

**Queen's Law Virtual Symposium,
Session 3: Reflective Practice and Fostering Wellbeing (22 June 2026)**

(Judith Marychurch) Welcome, everyone. I'll just wait for a minute or so, just for anyone else who might be joining us, and then we'll make a start. Okay. Looks like hopefully most people are here now.

Welcome to Session 3 of Day One of the International Symposium Series, *Reflective Practice for Legal Professionals*. My name is Judith Marychurch. I'm an Associate Professor at the Melbourne Law School at the University of Melbourne in Australia, and it's my pleasure to be here for this session and to offer my services as moderator.

We've got six papers in this session, so each presentation will be for a maximum of 12 minutes. And I will give our speakers an oral warning at two minutes. So don't be surprised if that happens. And that is in order to hopefully allow some time for questions at the end.

Please feel free to post questions in the Q&A function in the Zoom session. You can find that under the "More" link, with the circle and the three dots. So please make sure you do pop in any questions that you might have for any of our speakers. That would be a good record, as we go, of questions that you might want to ask. And I'll refer to that when we get to question time at the end. If you do want to, and I'm just going to get the chat up quickly, because I copied and pasted the link, and here we go. So, I'm just putting the link for the Padlet into the chat as well. So, if anyone would like to use the Padlet function to record any of their thoughts, please do so as well. That's something that's going to be there throughout this symposium series, to give people an opportunity to capture some of their reflections, maybe some of the things they've learned from the really interesting sessions that we're going to have during this symposium series.

So, I know for some people here in Australia, for instance, it's quite early yet, it's only the beginning of the day for us, but I know it's the evening for some other people. And so, some people will have their screens off so that they can have a meal, and so on, given that we're from all different time zones around the world. But it's great to see so many people here for this session.

I'm only going to introduce each speaker briefly, so that we can have the maximum time available to actually hear from our presenters and to have some Q&A at the end. But just a reminder that the abstracts and the biographies for our speakers are all available on the website for the International Symposium Series, so please do have a look at that. And take the time to have a read through the full abstracts and the bios for all of our great speakers that we have today. So, without any further ado, I'm going to introduce our first speaker. And we've actually got a team here for our first session.

So, I've got Professor Rachael Field from Bond University, Australia, along with Dr. Emma Jones from the University of Sheffield in the UK. I know both of them, and they're lovely people, and I'm really looking forward to hearing from them today. They're going to speak to us on their paper, "*Reflective Practice as a Critical Element of a Proposed New Legal Wellbeing Pedagogy*." Over to you, Rachael and Emma.

5:00 (Rachael Field)

Thank you, Judith. We're going to tag team in terms of doing this presentation. So, Emma's going to get us started, I think. Is that right, Emma?

(Emma Jones) Okay, good. Thank you. Thank you, Rachael. And thank you, Michele and Sharry, for organising this, and Judith for chairing this session. We're delighted to be involved with it. I'm just going to start by talking a little bit about legal wellbeing pedagogy, which is a model for legal education that myself, Rachael and Professor Caroline Strevens have been developing. And then I'll hand over to Rachael, who will talk specifically about reflective practice and why that is a key element of this proposed new pedagogy.

But you might be wondering, why do we feel that a legal wellbeing pedagogy is necessary? And if we could just move to the next slide, please, Rachael. Yes.

(Emma Jones) Brilliant. Thank you. The reason we think it's important is because wellbeing is such a core issue in legal education. Of course, it's not just legal education. We know that the wellbeing issues, the mental health experienced by students internationally, across all disciplines, has been a subject of increasing concern and discussion in recent years, and there have been a wide range of empirical and theoretical studies on this. However, there has been a particular focus on law, and this has started from even the 1950s in the USA. And of course, there's been amazing work done in Australia, in Canada. The UK is gradually perhaps catching up, I think. But there's been an idea that actually, potentially, law students experience greater wellbeing issues and poorer mental health than students in other disciplines. And the suggestion has been that there are elements of legal study in particular which can be detrimental to student wellbeing.

And these have been quite well established in the literature now. Things like the competitive nature of the legal sector leading to great academic pressure. The notion of thinking like a lawyer, that can become a very rigid, emotionless, or seemingly emotionless, way of thinking. And of course, if you're interested in that, there's a summary of a lot of these themes and a lot of the literature in the International Bar Association's international guidelines for wellbeing in legal education. So that's what led us to decide to try and develop this model, this legal wellbeing pedagogy. So, we could have the next slide please, Rachael. Thank you.

And we did this drawing on the theoretical basis of positive psychology, in particular Ryan and Deci's self-determination theory, which really looks at what people need to thrive. And as you perhaps know, it's got a lot of different sub-theories. But we focus particularly on basic psychological needs sub-theory. So, the idea that actually people need to have competence, relatedness and autonomy. And so, if we're applying that to both law students and law staff as well, because of course it's really important that we don't just focus on students, but we think about the whole law school community when we're thinking about wellbeing.

So, our aim with the pedagogy is to create a learning and teaching framework that promotes positive wellbeing. It's not just about ameliorating some of the issues, but actually it's about reimagining the legal curriculum as a vehicle to facilitate thriving and flourishing. And doing that by synthesising this evidence that's out there around students generally, around law students, and using positive psychology as its theoretical basis. So, if I could just have the next slide, please. Thank you. Rachael, you're ahead of me there now.

This is a visual representation of what we've captured in the legal wellbeing pedagogy. And I haven't got any time to go through it in any level of detail. But you can see that there's challenge and growth, which is really drawing on elements of competence. There's independence and meaning, which draws on elements of autonomy. And there's connection and collaboration, which draws on elements of relatedness. But what's really key for what we're talking about today is that there are some interconnecting concepts that we really see as the glue that hold all these different cognitive, experiential and affective elements together. And as you will see, those interconnecting concepts include values and ethics. They include empathy. But they also include reflection, which is really what we're focusing on today.

I'm going to hand over to Rachael now to talk a little bit more about the role of reflective practice in this model.

(Rachael Field) Thank you, Emma. Yes. So, as Emma has said, reflective practice is one of those very core components of the legal wellbeing pedagogy. And it's conceptualising the teaching of reflective practice as something that's going to be helping, supporting students to make sense of all of the challenging and complicated and discombobulating elements of the law curriculum, all of those things that take them out of their comfort zone and make them feel like they perhaps don't belong. You know, the development of imposter syndrome, that sort of thing. But reflective practice we see as that metacognitive skill that's going to support students to make sense of all of that, and to manage it in a way that will support their learning success. So, on the diagram, reflection comes between independence and meaning, and connection and collaboration. So, from that we take it that it's critical to both the individual but also communal aspects of wellbeing at law school, and also in terms of the pedagogy that we're aiming to develop.

We're hoping to offer some really practical ways for legal academics to incorporate and promote reflection throughout the curriculum. So Caroline, Emma and I, as Emma noted, came together in terms of working on the pedagogy, because we were also working together on the IBA's international guidelines for wellbeing in legal education. Which, interestingly, ages ago had some beginning in the Council of Australian Law Deans' statement on

law student wellbeing, which were issued in 2012. So, there's quite a long history sitting behind the pedagogy. But just to draw your attention to Guideline 4 of the IBA guidelines, that mentions that law schools make a commitment to evidence based, which is very important, and long-lasting change.

And one of the things that law schools commit, through the guidelines, to trying to do, and nobody's going to rap them over the knuckles if they don't achieve it perfectly, is to ensure that reflective practice, specifically referring to wellbeing, is promoted, supported and integrated across the law school. And that's obviously in order to get to the students. You've got to go to where they are, and that's through the curriculum. They're in the curriculum, they're connecting with the curriculum. So that's where we're going to place our emphasis. And I guess also just noting that increasingly it is being acknowledged that a range of skills that are relevant to student wellbeing can be explicitly taught. It's not a haphazard lottery that students may be able to manage their wellbeing, or indeed flourish. So, we can actually teach these skills, and it's important that we do so at law school. So, the IBA guidelines are committing to that.

So, there's going to be a lot of discussion over the next two days about reflective practice, obviously, and how it manifests as a metacognitive skill. In terms of how we're thinking about it in the pedagogy, the things that I would just like to emphasise are the things on this slide here: that we see reflective practice as something that will support autonomous learning for students. And that is very critical, in terms of positive psychology and the framework that we're using for conceptualising the pedagogy. Autonomous learning is really critical to wellbeing. But also, deep learning is supportive of not only wellbeing but flourishing. So, we want to see the students flourish.

The other day I was doing a presentation, and I just asked the students in front of me, who would like to do well at law school, and who would like to be a successful lawyer? And they all put up their hand. Of course they did, because they've come to law school with hopes and dreams of achieving well and thinking of a wonderful legal career ahead of them.

So, if we can support deep learning, we're going to be supporting the achievement of those dreams, and reflective practice is supportive of deep learning. The next thing that we see reflective practice as supporting is the development of those critical skills that are part of being a law student. So, the communication skills, the collaboration skills, the critical thinking skills, and the legal analysis skills. If reflective practice sits underneath all of those things and their development, the students are going to be able to flourish. We also see reflective practice as really getting in there and helping those levels of understanding and competence and capacity. Again, those things will help students to flourish, but also, at the other end, with the management of stress and the coping with difficulties and uncertainties. So reflective practice we see as being really front and centre in terms of developing positive approaches.

So, we don't take a deficit model in terms of this pedagogy. It is about flourishing. But we have to acknowledge the statistics that exist around the levels of distress in law students, that do increase over time from the beginning of their legal education.

Another thing: there is a lot of critical feedback at law school. And so we see reflective practice as being very important to helping students deal with that critical feedback. And I guess the time when students' wellbeing is noted as particularly going downhill is that first year of legal education. And so that's really important.

And the other thing about reflective practice is that it will help students to make connections with their own lived experience, values and beliefs, and that connects back to the autonomous learning.

So that's a little snapshot of our pedagogy that we're going to be writing about. A book is intended, and maybe some articles will be there along the way as well. I'll stop sharing now.

(Judith Marychurch) Fantastic. Thank you very much, Rachael and Emma. That's really insightful and great to hear. There's such a body of work. I know you've been working in this area for a long time, and it's great to see you've got so many things that you've been able to progress already, and that there's more coming. So we'll look forward to hearing further from you, as well as Caroline, on that. So, thank you.

(Rachael Field) Our intention is to rope Michele in as well on this particular chapter. Yeah, just to acknowledge Michele, because your scholarship in this area is exceptional. So, thank you.

(Judith Marychurch) Yeah. Amazing. Isn't it great how we can make these sorts of connections around the globe, and that an international symposium series like this is enabling some of those things to happen, so that we can hear from people we might not otherwise have met, that we might not have gotten to know their work. So, thank you very much for that.

All right. Our next speaker for this session is Associate Professor Anna Copeland, Director of Clinical Legal Education at Murdoch University, Australia. But I believe she's actually in Geneva now and has had a bit of a trip to get there today. So we are truly around the globe today. And she is going to be speaking to us on her paper, *"Reflection Will Be the Thing That Saves You: Linking Reflective Practice to Wellbeing and Happiness in Graduating Students."* Over to you, Anna.

19:30 (Anna Copeland)

Thanks, Judith. Yes, usually I'd be joining you from Whadjuk Noongar country, the unceded lands of the Noongar people, where I work and live. But I am actually in Geneva, about to teach a bunch of Australian students all about the UN. That will be fun in a heatwave. We'll see how we go with that. I'm going to share my slides now. Okay. Can you all see that? Okay, great. So, I have quite shamefully quoted Oasis, obviously, in this title. Oh, now I'm having the same trouble with moving it on. Oh, there we go.

I agree with everything that Rachael and Emma have said. I just am interested in taking it even further, in terms of some of the issues that I think really impact on students' wellbeing. And I noticed that Rachael mentioned that in first year it's the biggest dive in feeling of wellbeing. And I think that a lot of that is about the competitive nature of law school. And I prickle about that whole aspect of that being as if just something that we have to accept, because I don't think that that is the case. So those kinds of things will come up a little bit later on.

I just want to start with this whole idea that when you are in the midst of your education for practice, and this, of course, is a quote from Donald Schön, there's a profound sense of mystery, that students, particularly starting their law degrees, don't really know what they're doing, and their teachers can't really even explain it to them, because what the teachers know about legal practice, they can't say it to their students in a way that they'll understand it, because they're not at that point of their experience. Students have to experience that, and try to do these things, before they can understand the feedback that teachers might give.

Now, you might have guessed, I'm a clinical practitioner and a clinical teacher, and a big believer in clinic as a way of addressing a lot of these issues. Because when you are, sorry, I'm in a very different, sorry guys, I think I have gone through. Please bear with me. I'm sorry. (Technical difficulties – omitted conversation)

So, the difference between practice and then research, or theoretical approaches to things, I think is a crucial part of this idea of how students approach their legal education, and why there are difficulties in terms of them grappling with that legal education. So obviously, when you research something, you remove the variables. And this is what our students are used to doing. They're high achievers, usually, in their high schools and their undergrad degrees, before they come to law studies. And they're used to removing those variables and thinking through theoretically in a way that really narrows what they're looking at. Whereas practice is exactly the opposite of that. It's messy. You're in the middle of it. All you can really do is problem solve as you go through. You can't really remove variables, and you have to deal with all those variables as they hit you, and not in a way that you can control or expect, but just in the way that they come up.

So, this is also from Schön, and it's just talking about that idea of looking at something from high on the hill, which is this whole removal of variables of research. You're looking at something from up there. You're thinking about how you would approach it and how you would solve it, and you're seeing it in context. And when students start to learn law, and when they start to practise law through clinical work, they are right down in the swamp, and they can't even see that. They don't have that perspective of seeing those things within the context that it exists in. And this is really overwhelming for students. And I think this is a big part of what impacts on their wellbeing.

But we can't ignore that that is the reality of the world that they're approaching, and the kind of practice that they have to go into.

So, reflection provides an opportunity to really think that through and reflect on it in community, discuss, converse with the situation, but also with each other. And so of course, I'm talking about reflection-in-action here. And it hinges on that experience of, you don't know what to expect, and it's coming at you in whatever way. Now, these are all ideas that you are all very familiar with, working in this space. And what I do in my clinical course is - I talk to students about this exact thing, to try and get them to understand the reflective process and then try to talk to them about how they might reflect. So when we get to that point, it's really interesting, because what students are raising are quite broad issues around climate anxiety, around tech and particularly AI, and how that's going to impact.

So, we're not talking about narrow issues. We're talking about these very broad issues that fit within the socioeconomic context, if you like, of the world that we live in. So, with any legal problem, when there are ethical dilemmas, I wanted to raise those issues of climate justice, or rather climate anxiety, which we're seeing more and more in our students, and the anxiety around AI, and how to use it, and what it's going to do in terms of impacting on legal professionals. These are ethical dilemmas, and these are ethical dilemmas that are well beyond anything that the uniform practice rules or indications from practice guidelines will help our students with. Ethical dilemmas in law school are traditionally posed in a kind of stripped-down hypothetical, giving only the facts that you want them to look at, to decide whether there's an ethical issue and how they might deal with that ethical issue.

And for example, the one that's here on the slide, where they have to think through, what are their obligations? They have to refer back to the rules. They have to work through how they impact. But actually what they're dealing with is much bigger and much broader than that. And I think that in some ways, we can exacerbate the problem by only talking about a tiny bit, when they see this whole big fat mess. We're down in the swamp, and we're trying to pretend that we're up on the cliff going, yes, we can resolve this this way.

And AI is a classic example of this, I think, because there's lots of discussion about AI and how it's going to impact on the legal profession. There's lots of difficulty for students, especially in my law school, because we have some of my colleagues who won't allow them to use AI at all, and other colleagues who encourage them to use AI, but in a responsible way. So, they're already grappling with different messages coming to them around these issues. But the most they will get in terms of the ethical context of AI, in discussions with faculty, are things like what to do when AI hallucinates, or what are the issues with AI professionally? They very rarely get those broader ethical issues, such as, what is the impact on the environment of AI? Is it ethical to even use AI? What are the actual biases that are being used by AI, and what impact would that have on the practice of law if it just goes unchecked and we're using it, those biases?

So, these are the kinds of questions that students have to deal with, and we don't really give them the skills to do it very readily. I mean, even those law schools working with reflection and using reflection can often be quite a narrow form of that. Or if not narrow, I guess I don't mean to say narrow, but it's sort of contained. And that's partly because the way that we teach law, and our professional formation, is about stripping stuff down to teach the basics, isn't it? It's about getting to the elements and teaching the elements. And we tend to do that here as well, which can be limiting for students, because they're seeing this big, huge, messy swamp, and they're getting only a little bit of engagement with it from their faculty.

The solicitors' conduct rules were there to talk to the last slide, about how we go through and teach ethics. But I want to move on, because I've only got two minutes left. And think about this aspect of, the questions around some of these ethical considerations should not just be, how do the rules engage here? They should be: what would I do as a human being? What should I do as a person? And then work that through with reflection as to what you need to do or should do as a professional. I'm going to move on really quickly, because I want to get to my final point, which I think is the most important.

We're getting more and more information, and this was mentioned in the first session of this conference, that there's this kind of divide between personal values and maybe the organisational values of where people are working, and that this can result in really negative impacts on wellbeing of people, and serious impacts on their mental health. So, if we, in teaching reflection, don't delve into those very broad social issues that are impacting on our students, we're going to be failing them, because we need to be able to have them think about, what are their values on a personal

level? What are the values of the organisation or the enterprise that they're in? What are the values of the broader community, and how do all of these things fit together? And reflection is the only way that that can be done.

But I think we need to really reflect ourselves on how we're teaching reflection, and whether there are limits to it that are not serving our students. And I'll finish up there.

(Judith Marychurch) Fantastic. Thank you very much, Anna. That was great. And don't worry, everyone has technical issues like that. That happens to all of us. You did a great job, especially keeping to time, given those issues. Thank you very much, Anna. We'll look forward to hopefully having some more discussion after the next papers.

All right. Our third paper for this session today is presented by two speakers again. We've got Professors Véronique Fortin and Claudia Bérubé, both from the Université de Sherbrooke in Canada. And they're going to be speaking to their paper, "*Integrating Reflective Practice and Professional Identity Formation in Week 3 of L1: Too Soon?*" Over to you, Véronique and Claudia.

33.09 (Veronique Fortin)

Thank you, thank you, thank you. Okay, so thank you so much to the organisers, Michele and Sharry. And we're very happy to be here. And we come with humility.

We want to share with you this pedagogical initiative, a new course that we've been implementing for the past two years. It's called *Becoming a Legal Professional*. And we want to present to you this question we have. Is it too soon to talk about professional identity formation, and to integrate reflective practice, right at the end of September? So, week three, first semester. We're sharing our own reflective path with this course, and we're very open to comments and suggestions. We're here to learn. Okay. So, let's just do this. Quick outline. We're going to talk to you about the context of legal education in Quebec, Canada, which is a bit different than the rest of Canada. And then we're going to talk to you a little bit more about the course, *Becoming a Legal Professional*, of course, which we teach in French. And then we're going to get into the successes and challenges of professional development and reflective practice in week three of L1. So now to you, Claudia.

(Claudia Bérubé)

Yeah. So first of all, I will talk about the context of legal education in Quebec, Canada. The L1 students are mostly 19, 20 years old. There is no undergraduate degree required in Quebec. The law degree takes three years to complete, after which students must choose between attending bar school to become attorneys, or pursuing a master's degree in notarial law, if they wish to become notaries, so for about one more year. It should be noted that a notary in Quebec is a legal professional specialised in non-contentious matters, not someone who only authenticates signatures.

Another important aspect of the context is a Canada wide study conducted among more than 7,000 legal professionals by Professor Nathalie Cadieux. The report revealed that more than half of Quebec lawyers and notaries reportedly suffer from psychological distress, and the prevalence is significantly higher among at-risk or declining students and professionals with less than ten years of experience. The first recommendation in her report is to improve university education to better prepare students for the realities of legal practice. We took this recommendation seriously.

At that time, we did not have any courses that focused on developing interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence, and we had noticed that our students were experiencing anxiety related to academic performance and career options. So, we've been figuring out the best way to organise and structure a new course that will provide students with the tools they need, not only during their academic journey, but also for their future careers.

We launched a new course, *Becoming a Legal Professional*, in September 2024. The course is organised around five themes. Work methods, ethics and professional conduct, professional identity, emotional intelligence, and mental health. These five themes are inspired by the causes explored by Professor Nathalie Cadieux in her report. *Becoming a Legal Professional* is three credits, consisting of 15 hours of class time per year, spread out over the

three years of law school. The course is based on active learning, so we have guest panels, case studies based on the Harvard case method, discussion groups, simulation and role-playing exercises, testimonials from legal professionals, and even escape room type activities. Students must complete a reflective assignment after certain activities.

We have 25 to 35 students per group. The course is assessed on a pass or fail basis. For now, the course is optional, but about two thirds of the students take it. We hope that the course will become mandatory for all students within the next two or three years. And the lecturers are experienced legal professionals who are known for their student-centred approach.

(Veronique Fortin)

Okay, so what is it that we do? At the end of September, there's a panel of legal professionals that we bring in. It gathers lawyers and notaries from a variety of backgrounds, various work environments. They practise in different areas of law, and we bring them in for two hours and we have discussions with the students. It's very lively discussions about their career paths, their typical workday, the skills they've developed to get where they are, what they're passionate about, the challenges they face in their work. And in the Q&A, many students want to talk about work life balance. They're preoccupied by this. It's only the third week, but they're still very much preoccupied by this.

And after that, we give them a reflective assignment as their first one. It's guided. Here are the questions that we ask them. It's a one-page assignment. And we ask questions, like: what did you learn during that panel? What surprised you? Is there a panelist that spoke to you more than another one? Has your perception of the legal profession changed? How and why? What academic and professional goals would you like to set for yourself at this early point in your legal journey? So, to use Michele Leering's concepts, we could say that we focus on critical reflection and self-reflection here. Okay, so we were asking ourselves, is it too soon? Is it too soon to talk about this right from the get go, at the beginning of their legal study? And we found out, and that's part of our successes, we found out that it's actually good in providing early counter-narratives to the common beliefs about legal practice.

And so, what we read in the reflective assignment is that, oh, I thought that all lawyers were, like, in "Suits," and it's like, no, they're not. Sometimes they draft contracts all day in the office. And then they realise that. And they also realise, they're surprised, that professionals have changed, like, very successful professionals have changed jobs over their career, that they don't have a linear career path, that they've switched fields, environments, type of practice. And it actually encourages them to stay curious, to take an interest in the different fields of law that they can practise in, instead of having a specific idea in mind.

So that is one thing that we found was good, to, from the get go, talk about professional identity formation. And it also debunks the myths around the articling recruitment process in Quebec. It's called "the race." There's a lot to be said about that. It's a highly competitive process. And they've heard about it. They've heard about it before getting to law school. So talking about it right in September makes it a little less scary.

Challenges. It's too early, and we don't have time to really delve into teaching reflective practice in detail. So we kind of give them the assignment, talk about it for 5 or 10 minutes, and then we let them do it. And hearing all the presentations today, and in the next two days, I think we're going to have a lot of food for thought to improve this. So there's a lack of time here. And also students are a bit overwhelmed. They may be not in the best frame of mind to reflect and think about their future professional lives. They've just moved into a new apartment, maybe moved away from their parents. They're still figuring out where the grocery store is. So, it's maybe not the best frame of mind in September to talk about it. We're still doing it.

And also, there was some pushback from our colleagues who are skeptical about the role of law faculties in professional development. And should we talk about this right at the beginning? Is it really how we want to invest our time as teachers, in the life of those new law students? So, all in all, we're still doing it. We kept the activity, and we think that the successes are bigger than the challenges. But we're open to questions and to suggestions for improvement, if you have any. And if you need the study by Nathalie Cadieux, here it is. Thank you.

(Judith Marychurch) Thank you both very much. Great job keeping to time, and some excellent insights there into just what we can do in the curriculum, including very early on. All right. Thank you both very much. I'll move to our fourth paper now.

Our fourth paper is presented by Tanya Lat, adjunct faculty, Ateneo Law School in the Philippines. And she will be speaking on "*Transforming Law Students into Happier, Healthier, and More Ethical Versions of Themselves: A Philippine Response to Patrick Schiltz 25 Years Hence*." Thanks very much, Tanya.

44:26 (Tanya Lat)

Thank you very much, Judith, and good day to everyone. Well, hi from the Philippines. It's morning over here.

And I'd just like to start out by saying that it's been a delight to be part of this panel. And because of everything that has been said ahead of me, it makes my job so much easier, because for my part, I will be sharing classroom experiences that confirm the theory and the research that has already been done and presented by our previous speakers. So please let me share my slides. All right.

And so, I think Véronique just presented a recent study from Canada, and my paper is actually responding to a 1999 study done in the US by Patrick Schiltz. So, it's been a whole generation of law students who are now lawyers. But this particular article by Patrick Schiltz has helped inform my teaching. By way of background, I teach legal and judicial ethics. It is a mandatory course that is tested in the Philippine bar exams, a very competitive process. It's a circus over here when people take the bar exams and pass the bar exams. It has a particular fervour that's not present in other countries. So, it's an indication of just how competitive it is to get into law school, to get into the profession, and to stay in the profession.

There are different ways by which ethics is taught throughout the professional career of law students and lawyers. So, the basic course is three units, taught in either first year or second year. And then recently our Legal Education Board, our government regulators, required that there be another three units taught in the final year of law school, supposed to be a refresher and also to help prepare the students for the bar exams. Of course, it's tested in the bar exams. And so, there's another round of review. And then, when people are already admitted to the practice, we are required to do continuing legal education every three years. And six units are part of that curriculum. Be that as it may, legal and judicial ethics is considered the runt of the law school curriculum. Patrick Schiltz says as much in his article, and I myself have also had that experience, where when I started teaching, other professors, well-meaning, asked me, don't you want to teach something more substantial? And I have to remind my students, because they tend to make this the last priority in the hierarchy of subjects, I have to remind them that this is the only subject that could get you disbarred if you fail to master it. But be that as it may, it usually takes less priority among the different subjects that they have to contend with on a daily basis.

And so, as I started teaching legal ethics, I've had to ask these questions, because my interest is primarily getting students to embody legal ethics, and to not just memorise the rules. I consider it my task to prepare them for practice, not merely to pass the bar exams. These are the questions I've tried to answer in the course of my teaching. How do we develop people's instincts to act ethically? Because we know that the instinctive behaviour is self-interest, which is not always ethical.

Also, there are two systems of thinking. Daniel Kahneman talks about system one and system two, the reaction versus the response. And so how do we shift people from the instinctive, system one, reactive thinking to the more deliberate, intentional system two thinking that is responsive? How do we slow down the process to create the psychological space to think ethically? Third, this moral imagination. Is creative choice actually possible when you're under stress? Is it possible to think creatively? How do we create the space for creativity in both relaxed and stressful situations?

And last, and most importantly, is moral courage, regardless of the situation. How do we develop our students' inclination to choose to do the right thing, most especially when they're under duress or extreme stress?

And so, I ask these questions in the context of the law school experience.

The previous speakers have already talked about how our students are very stressed, how the law school environment is generally very toxic, and I think it's a common experience internationally that the law school is a very stressful, competitive environment compared to other disciplines. It also must be pointed out that in the Philippines, we still adhere to the Socratic method. You see the image from *The Paper Chase*. I'm sure most of us have seen that movie, or at least have heard of it, and it still remains a dominant mode of instruction here in the Philippines, even though there are now moves to veer away to more, let me say, relaxed methods of teaching. But students have consistently described the Socratic method as a nerve-wracking experience. It's very toxic. They feel very stressed. These are actual quotes that I've gotten from my students throughout the years. They dread coming to class, primarily because of the Socratic method. And because the other professors use this particular mode of instruction, I have to deal with the fallout when the students come to my class, which is usually in the middle or at the end of the day. And so, coming from a very toxic environment, cold calling is the dominant way of doing things over here.

And so, law students come to my class very stressed, generally. They have a dysregulated nervous system. They're in fight or flight or fawn mode, survival mode. And generally, I found them to be operating on autopilot. They come in with a dazed look on their face, or they're flipping through pages, trying to cram for class, that kind of thing. And because of that, they feel very emotionally dysregulated. They feel disconnected from their selves. They're focused on themselves. They don't connect easily with others. In many instances, they find themselves unable to feel. They're reactive. And in terms of unethical behaviour, they're more likely to take shortcuts and the easy way out, because it's just simply too stressful to do the right thing. And generally law students under extreme stress, toxic stress, are unhappy and unhealthy, and they generally don't do well in the classroom. They don't do well in class.

And so, I chanced upon Patrick Schiltz's article written in 1999. He's since moved on from being a law professor. He's now a member of the bench in the US, as far as I know. But I found his article very helpful in the Philippine context. We are very similar to the US in a lot of respects. I teach at a very competitive law school. We have the distinction of having the highest bar passing rate. We consistently have students in the top ten, and our university takes immense pride in that. And so, how do we balance the desire to top the bar exams, to do well academically, while also maintaining the mental health and wellbeing of our students? We take pride in *cura personalis*, which is basically Latin for care for the whole person. And so, my question as a professor is, how do I ensure that my students get good grades, they pass the bar exams, they do well in the practice, they become honours students, while staying healthy, and most of all happy? Because from my experience, it's easier to be ethical if you're happy and healthy.

And so, I've also been looking at other models, like the *unitive justice* model prescribed by Sylvia Clute. And my question has been, how do we shift the culture in the classroom from one of fear to love, from distrust to trust, from a reliance on rules to operating from deeper values, from control of the professor to shared governance? A democratic classroom, where governance is the shared responsibility of students and the professor? And from operating from narrow self-interest towards working in community, towards the common good?

And so, in the course of my research and practice, I have realised that at the intersection of ethics, health and happiness is reflective practice. And we have been seeing these overlapping circles in many presentations that have gone ahead of us today. I found that reflective practice has been the secret to merging these three goals of health, happiness, and ethical behaviour for law students. So, I've also come to the realisation, as I prepared for this symposium, that reflective practice is only possible with stillness and presence. So, it's necessary to cultivate stillness as a practice in the classroom. And so reflective practices can cultivate self-awareness, being grounded in the present moment. Very important, actually, to be grounded in one's body. So, embodiment. Not living in the head but also being fully present in one's body. And this is key to nervous system regulation. A lot of the neuroscience, and even the pop psychology, talks about nervous system regulation, regulation of the vagus nerve, leading to the overall ability to calm down in the midst of stressful situations.

And so, just to breeze through some classroom practices that I use. Thank you. I establish a class contract in order to create a psychologically safe space. I also make time for a check in, in stillness. And it can take the form of mindfulness, or silence. Or it could even be emotional freedom techniques. I've recently introduced tapping, which the students really like very much. They journal. They also have time to share in small groups and in plenary, and it

gives them a chance to unburden themselves of the stresses of the day. They also check out what they've learned from class.

And in terms of teaching methods, I don't use the Socratic method deliberately, because of the stress that it engenders. And I also encourage problem-based learning, where they work in teams to solve hypothetical problems. And this also in itself is a form of reflective practice.

And so I'd just like to share this diagram. Because basically the whole semester is a journey. And this is taken from *Theory U* by Otto Scharmer. And it's basically a process where people move from stress towards wellbeing, they move from mistrust to trust, and they move from control to shared governance. And reflective practice has been very important to help open up people enough: opening their minds, opening their hearts to each other, and opening up their will to want to learn to be ethical. And in the process, it also cultivates a brave space where the students feel empowered to speak their minds, and to also not judge others, as others are given permission to speak their truth.

And so, as I close this presentation, I'd just like to give a few pointers about cultivating reflective practice. My method has been more of titration and dosing. I believe that less is more. I do have to cover doctrinal principles, and so I can't spend the whole period for reflection. But I found that 5 to 10 minutes usually is more than enough to help set the tone for the students, and to get them into the state of mind where we can have a calm and very fruitful discussion. And it's very important that the professor, most of all, is intentional. I have to embody stillness. I have to embody presence and reflection. I have to practise what I preach, otherwise I will get exposed as a hypocrite, which is detrimental as an ethics professor.

Okay, so in closing, I'd just like to share. So basically, ethical behaviour is intertwined with overall health and happiness. It's easier to be ethical if one is self-aware, calm, healthy, and happy. And reflective practice is the key to ensuring that all three are present in our classrooms and in our profession.

(Judith Marychurch) Fantastic. Thank you very much, Tanya. Some really interesting and practical tips there, and just showing how much little changes can make, just in terms of the presence that one has in the classroom and encouraging students to do that. And I like what you say about practising what you preach as well. I think that's a really important thing, and something that we can all do with just checking in with ourselves about, as part of our own reflective practice.

All right. Our fifth speaker for today is Professor Raheena Lalani Dahya, Professor of Alternative Dispute Resolution at Humber Polytechnic, and a mediator and consultant based in Canada. And she's also presenting with Rebecca Norris on their paper, which is titled "*Bias, Burnout, and Blind Spots: Why Reflection Matters in Trauma-Informed Law and ADR*." Okay. Over to you, Raheena and Rebecca.

58:40 (Raheena Lalani Dahya)

Thank you. Rebecca's not with us today, so I'm going to be sharing this with you. If you could just let me know if you could see my slides, or if you can see the main deck, I would be very appreciative.

(Judith Marychurch) We can. The notes are just the deck slides. Perfect.

Raheena Lalani Dahya) Okay, wonderful. So today we're going to be covering a bit of neuroscience. And we're going to be talking about why self-reflection matters as a result of that neuroscience.

Both Rebecca and I are lawyers by background, and I'm a mediator by trade.

I'm going to start us off with this one question, which is, there's this proposition that legal professionals pride themselves on objectivity. And what if the greatest threat to objectivity is believing that we already possess it?

So, we wanted to bring some light to this myth of detached objectivity, because there are some traditional assumptions that, when Rebecca and I were becoming lawyers, we were called to the bar at the same Inn of Court in England and Wales. And at the time, we were taught on these traditional assumptions, and we understand that these are still occurring: this assumption that emotion compromises judgement, and that professionals should suppress

responses, and that reflection is about wellbeing. Now, while I will argue that reflection impacts wellbeing in a positive way, we have a different proposition. And that is: unrecognised emotion compromises judgement, that professionals need to understand and regulate responses, and that reflection is about competence. For us, we cannot separate legal reasoning from the nervous system doing the reasoning, and this is why we want to spend some time on neuroscience. So, what it means for us is that we must factor in human neurobiological realities, because we are humans operating as actors in the legal system, dealing with humans who are the subjects of the legal system, advocating to humans who are sitting on the bench within the legal system. So, no matter which way you cut it, we're a very human field.

There are different rants I will have on different days about AI but today is not that day. Perhaps I'll pop something in in a little bit.

But first we want to get to, why neuroscience? It's so important from a trauma-informed perspective. And so one of the first things that we get a lot is this: oh, well, I'm trained as a lawyer; I'm trained as a mediator. I'm not trained as a mental health practitioner. So, what should I know about trauma? So just to bring the tone down, this is not diagnostic. What we are doing is borrowing from our peers in other fields. This is interdisciplinary. We're borrowing what they know, their knowledge, and integrating some of that knowledge into the way that we practise. So, there's a stethoscope. We're not trained to use a stethoscope, but we are trained to listen to our clients. So, we're not the doctors, we're not the medical professionals, but we're borrowing some of their tools to help us practise better.

So, brief overview of trauma: It's a psychophysical experience. It's a normal coping mechanism when we are overwhelmed, in response to the perception of threat, and the inability to protect oneself and stay safe. Now, one of my favourite mediation aphorisms is, "there's always a reasonable reason for the unreasonable behaviour." I don't know who to credit, but I first learned it from Paul Randolph.

And one of the things that my colleagues and I have done, my co-authors, Dr. Michael Saini and Dr. Shely Polak at the University of Toronto, along with myself, was we wrote a trauma-informed framework for mediation. And what it is, is an approach. So even though we wrote one for mediation, it can be applied to other areas of practice. Our paper focused predominantly on family law litigants, but it can be applied to other areas of legal practice as well.

Jeffrey Sculthorpe wrote a three-part blog adapting our work to estates law and mediation.

Here's our basic model for those looking at the ADR side of our presentation. Most ADR, or most mediation nowadays, it's almost taken for granted, particularly in the West, is that it's interest based. I'm not going to go into what that is today, because we have very limited time, and I want to focus more on self-reflection. It also focuses on power imbalances. And without self-reflection, we're not going to be able to identify the power imbalances as well as possible.

I'm going to touch on dysregulation and negotiation a little bit, because understanding dysregulation, Tanya used that language earlier, dysregulated students, I'm going to help us understand what dysregulation and regulation can look like, and what that means for self-reflection. There are also the six trauma-informed principles, which I'm not going to touch on today, but I have given you the title, and if you'd like, I can drop a link to the paper in the chat once I'm done. We've also looked at attachment and culture, so there are lots of different things that mediators need to take into account.

And this doesn't have to apply just to mediators. As Jeffrey made very clear in his three-part blog, this is an approach, and it can be applied to the practice of law, the practice of arbitration, parenting coordination. And all of these require some degree of reflection, when we are thinking about the file, the clients, and the context.

So, spend a couple of minutes on regulation. So, this is one model. All models have pros and cons, as we all know. This is the *Window of Tolerance* model. Its father is Daniel Siegel, who's the father of interpersonal neurobiology. And this particular image is my adaptation of Levine and Ogden's adaptation of Siegel's *Window of Tolerance*. And the basic idea is this: when we're within that square, we're connected to our prefrontal cortex. Here's another way of thinking about it. I'm going to stop sharing my slides just for two seconds.

(She begins to motion on the video to parts of her head.) Here's another way of thinking about it. So, we've got our spinal cord here, and it connects to our brain stem. Around here is what is traditionally thought of as the limbic brain, or the reptilian brain. And this is governing things like our need to breathe, or to eat, or to sleep. Our very basic needs. It also governs fight, flight, freeze and fawn fear responses. Around here is our mammalian brain. This can govern a lot of our social responses. And around here is our prefrontal cortex. Now, it takes seconds to get from back here all the way over here. Our prefrontal cortex is where we do our thinking, our rationalisation, our philosophising, our mathematics, and yes, our legal reasoning.

So why did I take that little break? Because I wanted to help everyone understand. So, when we're inside that square, we're able to access our prefrontal cortex. We are able to feel stress and connect to our prefrontal cortex. There's that healthy stress that certainly got me through law school exams, and I'm guessing got a bunch of you through it too. It got us a little anxious, got us following deadlines and getting those results. There's also that healthy stress where afterwards we're a bit depleted. These things can happen while we're connected to our prefrontal cortex. When we're connected to our prefrontal cortex, we're able to be emotionally regulated, to self soothe, and we can be stressed out, but we have the cognitive ability to express ourselves.

But there are other areas. If we exceed our window of tolerance, we can go into hyper-dysregulation. This can look like crying, screaming, red face, hostility, hypervigilance, signs of distress, anxiety or panic. And it can feel like a lot of anxiety. It can also look like completely calm on the outside but seething on the inside. Think road rage. When we're here, we're not connected to our prefrontal cortex. We cannot access our thinking, rational brain. Similarly, if we exceed it, but on the bottom, we go into hypo-dysregulation. This can involve withdrawing, fatigue, lethargy. Someone says something and, bam, you've got fuzzy brain, or that still face, flat affect. And it can include signs of depression. It can feel like depression, or disorientation. It can feel cold. And this maps on to our autonomic nervous system.

We have two parts of our autonomic nervous system, the parasympathetic and the sympathetic. So, the sympathetic nervous system, when it is engaged, our blood goes to our brain and our big muscles. It sets us up for fight or flight. Our heartbeat goes fast, our breathing goes fast. Similarly, on the other side, or rather in contrast, on the other side we have our parasympathetic system. In our parasympathetic system, we're calm, we're relaxed, our blood goes to our organs. So, this is just a Creative Commons slide that I had before, that shows you the difference. So, one of the important pieces here is mirror neurons, and what we do here.

When we're in our window of tolerance, we can self-regulate by keeping ourselves within our window of tolerance. Or we can turn to others and co-regulate. And that's because we have mirror neurons. So, someone who's calm, and who we trust, crucially, can support us in calming down.

So why does this matter for us? Well, when we're in stress or threat, our attention can narrow, so our interpretations can shift. Our communication is impaired. Our decision-making changes, and client outcomes change. Cognition is embodied, as Tanya said. Our physiology affects our reasoning, so it's important that practitioners recognise and understand its influence.

And self-reflection engages the prefrontal cortex. So, it is a way of biohacking back to being able to think.

Reflection also protects against three key risks. Bias: misreading distress as dishonesty. That person dysregulated on the stand, they must be lying, Your Honour. Reactivity and advocacy, confirmation bias. Burnout: that chronic emotional suppression, cynicism and depersonalisation, moral injury. I don't have time to go into that, but we'll write the paper and then you'll get a chance to read it. And blind spots: confusing our responses with objective reality, missing or misinterpreting trauma responses, and reduced curiosity.

So, I'm going to skip this bit here. But just a quick point on reflection as a professional competency. Reflective practice sits alongside ethical decision making, professional conduct duties, risk mitigation, supervision, and continuing professional development. It supports us in advocacy and our legal skills. Our awareness of our own cognitive and physiological state is part of competent professional judgement.

So, just to finally wrap up, there are some tools for self-reflection. It doesn't have to be something stodgy where you're sitting down and thinking in some really deep meta way. It could take place during journaling, or in a walking

reflection. I encourage my students to intentionally create different playlists that impact their mood in different ways. They could create one that's instrumentals for reflection. And verbal processing with someone who's within the chain of confidentiality, so that there is a co-regulator available. And that is very brief. I've gone 45 seconds over. Thank you very much.

(Judith Marychurch) Fantastic. Thank you very much, Raheena. That was great. All right. So that we can get to hopefully some time for questions, I'm going to move straight to our sixth speaker.

So, our final speaker for this session is Amy Dallas, Program Manager for a US national non-profit. Amy is an attorney and former public defender based in the US, and today she will speak to her paper, "*In Right Relationship: Practicing and Teaching Trauma-Responsive Restorative Advocacy*." Over to you, Amy.

1:12:14 (Amy Dallas)

Thank you so much. I'm so thrilled to be here and round out this incredible day and incredible panel. And I'm so glad that I'm actually coming at the end of these discussions, because I hope that what I'm sharing will be additive. So many people touched on already many of the issues that I've, of course, included in my paper, and I know everybody has access to it, but I'm going to just pop it into the chat just in case. It is quite robust, I will say. So, I wrote this paper. This really felt like a love letter to the field. So much of my reflections in this work came from a decade of being a public defender and really understanding that there is so much that I wish I would have learned along the way. A lot of this learning came the hard way, whether it was in practice, or just really my own finding reflective practices to help me as a practitioner. So, I'm going to do this presentation. It's going to feel a little bit maybe different from some of the others today, because I do want us to have a little bit of an experiential experience with this discussion.

So, I start with this. If we're talking with students, and we're talking with students in a clinical setting, right, I like to sometimes really think with students about, like, who are you in this work? Imagine yourself in this work and imagine this is the person you're speaking with. Maybe this is your client, maybe this is your supervisor, your colleague, or your co-counsel. And now imagine all these other people who also work in the legal system with you. Maybe these are your other clients, or the people in the courtroom, or that person who you owe an email to. And what is your obligation, and what is your relationship with all of these people, and how does it feel?

And I really appreciate, Raheena, your last presentation, just really talking about how our bodies, and how we react to each other. So really thinking about the physicality of this work: how does it feel to be amongst all of these people? And then I like to ask students to think about what kind of lawyer do you want to be, right? Why do we come to law school? And so many of us who come to this work, who want to work in direct service, in the public interest, in movement-centred work, we see ourselves in all of these different ways. And I do wonder with the audience here too; what resonates for people? How do we see ourselves, as advocates, as companions, as specialists in this work? How do we identify? And so, we recognise, as many have said today, that so many students are coming to this profession at a time where legal practice is marked by crisis.

And I am pleased to not have to go into all of the research around this, because I know that we are all sharing an understanding around this, but I am speaking from a US context. So, I will say that, and we know that there is a crisis of wellness in the legal profession. Those of us who actually practise in the profession can speak to our own experiences of burnout and overwhelm, and the stress of the work. And then we also know that our students are really coming in with a very, very different experience than maybe some of us had when we were coming up. And of course, the rise of technology. And I did hear an earlier speaker talking too about the anxieties around all of these changes. It's no surprise, because also the term poly-crisis has been coined by Adam Tooze and others around these conflicting, overlapping crises that we are all experiencing on a global scale, whether it's political, climate, technological. And so, we're all kind of affected by this. And so too are our students.

So, I wrote about a framework that I am calling *trauma-responsive restorative advocacy*. And I'm going to explain what this framework is, dividing it up into a couple of pieces. And then speaking more specifically, and, mindful of time, experientially, of some of what these practices could be as part of this framework. So first, let's talk about what it is to be restorative in our advocacy. Okay. Restorative advocacy. What does this mean, in the context of direct service? So restorative advocacy is grounded in restorative justice principles. And essentially what this is, is really

centring relationships. Like, what are our relationships with our clients and others that we work with, or against, even, in this field? And it affirms human dignity at its core.

And restorative justice, many of you may be familiar with it, maybe it's just something that you've heard. It has a lot of values to it, and a lot of times it's associated with conflict, and as a strategy alongside the criminal legal system. But really it has some essential core values. For many people, restorative justice is really a way of life. And I must also, of course, say that it's really rooted in Indigenous and non-Western practices of people from all over the world, and especially First Nations people here in North America and Canada. And so, to say that it's a real framework, a frame of reference, of interconnectedness, of understanding what it is to be interconnected with others, with planet, and what it means to be in relationship, respect, treating people with dignity, and repairing harm when there has been harm. Which is why a lot of times we think about restorative justice in the context of criminal justice and violence, but it's also about truth telling, and inclusivity, and showing up voluntarily.

And I quote here Howard Zehr, who's often coined as one of the grandfathers of modern restorative justice, which is that we take relationships seriously, and we envision ourselves in an interconnected web of people, institutions, and the environment. And so here you are, and here's everybody, right? And so can we have our students, and can we have lawyers, really understanding and thinking of ourselves as interconnected with everyone we encounter in our practice?

What does it mean to be restorative? I'm going to breeze through this, but really, at its core, it's dignity, right? Dignity. And I love the work of Donna Hicks. She has a book called *Dignity: The Essential Role It Plays in Resolving Conflict*. And she isolates these ten essential principles of dignity. I won't list them all here, but I highly recommend it. I won't read them off, for time's sake. But really, these are the kind of ethical values that we want to come to this work with, and we want to treat people with dignity and feel our own dignity while we are engaging in this work.

So how do we do that when there's also moral injury, overwhelm, stress, and all of the other things that others have discussed? And also, there are just the temptations to violate dignity too, that Donna Hicks also identifies. So, can we identify when we are moving into these habits that really undercut our ability to be in right relationship? But we know humans are complex, especially in this work, especially our clients, especially the people we work with. And so how do we navigate all of this, and how do we find ourselves within this too? And, of course, enter stress and trauma in this mix. And I really appreciate that we've already had some really amazing discussions on trauma and definitions around it. And so, I'll just say here, though, and this is being a little glib here: is everything trauma, though? Well, I don't know. In an era of poly-crisis, sometimes it feels that way. But what I will say, though, is that we know that this term has increased over the last many decades and sometimes is used a bit out of the right, appropriate context. And so, as part of trauma-responsive restorative advocacy, students might be coming in with this sort of idea of trauma, but it is really important, for being trauma responsive, to have an understanding of trauma. And so, I know we had just covered some of that in another presentation.

So, with restorative advocacy, we talk about how do we be in relational integrity. Trauma responsiveness is focusing on the how, and how we do that. And I love that the last speaker just really talked about this, this idea of responsiveness to how we show up with one another, how we are conscious of what's happening with ourselves. And so, it's really thinking about our presence and attunement. Presence, as we are understanding in ourselves, and how we attune to others. I'm going to breeze through these, so, the trauma-informed slide. Right. Somebody mentioned the six principles of trauma and practice.

So, when I was practicing, and while I was in law school, I've had some education around trauma-informed lawyering, and what is trauma-informed lawyering. But what about the skill sets and the practices to actually show up and be trauma responsive? It's about having body-based literacy and awareness, and some practices for that. So, let's move into the practices, as I'm mindful of time. So, the trauma responsive restorative advocacy framework includes these four pillars. One is stress and trauma education, and really expansive around what that means. I'll talk about that in a second. Somatic body-based practices, contemplative practices, and restorative practice. And to do this in an experiential way throughout, in clinical practice and even in doctrinal.

So, I'm going to introduce a term about interoception. And some of you may be familiar with this. And interoception is truly, might be something that's new for many law students, and especially in cultures like many of ours, I'm sure,

where we are really conditioned and trained to be in our brains. And so many law students come to this work because they are good students. And so, we are constantly here. But interoceptive awareness is really the ability to sense and interpret our internal body cues, like our heart rate, muscle tension, our breath, other visceral sensations. Dr. Rae Johnson describes it as the sensory information arising from within our body. And so, can we work with students to be able to learn how to identify that within themselves, get out of their brains, and feel more into their own visceral experiences?

Now we'll start with stress and trauma education, and again breezing through this, two minutes to go. So, we're talking about all sorts of different levels of what we're talking about when we're saying trauma, right? Developmental, complex, collective, systemic, historic, et cetera. And then neuroscience. And I know we just did a really beautiful deep dive into some neuroscience here, but how can we bring this into legal education? Polyvagal theory, to build on the last presenter's describing of the fight, flight, freeze and fawn, just including polyvagal theory, which also then has a concept of neuroception. Since we just spoke about interoception, our own awareness, neuroception is the concept of how our bodies are all scanning for threat or safety at any given time. And so, if we have awareness of this, this is you, this is your client. Who are you speaking with? And they're scanning for threat, and you're scanning for threat. And so is everyone around us. So, what are the practices, that you can be that stabilising force? So, a combination of all of the practices here help us amplify and cultivate these competencies that are so essential for being attorneys in this practice landscape. This work really thinks about neuroplasticity, right? It's about habit formation. So how can we, as educators and practitioners, start to implement this in a habitual way when we're engaging with students? And some beautiful examples have been already given.

So, contemplative practice. I'm going to preach to the choir here. You all know what these are. There can be so many. There's lots of science. I know we all know this.

But I want to just touch briefly here on restorative practice. Restorative practice as a circle process is one of them. This is not all encompassing, but it's really a way for students to be able to cultivate deep listening, humility, patience. And it's a process that moves slowly and deliberately. And so, through that, it also cultivates a practice ground for students, like its own gymnasium. So, we think about practice.

But I have about a minute or less. So, last one, just to close out. And so, somatic practice. And I knew this was going to be kind of the tail end here. But somatic practices, so body-based practices, breathing, breathing through this, just to say that this is a vast field, somatic practices from stress reduction - all the way to trauma healing. And there's so many modalities.

And so how can this be also incorporated into students' day, even if it's just, like, questions of, what are you noticing right now? And maybe some other practices of, how was that for you, to really start moving us from our heads to our hearts and back into our bodies.

And so, thank you. Was able to do it almost in enough time. Thank you, everybody.

(Judith Marychurch) Amazing. Thank you very much, Amy. That was really, really interesting, and perfect sequence, I think, in terms of the ordering of the papers today. I'm going to go straight to the questions, but encourage you, if you've got questions that you'd like to put into the Q&A function, please do.

*** PUBLIC TRANSCRIPT ENDS HERE – Q & A omitted ***