

# Tulsa Law Review

---

Volume 55 | Number 3

---

Spring 2020

## Foreword

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.law.utulsa.edu/tlr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

*Foreword*, 55 Tulsa L. Rev. vii-Foreword (2020).

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.utulsa.edu/tlr/vol55/iss3/5>

This Front Matter is brought to you for free and open access by TU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Tulsa Law Review by an authorized editor of TU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [megan-donald@utulsa.edu](mailto:megan-donald@utulsa.edu).

# FOREWORD

Law reviews at most American law schools are student-run, student-edited. Students select the articles, make offers in a competitive market, and then cite-check, edit, format, and publish the journal. The *Tulsa Law Review* is no different. It is a herculean task. Second and third year law students are basically thrown in the deep end and asked to swim without even having graduated from law school, let alone acquired any sort of deep familiarity with legal scholarship.

Yet year after year, most students at most reviews do a decent to spectacular job. If some critics of legal education think that law school is too detached from “real life,” law review, particularly from a position on the board, offers students a crash course in how to acquire knowledge and skills quickly, how to handle crises that you have no past experience to draw on for guidance, when to ask questions and when to ask for help, how to manage people and how to manage your own time, how to get a project out on deadline, to develop tact, diplomacy, and professionalism. Most importantly, the law review experience is, for some students, one of the few places (clinics and internships being others) where they are professionally responsible for what they produce. The product is theirs. The masthead has their names on it. There is no net.

That is a lot to ask when the review publishes legal scholarship that is primarily doctrinal. However, for some time now some of the most important and exciting work is interdisciplinary. It strains the system to ask students to pass on the legitimacy of work that draws on fields outside of law. So, the students felt they had a dilemma: do we pass up some interesting articles because we feel out of our depth? Or do we take a chance and run the risk that we publish something that is obviously poor?

To address this problem, TLR launched an experiment that took advantage of the wealth of expertise that exists in other colleges at the university. They put out a call to faculty in all of the other colleges—Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Health Sciences, and Business—for faculty willing to help in the article review and editing process for articles in their fields. The volunteers would form the Interdisciplinary Faculty Advisory Committee. Volunteers agreed to do a brief review for substance at the submission stage, after TLR editors had done an initial screening, but to help determine whether an offer should be made. This is not the deeper review they would do for publication in their own fields, but rather a screen for errors and problems that would be obvious to someone in the field. Thereafter, if an article was selected for publication that fell into this category, the advisors would serve as a resource during the editing process for questions and concerns as they arose.

So far, the IFAC seems to be a success! You can see our board of advisors listed on page vi, with names in bold of those who provided help this year. I invite readers to check out the profiles of this distinguished group. We are fortunate to have their input and we feel that this innovation goes some way toward addressing a common complaint about law reviews—their lack of expertise in fields outside of law.

While this solution may not be unique, I think it is one of only a few journals with a process like this. We hope that this will not only increase reader confidence, but that it will encourage authors of interdisciplinary articles to submit their pieces to the *Tulsa Law Review*, knowing that with respect to the data, the history, the medicine, economics, sociology, psychology, or any other discipline, that there will have been someone from that field helping the students in the selection process and helping to resolve issues through the editing process. The final product is still in the students' hands. However, they have a deep bench of experience on which to draw for help making difficult calls whenever they feel they need that expertise. This is not so different from what lawyers must always do—know the limits of their knowledge, learn how to acquire the knowledge, or locate the person or persons who can help. I am grateful to the members of the IFAC for their help in making the *Tulsa Law Review* experience reach its pedagogical goals in giving students this valuable guidance and joining our team.

A final word: This issue is being pulled together and published during the global coronavirus pandemic that less than a month ago required an abrupt shift to online classes and doing most of the work remotely. The TLR board has put out a spectacular issue and is putting it out on time, while having their lives unimaginably disrupted. People have faced illness, abruptly having to move out of student housing, dealing with new modes of delivery for classes and all the ordinary anxieties we all feel. I cannot express how proud I am of them. It was clear to me before the crisis that this year's board was exceptionally talented and that they were going to learn to “swim” and to put out a great issue. But their ability to continue to do so during the worst pandemic in living memory and the biggest social crisis in decades, is truly awe-inspiring. After this experience, I feel that the members of this team will be able to handle any challenge thrown at them by the practice of law! Well done!

—Tamara Piety  
Professor of Law  
*Tulsa Law Review*, Faculty Advisor  
University of Tulsa