needed before equal opportunities for women and other groups traditionally excluded from the portals are assured.

A survey conducted in 1997 in the UK revealed that of the 301 law professors in the UK, 43 were women, making up 14% of the total. Fifty-seven out of 83 law schools had no women professors at all and in only two law schools did women professors out-number men. Women entering the academic profession now will still find that they are in a minority, and most women law professors have spent most of their career in a very isolated position in most of their professional activities, whether within their academic departments, within their institutions, or in the wider world of their subject associations.

University teachers, at least in the UK, have only recently begun to examine who they are. It is somewhat ironic that notions of academic freedom and objectivity have tended to mask the need for analysis, rather than encourage self-reflection about the processes whereby individuals come to occupy their places in the academy. Also the university sector as a whole is only slowly coming to recognise that some proactive policies might be needed before equal treatment for women and other traditionally excluded groups are assured.

Many studies of the rise of women in professional work and changing perceptions of their roles reveal that women are concentrated in the less well-paid and lower status jobs. Within the university sector, women are concentrated in library, administrative and clerical posts, while women in academic positions are disproportionately on fixed-term contracts, and found at junior rather than senior levels. Three out of five UK law schools have no women professors, allowing them to reinforce their own prejudices and to continue to be blind to the possibilities of their world looking any different.

Direct and indirect patterns of discrimination include old boy networks, age barriers, discriminatory attitudes and practices. Examples are allocation of pastoral, administrative and teaching loads, and the prevalence of patronage. All of these are chalices of poison and they can also work in several negative ways. These include overloading women with administration; leaving women to absorb pastoral work from less conscientious colleagues; or failing to allow for their attracting a disproportionate share of pastoral work through being perceived to be more accessible; and applying different standards to women who fail their obligations than to men. Women may be left with no time for, or be perceived as uncommitted to, research.

In universities and most of our social and political institutions power is held by men, and it is not surprising that the normative structures and rules within those institutions generally reflect and further the interests of those holding power in that system. It is within these broader cultural foundations that localised cultures and politics are played out and 'choices' are made. These include encouraging, mentoring and headhunting 'people like us'. The very qualities of competence, compliance and social immobility which are taken to be natural in women may also make them ideal candidates for filling out the base of the pyramid, providing the teaching commitment that the expanding

A number of obstacles to the development of equal opportunities policies in higher education have been identified: resources, work arrangements, training, recruitment and selection, targets, and attitudes and culture. While nearly all universities have equal opportunities policies, only a third have action plans to accompany those policies.

Leadership from the top emerges in a number of studies as a crucial factor in bringing equal opportunities compliance within the institution beyond mere lip service. A vice-chancellor committed to the value of diversity in the university can be very effective. But without support from the senior officers, it is extremely hard for committed individuals to make much progress.

Most of the women who work in university law schools are white, (very) middle-class and not all of them would identify themselves as feminists. It is unlikely these days that a suggestion that we teach a course in gender and law would be dismissed as laughable. But the major changes we have witnessed and experienced in the higher education sector in the last two decades have, paradoxically, both exposed and obscured previously hidden questions. Gender, ethnicity and disability are emerging more strongly but are none the less still often seen as someone else's problem. Universities are extremely hierarchical yet management is often indirect. Women are often strung between the poles of two 'greedy institutions', the family and higher education.

LAW TEACHERS

Legal scholarship blueprint
W B Slomanson
50 *J Legal Educ* 3, 2000, pp 431-449

What do you want to accomplish with the scholarship ingredient of your professional career? Were you to pose this question to your more experienced colleagues, any candid reply would acknowledge the so-called teaching-versus-scholarship debate – one of the most persistent and vexing issues in legal academia. The role of scholarship is misunderstood, or at any rate, law teachers have varying understandings of the raison d'etre for legal scholarship.

The academic literature addresses the law teacher's scholarship responsibility. The common perception is that scholarship ranks first at upper-tier schools, teaching first at others. Put another way, we are all good teachers, but tenure is not necessarily determined by teaching accomplishments. One reason is that evaluating teaching is arguably more subjective than evaluating scholarship. A number of schools effectively delegate this part of the tenure evaluation process to the law reviews: you either publish or you don't, and the more publications, the better. Some schools may rely heavily on external scholarship review.

So where do you need to be in the scholarship debate? Know that new scholars are bound by local rules, a.k.a. 'the tenure plan'. If you are at least aware of the philosophical disconnect within our ranks, you will not be unduly surprised

should you be exposed to conflicting assessments of the role of scholarship, and you will be better equipped to enter the fray. Is your next publication affiliated with any particular blueprint? This question presupposes the need for a career-enhancing game plan.

Should you publish in just one area? Some schools want to predict, at the close of the tenure-track period, whether you will be a leader in a particular field. Branching out could be disastrous. On the other hand, scholarly diversity may work for you. The world-renowned scholar who has published in multiple areas is the exception, not the rule.

What type of publication should you produce? One general list of priorities divides legal writing into four broad categories, in ascending order of worthiness: practice-oriented materials (bar journals and manuals); academic short subjects (essays, book reviews, and brief case notes); law review articles; and books. If you are dreading the process of getting your first law review article into print, remember that everyone can get an article published somewhere.

A book-length legal analysis will have a book-length impact on frequency of publication. You may not have adequate time to write a book that will be a significant contribution to your tenure portfolio. This is one of the reasons for the quantitative primacy of the article, rather than the book, at both the pretenure and post tenure stages. If you work only on a book during the pretenure period, there is nothing else to fall back on when making your case for tenure.

Ascertain expectations. Is a precise minimum number of publications required? Does your school expect to predict, at the end of your tenure-track period, whether you are likely to become a leading scholar in your chosen area? Are you expected to publish in just one area?

Traditional wisdom counsels against topics involving the practical aspects of law practice. The leading thou-shalt-not is the production of practice-oriented materials for continuing legal education, bar journals, and practice manuals.

Where should you publish? There are several layers to this question. These underlying themes involve peer-edited journals, 'second' law reviews, and electronic journals. Fortunately one has an increasing potpourri of publishing choices other than the traditional student-edited law review. Publication in a faculty-edited journal allows an author the satisfaction of knowing that professional peers made the acceptance decision. While students are knowledgeable, you are nevertheless placing your career in the hands of neophytes who have only one or two years of legal education under their belts.

As you develop a scholarly arsenal, you should keep track of your successes. Placing your publications on a Web site has its advantages. An authorised electronic version can be posted for classroom use. Another advantage is the convenience of not having to respond to requests for a print version. Scholars might also keep track of their personal publication citations, which may be one indicator of the utility of their scholarship. More seasoned scholars can use this track record when seeking book contracts, grants, or speaking opportunities.

Law reviews, as we know them, will one day be academic dinosaurs. So you might consider publishing in an electronic journal. The e-world is gradually replacing the print world.

Professional conflicts of interest and 'good practice' in legal education
P Hayden
50 *J Legal Educ* 3, 2000, pp 358-375

Good practice in legal education involves identifying and resolving professorial conflicts of interest. Therefore a broad definition of 'conflicts of interest' is not only appropriate but also essential. The essence of conflict of interest is acting with divided loyalties – loyalty involving, in this context, performing central professorial functions on behalf of all those to whom that duty is owed. Whenever, because of duties owed to someone, a teacher cannot perform work competently for another to whom duties are also owed, that teacher has a conflict of interest. Professorial conflicts of interest come in many guises: clashes between one's personal interests and core job functions; between one's outside activities and core functions; between core functions; and within a particular function. Left unrecognised and unchecked, some conflicts threaten to undermine teachers' effectiveness in performing one or more core functions. Good practice in legal education, then, requires that such conflicts gain our collective and individual attention.

When performing their core functions, law teachers owe significant ethical, fiduciary-like duties to many constituencies – their students, their colleagues, and their institutions, for example – whose interests may be compromised by professorial conflicts. Even more pointedly, law teachers depend upon the trust and respect of others – their students, their colleagues, and the legal profession as a whole – to be able to perform their core functions effectively, and some conflicts of interest may lessen such trust and respect. Additionally, law teachers must always be mindful of serving (sometimes unintentionally) as role models for their students – future lawyers and judges who will themselves be subject to rules governing conflicts of interest.

Professorial conflicts, then, are of pointed concern when they lessen materially a teacher's ability to perform any core professorial function competently. Most law schools evaluate their faculty on three such functions: teaching, scholarship, and service. While these job functions can and should overlap significantly, each involves distinct responsibilities that benefit various important constituencies in different ways.

A frequent source of potential conflict is between the non-law-related personal interests of faculty and the interests of the various constituencies served by competent performance of their core job functions. Certainly, lawyers must all deal with conflicting time demands of this kind, and teachers can effectively model how to deal with them within the context of our professional culture. Anyone with