

1. Please comment on the individual instructors with regard to effectiveness and attitude toward students:

Strengths

- RJM is an AMAZING instructor and put a great deal of effort into this course, to the benefit of everyone involved!!! Discussion-style course was very engaging. This was perhaps the best course that I have taken during my time here at Stanford.
- Enthusiastic about the material and was available to the students.
- Pfoessor Morris was excellent. She was very engaging and made class very enjoyable.
- Professor Morris is really fabulous to work with in person. She clearly enjoys teaching and has a lot of fun with it. There were certain aspects of the class I thought were great and certain aspects I thought could use improvement. On the good side, she was always available to respond to questions and to meet to discuss assignments. I thought she knew a ton about the course content and had pretty comprehensive knowledge of patent law and law/science issues.
- Professor Morris is the most enthusiastic professor I have had since coming to Stanford. She consistently conveyed the law related material in a way that not only made it very accessible, but also interesting to the graduate students in the course. Part of what made this so successful were her frequent anecdotes of her and her professional colleagues experiences. For someone without a law background who is unfamiliar with how cases progress and firms operate this was extremely helpful. She was also always careful to relate topics back to the larger picture of how they play a role in patent cases today. The classes were always engaging and the material was also presented at a pace which allowed us to cover quite a bit in the semester, but still in a coherent enough fashion such that I'll actually retain the information.
- Prof. Morris is engaging, enthusiastic and interested in her students.
- Professor Morris was great! This was one of the most enjoyable classes I have taken, and I learned so much. I am very happy that I took the class, and I highly recommend it.

Suggestions for Improvement

- Seating arrangements were a bit wacky, and it is not clearly if they were beneficial to the students (although maybe they helped the instructor).
- On the negative side, Professor Morris conducted a large part of the class over email. Her style tends to be rambling with a lot of all-caps; her emails come in bursts. On rare occasion, her tone in emails was abrasive and could be condescending. Because so much of the class was conducted through email (see below) and her email character was so divergent from her character in person, I would hope that in the future, much less of the class will be conducted electronically.
- Her teaching style can be a little "off the wall". I would have preferred a slightly more struted approach. I often was not able to see the point of homework assignments.
- long, frequent, and often angry-sounding emails may not have been the best way to interact with students

2. Please comment on the strengths and weaknesses, if any, of the textbook(s) and reading(s). What materials were most and least valuable? Why?

Strengths

- RJM gave students the option of choosing readings which were most relevant/interesting to the student. I liked this a lot.
- There were few readings and course materials (see assignments for further discussion)
- The materials were all well chosen and I particularly liked reading actual cases and transcripts. Even though they were at first a bit murky for a graduate student, as soon as most of the terminology was covered in class they got much easier to go through.
- material selected was pertinent and interesting

Suggestions for Improvement

- Reading the entire file history from one of the previous years' simulation groups was the only assignment from the course that I feel like I didn't get as much out of it as the time I put into it merited. I think picking out a few

office actions and responses to go through would have given me the same information about how the interactions between the PTO and inventor go, without taking up so many hours.

- class discussion could have been better connected to readings

3. Please comment on assignments and exams (difficulty, length, frequency, usefulness, and their success at testing conceptual understanding rather than recall):

Strengths

- Assignments, particularly the written comments, made me think about the subject more carefully and express my opinion in a more organized manner than I might have done otherwise.
- I felt that the project we did was really great. For someone considering patent litigation, the opportunity to work with scientists in a setting where we had to identify issues, create arguments, and learn the science was excellent. It was hands-on and I think was a nice addition to the skill set built in law school. It really forced us to see the challenges that exist in choosing issues for litigation and in bringing science and law together. I only wish that the project was more integrated into the course from an earlier point in the semester, with some of the less effective weekly assignments being supplanted with ones that would allow the students to deepen their understanding of the weekly topics through the vehicle of the project.
- I liked extremely well the comment and comment² format for the assignments and both their frequency and amount of time they took to complete were quite reasonable. Every assignment also focused on concepts and analytic thinking, as there was virtually no memorization involved in the class.
- simulation is very useful and practical
- Lots of feedback from fellow students was valuable and thought provoking.

Suggestions for Improvement

- 1) RJM should state the deadline and method for handing in the assignment clearly at the top of each e-mail. 2) Students should not be able to create new threads in Coursework...allow them only to post to currently existing threads. 3) RJM should be careful when making comments about students' final grade (i.e., any missed points on quiz will result in a decrease of one letter grade in course grade) that were not previously discussed in the syllabus and/or flip-flopping on such statements. 4) I understand that people turning in assignments late and/or failing to do them became a problem at some point in the course but I don't think e-mails to the entire class were necessary. A direct e-mail to such students expressing disappointment and/or consequences would probably be much more effective than an e-mail to the entire class, which was perceived as overly-threatening. In general, I think most people who take this class do so because they want to learn the subject material.
- Unlike the project, I felt that the weekly assignments were a little random, and sometimes were not terribly effective in instruction. We would get these assignments via email a couple days before they were due. They often involved a brief reading and then writing some response points. I felt, though, that there was something unpremeditated about the assignment selection, and that had the assignments been considered ahead of time, they might have been better able to be integrated into a collective whole. I also felt that context for the assignment wasn't always apparent (making a table of contents for a file history seemed like busy work), although I had the sense that Professor Morris had some goal with the assignment that wasn't clear to the students. In the end, the assignments often seemed divorced from a larger learning scheme. I often felt that I was spending several hours a week producing a product that didn't connect to anything and for which there was no feedback.
- we need more time for simulation. Better to do re-direct and re-cross
- I felt I wanted a little more direct feedback by the professor on my progress in the course.

4. Do you have any additional comments on the course over-all?

Strengths

- I highly recommend this course!
- Great course. Keep offering it!
- Somewhat unusually, I have both strong pluses and strong minuses about this course. As said above, Professor Morris was hugely knowledgeable and delightful to work with in person. The final project was a great learning experience.
- This was a very valuable course for me. I enrolled purely for personal interest and am leaving it with a fairly solid understanding of the general ideas of how patents and scientific evidence work. This is exactly what I wanted from the course and I am extremely glad that it covered the more foundational aspects of the topics than any sort of legal nuisances and details. I think the course was also very well planned with respect to the mixture of law and graduate students as we did all have the chance to learn from each other. This was a great course, and I will definitely recommend it to other graduate students in my department who are also interested in the topic.

- simulation projects

Suggestions for Improvement

- In contrast, the fact that so much of the course was conducted electronically - instructor communication and assignments - took away from the overall experience. I don't think email is the strongest medium for Professor Morris' style of communication, as I've indicated. I also don't think the weekly written product, when confined to an electronic exchange the day before class with no ultimate feedback, is so effective pedagogically. I think a little more reading about patent law (etc) and a little less writing (so there can be feedback and more time for information intake) would be helpful. Another strong suggestion I have in order to do this would be to structure some of the weekly assignments around the final project itself. Use that as the focal point. It would have been great had we picked groups and patents much earlier in the semester and used our project patents as the source of lessons about patent law, etc.
- starting the projects sooner