# LWI One-Day Workshop at the University of Washington School of Law
# Friday, December 4, 2026
# Virtual 8:45 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. PST

## "Your One Best Thing: Social Justice Edition"

| Time | Speaker | Presentation |
|---|---|---|
| 8:45 – 8:50 | Welcome and Introduction | |
| 8:50 – 9:15 | Margaret Hahn-DuPont (Northeastern University School of Law) | *Reading Between the (Legal) Lines: Teaching Critical Persuasion Through Examining Embedded Stories in Supreme Court Jurisprudence*<br><br>This presentation will illustrate how teaching students to identify and analyze subtle narratives embedded within judicial opinions - particularly in Fourth Amendment cases like Graham v. Connor - can improve their persuasive writing skills while fostering critical engagement with issues of social justice. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Through close textual analysis of Supreme Court decisions involving police use of force and similar contexts, students learn to recognize how judicial language constructs competing narratives about power, authority, and individual rights. |
| 9:20 – 9:45 | Katie Axtell (Seattle University School of Law) | *Discussing Inclusivity Through the Lens of Professional Identity*<br><br>In the first week of the semester, our first-year legal writing program teaches a unit on professionalism and has the students submit an ungraded reflection piece at the end of the week. Along with readings from *Essential Lawyering Skills*, we assign a law review article discussing racial bias in ideas of legal professional identity. One of the reflection prompts asks students what internal, external, and/or societal factors do they think may present challenges for them. The resulting reflections are mostly raw, thoughtful pieces about racial and gender identity and class. We provide feedback for each student which allows us to engage further to support those who have particular concerns about their future professional identity due to their background or to gently challenge students who miss the purpose of the prompt. |
| 9:50 – 10:15 | Amanda Elyse (University of Washington School of Law) | *One Best Thing: Personal/Political/Legal Goals Framework*<br><br>A personal/political/legal goals framework* provides a way to analyze the goals of everyone involved in a case, from client to opposing party to opposing counsel to oneself, to make informed, strategic decisions. Additionally, the framework sets |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | up consideration of social justice issues that may be implicated by a case and how to best advance those issues, whether in the courtroom, media, or elsewhere. In this workshop, I share how this framework becomes my "one best thing" throughout the term (with providing examples), to give students an approach to social-justice-oriented, client-centered lawyering.<br><br>*from A Tilted Guide to Being a Defendant |
| 10:15 – 10:30 | Break | |
| 10:30 – 10:55 | Lisa White (Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University) | *Making Room for Every Voice: Using Breakout Groups to Create a More Inclusive Legal Writing Classroom*<br><br>My one best thing for promoting inclusivity in the legal writing classroom is also one of the simplest: small breakout groups. Based on my article, Collaboration Is Key: How Collaborative Learning Unlocks the Door to an Inclusive Legal Writing Classroom, published in Perspectives: Teaching Legal Research and Writing, I will explain how I structure recurring breakout groups using specific rules designed to promote inclusion, including professor-selected, purposefully diverse groups. I will also explore how these groups encourage participation, amplify a broader range of voices and perspectives, build community and mutual respect, and increase meaningful interaction between students and the professor. |
| 11:00 – 11:25 | Lorraine Bannai (Seattle University School of Law) | *Using Korematsu To Teach Legal Research, Writing, And Analysis* |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | In *Korematsu v. United States*, one of the most infamous cases in United States Supreme Court history, the Court upheld the mass removal of approximately 120,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from their West Coast homes. Two-thirds were American citizens. Forty years later, Mr. Korematsu reopened his case, and his conviction was vacated, on proof that the government suppressed, altered, and destroyed material evidence while seeking to legitimize its wartime actions before the Court. Through the lens of the *Korematsu* case, this presentation describes a series of three modules, designed for use in a Legal Skills course that teaches legal research, analysis, and writing, that can help faculty integrate issues of social and racial justice into their courses and in recognition of how much students seek those discussions during their professional formation. |
| 11:30 – 11:55 | David Ziff (University of Washington School of Law) | *The Social Substance of Citation*<br><br>Students often view legal citation as a litany of punctilios—bits of miscellany to be looked up, memorized, and hated. Sure, there is some of that. But citation practices and citation choices contain communicative content, which often reflects values-based decisions by lawyers and judges. This presentation will offer some ideas for the dreaded "Bluebooking" part of your syllabus, if you're interested in adding something worthy of discussion and reflection beyond trying to figure out why the first comma but not the second comma is italicized in the *See, e.g.*, signal. By creating |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | connections between citation format, citation choices, and citation power, students can better understand how lawyers' choices influence the law's path in ways that might advance or inhibit social justice. |
| 12:00 – 12:30 | Break | |
| 12:30 – 12:55 | Robin Boyle-Laisure (St. John's University School of Law) | *Protecting Freedom of Speech - Anti-SLAPP*<br><br>To protect the freedom of speech of those who publicly criticize organizations and others with power and money, 40 states have enacted Anti-SLAPP (Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation) statutes. Anti-SLAPP statutes give courts a mechanism to dismiss meritless defamation suits and grant damages. I will share a short, objective memo exercise based on New York's statute and facts drawn from a composite of cases involving high-demand groups ("cults"). Students were required to assess whether the post was in a "public forum" and "in connection with an issue of public interest." |
| 1:00 – 1:25 | Erica Byrd (University of Hawai'i at Manoa - Richardson School of Law) | *Same Facts, Different Story: Teaching Students to See the Power of Perspective*<br><br>Students often learn persuasive fact writing as a set of techniques for telling a client's story effectively. This presentation shares an exercise that pushes that lesson further by asking students to examine why those techniques work. Students unknowingly receive the same factual scenario written from opposing perspectives and reach markedly different |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | conclusions about the appropriate outcome. After the reveal, they identify the language and drafting choices that shaped their reactions. The exercise then asks students to consider the assumptions those choices invite, including how seemingly neutral characterizations may draw on broader social narratives and stereotypes, and how lawyers can advocate persuasively while writing with greater awareness. |
| 1:30 – 1:55 | Lauren Sancken and Amanda Stephen (University of Washington School of Law) | *Weaving Social Justice into any Memo Problem*<br><br>Not every memo problem comes with an obvious social justice hook. Many are built around doctrines that help students learn a critical analytical skill with no explicit equity angle on the surface. So how do we bring social justice conversations into the classroom when the underlying problem looks neutral? This session shares a practical approach for surfacing social justice themes within standard memo assignments, regardless of subject matter. |
| 1:55 – 2:00 | Closing Remarks | |