



MEET THE MODULE BUILDING TEAMS: CONTRACTS AND TORTS



Building Bar Skills Conference

Contracts and Torts Modules



Garrett I. Halydier

Visiting Assistant
Professor, Interim Director
of Bar Success

University of Hawaii at
Manoa, William S.
Richardson School of Law



Liam Skilling

Associate Professor,
Director of Academic
Success

University of Hawaii at
Manoa, William S.
Richardson School of Law



**Christopher
Engle-Newman**

Assistant Director of Bar
Success, Visiting Assistant
Professor of the Practice

University of Denver, Sturm
College of Law



Florence Kerner

Associate Director
Grading Services and In-
School Programming

Helix Bar Review by
AccessLex



Building Bar Skills Conference

Today's Conversation



General Features

Number of modules

Components and mechanics of these modules

- Problem sets vs. performance tasks
- Professor guide vs. answer sheets
- Grading vs. self-assessment options

How to use the modules

Unique features



Lessons Learned From Test Driving the Modules

Student interactions and reactions

Changes made based on student interaction



Questions



Building Bar Skills Conference

Integrated Problem Set: Substance and Skills

Intentional Torts

- Assault
- Battery
- Self-Defense
- Consent

Test Skills

- Critical Reading and Focus
- Issue Spotting
- Recalling Legal Rules
- Evaluating Claims
- Becoming Familiar with NextGen Test Format



Building Bar Skills Conference

To : Associate
From: Partner
Re: Client Intake

I conducted an intake interview with a new client this morning. Based on what the client told me, I believe there are potential intentional tort claims for both battery and assault. Please review my notes on the client interview and respond to my questions below.

NOTES ON CLIENT INTERVIEW

I met with a prospective client (“Client”) to discuss potential claims arising from an altercation that occurred at the Lucky Strike bowling alley. Last Monday, Client was there with a group of ten to twelve friends and family members celebrating his uncle’s birthday. Among those present was Client’s elderly grandfather (“Grandfather”).

According to Client, another group of five or six patrons was occupying the lanes next to them. Client said that the other group was drinking heavily and grew progressively louder and more unruly over time. At approximately 11:00 p.m., one of the patrons in the other group (“Patron”) approached Client, holding a bowling ball. Patron accused client of coming too close while Patron was bowling, interfering with Patron’s game. Despite attempts from Client and others in the group to resolve the matter peacefully, Patron grew increasingly angry and agitated.

Patron then swung the bowling ball at Client, attempting to hit Client. The bowling ball slipped out of Patron’s hands. The bowling ball rolled across the alley, striking the chair on which Grandfather was sitting. As a result, Grandfather fell and struck his head on the floor, causing serious bleeding and a concussion. Grandfather was transported to the hospital in an ambulance and was kept overnight.

Question 1

Based on the facts presented by the client and the rules you identified in your research, evaluate whether your client will be able to establish a prima facie assault claim against the bowling alley patron. Please use IRAC format and put the rules into your own words. Limit your response to 8–10 sentences.

Question 2

Based on the facts presented by the client and the rules you identified in your research, evaluate whether the client’s grandfather will be able to establish a prima facie battery claim against the bowling alley patron. Please use IRAC format and put the rules into your own words. Limit your response to 8–10 sentences.

Question 3

What additional information would be helpful in assessing the likely success of the potential claims? (Provide one example)



Building Bar Skills Conference

Integrated Problem Set

I just spoke with Employee at the Lucky Strike bowling alley. Employee is a server at the bowling alley and was serving both Client's and Patron's parties on the night of the altercation. What Employee had to say supplements, and in some significant ways, contradicts what we learned in the client interview. I'm going to meet with Client later today. Please review my notes and respond to my questions below to help me prepare for my meeting with Client.

NOTES ON EMPLOYEE STATEMENT

Employee works at Lucky Strike serving food and drinks to the patrons. Employee was working on the night of the altercation and observed the events closely. Employee served members of both groups, including Client, Patron, and Client's grandfather.

Employee stated that members of both groups were drinking heavily, and Employee believed that both Client and Patron were intoxicated when Client's grandfather was injured.

Employee did not see exactly what precipitated the incident; however, employee saw members of both parties pushing and shoving, and observed Patron and Client yelling at each other and using profanity. Employee saw Patron holding the bowling ball while arguing with Client. However, Employee was unclear whether Patron intended to strike Client with the Bowling ball or whether the bowling ball slipped out of Patron's hands while Patron was gesturing.

Employee stated that the altercation also resulted in property damage at the venue. A tray of glasses Employee was carrying was smashed, a large screen TV was knocked over and broken, and the automatic ball return mechanism for one of the lanes was damaged, requiring costly repair. Employee stated that the owners of Lucky Strike were upset about the incident and damages, but currently planned no action against Client or Patron because the venue wishes to avoid additional publicity about the altercation.



Building Bar Skills Conference

Question 4

In what way does the Employee's statement impact the evaluation of the likelihood Grandfather can satisfy all the elements of a claim for battery? [Do not discuss defenses]

Question 5

Assuming Employee's statements are accurate and truthful, what is one defense Patron could raise? What facts must Patron establish to prevail on the defense?

Question 6

If the client's grandfather were to assert an assault claim against the patron, which of the following statements of fact, if true, would be the most favorable to the patron? **Select one.**

- (A) The patron had a close personal relationship with the client's grandfather and would never intentionally do anything to scare him.
- (B) The grandfather could have avoided injury if he had seen the ball coming and moved out of the way.
- (C) The grandfather is nearly deaf and was engrossed in the football game playing on the bowling alley television when the ball struck his chair.
- (D) The patron did not intend to strike the client with the bowling ball, but instead, to startle her.

Question 7

Are there any additional issues I should raise with Client in relation to the advisability of bringing a claim against Defendant? (Identify one issue)

Exercises and Samples – More Than a Rubric

- Critical Reading Exercises
- Color-Coding Exercises
- Sample Answers by Level
- Student Rubrics

Step 1: Highlight each element of the basic/top level/general rule in a different color. If the rule includes subrules, highlight each subrule in a color that corresponds to the relevant element of the general rule. The pattern of color in the general rule should repeat no more than once (i.e., all subrules related to a particular main rule element should be grouped together), and it may repeat only in part if there are only a few subrules. For example:

An assault is an intentional physical act of a threatening nature or an offer of corporal injury which puts an individual in reasonable fear of imminent bodily harm.

Step 2: For each rule element and subrule, highlight in the same color the corresponding part of the analysis. The colors in the analysis should appear in the same order as the colors in the rule statement(s). For example:

Here, the fact that Patron swung the bowling ball “intending to hit Client” shows intent to conduct a physical act that would result in a corporal injury or make harmful contact because they were in the middle of an altercation, not a friendly discussion. The fact that Client was interacting with Patron when he swung the bowling ball tends to show that Client would have seen the bowling ball coming and so would have had an apprehension of imminent contact.



It's Not Just About What Cases "Say"

Standard of Review

Paragraph 18: States the standard of review

Assault and Battery

Paragraph 19: States defendant's arguments about assault and battery and court's conclusion

Paragraph 20: States assault rules

Paragraph 21: Applies assault rules to the facts; states court's holding on assault

Paragraph 22: States battery rules

Paragraph 23: Applies battery rules to the facts

Paragraph 24: States court's holding as to battery and ultimate conclusion on both claims

It's About What They "Do"



Building Bar Skills Conference

Color Coding Exercises

Integrating Legal Writing Practice

Active Rubric Exercises:

- Helps students identify what statements “do” in their own writing as a tool for teaching how to organize legal writing
- Paired with traditional writing and substantive law rubrics

Example:

An assault is an intentional physical act of a threatening nature or an offer of corporal injury which puts an individual in reasonable fear of imminent bodily harm. A specific intent to threaten the victim is unnecessary if there was intent to do an action that could reasonably be construed as a physical act of a threatening nature or an offer corporal injury. The act must be physical—online threats or mere verbal activities of any nature do not count. The fear must be reasonable, i.e. any other person would have the same fear in similar circumstances. Bodily harm means actual harm or offensive contact. Voluntary intoxication is not a defense to intent. All intentional torts require proof of causation and damages, including damages for medical expenses, lost wages, and emotional distress.

Here, the fact that Patron swung the bowling ball “intending to hit Client” shows intent to offer a corporal injury or make harmful contact because they were in the middle of an altercation, not a friendly discussion. Swinging a bowling ball is a physical act that could cause physical harm. The fact that Client “jumped out of the way” to “avoid being stuck” shows Client’s apprehension of imminent contact because they would not have moved in such a way unless they thought the bowling ball was about to hit them. Client’s apprehension was reasonable because it is general knowledge that bowling balls are heavy, meant to knock down other objects, and would cause damage if contact were made. The fact Patron was drinking does not nullify his intent because Patron chose to drink that night at the bowling alley. Finally, Client’s apprehension of imminent contact resulted directly from Patron’s attempt to make contact because Client would not have moved or backed down from the altercation unless they saw the bowling ball swinging at them. Absent evidence of injury, Client is still entitled to nominal damages for the assault unless there is evidence of medical expenses, lost wages, or emotional distress.



Platonic Ideal

2. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* (Rule), the Ranch will likely not be found negligent in its saddling of the horse (Result) because man unexpectedly leaned back outside the normal range of the saddle (Reason).

The rules for negligence are as above. Additionally, when a plaintiff cannot demonstrate the elements duty, breach, and causation due to the unavailability of evidence from the defendant on the issue, the plaintiff may still prevail under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*. This doctrine allows a jury to infer a defendant's breach based on the nature of the accident and the defendant's relationship to the accident. Plaintiff must show the (1) injury is of the kind that does not ordinarily occur without negligence or is uncommon in the course and nature of said act. (2) The injury is caused by an agency or instrumentality within the exclusive control of the defendant. (3) The injury-causing accident is not by any voluntary action or contribution on the part of the plaintiff. (4) The defendant's non-negligent explanation does not completely explain plaintiff's injury.

Here, despite a good faith effort, the Ranch was unable to identify which saddle the man used because it had already been removed from the horse as was their regular practice. So, the man will not be able to obtain evidence of his claim that the Ranch's negligence in fastening the saddle caused his injuries. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* then, (1) a properly fastened saddle will not normally tilt and dump the rider, this is especially true for this make of saddle that was designed to remain stable on a horse and not tilt significantly from side to side. So, the only way the man could have fallen off of the horse was if there was some negligence in Ranch's duty to maintain the horses and prepare them for rides by appropriately fastening the saddles. (2) The Ranch was exclusively responsible for maintaining the horses and had already saddled them when the man arrived for the trail ride. No other party touched the saddle prior to the injury. (3) However, the man's action in leaning back was likely partly responsible for the saddle slipping. The saddle was only indicated to be stable from side to side, the traditional motion when a rider is slipping on a horse. A rider would not typically lean back on a horse riding on a flat trail, so there is no reason for the saddles to be designed to prevent such, and it was that action by the man, in conjunction with leaning left, that overwhelmed the tolerances of the saddle. Thus, the man contributed to the harm and there is insufficient evidence to find the Ranch liable for negligence. (4) This explanation could completely explain the harm attributed to the alleged negligent fastening of the saddle, so the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* is unsatisfied in this case. There is no evidence of assumption of risk or any other defense to negligence.

Thus, the Ranch will likely not be found negligent for failing to appropriately fasten the saddle.

Sample Answers

Middle of the Road

2. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* (Rule), the Ranch will likely not be found negligent in its saddling of the horse (Result) because man unexpectedly leaned back outside the normal range of the saddle (Reason).

The rules for negligence are as above. Additionally, when a plaintiff cannot demonstrate the elements duty, breach, and causation due to the unavailability of evidence from the defendant on the issue, the plaintiff may still prevail under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*. Under this doctrine, Plaintiff must show the (1) injury is of the kind that does not ordinarily occur without negligence or is uncommon in the course and nature of said act. (2) The injury is caused by an agency or instrumentality within the exclusive control of the defendant. (3) The injury-causing accident is not by any voluntary action or contribution on the part of the plaintiff.

Here, despite a good faith effort, the Ranch was unable to identify which saddle the man used because it had already been removed from the horse as was their regular practice. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* then, (1) a properly fastened saddle will not normally tilt and dump the rider. So, the only way the man could have fallen off of the horse was if there was some negligence in Ranch's duty to maintain the horses and prepare them for rides by appropriately fastening the saddles. (2) The Ranch was exclusively responsible for maintaining the horses and had already saddled them when the man arrived for the trail ride. (3) However, the man's action in leaning back was likely partly responsible for the saddle slipping. The saddle was only indicated to be stable from side to side. A rider would not typically lean back on a horse riding on a flat trail, but it was that action by the man, in conjunction with leaning left, that overwhelmed the tolerances of the saddle. Thus, the man contributed to the harm and there is insufficient evidence to find the Ranch liable for negligence.

Thus, the Ranch will likely not be found negligent for failing to appropriately fasten the saddle.



Building Bar Skills Conference

Sample Answers by Level

Passable

2. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* (Rule), the Ranch will likely not be found negligent in its saddling of the horse (Result) because man unexpectedly leaned back outside the normal range of the saddle (Reason).

The rules for negligence are as above. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*, a Plaintiff can prove negligence on a showing that their (1) injury is of the kind that does not ordinarily occur without negligence. (2) The injury is caused by an agency or instrumentality within the exclusive control of the defendant. (3) The injury-causing accident is not by any voluntary action on the part of the plaintiff.

Here, (1) a properly fastened saddle will not normally tilt and dump the rider. So, the only way the man could have fallen off of the horse was if there was some negligence in Ranch's duty to maintain the horses and prepare them for rides by appropriately fastening the saddles. (2) The Ranch was exclusively responsible for maintaining the horses and had already saddled them when the man arrived for the trail ride. (3) However, the man's action in leaning back was likely partly responsible for the saddle slipping. The saddle was only indicated to be stable from side to side. A rider would not typically lean back on a horse riding on a flat trail, but it was that action by the man, in conjunction with leaning left, that overwhelmed the tolerances of the saddle. Thus, the man contributed to the harm.

Thus, the Ranch will likely not be found negligent for failing to appropriately fasten the saddle.

**Students need to see
"correct" examples
they can identify with**

**"Perfect" answers
are intimidating**

At Least It's Complete

2. Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur* (Rule), the Ranch will likely not be found negligent in its saddling of the horse (Result) because man unexpectedly leaned back outside the normal range of the saddle (Reason).

Under the doctrine of *res ipsa loquitur*, a Plaintiff can prove negligence on a showing that their (1) injury is of the kind that does not ordinarily occur without negligence. (2) The injury is caused by an agency or instrumentality within the exclusive control of the defendant. (3) The injury-causing accident is not by any voluntary action or contribution on the part of the plaintiff.

Here, (1) the only way the man could have fallen off of the horse was if there was some negligence in Ranch's duty to maintain the horses and prepare them for rides by appropriately fastening the saddles. (2) The Ranch was exclusively responsible for maintaining the horses and had already saddled them when the man arrived for the trail ride. (3) A rider would not typically lean back on a horse riding on a flat trail, but it was that action by the man, in conjunction with leaning left, that overwhelmed the tolerances of the saddle. Thus, the man contributed to the harm.

Thus, the Ranch will likely not be found negligent for failing to appropriately fasten the saddle.



Building Bar Skills Conference

Sample Answers by Level

Performance Test Rubrics

Full Sample & Structure Explanation

To: Partner
From: Associate
Re: Takai v. State, Proximate Cause

Transmittal Statement

The below memo analyzes the causation issue in the Takai case with specific assessment of the relevance and impact of the included cases.

Objective Rule/Result/Reason Heading

- I. Under the rules for proximate, legal causation (Rule/Reference to the Rule) the State is likely not liable for Takai's additional damages, (Result/Task from the Task Memo) because Rowley intentionally drove away to save himself after beginning the attempted medical transport of Takai (Reason/One Relevant Fact).

Overarching Rule

To prevail on a negligence claim, a plaintiff must establish duty, breach, causation, and damages. The defendant's negligent actions must be both the factual and legal (proximate) cause of the injuries sustained. *Smitts v. Lambert*, Fr. Ct. App. (2019). Courts evaluate proximate cause based on the specific circumstances of the case. *Id.*

Standard of Proof

General Rule with Initial Definition of

According to the Franklin Supreme Court, it has long been the general rule in determining legal causation that an actor may be liable if negligence is a substantial factor in causing an injury. *Oglethorpe v. Broder*, Fr. Sup. Ct (1972); *Murphy v. Perry*, Fr. Sup. Ct. (2003). The intervening act of a third person, if reasonably foreseeable, does not relieve the negligent party of liability. *Id.* A plaintiff is entitled to recover all damages proximately traceable to the primary negligence including subsequent aggravation which the law regards as a natural result likely to flow from the original injury. *Smitts*. "The foreseeability required is of the risk of harm, not of the particular intervening act." *Oglethorpe*.

Traditional Writing Rubric

- _____ Does my memo include a relevant memo header and introductory statement?
- _____ Does my memo follow the format (header, intro, substance, conclusion) of a legal memo?
- _____ Do I use appropriate "objective" legal language throughout?
- _____ Does my memo accurately introduce the issue(s) the client wants addressed?
- _____ Does my memo include a distinct IRAC for each issue?
- _____ Do I have point headings that are appropriate for the type of assignment (objective)?
- _____ Did I paraphrase the applicable statute or case law rather than copy/paste large chunks?
- _____ Did I start with general rules and then expand upon them with more specific subrules?
- _____ Did I paraphrase the holding and rule from each case that I used?

Notetaking Examples

Directions: Compare your notes/outline to the following sample notes outline and identify three ways you could improve your own notes.

- (4) *Murphy v. Perry*, Fr. Sup. Ct. (2003).
 - (a) Emergency airlift helicopter crashed — was this foreseeable?
 - (b) An actor may be liable if negligence is a substantial factor in causing an injury.
 - (c) The intervening act of a third person, if reasonably foreseeable, does not relieve liability.
 - (d) No Franklin ruling that transportation accidents in route to medical attention are foreseeable.
 - (e) *Purdy* is persuasive.
 - (f) Illogical to treat medical accidents separately from accidents during transportation.
 - (g) "The original tortfeasor is liable for additional injuries sustained while being transported to a hospital where medical services can be obtained."
 - (h) Negligent maintenance of the transportation (helicopter) is not a superseding cause if the transportation is a normal response to the injury situation (traffic accident) and the negligent maintenance is "not extraordinarily negligent."



Building Bar Skills Conference

Instructor Guides

Overall Introduction to Module

Introduction to the Assessment Type

Description of Module

- Rules
- Skills
- Assessment Tools (*Model Answer, Grading Grid, Instructor Evaluation Rubric, Student Self-Assessment*)

Customization Options



Building Bar Skills Conference

Instructor Evaluation Rubric
Contracts – Module 3 – Performance, Breach, and Damages

Criteria	Excellent (3 points)	Satisfactory (2 points)	Developing (1 point)	Not Present (0 points)	Points Earned
Structure	Used a clear, easily identifiable IRAC structure to analyze the issues, separating each issue and sub-issue into distinct IRAC sections, while also using headings for each issue and sub-issue.	Used a somewhat clear and identifiable IRAC structure to analyze issues, but not all issues and sub-issues separated into distinct IRAC sections. Used headings for the major issues, but did not use headings consistently for sub-issues.	Used a somewhat clear and identifiable IRAC structure to analyze the issues, but the issues and sub-issues were not separated into distinct IRAC sections to clearly discern the analysis of each issue or sub-issue. Use of headings and sub-headings are missing or inconsistent.	Did not use an identifiable IRAC structure and headings to analyze the issues.	
Format, Tone, & Instructions	Used a proper format for a legal memorandum, providing an easily identifiable overall introduction and conclusion to the legal questions, writing in an objective tone, and following all instructions by the supervising attorney for addressing the legal questions.	Used a proper format for a legal memorandum, providing an overall introduction and conclusion to the legal questions, writing in an objective tone, and following most of the instructions by the supervising attorney for addressing the legal questions.	Used a proper format for a legal memorandum, but an overall introduction and conclusion is undeveloped or missing, may not adhere strictly to an objective tone throughout, and misses a few of the instructions by the supervising attorney in addressing the legal questions.	Did not use a proper format for a legal memorandum, with no overall introduction or conclusion, not in an objective tone, and does not follow the instructions by the supervising attorney in addressing the legal questions.	
Issues and Rule Statements	Clearly and precisely identified and stated the rule statements from the legal authorities provided to clearly analyze each of the issues and elements needed to resolve the legal question. The answer provides at least two rule explanations	Clearly identified and stated most of the rule statements from the legal authorities provided to satisfactorily analyze each of the issues and elements needed to resolve the legal question. Very little, if any, use of rules from the legal authorities unnecessary to resolve the legal issues	Somewhat identified and stated some of the rule statements from the legal authorities provided to satisfactorily analyze the issues and elements needed to resolve the legal question. Overquoting or overuse of the legal authorities unnecessary to resolve the legal issues	Did not identify and state most, if any, of the rule statements from the legal authorities provided to satisfactorily resolve the legal questions, including possible use of irrelevant rule statements or law	

Instructor Competency Rubric



Student Self-Eval Parts 3-5

- 3) Competency Rubric
(same as for instructor)
- 4) Self-Assessment Reflection
Questions
- 5) Next Steps

Part IV: Self-Assessment Reflection

Reflection is a critical component of active learning. It is only after reflecting on what went well, and what you would like to improve, that you can come up with concrete learning goals and steps for improvement.

1. Preparation: Law school assignments and exams are different from assignments and exams taken in the past, so preparing for them is also different. How well did your materials and resources set you up for completing this module? What do you wish you had done differently, or done more of? Did you use your study time effectively? How well did your materials work for you? What do you wish you had done differently, or done more of?
2. Organization: Did your answer use the same headings as the Sample Answer and/or minimize the use of the essay prompts? Why or why not?



NextGen	1L Set
Common fact scenario; may include some legal resources and/or supplemental documents	✓
Follow a newly licensed lawyer through a portion of the life of a client matter, asking questions at critical junctures	✓
Mixture of multiple-choice and short-answer questions	✓
Tests both doctrine and skills	Tests skills; doctrine provided
Two subject areas	One subject area
Two multiple-choices questions, four short answer	Six multiple-choice questions, one short answer
Three-four questions from Group B (client counseling), the rest may come from Groups A (issue spotting, investigation) and C (legal research)	One question from Group B (client counseling), the rest from Groups A (issue spotting, investigation) and C (legal research)



Building Bar Skills Conference

Professor Guide

- Exercise description with suggestions how to use it
- Question set with answers and explanations
- Guide to student assessment, including the identification of the skills assessed in each question, how those skills should be applied to reach the correct answer, and suggestions for skills development
 - Question 1: Statute Reading; Issue Spotting; Application of Rule to Facts. This question asks students to dissect the meaning of ... Students who struggle with this question need to work on...



Building Bar Skills Conference

Professor Guide: Example

Question 1: Statute Reading; Issue Spotting; Application of Rule to Facts

This question asks students to dissect the meaning of UCC § 2-201. They should determine that subsection (1) states the **main rule**, subsection (2) defines an **exception** to the writing requirement that may be available only when both parties are merchants, and subsection (3) defines three other exceptions that may apply regardless of the parties' status. **Students must apply § 2-201 to the facts from the client interview and should be able to identify that** the oral agreement is subject to the statute of frauds because the cost of the painting exceeds the monetary threshold in § 2-201(1). **Students should also conclude that § 2-201(1) is not satisfied because** there is no writing signed by the gallery owner-buyer (i.e., the party trying to avoid the contract). **Finally, students need to read closely to understand that § 2-201 does not bar an argument by the client that** an oral contract has been formed, but does provide the buyer with a potential defense to enforcement.

Students who struggle with Question 1 need to work on their **statute-reading skills**, as well as **their ability to separate background facts from legally relevant facts by matching facts to the associated parts of the rule**. This requires students to **understand each subpart** of the rule **individually** and then understand the **relationship between the subparts**. Students must also understand that when a statute includes both a rule and an exception, they should **analyze whether the rule is satisfied before reaching the exception**.



Building Bar Skills Conference

Student Self-Evaluation Guide

- Includes answers and explanations
- Identifies the skills needed to select each correct answer
 - E.g., “If you struggled with Questions 1 and 2 ...work on your ability to separate background facts from legally relevant facts.”
- “Moving Forward” sections include tips for practicing these skills and enhance future self-assessment
 - E.g., “... do not ignore any facts. Match each fact to the part(s) of the rule to which it relates. If a fact does not seem to relate to the rule, make a note of that; perhaps the fact will be relevant to an aspect of the rule that is not yet clear.”



“Moving Forward” Example

Moving Forward

If you struggled with Questions 1 and 2, work on your statute-reading skills. As you read each part of a statute, make sure you **do not ignore any language**. Determine the **meaning of each subpart individually**, and then consider the **relationship between the subparts**. **For example**, is one section a general rule, while the other sections are exceptions, as in the statute in this integrated question set? Alternatively, do parts of the statute constitute elements, each of which must be satisfied to meet the rule, or are they factors, which are criteria that should be considered and weighed to determine whether the rule is satisfied? Remember that when a statute includes both a rule and an exception, you **should analyze whether the rule is satisfied before reaching the exception**.

In addition, you should work on your ability to separate background facts from legally relevant facts. Legally relevant facts are the **facts that are key to determining whether and how the rule applies to your fact scenario**. To do this, **do not ignore any facts. Match each fact to the part(s) of the rule to which it relates**. If a fact does not seem to relate to the rule, make a note of that; perhaps the fact will be relevant to an aspect of the rule that is not yet clear.



Building Bar Skills Conference

Key Findings/Takeaways



Building Bar Skills Conference

Questions or Comments?

ghalydie@hawaii.edu

lskillin@hawaii.edu

christopher.s.engle-newman@du.edu

fkerner@helixbarreview.org





AccessLex
INSTITUTE®

THANK YOU!