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Surface structure
- Observable, behavioural features

Tacit structure
- Values and dispositions that the behaviour implicitly models

Deep structure
- Underlying intentions, rationale or theory that the behaviour models

Shadow structure
- The absent pedagogy that is, or is only weakly, engaged

Transforming Legal Education: four key themes

Experience of...
- law in the world
- interdisciplinary trading zones
- creative, purposeful acts

Ethics in...
- an integrated curriculum
- habitual action
- reclamation of moral spaces in the curriculum

Technology for...
- our discipline, our curricula
- learner-centred control
- transactional learning

Collaboration between...
- students
- institutions
- academic & professional learning
- open-access cultures
Values...
- Professionalism
- Professional relationships
- Transactional learning
- Authenticity (http://tinyurl.com/5vautp)

Assessment paradox
- Technology always constrains the range of assessment
- A platform should enable as wide a range of assessment as possible
what are we assessing in SIMPLE?

- Professionalism
- Skilled performance to benchmarked levels
- Substantive knowledge of law
- Procedural knowledge
- Many other categories of assessable experience

- The learning space is close to the Renaissance concept of *officina* – both the workspace and a space of learning existing, eg, between master & apprentice.
how are we assessing in SIMPLE?

Four examples:
1. Tasks (eg drafting, letter-writing, research)
2. Whole file + performative skill (PI Negotiation)
3. Tasks + whole file (Conveyancing)
4. Tasks + file + performative skill (Civil Court Practice)
1. tasks

- Set context (or not: let student figure that out – the clearing in the forest…)
- Set task (but in how much detail? Supported with templates? Guidelines? Commented examples?)
- Design feedforward (but don’t do the task for students)
- Deadline a task (bearing all contextual factors in mind)
- Task completed (and sent to staff in role)
- Feedback on task (by staff in role)
- Debrief (either in role or out of role)

- Useful for sandbox activities
2. whole file + performative skill

- Holistic assessment of document chain
- Bodies of evidence generally, but can embed critical points of assessment, eg report to client, speech plan, etc
- Preparation for performative skill, including overlap with other skills – eg relation of legal research to professional negotiation.
Specific tasks are the foreground, eg four tasks in Private Client...

... but group must complete entire file process. No completion, no competence.

Tasks are the shadow of tutorial work or feedforward

Two attempts only – if both ‘not yet competent’, then overall fail by entire virtual firm.
4. tasks + whole file + performative skill

- Most complex, and most authentic
- Potentially 1-3 plus more – eg performative skill can be assessed *in role.*
Eg PI project:

- PI mentor: passes information in real time; takes all fictional roles including PI senior partner (instructs, praises, warns, & cd be ethically treacherous), e-comm only: student responses are assessed

- Surgery mentor: gives detailed feedforward on task, f2f, out of role: responses not assessed

- Discussion forum: gives detailed feedforward on task, e-comm, out of role: responses not assessed

- Practice Manager: gives coaching on firm experiences, in role: support & coaching not assessed, but the result is...
example: embedding transactional resources 1997 > 2004

PI Negotiation Project 1997 – paper-based and email-based information flows

example: embedding transactional resources 1997 > 2004

PI Negotiation Project, 2004 – web-based information flows.

Note the three forms of discussion forum used in the project, represented in bold.
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