

September 15, 2010 draft

*note: This is a work in progress. Please do not circulate or cite without permission.*

## **Multidimensional Advocacy: A Clinical Teaching and Strategic Lawyering Framework**

Suzanne B. Goldberg<sup>1</sup>

*If you want to address harassment of gay youth in schools, should you file a lawsuit or try to get your client onto Oprah?*

In the opening session of my Sexuality & Gender Law Clinic, I frame our challenge for the semester in this way: We will take problems in the world that are related to sexuality and gender and do something about them. As is well familiar to most advocates, this “doing something” requires multidimensional advocacy. That is, the advocate aims to identify all possible strategies for addressing the problem at hand and then mixes and matches those strategies with care and creativity to make a dent, and hopefully more, in bringing about social change.

Of course, all lawyering is multidimensional in the sense that no problem is ever solved with one strategy or one action. But by multidimensional advocacy, I mean to refer to something more specific: a mindset that takes as a given that problems - especially those that lawyers are called on to address - are rarely discrete or monolithic. Instead, the multidimensional advocate appreciates, almost instinctively, the complex environment in which problems arise, the varied audiences that have some interest in, and influence on, the problem, and the need to for multifaceted and dynamic strategies in response. Thus, within a multidimensional frame, lawyers devote attention not only to developing legal arguments for classically legal communications (demand letters, lawsuits, contracts etc.) but also to less conventional lawyering strategies (community meetings, marches, media outreach, etc.) , and sometimes less conventional arguments as well.

The point of embracing multidimensional advocacy as an approach to lawyering, then, is to be self-consciously and consistently multidimensional in thinking about problems and potential solutions. For advocates who do impact or law reform work, which is the primary focus here, this mindset is particularly useful. But it is also valuable for individual client

---

<sup>1</sup> Clinical Professor and Director, Sexuality and Gender Law Clinic, Columbia Law School. I welcome your comments and can be reached at [suzanne.goldberg@law.columbia.edu](mailto:suzanne.goldberg@law.columbia.edu) or (212) 854-0411.

representation and discrete issue advocacy, as well as for non-legal advocacy on both public and private law issues.<sup>2</sup>

Within the law school clinic setting, a multidimensional approach that models and involves students in developing both the mindset and related skills likewise can infuse all aspects of a clinic's work, from project selection and student lawyering to classroom teaching and team supervision.

My aim in this paper is to elaborate both the theory and practice of multidimensional advocacy as both as an approach to advocacy and, more specifically, as a clinical teaching framework. In the first part, I consider multidimensional advocacy generally, with illustrations from a range of contemporary advocacy situations, to reinforce that complexly-strategized and executed work oriented toward multiple audiences is both inevitable and necessary for 21<sup>st</sup> century lawyering. The paper's second part provides additional context from a clinical vantage point, illustrating the multidimensional framework with examples from the Columbia Law School's Sexuality & Gender Law Clinic.

In the third part of the paper, I offer a concrete list of practices that I incorporate in my Clinic to help students develop multidimensional advocacy skills. These range broadly. Some are more general points, such as how we work to keep central to any project considerations of how we will leverage the work that we do. Others are more specific ideas that readers might be interested in implementing (or criticizing), such as the way in which we structure meeting facilitation and have student-run rounds (without faculty present) to develop leadership and decision-making schools. I also address the media advocacy component of the Clinic as well as the specific ways in which the multidimensional framework shapes pedagogical aims related to developing communication skills. The aim here is to offer concrete, potentially transferable or adaptable ideas to anyone who might be interested in incorporating aspects of this framework into their teaching.

### *21<sup>st</sup> century multidimensional advocacy: The background*

In contrast to law school, where problems are studied from many angles, practice is often conceived far more narrowly. Ask most lawyers and they will identify themselves as litigators *or* transactional lawyers or, if they do policy work, as "not practicing law."<sup>3</sup> Yet

---

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, although intra-firm change is not this essay's focus, both the multidimensional framework and the related implementation strategies likewise can be useful in bringing about change within organizations because, ultimately, any change requires the sorts of planning and dynamic advocacy that is addressed here. See, e.g., Lawrence Polsky, *Perfect Phrases for Communicating Change* (2010).

<sup>3</sup> Of course, some, such as family, real estate, securities, and immigration lawyers, identify more by issue area than type of practice. And others have general practices that involve multiple kinds of problem-solving, including civil and criminal litigation and a wide array of transactional work. Even still,

virtually any lawyer, when pressed, will describe a practice that deploys a range of problem-solving advocacy, from demand letters and responses, to negotiations, and more, with strategizing not just about the particulars of a legal theory or a price point but also about who should be involved and how the work should get done. As part of that advocacy, both for commercial and public interest lawyers, attention is also often directed to the broader community in which the matter has arisen, in fora as diverse as community meetings and the offices of elected officials print as well as in television, print media, and the web.

For public interest lawyers who focus on impact litigation and advocacy, multidimensional work is often, quite simply, the only way to get things done. Think, for example, of Julie Su's description of her work with Thai laborers who were confined by a Los Angeles garment factory and paid virtually nothing for their work.<sup>4</sup> When the workers finally escaped the factory, they were detained immediately by the INS for immigration law violations. On behalf of the Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California, Su and her colleagues made appropriate submissions, with the relevant legal arguments, and sought to have the workers released. Yet their legal advocacy was unavailing, leading the legal team to "resort[] to aggression and street tactics. We set up a makeshift office in the basement waiting room of INS detention. We used their pay phones, banged on windows, and closed down the INS at one or two in the morning, refusing to accept 'paperwork' and bureaucracy as an excuse for the continued detention of the Thai workers."<sup>5</sup>

In the terms of this essay, Su and her colleagues' multidimensional advocacy involved handling the legal work and, simultaneously, thinking more broadly about strategies to move the decisionmaker to the preferred resolution of the conflict. At the same time, even within the civil action that they filed against the manufacturers, creative community-based work underlay their strategy and legal theories. Rather than suing only on behalf of the Thai workers, for example, the advocates worked with the Thai and Latino communities, both separately and together, to join their claims. This nuanced attention to the plaintiff group's demographics not only had an empowering effect for many of the individual litigants but also made it possible to bring a lawsuit framed to show that the problems endured by the workers were structural, rather than isolated incidents or particular to one or another community.<sup>6</sup>

---

we tend to think of lawyers as doing particular types of work when addressing particular categories of issues or problems.

<sup>4</sup> Julie A. Su, *Making the Invisible Visible: The Garment Industry's Dirty Laundry*, 1 J. Gender, Race & Justice 405 (1998). In the civil suit that followed the advocacy with the U.S. Department of Immigration and Naturalization Services, Su advocated on behalf of Latino workers as well.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 408. Su also observed, "I am convinced that we succeeded in getting the workers released in just over a week in part because we did not know the rules, because we would not accept procedures that made no sense either in our hearts or to our minds. It was an important lesson that our formal education might, at times, actually make us less effective advocates for the causes we believe in and for the people we care about." *Id.* (footnote omitted).

<sup>6</sup> *Id.* at 411.

Similarly, lawyers from impact organizations who have brought marriage litigation on behalf of same-sex couples spend years preparing the groundwork for the lawsuits, with most of their time devoted not to developing legal theories but to learning the sociopolitical landscape, developing community support, finding plaintiffs, and creating networks of allies. In the Iowa marriage litigation, for example, Lambda Legal’s lawyers spent their time “crisscross[ing] Iowa, meeting gay and lesbian couples and organizing workshops and panels on issues that concerned them.”<sup>7</sup> In addition to networking with the organization’s constituents and community-based ally organizations, the lawyers spent time forging connections with members of the Iowa bar, including with their co-counsel, a former state solicitor general and partner in a prominent law firm, who ultimately argued the case to the Iowa Supreme Court. In both Iowa and other states, lawyers as well as public education staff also worked directly with the local media, including reporters and editorial boards, to introduce them to key issues in the legal case and the communities affected by the exclusion of same-sex couples from marriage.<sup>8</sup>

Again, seen through the lens of the multidimensional paradigm, the advocates treated as central not just the development of legal claims and drafting of briefs but also, and perhaps more so, the relationship-building with both lawyers and nonlawyers, public presentations about the issues, and conversation with the media. To indulge a farming analogy befitting Iowa, the best harvests typically require a deliberate, long-range approach to preparing the fields and then ongoing cultivation as well as attention to the surrounding environment. Likewise, in the lawyering context, although the surrounding environment and how one goes about cultivating it are quite different, the need for a complex, environmentally-attuned strategy, ongoing attention, and ability to work with ever-changing conditions are all essential elements.

Of course, multidimensional advocacy is not the exclusive domain of lawyers who think of themselves as doing public interest or social change work, though that work is my primary focus here. A look at the business pages of any newspaper will reveal numerous stories where the lawyers involved are necessarily thinking about and managing not only the fine points of the particular transaction or litigation at issue but also the relationships among the key players, the way the story plays out in the media, and the possible risks and benefits as the situation evolves. In this regard, I often recall a conversation with a friend who was representing a senior business person in the midst of a massive insurance litigation regarding the building of a major structure. There, as in the more conventionally public interest cases just described, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Keith B. Richard, *How Gays Won a Marriage Victory*, Washington Post, Wednesday, April 15, 2009; A01. As lead lawyer Camilla Taylor recalled, “Sometimes it was lonely in those early days,” including events were just a handful of people turned out to discuss the issues. *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> [Cite] Media advocacy, which is discussed in greater depth *infra*, can be particularly challenging to advocates seeking to portray complex social conditions or legal issues. See Su, *supra* n. xx, at 414 (discussing the value of the media and “the struggle . . . to keep [] stories from becoming distorted.”).

lawyering involved far more than the particulars of the legal questions at issue regarding state's insurance code and the terms of the policy. Instead, the many audiences involved in or affected by the conflict required similar levels of attention, and the legal strategizing was interwoven with plans for how to address media coverage; finding the right lawyers and spokespeople for different issues that arose; anticipating near-daily changes in the political landscape; and taking advantage of opportunities to press both the government officials and private sector parties toward a favorable settlement.<sup>9</sup>

Indeed, because negotiation often requires a multidimensional approach, and because most legal work turns on negotiated results, it is hard to imagine most forms of lawyering other than through a multidimensional lens. Yet it is quite different to engage in multidimensional work by happenstance than to do so self-consciously to maximize the effectiveness of each decision in a matter. Especially when we are mired in editing an affidavit, reviewing discovery, rereading a contract for the nth time, or even writing an email, this advocacy framework can seem distant, if not irrelevant. Still, my contention here is that, even if one does not think of every lawyering moment through a multidimensional lens, it is often a disservice, whether to a client or a cause, when the lens and the framework are not regular parts of a lawyer's work. And for that reason - and more to be elaborated shortly - it is likewise critical to clinic students' successful development that they at least be exposed to multidimensional analysis of the work in which they are engaged, even if it is not a central feature of their learning experience.

#### *Multidimensional Advocacy in the Columbia Sexuality and Gender Law Clinic*

A few more examples, these from the context of the Columbia Sexuality and Gender Law Clinic, may help provide some additional depth to the sketch above and, in turn, lay the groundwork for discussion of the pedagogy related to multidimensional advocacy, which I describe below. For illustrative purposes, the projects discussed here are diverse in form as well as subject matter; one is primarily litigation-related; one is centrally legislative; and the third is largely focused on policy-related advocacy.

Litigation projects may have the least obvious synergies with a multidimensional framework because we typically think of litigation is relatively straightforward in terms of both the process and the way in which arguments are expected to be made. You write the brief, argue the case, let the judge decide. Yet by placing litigation within a multidimensional framework, students can begin to see more precisely how litigation fits into a broader project of social change.

For example, the Sexuality and Gender Law Clinic recently filed an amicus brief with New York's highest court in a family law case involving a custody and visitation dispute between

---

<sup>9</sup> Similarly, government lawyers, with their constant attentiveness to political dynamics and consequences, must also think and act multidimensionally whether they are engaged in litigation, transactional work, or other forms of advocacy. For a related discussion of legislative lawyers and the legislative process, see Chai Feldblum, *Legislative Lawyering*, [cite].

two women who had been raising a child together. We filed on behalf of the non-biological mother, who had been cut off from seeing the child after she and the child's biological mother ended their relationship. Per her lawyer's request, we sought in our brief to show that both the family law scholars and the case law in the field favored recognition of functional parent-child relationships like the one that existed between the nonbiological mother and her son. In that sense, the brief was a typical legal academics' amicus brief; it recommended an analysis to the court by weaving together judicial opinions and related scholarship.

What made the project multidimensional was that we thought of the brief as just one piece of our work on the issue. That is, the students understood that, as important as the litigation might be to securing the rights of functional parents, we should see the court as just one audience for these arguments and we should anticipate that it might take more than a court decision to bring about change. Of course, if the litigation were successful, the law would change - but even then, we would want to be raising awareness of the legal and other challenges faced by functional parents. And if the litigation did not succeed, we would not want to find ourselves still at square one, having put all of our advocacy eggs into the court's basket.

So, the questions for the students became: How can we leverage the work in this brief to maximize exposure of the arguments we are making and how can we create a community of supportive allies and advocates along the way? The responses took us in several different directions. First, even in seeking amici for the brief, we envisioned the brief not just as a legal submission but also as an educational and community-building tool. Rather than reach out only to likely allies, we decided to ask every single faculty member listed as teaching family law or a child advocacy clinic at a New York State law school to sign on. By casting a broad net, we aimed to highlight for family law scholars, whether they signed the brief or not, that issues related to functional parents' legal vulnerability remain a live issue in many courts and for many families.

Further, in thinking about how to orchestrate the sign-on, we decided to reach out to the whole group via a collective email, so that the recipients had a sense of themselves as part of a potential community of signers. This approach runs certain risks, as anyone who has solicited amici knows, because the amici group sometimes begins to debate about either large or small issues in the brief, over email. While those debates can be interesting, they can also prove challenging for the lawyers who are trying to finish up the brief, especially if the filing deadline is looming.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps we were just lucky, but there was overwhelmingly positive

---

<sup>10</sup> A related risk is that, when "cold-calling" for signers based on the Association of American Law School's teaching lists, some recipients might actually be adverse to the brief's position, particularly on a family law issue related to lesbian parents, which remains controversial for some. This possibility gave the students an opportunity to weigh the risk of triggering angry or hostile emails against the benefit of creating an informed on-line community. Remarkably, as it turned out, although many recipients did not respond to our sign-on request, not a single faculty member at any school weighed in against the

response, and we were then able to continue to engage this community with subsequent emails regarding developments in the case.<sup>11</sup>

Beyond seeking amici, we also wanted our arguments to have a reach beyond the court itself. So, as we do for many clinic projects, the students issued a press release that told the story not only of the case but also of a growing consensus among family law professors that functional parents should receive legal recognition. Perhaps because we filed the brief around the time that we filed another family law brief in the Puerto Rico Supreme Court, several blog writers and newspaper editors latched on to the story and helped us extend our message further, as did Columbia's own Center for Gender & Sexuality Law blog.<sup>12</sup>

But we wanted to press further. Within the Clinic, one of the regular mantras is that our work is about changing the conversation on the gender and sexuality law issues that are our focus. The various activities we undertake - traditional lawyering and otherwise - are all a means to that end. With that conversation-changing goal in mind, we knew we wanted to raise the issue of functional-parent recognition not only through the frame of the amicus brief we filed but also more generally, in non-law-focused forums, to shed light on the problem at hand. So, the students took the next step of drafting an oped that distilled the complex legal arguments into a punchy and compelling 500-word essay. The oped drafting, in itself, is a wonderful way for students to develop fluidity with making arguments, as they move from advancing nuanced, carefully articulated legal theories to conveying their ideas in one syllable words and one sentence paragraphs, with no reference to sources. But drafting alone was not enough; we had to think strategically about where we wanted to try to place the piece and how we wanted to try to time the placement. With the help of the law school's public relations staff, we decided on the Albany Times-Union, in part because it is the paper where the state high court is located, upping the chance that a member of the court might see this somewhat-differently framed angle on problem it had been asked to decide. In part, too, because the paper is well-respected, we thought we might benefit from both the wide readership and the paper's online presence to spread the essay's ideas even more broadly. And we were able to interest the paper in publishing the piece right around the time of oral argument.

---

arguments we were making. Indeed, faculty from every one of New York's 15 law schools joined the brief.

<sup>11</sup> And, as often happens, once an online group has been created for one purpose, it may then be useful for others. Here, when a colleague was addressing a different family law issue a few months later, we were able to share our list quickly and easily, so that the same community could be engaged in that advocacy effort as well.

<sup>12</sup> In another instance, the Clinic issued a press release after filing a brief with the European Court of Human Rights in a trafficking case. This triggered the European Lawyer magazine, which has a wide readership among private sector lawyers, to solicit a feature article, which we wrote through the Clinic, about legal regulation of trafficking in Europe. See Suzanne Goldberg, *Europe's Modern Slave Trade*, *European Lawyer* 50 (January 2009).

Still looking for more conversation change, we decided to publish the amicus brief in a law journal. Here, the idea is in part that the specific issue addressed by the brief remains a problem both in New York and in some other states, and that we would be delighted to have others take up our arguments in new fora. In addition, on a related messaging front, we wanted to reinforce, in yet another forum - this one aimed at the law journal readership – the specific synergies of family law scholarship and jurisprudence with respect to functional families.<sup>13</sup>

[Two additional illustrations to come. One describes the work Clinic students did as part of an effort to reform New York’s domestic violence law to broaden access for civil orders of protection. The other describes Clinic work challenging the use of condoms as evidence of prostitution by police departments. Both will address the many different audiences that the Clinic’s work addressed and the varied strategies we used for raising awareness and advocating for change.]

### *Multidimensional Advocacy as a Clinical Teaching Framework - A Pedagogical Guide*

Thus far, much of what I have described focuses on developing an approach to cases or other projects that keeps a dynamic focus on the multiple strategies that might shape the conversation taking place around the targeted issue. But how does this translate into the day-to-day work of teaching students within a clinical setting? In this part, I describe several specific practices that aim to hone a multidimensional mindset while also advancing students’ abilities to do the work before them.

- *Big themes - communication and collaboration*

From the start of the semester, the students hear repeatedly from me that effective communication and collaboration are central to success, both with respect to the clinical experience and for our advocacy on the issues we address. Careful legal analysis is essential too, of course, but most law students have already internalized the importance of developing that skill through their other courses. Against that backdrop, my aim, in part, is to persuade students that successful advocacy rests on at least three foundations, and that strong legal reasoning, while terrifically important, is only one of them.

Each of these themes then becomes the subject of discussion in subsequent seminar sessions and stays with us as a frame to be integrated into everything that the students do – both internally to the clinic, with each other, with their teams, and in supervision meetings with

---

<sup>13</sup> See Suzanne B. Goldberg, Harriet Antczak and Mark Musico, *Family Law Scholarship Goes to Court: Functional Parenthood and the Case of Debra H. v. Janice R.* (forthcoming in the Columbia J. of Gender & L. (2011). The Clinic has also sought to leverage its work in other kinds of cases by republishing briefs, with added analysis, in law reviews. See, e.g., Suzanne B. Goldberg, Sarah Hinger, & Keren Zwick, *Equality Opportunity: Marriage Litigation and Iowa’s Equal Protection Law*, J. Gender, Race & Justice (2008).

me, as well as their external-facing work with project partners,<sup>14</sup> as well as with adversaries and decision-makers.

More concretely, we read several articles about collaboration<sup>15</sup> and then discuss strategies for working with others - but with the broadest possible frame. That is, collaboration becomes a way of thinking not only about how to work well with another person on a joint project but also about how to engage in social change work - so that any conversation-change effort can be understood as a kind of collaboration with the person or group whose views the advocate is aiming to change.

Put another way, we treat collaboration and communication as inextricably interrelated. Following the collaboration seminar, the next several sessions are devoted to exploring means of effective communication.<sup>16</sup> We focus early on developing clear and persuasive writing skills, and again, concerns with collaboration and communication are the frame. For this reason, we devote as much attention to writing effective emails as we do to drafting clear legal memoranda and persuasive letters and briefs.<sup>17</sup> Likewise, we spend substantial time on oral communication skills. Here, the focus is likewise not only on clients but also on communicating with colleagues, adversaries, and decision-makers. For both written and oral communication, the central idea is that while there are important differences in the way we communicate in different settings, there is also a shared baseline interest in being clear and in having the listener understand (and, often, be persuaded by) what we are trying to get across.

- *Clinic Operations*

Virtually every feature of the Clinic is designed to maximize students' opportunities to develop their communication and collaboration skills in a multiple-audience-oriented way, consistent with the multidimensional advocacy approach. While discussion related to team meetings and rounds will be familiar, my aim here is to show how a multidimensional framework can be useful for thinking about a clinic's institutional design.

---

<sup>14</sup> In the clinic, we often work collaboratively on projects with advocacy organizations that address gender and sexuality law issues.

<sup>15</sup> Susan Bryant, *Collaboration in Law Practice*, 17 Vermont L. Rev. 459 (1992-93); Susan Bryant, *The Five Habits: Building Cross-Cultural Competence in Lawyers*, 8 Clinical L. Rev. 33 (2001-02); David Chavkin, *Collaboration*, in CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION: A TEXTBOOK FOR LAW SCHOOL CLINICAL PROGRAMS (2002)

<sup>16</sup> In an intervening session, we focus on matter planning, which, like everything else, has requires both collaboration and effective communication in clinical (and other) settings.

<sup>17</sup> Here, I use a wide range of materials, including excerpts from Johns, *Professional Writing for Lawyers*; Stark, *Writing to Win: The Legal Writer*; some of Bryan Garner's work; and other, nonlaw-focused readings, including a popular book on email writing.

As a general point, if lawyers are going to advocate effectively across varied settings and with diverse audiences, it is essential that they be able to hold productive conversations and lead productive meetings, whether with colleagues, allies, clients, or adversaries.<sup>18</sup> More practically, they need to be very good developing agendas, moving conversations and meetings along, leading a group in discussion, handling conflict, and insuring follow-up where necessary. In the clinical setting, this means that every single gathering is an opportunity to act on, or at least observe, those skills.

*- Agenda setting*

From the very first seminar session, I begin with an agenda, both to give the students a sense of where we are headed for our two hours together and to model for them a method for keeping conversations on track. These are not written agendas, but instead, as in the types of formal and informal meetings that fill most lawyers' days, they are set out orally a means for structuring the conversation to come and for preparing those present to shift gears from topic to topic as the conversation moves along.

In every other interaction outside of the seminar, it is up to the students to do the agenda-setting work. So, when students come in for a team supervision meeting, the conversation begins with one of them setting out the agenda, orally, for our time together. Typically, that student also takes responsibility for insuring that we move the meeting along to reach the priority topics within our allotted time, or, if the discussion heads in an unanticipated direction, that the priority items are left deliberately, rather than inadvertently, for another day.

Likewise, when students meet with each other in teams, they too set agendas for their meetings. This can be awkward at first, as students are typically accustomed to more casual and rambling interactions. But agenda-setting quickly becomes a comfortable norm as students begin to see the efficiency and other gains from being clear at the outset about what they want to accomplish in their time together.

*- Meeting facilitation and student-only rounds*

Most obviously, the team meetings provide opportunities for students to develop their facilitation skills as they try to navigate the relationship between their goals for a meeting and the ways in which conversation often becomes more complicated or different than the agenda anticipated.

But I want to focus here on another critical facilitation opportunity within the clinic, which is the weekly rounds session. In the Sexuality and Gender Law Clinic, rounds are, I am

---

<sup>18</sup> I do not mean to suggest that a meeting's success necessarily hinges on something being "produced" but rather that, whatever the result, the participants are acting deliberately to achieve whatever they sought to achieve by gathering together.

told, one of the students' favorite parts of the Clinic experience. Perhaps I should be worried, since rounds are also one of the weekly activities for which I am deliberately not present. Instead of worrying, though, I will just explain and then offer some analysis.

At the semester's start, at the end of the first class, I leave the room and ask the students figure out one hour per week that they can all attend consistently, and that becomes the weekly rounds session. Like for most other clinics, part of the point of rounds is to hash through difficult problems in projects, whether they relate to the substantive law, collaboration, communication, or anything else. Yet because I am not in the room, the group has to figure out how to run itself. What this means, in practice, is that the students rotate responsibility for facilitating the meeting. And the facilitator of the week not only helps keep the conversation running smoothly but also selects a short reading for the group to discuss if there is time after project-related discussion.

One obvious benefit of conducting rounds in this way is that the clinic, as a whole, almost necessarily gels as a team. The time together enables students to learn about all of the clinic's projects and to collaborate, even if in a loose way, with students who are not on their project teams. Any challenges that an individual team faces become challenges for the group as a whole. And because I make clear, at the outset, that collaboration difficulties are an essential part of the clinical learning experience, these difficulties - as well as substantive struggles - become topics of conversation rather than forbidden subjects for group discussion.

I am convinced that because I am not there for these conversations, the group has a sense of responsibility for its own conduct that it could not achieve if I was, as the supervisor/professor, available as the backstop for negotiating challenges or problems. Also, for the quietest of students as well as for the most assertive, the responsibility of chairing the rounds session in a given week, while daunting, is invariably a valuable opportunity to develop and stretch their leadership skills.

There are a couple of practical keys to making this work, at least for the groups I have had thus far. First, for the initial rounds session, I ask one or two students from the previous semester to attend and facilitate so that they can model what the new students should be doing in rounds. Second, I provide a memo to the group - prepared by previous students - that identifies the multiple purposes of rounds and also offers ground rules to try to insure that the conversations remain productive and collegial even when there is intra-team conflict. Third, we have a post-rounds discussion in class each week. I ask the facilitator to email me about any issues that the group either asked to discuss in class or that the facilitator thought could benefit from discussion. And finally, if there is some sort of breakdown in the group dynamic (which has happened only rarely in a way that affects rounds), I speak with students individually or in teams. But in these conversations, I reinforce that dealing with breakdowns is part of the learning experience with respect to effective collaboration and communication, and, in that sense, when they realize that I will not take responsibility for fixing a difficulty group dynamic, they consistently step up to try to figure out how to do this themselves, which, in itself, is invaluable training, particularly when a professor is available for conversation along the way.

- *Skills-building*

[in this section, which is to come, I will describe the concrete ways in which we focus on developing sensitivity to effective (and not-so-effective) communications. Included among these are: a) a comparison of tables of contents of briefs, both for clarity of writing and for visual appeal; b) sharing of project planning charts; c) mock press conference, which reinforces oral communication skills as well as providing an opportunity for students to work on distilling simple conversation points from complex arguments.]

- *Incorporating multidimensional advocacy*

[In this section, which is also to come, I will describe, concretely, the types of questions we frame around every project related to leveraging the work and shaping the conversation, along the lines of the examples offered in the previous part.]

*Conclusion*

[also to come]