Warren is not quite as fabulous as everyone says, but the class is fine. I think Warren's reputation is more a reflection of how atrocious the other tax professors are supposed to be, rather than how great Warren is. Over all, I would say the class was OK, but not worth my number two lottery pick.

Made tax clear and interesting. He is socratic, but goes up and down the aisles so you have a good idea whether or not you will be on call in a particular class.

Loved it- favorite class of the semester. Warren is a really great TEACHER. He has figured out a really great way to teach tax, but it's not stale. His enthusiasm is infectious, and the reading is extremely manageable. He goes down the rows calling on people so you always know what days to expect it.

This is a great class with a wonderful professor.
COURSE: Taxation: Partners and Partnerships
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Mark Gergen
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 20
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)
C. 25.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 25.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 50.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 50.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 25.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 25.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 75.0% (Organized)
F. 25.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 25.0% (Theoretical)
I. 25.0% (Engaging)
J. 75.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 25.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 25.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 25.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 75.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 25.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 75.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 25.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 25.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 25.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 25.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 25.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 25.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 50.0% (Yes)
B. 50.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| n/r | Gergen was actually a pretty good professor. However he spoke so quietly that class was unbearable because you couldn't hear him and were always straining to catch what was being said. I think a microphone would improve class by 100%.
| n/r | By far the most boring, frustrating, and worst class I have taken in law school |
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COURSE: Taxation: Taxation and Regulation of Nonprofit Organization
PROFESSOR: Professor Daniel I. Halperin
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 15
RESPONSES: 4

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 100.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 25.0% (Easy)
B. 0.0% (Average)
C. 75.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 75.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 25.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Clear about content)
B. 75.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 25.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 25.0% (Organized)
F. 50.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 25.0% (Theoretical)
I. 50.0% (Engaging)
J. 25.0% (Boring)
K. 25.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 25.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 25.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 100.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 25.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
### Class time (check all that apply)
- A. 50.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
- B. 25.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
- C. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
- D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

### Instructor availability (check all that apply)
- A. 25.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
- B. 75.0% (Available during office hours)
- C. 100.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
- D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
- E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

### Exam (choose one)
- A. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
- B. 25.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
- C. 25.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
- D. 25.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
- E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
- F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

### All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
- A. 75.0% (Yes)
- B. 25.0% (No)

### Your year/program in school (choose one)
- A. 0.0% (1L)
- B. 25.0% (2L)
- C. 75.0% (3L)
- D. 0.0% (LLM)
- E. 0.0% (SJD)

### Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The syllabus, if you could even call it that, was incomplete and confusing, and Professor Halperin was constantly changing it over the course of the semester. I often had no idea what I was supposed to be reading for each class. The class discussion was often difficult to follow as well. Sometime it seemed like he was just repeating the basics from the textbook, and other times it seemed like he was talking about something too specialized for me to understand that definitely had nothing to do with the reading. He also talks pretty softly, so I had a hard time understanding what he was saying at times. I think Professor Halperin is very nice, and he clearly cares about and knows a lot about the subject matter, but I don't think the class itself was that good.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An expert on the material, but very disorganized. He is disorganized in his presentation of the material and soft-spoken, so often class lectures were hard to follow. Also, multiple (understatement) revisions of the syllabus made it difficult to keep track of what reading was assigned or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think Tax and Corps are necessities for taking this course.
**COURSE:** Theories About Law  
**PROFESSOR:** Professor Lewis D. Sargentich  
**SEMESTER:** Fall 2007  

**CLASS SIZE:** 46  
**RESPONSES:** 6

### Workload
- A. 0.0% (Light)  
- B. 83.3% (Reasonable)  
- C. 16.7% (Heavy but manageable)  
- D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

### Difficulty of material (choose one)
- A. 16.7% (Easy)  
- B. 16.7% (Average)  
- C. 66.700005% (More challenging than average)  
- D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

### Primary questioning style (choose one)
- A. 0.0% (Panel)  
- B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
- C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
- D. 66.700005% (Volunteers only)  
- E. 33.3% (Class discussion)

### Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
- A. 66.700005% (Clear about content)  
- B. 16.7% (Unclear about content)  
- C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)  
- D. 33.3% (Unclear about expectations)  
- E. 100.0% (Organized)  
- F. 0.0% (Disorganized)  
- G. 16.7% (Practical)  
- H. 100.0% (Theoretical)  
- I. 83.3% (Engaging)  
- J. 0.0% (Boring)  
- K. 16.7% (Regurgitates the reading)  
- L. 83.3% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
- M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
- N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
- O. 83.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
- P. 33.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
- Q. 83.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
- R. 16.7% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
- S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
- T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
- U. 16.7% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 83.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 16.7% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 83.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 33.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 16.7% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 16.7% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 83.3% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 83.3% (Yes)
B. 16.7% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 16.7% (3L)
D. 16.7% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| I loved this class, but it is very heavily theoretical so people looking for a practical approach to the law may be disappointed. Sargentich can be a bit boring at times but he manages to make even the most obscure theoretical works accessible. Also, I think this class is key for understanding all the theories professors allude to in other classes. In particular, Sargentich does a very good job of explaining legal realism, idealism and critical legal theory. | n/r |
| The professor spends half of the class time going over the (usually complicated) readings; and half of the class time in discussion with the class. Sargentich is the best. Highly recommended. | n/r |
| This is largely a lecture class. The papers are very tough, because the class is pure theory - few if any cases to link the ideas to, little regard for practical applications. But it's a good experience for making you think on a theoretical plane. The handful of
students who regularly participate in class discussions seem to have strong philosophy or theory backgrounds.

Professor Sargentich knows how to take complex legal theory and distill it into understandable form. No mean feat! Sometimes I bemoaned my lack of philosophy background, but most of the time it was not an issue.
COURSE: Title IX: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Ms. Diane Rosenfeld
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 20
RESPONSES: 3

Workload
A. 66.700005% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Easy)
B. 33.3% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 66.700005% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 100.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 66.700005% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 33.3% (Boring)
K. 33.3% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 33.3% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 66.700005% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 100.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 0.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 33.3% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 33.3% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
the class is not exactly based around title IX but rather gender stereotypes and on-campus assault, and in that way it feels more like an undergraduate seminar than a law class. on the bright side, students were able to compose a model sexual assault policy for their final project that will supposedly be presented to the school for implementation

I wish the professor had made it clear that this seminar would only cover a very small part of Title IX.

This is the most disorganized, unprofessional, and downright frustrating professor I have ever dealt with. Nothing I learned about Title IX I learned from her. The class was a Tuesday evening seminar, and we were lucky if she had the readings prepared by Friday. She was seemingly incapable of hearing differing opinions, and many students simply stopped attending the class out of frustration. I would not recommend anybody take a class with her.
COURSE: Topics in Islamic Law: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Hossein Modarressi
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 13
RESPONSES: 0
**COURSE:** Torts I  
**PROFESSOR:** Professor Morton J. Horwitz  
**SEMESTER:** Fall 2007

**CLASS SIZE:** 81  
**RESPONSES:** 13

### Workload
- **A.** 0.0% (Light)  
- **B.** 100.0% (Reasonable)  
- **C.** 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)  
- **D.** 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

### Difficulty of material (choose one)
- **A.** 0.0% (Easy)  
- **B.** 46.2% (Average)  
- **C.** 53.8% (More challenging than average)  
- **D.** 0.0% (Very difficult)

### Primary questioning style (choose one)
- **A.** 0.0% (Panel)  
- **B.** 69.2% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
- **C.** 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
- **D.** 23.1% (Volunteers only)  
- **E.** 7.7% (Class discussion)

### Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
- **A.** 53.8% (Clear about content)  
- **B.** 30.8% (Unclear about content)  
- **C.** 30.8% (Clear about expectations)  
- **D.** 30.8% (Unclear about expectations)  
- **E.** 23.1% (Organized)  
- **F.** 46.2% (Disorganized)  
- **G.** 15.4% (Practical)  
- **H.** 69.2% (Theoretical)  
- **I.** 84.6% (Engaging)  
- **J.** 7.7% (Boring)  
- **K.** 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
- **L.** 76.9% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
- **M.** 15.4% (Does not use the reading)  
- **N.** 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
- **O.** 84.6% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
- **P.** 30.8% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
- **Q.** 69.2% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
- **R.** 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
- **S.** 92.3% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
- **T.** 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
- **U.** 15.4% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 92.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 15.400001% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 23.1% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 25.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 66.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 41.7% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 8.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 33.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 7.7000003% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 30.800001% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 23.1% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 7.7000003% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 30.800001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 92.3% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 7.700003% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exam was exceptionally difficult and long. There was nearly no way to finish it in the time allotted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascinating look into legal theory, but a little light on black-letter law. A class that deserves to be a favorite, although the professor may have lost half a step, leading some of the later lectures to be a bit disorganized. Nonetheless, still the most thought-provoking class I've taken, and worth a recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class was very difficult overall. Professor Horwitz is a wonderful man who clearly cares a lot about students, but he was often quite confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mort Hortwitz was a treat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Torts 2
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor John Goldberg
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 16

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 93.8% (Reasonable)
C. 6.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 31.300001% (Easy)
B. 68.8% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 93.8% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 6.3% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 93.8% (Clear about expectations)
D. 6.3% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 93.8% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 81.3% (Practical)
H. 43.8% (Theoretical)
I. 93.8% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 37.5% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 75.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 75.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 31.300001% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 6.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 43.8% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 87.5% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 6.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 50.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 62.5% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 75.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 56.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 6.3% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 18.800001% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 12.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 6.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 62.5% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 18.80001% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
Prof. Goldberg was truly outstanding. Made difficult material accessible and clear. The class was challenging in a good way.
I would take any class offered by Professor Goldberg. He was engaging and made the entire class laugh at 8:30 in the morning. He was clear when lecturing and made sure we both understood the black letter rules of the law, but also included theoretical debate and the reasoning behind the law. I learned more in this class than any of our other classes while also enjoying this class the most. Goldberg really stood out from the rest of our professors as the best. He really made sure we understood the material we were learning but also engaged us to think. Excellent class.
This class was perfect in pretty much every way. Professor gave a reasonable amount of work, taught it in a clear way, gave us a good idea what to expect on the final, gave use 2 assignments to practice taking tests during the semester. Overall,
he had very realistic expectations of his students, given that they are new to the law, and didn't try to make us engage in conversations that are beyond our ability. Professor Goldberg is extremely knowledgeable about the material, and made the class interesting and challenging without making it frustrating and confusing. I would highly recommend this class to anyone, and hope that Professor Goldberg is hired as a permanent faculty member.

The professor's engaging personality and no-nonsense approach made class surprisingly enjoyable. My only complaints are these: 1) he often seemed to get bogged down in the details of cases, which caused us to fall significantly behind; 2) he is not teaching any of my courses this semester!

He was the best teacher for the section. Hands down. He should be brought back to HLS full-time. His lectures are crystal clear, he is very clear on what he expects for his exam and his book is outstanding. His exam tests everything learned in the course, literally everything, but the clarity helps in reformulating that in exam format.

Prof. Goldberg was soooo awesome, amazing, fun, everything you wish every professor was. Incredibly engaging, very funny, a pleasure to learn from. It will be very sad if he doesn't get hired - everyone should get to learn torts from him! A great way to start the week at 8:30 Monday and Tuesday...

n/r

Prof. Goldberg is fantastic in the classroom. Although some felt he was spoon-feeding the material from his casebook, his straightforward blackletter style was well-received by all.

Goldberg presents the material in a very entertaining and easy-to-follow manner. Though he seems fun in front of the class, he seems less approachable/personable when you actually try to talk to him. And although the material felt easy during class, the exam was quite difficult and complex.

Torts is the easiest class we took this semester, but Goldberg is generally a FANTASTIC professor - he makes things very clear while also making them very entertaining. The exam was more difficult than expected, but not unfair, I don't think.

I love Goldberg. His class made more sense than any of my other classes. He is great at working the room and keeping students involved, and I felt like I learned something every day and came away with a better understanding of the reading. His course book is great too.

Prof. Goldberg is amazing. Entertaining in class, encouraging of his students, and fair with his assignments. I couldn't have asked for more!

n/r

If HLS is a smart bunch of administrators and hires Goldberg, take any class he offers and know that you'll get an engaging, black-letter law instruction in whatever the topic is that will be funny even at 8:30 on Monday morning and will make you feel like you're actually learning something instead of squishy nonsense.

I really enjoyed goldberg. probably my favorite professor of the semester. bring him back!

Class time with Goldberg is funny and engaging. I know that he was many students' favorite instructor this semester. He is very fact oriented and can get bogged down with details that ultimately aren't significant for the holdings of the case. He also repeats information frequently and follows the book very closely. This is actually really nice, but it is definitely a significantly slower pace than other courses.
COURSE: Torts 4
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Allan Hutchinson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 80
RESPONSES: 15

Workload
A. 6.7000003% (Light)
B. 26.7% (Reasonable)
C. 53.3% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 13.3% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 28.6% (Easy)
B. 64.3% (Average)
C. 7.1% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 6.7000003% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 93.3% (Volunteers only)
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 46.2% (Clear about content)
B. 30.800001% (Unclear about content)
C. 76.9% (Clear about expectations)
D. 7.7000003% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 38.5% (Organized)
F. 23.1% (Disorganized)
G. 46.2% (Practical)
H. 38.5% (Theoretical)
I. 53.8% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 23.1% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 23.1% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 7.7000003% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 61.5% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 92.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 38.5% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 30.800001% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 46.2% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 7.7000003% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 36.4% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 45.5% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 18.2% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 54.5% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 58.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 58.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 66.7% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 8.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 7.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 57.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 14.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 21.4% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 64.3% (Yes)
B. 35.7% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Many students found it useful to refer to a hornbook in preparing for the exam in order to straighten out the foundational concepts. I probably would have gotten more out of the class by reading the hornbook throughout the course of the semester.

Hutch is a super nice guy and perhaps one of the most personable professors I've met at HLS, but I feel I didn't learn much at all in his class. Most of the time was spent talking about how deserving plaintiffs are and how they should always be compensated. Very little time was spent talking about justice, efficiency of incentives.
or other potentially useful aspects of tort law. I learned a lot more about torts in my undergraduate law and econ course than I did in this course. I highly recommend Hutch as a friend, someone to hang out with, do research with etc, but am not crazy about his teaching method (though the delivery of the lectures is excellent and entertaining).

Prof. Hutchinson is a very engaging classroom presence and a smart, personable man with interesting views on the law and the structure of our legal institutions. For all his charms as a person and a thinker, however, his teaching leaves a lot to be desired—at least when it comes to basic 1L courses like Torts. He usually seemed ill-prepared for class, like he was relying on his natural wit and general knowledge of the law to get him through class. Also (and this is a complaint you'll probably hear from a lot of students) he is very dogmatically pro-plaintiff in thinking about tort law. He may have been pretending to be more dogmatic along those lines than he actually is outside of class in order to challenge American students to defend their libertarian instincts about how the law ought to work. In any case, a better balance of perspectives coming from the front of the classroom would have been much appreciated. Although there were probably some adamantly pro-defendant students in the class, I would imagine that most of us are still trying to make up our minds about how we think the legal system should work, and being hammered class after class with the progressive pro-plaintiff view just made me want to swing as far in the other direction as I reasonably could. It's not good pedagogy, and it's not even particularly good proselytizing. As for course material, it's strange, I think, that we didn't talk about intentional torts at all. Also, the readings assigned were too long, too disjointed, and class discussion didn't add much to what we read. It would have been better to assign a smaller, carefully selected set of readings and treat them in more depth (with a greater balance of perspectives).
Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 31.6% (Reasonable)
C. 26.300001% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 42.100002% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 20.0% (Easy)
B. 65.0% (Average)
C. 10.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 5.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 5.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 80.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 15.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 55.0% (Clear about content)
B. 35.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 35.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 45.0% (Organized)
F. 35.0% (Disorganized)
G. 15.0% (Practical)
H. 100.0% (Theoretical)
I. 70.0% (Engaging)
J. 10.0% (Boring)
K. 25.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 15.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 85.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 95.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 30.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 45.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 75.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 5.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 30.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 68.4% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 21.1% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 5.3% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 89.5% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 65.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 70.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 75.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 10.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 10.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 10.5% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 21.1% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 36.8% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 21.1% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 10.5% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 65.0% (Yes)
B. 35.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Prof. Hanson is truly passionate as a teacher & about his material. I wish there was less lecture & more engagement with students.
This course isn't really about torts...it's really a "why the strict liability standard is better than the negligence standard" class. The course was really interesting at times, but even though I usually agreed with Professor Hanson's viewpoints, I still felt as though I was being beaten over the head with them by the end of the semester.
Hanson's Tort class is definitely not your average Torts class. You won't learn a lot of torts, but you will gain a very important perspective on the legal system that everyone should be exposed to, but few are. Hanson's Tort class is one of benefits of being at a school like Harvard.

n/r
n/r
A very unique and extremely thought-provoking Torts class. Close examination of a small number of cases from a different and illuminating perspective. An invaluable asset in a first semester of law school.

my favorite 1L class.

Hanson presented some interesting theories, but was so one-sided in his presentation that he turned off even students inclined to agree with him. We did not learn torts.

Jon Hanson is a very energetic instructor. He loves teaching, and that trait is increasingly rare, so he is to be commended for that. However, he is very close minded regarding his theory of tort law, and often bends the truth to reflect only his perspectives.

I have such mixed feelings about this class. All in all, I'm glad I got to take it, and I really appreciated Prof. H's critical reading of torts and the law. The course is non-traditional - the down side to that is that you just don't learn doctrine or elements of torts. The up side to this is that you get a chance to learn very interesting aspects like critical theory and tons of law and economics (which I hated at first, but grew to really appreciate knowing). On balance, as far as substantively, I think the course material was great and realized that we learned a lot about torts and the law in general, and I don't regret not knowing more about doctrine. The other nontraditional aspect of the course was the power-point lecture method. On VERY RARE occasion, Prof. H. would call on volunteers to answer questions, or - more often - would allow students to ask questions. But he essentially NEVER (literally no more than 3 classes) stimulated meaningful or provocative class discussion, and never used the Socratic method. I think this is a real shame. Since he is teaching a critical method, it is extremely important for students to be able to think through problems ourselves. Instead of allowing that to happen during class discussion, he would basically preach to us about his theory. This turned a lot of people off, including me, even though I really agree with and appreciated the content of his criticism. He reacted often very defensively to students' questions, even when they weren't challenging his ideas, and certainly when they were. I think this aspect of the course was a major tragedy. On the other hand, Prof. H. is extremely supportive and holistic about building class community. He was also our section leader - and he is a terrific leader for this role! He helped us create an events committee and a community outreach committee to volunteer and fundraise for various causes. He built class community and helped make our section bond and feel happy during the year. So on balance, I am really happy to have taken the course and received the perspective I did. Whoever has him as a section leader is lucky!

Hanson is very theoretical, with sometimes polarizing views. I loved it; this is not a black letter torts course!

The main thing I would highlight about this class is that there is a TON of reading, not all of which you really have to do because Professor Hanson's lectures just about cover it. Plus, some of the more difficult topics (like the various economic models) don't make sense whether you do the reading or not. The other thing I would highlight is that his class is almost EXCLUSIVELY taught from his point of view. It's
not really torts; it's more like Professor Hanson's critical (socio-psychological) analysis of tort law. Which is totally fine, it's just that if you disagree with him, it's a bit weird. But I would just like to make one final thing clear: Professor Hanson is about the nicest professor you will ever have. He's the funniest, sweetest, most understanding, most hilarious professor you will ever have at HLS. He's the best, in that respect. He's so awesome as a person, no doubt about that. He's very cool and very humorous. I just don't know if what you learn in his class is torts. Rather, it's a situationist critique of tort law.
COURSE: Torts 7  
PROFESSOR: Assistant Professor Jed Shugerman  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 79  
RESPONSES: 15  

Workload  
A. 0.0% (Light)  
B. 53.3% (Reasonable)  
C. 33.3% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 13.3% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Easy)  
B. 73.3% (Average)  
C. 26.7% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 64.3% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 28.6% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 7.1% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)  
A. 40.0% (Clear about content)  
B. 60.0% (Unclear about content)  
C. 66.700005% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 13.3% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 46.7% (Organized)  
F. 46.7% (Disorganized)  
G. 20.0% (Practical)  
H. 60.0% (Theoretical)  
I. 60.0% (Engaging)  
J. 20.0% (Boring)  
K. 33.3% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 46.7% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 6.7000003% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 80.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 13.3% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 73.3% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 6.7000003% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 66.700005% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 13.3% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 66.700005% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 46.7% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 40.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 46.7% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 6.7000003% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 80.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 86.700005% (Available during office hours)
C. 86.700005% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 13.3% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 13.3% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 73.3% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 13.3% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 100.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 0.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than anything, I was impressed by Shugerman's dedication to being a good teacher. He makes himself constantly available outside of class. In addition, the class was both tied to the law but also policy oriented in a good way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in-class lectures were often more confusing than helpful, especially at beginning of semester, but professor Shugerman seems really committed to helping students understand the material through use of handouts and extreme enthusiasm for talking to students outside of class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n/r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shugerman can be a bit confusing when he lectures, but he is a great professor overall, and I would take another class from him if I were interested in the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The exam was very fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My answers to the questions were somewhat contradictory -- Prof. Shugerman is both organized and disorganized -- but I think that gets at his strengths -- devoting so much time to the class that we had an outline of almost every lecture, and frequent emails explaining tough points -- and his weaknesses, which is that he seemed to need all that organization and hard work to overcome what I would guess is a natural tendency to not always be as clear as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read the Restatement and a torts hornbook because the professor teaches you the majority rules and minority rules (and even historical rules that have now been overruled) without really telling you which is which.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shugarman was kind of disorganized, but I got used to his style. He's excited about the material and about teaching, and it shows. He actively sought suggestions and comment as we went through the semester, and had a couple practice exams on which he offered feedback, which I found very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loved professor shugerman. the class really turned around right before october break. he is funny, smart, and dedicated. very thorough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COURSE: Trial Advocacy Workshop A  
PROFESSOR: Professor Charles J. Ogletree and Ms. Soffiyah Elijah  
SEMESTER: Fall 2007  

CLASS SIZE: 51  
RESPONSES: 2  

Workload  
A. 0.0% (Light)  
B. 50.0% (Reasonable)  
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 50.0% (Extremely time-consuming)  

Difficulty of material (choose one)  
A. 50.0% (Easy)  
B. 0.0% (Average)  
C. 50.0% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)  

Primary questioning style (choose one)  
A. 50.0% (Panel)  
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 50.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)  

Characteristics of instructor - Professor Charles J. Ogletree (check all that apply)  
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)  
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)  
C. 100.0% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 100.0% (Organized)  
F. 100.0% (Disorganized)  
G. 50.0% (Practical)  
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)  
I. 50.0% (Engaging)  
J. 50.0% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 50.0% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 50.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 50.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Characteristics of instructor - Ms. Soffiyah Elijah (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 0.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 50.0% (Practical)
H. 0.0% (Theoretical)
I. 0.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 0.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 50.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 0.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 50.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 50.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 50.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)

Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability - Professor Charles J. Ogletree (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 50.0% (No basis for judgment)

Instructor availability - Ms. Soffiyah Elijah (check all that apply)
A. 0.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 0.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 100.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)
All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 0.0% (2L)
C. 100.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

| This is an intense time commitment right at the beginning of Fall semester. Be careful if you’re trying to interview for clerkships and/or observe the Jewish Holidays. It might be worth considering taking it in the winter because it gets very hectic. That said, once it’s over with, your semester kind of frees up because it is so frontloaded. |
| Extremely good introduction to trial skills. Course was a bit disorganized. The guest judges were great. |
COURSE: Trials in Second Life: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Professor Charles R. Nesson
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 10
RESPONSES: 0
COURSE: Water Law
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor John Leshy
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 31
RESPONSES: 5

Workload
A. 40.0% (Light)
B. 40.0% (Reasonable)
C. 20.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 20.0% (Easy)
B. 60.0% (Average)
C. 20.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 80.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 20.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 60.0% (Clear about content)
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 40.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 0.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 80.0% (Organized)
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)
G. 100.0% (Practical)
H. 20.0% (Theoretical)
I. 40.0% (Engaging)
J. 40.0% (Boring)
K. 60.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 20.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 0.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 40.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 60.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 40.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 40.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 80.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 20.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 20.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 40.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 20.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 0.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 60.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 40.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 20.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 40.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 0.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 80.0% (Yes)
B. 20.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 40.0% (2L)
C. 40.0% (3L)
D. 20.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)
This is a key class for HLS to offer for environmental law students. Hire Leshy!

Water Law is primarily the study of Western Water Law, and is inextricably linked with agriculture. If Water Law doesn't sound fascinating to you already, it is going to be REALLY boring and confusing once you start learning it.
**COURSE:** White Collar Criminal Law and Procedure  
**PROFESSOR:** Mr. John Savarese  
**SEMESTER:** Fall 2007  

**CLASS SIZE:** 65  
**RESPONSES:** 3

**Workload**  
A. 33.3% (Light)  
B. 66.700005% (Reasonable)  
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)  
D. 0.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

**Difficulty of material (choose one)**  
A. 100.0% (Easy)  
B. 0.0% (Average)  
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)  
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

**Primary questioning style (choose one)**  
A. 0.0% (Panel)  
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)  
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)  
D. 100.0% (Volunteers only)  
E. 0.0% (Class discussion)

**Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)**  
A. 100.0% (Clear about content)  
B. 0.0% (Unclear about content)  
C. 33.3% (Clear about expectations)  
D. 66.700005% (Unclear about expectations)  
E. 100.0% (Organized)  
F. 0.0% (Disorganized)  
G. 100.0% (Practical)  
H. 33.3% (Theoretical)  
I. 33.3% (Engaging)  
J. 0.0% (Boring)  
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)  
L. 66.700005% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)  
M. 33.3% (Does not use the reading)  
N. 0.0% (Focuses on black letter law)  
O. 33.3% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)  
P. 0.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)  
Q. 66.700005% (Is open to disagreement from students)  
R. 0.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)  
S. 100.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)  
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)  
U. 0.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 33.3% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 66.700005% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 33.3% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 33.3% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 33.3% (Available during office hours)
C. 33.3% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 66.700005% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 66.700005% (Yes)
B. 33.3% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 66.700005% (2L)
C. 33.3% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Prof. Savarese is engaging, friendly, and very knowledgeable. I just didn't realize that the class would be taught primarily from the perspective of in-house counsel for corporations that get investigated. I thought we would also learn about other types of corporate crime (e.g., human rights violations) and also crimes committed by government officers. Seeing as I'm not planning to be a corporate defense counsel or in-house counsel, I found the material pretty boring. I did learn quite a bit from writing my paper, though.

n/r

Fantastic class! Professor is a partner at Wachtell, a former federal prosecutor, and a sharp, engaging and interesting teacher. Half the class is taken up in stories about his practice, which is really neat because he's seen both sides of white-collar investigations. Evaluation was based on a 5-8 page paper on one of three topics he provided (he won't tell you that until the last day of class, though - I think he doesn't
like to remember that he has to grade the class!). He doesn't much rely on the reading, except for the statutory material.
COURSE: Women’s Human Rights: Seminar
PROFESSOR: Visiting Professor Catherine MacKinnon
SEMESTER: Fall 2007

CLASS SIZE: 20
RESPONSES: 2

Workload
A. 0.0% (Light)
B. 0.0% (Reasonable)
C. 0.0% (Heavy but manageable)
D. 100.0% (Extremely time-consuming)

Difficulty of material (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Easy)
B. 100.0% (Average)
C. 0.0% (More challenging than average)
D. 0.0% (Very difficult)

Primary questioning style (choose one)
A. 0.0% (Panel)
B. 0.0% (Socratic, focusing on a few students per class)
C. 0.0% (Socratic, calling on many students per class)
D. 0.0% (Volunteers only)
E. 100.0% (Class discussion)

Characteristics of instructor (check all that apply)
A. 50.0% (Clear about content)
B. 50.0% (Unclear about content)
C. 50.0% (Clear about expectations)
D. 50.0% (Unclear about expectations)
E. 0.0% (Organized)
F. 50.0% (Disorganized)
G. 0.0% (Practical)
H. 50.0% (Theoretical)
I. 100.0% (Engaging)
J. 0.0% (Boring)
K. 0.0% (Regurgitates the reading)
L. 50.0% (Adds meaningfully to/builds usefully on the reading)
M. 50.0% (Does not use the reading)
N. 50.0% (Focuses on black letter law)
O. 50.0% (Focuses on theory, institutional design, politics, history, economics, etc.)
P. 100.0% (Focuses on his/her personal views)
Q. 0.0% (Is open to disagreement from students)
R. 100.0% (Is not open to disagreement from students)
S. 50.0% (Is knowledgeable about the material)
T. 0.0% (Does not seem to know the material)
U. 50.0% (Is easily sidetracked by student questions/comments)
Class time (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Enhanced my understanding of the material)
B. 0.0% (Did not enhance my understanding of the material)
C. 0.0% (Lecture/discussion is difficult to follow if you have not done the reading)
D. 100.0% (Lecture/discussion is easy to follow independent of the reading)

Instructor availability (check all that apply)
A. 100.0% (Available right before and/or after class)
B. 50.0% (Available during office hours)
C. 50.0% (Seems enthusiastic and/or proactive about interacting with students outside of class)
D. 0.0% (Seems reluctant and/or too busy to interact with students outside of class)
E. 0.0% (No basis for judgment)

Exam (choose one)
A. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in the reading)
B. 0.0% (The exam primarily reflected the material covered in class)
C. 0.0% (The exam equally reflected the reading and the class discussion)
D. 0.0% (The exam did not fairly reflect the material covered in the course)
E. 0.0% (I have not yet taken the exam)
F. 100.0% (No exam in this class)

All things considered, if you had it to do over again, would you take this class? (choose one)
A. 100.0% (Yes)
B. 0.0% (No)

Your year/program in school (choose one)
A. 0.0% (1L)
B. 50.0% (2L)
C. 50.0% (3L)
D. 0.0% (LLM)
E. 0.0% (SJD)

Comments (e.g., classes you would recommend taking before this course, anything you wish you had known in advance, information on papers required for course, any other miscellaneous comments)

Prof. MacKinnon is brilliant and her class (my first in feminist theory) was perhaps the most influential one I've ever taken, in terms of profoundly altering the way I interpret power distribution. There were some weaknesses, and much room for improvement, but I still recommend it wholeheartedly. Class discussions were sometimes excellent, and other times lukewarm. She had a tendency to dominate the discussion in a way that sometimes discouraged dissenting voices. The more effective classes occurred when she allowed students to bounce ideas off each other. There is entirely too much material, more than any human law student could read and have any sort of life. If she cut the reading in half, people would have been more prepared and more engaged in the discussion. I have a solid international human rights background and this was still very useful to me, and not very repetitive at all. Students with no international human rights background at all might have been a bit lost at times, but I think they got a lot out of the class regardless. Finally,
while in some way this class is one giant critique on the law -- because it looks at it through the feminist lens -- other critiques weren't always well-received. We could have talked more about the impact all this black-letter international human rights law has to the real women involved, and we definitely should have talked more about class issues than we did. Also, the class would have been richer had we read more recent feminist legal theory that critiques MacKinnon's groundbreaking work. That said, I think Prof. MacKinnon would be very responsive to written feedback and would be willing to make some of these changes. I hope she gets hired. It would be great to have her on the faculty.

This class is worth taking if you care about feminist legal theory, just for the experience of having with Catharine MacKinnon. However, the amount of reading was excessive and consisted primarily of dry UN reports, international treaties and conventions, and foreign cases. I think some background in human rights or international law is necessary.