Finding New Classroom Tricks in a Virtual Teaching World: One 'Old Dog's' Tale

Daniel Keating

"You can't teach an old dog new tricks."
—From John Heywood's 1546 proverb collection.

I. Introduction

It has been hard to find many silver linings in this dark cloud we call the pandemic, but here's one: Two colleagues and I, all three of us at different law schools, were having an e-mail discussion about how online instruction had affected us and challenged our "business as usual" approach to teaching. Among the three of us, we have taught for more than 100 years combined. Yet here we were, trading notes on our successes and failures with polls, online discussion boards, and virtual breakout rooms. Finally, the most senior member of our trio summed it up with this message: "In our old age, we are finally, actually learning how to teach. I've had this feeling since shortly after the move to Zoom."[1]

As I write this, I am in the final week of our fall semester, and eight months have passed since my first Zoom classes in mid-March. My transition to virtual teaching has been difficult and challenging, but also rewarding in ways that I could not have imagined when I was first compelled to embark on this journey. After more than three decades of in-person teaching, I had settled into what I thought was the optimal approach to classroom instruction. My students seemed satisfied with what they were getting, and I was certainly comfortable with my tried-and-true pedagogical methods.

In retrospect, I may have been too comfortable—too comfortable to try new techniques, and too comfortable to shake things up and experiment with new

1. The quote is from an e-mail that Professor Lynn LoPucki (UCLA) sent to me on Sept. 2, 2020. The third professor in our e-mail exchange was Professor Bob Lawless (University of Illinois). On file with author.

ways of engaging my students. Then the pandemic hit and, like millions of teachers around the globe, I was jarred out of my usual routines and forced to think about alternative modes of instruction. In many ways, I was like a beginner again. And, for the most part, that was probably a good thing.

II. The Summer Decision

Our campus shutdown, like many others across the country, occurred in March 2020 during spring break. Our university extended our one-week spring break to two weeks so that faculty would have the opportunity to do some training on the Zoom platform to complete their courses in a synchronous online format for the remainder of the spring semester. I was in a better position than most of my colleagues when it came to making the transition to online teaching, as I had taught a summer course online seven years earlier as part of the online LL.M. program for international students that we had just begun.

For that eight-week summer course, I had about twenty students who were in several different countries. Zoom did not exist then as an online teaching platform. The platform we used was solid for its time, but not as sophisticated as the one Zoom offers now. In any event, there were many features on the platform that I did not use, and I chose instead to keep things simple. I taught that summer online course pretty much as I taught an in-person course, using a problem-based method, cold-calling students and taking questions from students. The students seemed happy enough, and my reviews were strong. I was glad that I tried online teaching, but I did not have a great desire to do more of it.

Fast-forward seven years. My online teaching story for the remaining five weeks of the 2020 spring semester was similar. There was nothing about my teaching approach that really took advantage of the online format or that was different in any way from how I taught in the physical classroom. I did use the shared whiteboard feature of Zoom, but only in ways that I would typically use the real whiteboard during an in-person class. Nevertheless, my student evaluations for the two nonseminar courses I taught in the spring (two large upper-class sections of UCC Article 2) were actually a little higher than usual.[2] Even more surprising to me was that I also scored high on a special question that the law school had added to the standard evaluation form that asked how well the instructor had made the transition to the online teaching format.

I mention these evaluation scores only as background to a big decision that I had to make during the summer break: Did I want to keep doing online teaching just as I had in the spring (which of course was just the way I taught my in-person classes), or did I want to try to incorporate new techniques into my online teaching that are unique to that platform? My motivation for changing the way I was doing things could not be that the students were not happy with

2.   I also co-taught a Chapter 11 reorganization seminar that semester with two local bankruptcy lawyers. Because of pandemic-related travel restrictions, one of my two co-teachers ended up being stuck in Florida. Ironically, the Zoom format that was forced upon us ultimately enabled him to continue co-teaching with us for the remainder of the spring semester, something that he could not have done from Florida if we were still meeting in person.

the status quo, because the evaluations suggested that they were. My motivation had to be more internally driven, and I had to have some good reason to want to make a change, because any such change was not going to be cost-free to me.

In the end, I am not sure exactly what prompted me to take the plunge and try some new approaches to teaching in the online format. Maybe I just wanted to challenge myself or get out of a teaching rut, however unobjectionable my long-standing approach had apparently been from the students' perspective. There may have also been another motivator at work for me in making this decision, and that was the dual challenges of "class time slot" and "student numbers" that I was going to be facing in my two fall classes.

I was scheduled in the fall to teach the basic bankruptcy course at 7:30 a.m. on Monday and Wednesday, and I was slated to teach UCC Article 2 at 6:00 p.m., also on Monday and Wednesday. The beginning-of-day and end-of-day time slots were partly chosen as an accommodation to a number of our LL.M. students who had not been able to leave China because of the pandemic and would therefore be attending class in a time zone that was thirteen hours ahead of ours. Besides the challenge of engaging students at the start and end of the day, there was also an issue of student numbers.

In the fall semester the bankruptcy course enrollment, fueled by a pandemic-related belief that bankruptcy would suddenly become very relevant,[3] swelled to as high as 155 students before settling in to its final number of 132, which was more than four times its typical size.[4] The UCC Article 2 class hovered around 100 students and ended up at eighty-six students following the usual pre- and early-semester melt, a fairly typical enrollment size for that course. These enrollment numbers for both classes were such that I knew it would be daunting for me to actively engage this many students who were not physically present in the classroom. This reality was, I suspect, what may have tipped the balance and spurred me to try some Zoom-specific teaching techniques that I had never before attempted.

III. Do Few Things, But (Poll) Them Well

As I prepared for my two fall Zoom classes, I wanted to make them different from what I had done in the spring, and different from what I typically do in an in-person class. The Zoom platform offers a number of ways for teachers to enhance the online classroom experience: in-class polling, breakout rooms, shared videos, shared PowerPoints, shared whiteboard, the chat function, virtual backgrounds, and the ability to videotape asynchronous lectures for students to view on their own time. My next challenge was deciding which of those techniques to incorporate. One approach would be to try a "smorgasbord strategy" and use a little bit of each. Given the sunk cost and learning curve

3.　*See, e.g.*, David Z. Morris, *Bankruptcy Attorneys May Have the Hottest Job in the Downturn,* Fortune (May 26, 2020).

4.　The bankruptcy class enrollment the previous fall semester was just thirty-two students.

for effectively using each feature, I concluded that I would just choose a few techniques and try to do those really well.[5]

The techniques that I chose to focus on were an expanded use of the shared whiteboard feature, in-class polling and, for a short time, the breakout-room feature (more on that experiment later). The expanded whiteboard use was easy to incorporate. I usually begin each class with a summary of highlights from the previous class. During this time I use the shared whiteboard to type a short sentence for each highlight and then expand orally on that particular point before getting to the next highlight. At later points in the class I might also use the whiteboard anytime I need to visualize a concept for students, whether a formula or a flow chart. I even bought a tablet so that I can draw charts or graphs with a stylus in addition to using my keyboard to type.[6]

While the expanded whiteboard has been helpful, the use of in-class polling has been the real game-changer for me. This has truly transformed the way that I teach my classes. Perhaps the reason that I was partial to choosing polls as one of the Zoom-specific techniques I would use is that I have had experience with in-class polling through a non-law class that I have taught. For the past five years, I have taught a free ten-week ACT prep course to high school students each semester in either Chicago or St. Louis. For the past three of those five years I have used clickers to do in-class polling of students as they do selected questions from the practice tests in their ACT prep books.

The benefits of using polls in my law Zoom classes have been similar and probably even more pronounced than what I experienced in my ACT prep classes. This has been a great way to actively engage eighty-six or even 132 students when I can realistically call on only a small fraction of them during each virtual class. All of the recent science on learning indicates that active learning is much more effective than passive listening,[7] and polls are a simple device to get students thinking actively and solving problems as they learn.

5.   Another reason for me to avoid trying too many new things on Zoom was my fear that I would botch the implementation because of my lack of technology skills. I think one of the most frustrating things for students in an online class is to have a teacher who cannot manage the technology. While I am not a complete Luddite, nor am I someone that I would classify as "tech-savvy."

6.   My first use of the tablet was in a summer practice session with me on my basement work computer and my wife, Jane, serving as my "student" on the upstairs home computer. My first attempted graphic was a simple four-square box that I drew by hand. I could see it fine on my tablet, but my wife couldn't see anything on her end. It turned out that I had accidentally used a black ballpoint pen instead of the stylus to draw that first figure. Luckily, a seventy percent alcohol solution was enough to erase all traces of the black ink from my brand-new tablet! The tablet that I ultimately chose, on the wise recommendation of my casebook co-author Bob Lawless, *see supra* note 1, was a Wacom One Digital Drawing Tablet with Screen, 13.3-inch Display, for about $400 on Amazon.

7.   For a good summary of some of the many studies in that area, see Peter C. Brown et al., Make It Stick: The Science of Successful Learning (2014).

One of the things I love about polls is that I can tailor each poll for my teaching goal on a particular issue or topic. For some of my polls, like this one about the § 547(c)(5) exception to preference liability in bankruptcy law, I will give students just various possible outcomes but not explanations. That way, I can leave the explanation part for my Socratic questioning when I cold-call students to ask them how they arrived at their answer:

On Day 90 before bankruptcy, Debtor (D) owes Bank (B) $900K secured by inventory worth $300K. On Day 40 D gets $700K of new inventory on unsecured credit. At Day 0, debt still = $900K and collateral = $1M. What is B's preference liability?[8]

    A. Zero

    B. $100K

    C. $600K

    D. $700K

Instead of a strictly outcome-focused poll, a poll can also be a pure policy poll, in which students have to figure out the best choice of several policies offered in the answers. Below is an example of that kind of poll, this one from my UCC Article 2 class and our coverage of title issues. Students had just seen two different hypotheticals about the sale of a painting and two competing buyers: Buyer One, who prepays for the painting but leaves it in the seller's possession for later pickup; and Buyer Two, a good-faith purchaser who buys the painting in person with cash after Buyer One has paid for the painting but has not yet picked it up. This poll question challenged students to determine what policy helps explain why Buyer One lost to Buyer Two when the seller was a merchant who deals in goods of the kind, but defeated Buyer Two when the seller was not a merchant:

What is the likely policy behind the UCC Article 2 drafters' decision to have a different outcome in these two cases?[9]

    A. *The drafters probably felt that the apparent ownership problem did not exist in the second case since it did not involve a merchant seller.*

    B. *The drafters probably assumed that only when owners of goods entrust the goods to a true merchant, the owners must know that they are assuming the risk that the merchant might sell the goods to a buyer in ordinary course.*

    C. *The drafters probably wished to discourage the sale of unique goods by non-merchant sellers, especially in cases where the owner chooses to entrust the goods to the non-merchant seller.*

    D. *The drafters probably felt that the apparent ownership problem is much more serious for a potential buyer when it is a merchant who deals in goods of that kind that appears to own the goods.*

8.   Spoiler alert: The correct answer is C.

9.   The correct answer is D.

Finally, a poll can mix outcomes with policy justifications. That is probably the most common type of poll that I use, such as this one concerning preference law in bankruptcy:

Bakery (B) buys sugar from Manufacturer (M). Seventy days before M files bankruptcy, B pays M $10K in advance for a shipment of sugar. Twenty-five days later, B receives the sugar. Forty-five days later, M files bankruptcy. Preference?[10]

    A.   *Yes, this transfer of the sugar meets all of the necessary 547(b) elements.*

    B.   *Yes, but the answer would be different if the prepaid item here had been a unique item that was specially made to order for B rather than merely fungible goods as this shipment of sugar was.*

    C.   *Both A and B are true.*

    D.   *No, because B was not even a creditor at the time it received the sugar, given that B was not owed any money at that point but instead was just owed sugar.*

    E.   *No, because at the time M transferred the sugar to B, the sugar was no longer property of the debtor (B) as is required by 547(b); instead, at that point the sugar was already B's property since B had fully paid for it by then.*

The ability of the teacher to share poll results on Zoom is a critical feature for both students and teacher. It is critical for students because seeing the results means that the polls can provide formative assessment of whether students truly understand a particular concept.[11] The poll results also show students how they compare with their classmates in their understanding of a concept.[12] The poll results are probably even more important for me as the instructor because of the way that the results help me to determine how much time I should spend on a particular issue.

I used to think that after more than thirty years of teaching I could read the faces of my students to know whether the group was really comprehending a point. After almost a full semester of in-class polling, I now realize that for many years I was often being fooled by the students' confident head-nodding as I

---

10.   The correct answer is A.

11.   Thus, the use of polling implements the American Bar Association requirement that law schools incorporate formative assessment tools or devices that enable students to measure their mastery of the subject matter before the final exam. *See* Standard 314, ABA Standards and Rules of Procedure for Approval of Law Schools (2020). One of my research assistants who is taking my bankruptcy class this semester put it to me this way: "Polls make concepts much more memorable to students than when those concepts are taught in a typical class lecture. This in turn decreases the amount of time that we have to spend studying later on. For example, I almost always remember when I miss a particular poll question and why I missed it, but I usually don't remember a concept that was fuzzy to me that was taught through a lecture." Polling also offers students the very practical benefit of getting practice doing multiple-choice questions similar to what almost all of the students will eventually see on the 200-question Multistate Bar Exam.

12.   When the grading system is a mandatory-mean system, as ours is, rather than an absolute system, this information about relative performance is not insignificant for students.

covered various issues. With polling I know exactly where the group stands, and that knowledge of the collective class mastery will dictate whether I linger on an issue or move on quickly.

Even with polling, I still do cold-calling. It is just that my cold-calling is now driven by the results of the polls. If, for example, eighty-three percent of the class gets a poll question correct, I am not even going to bother calling on an individual student to probe the ins and outs of that question. However, if fewer than half the students choose the correct answer, that is a question on which I will do some Socratic dialogue with one or more students. The beauty of polls, as I illustrate with my three examples above, is that you can reveal as much or as little as you want in your multiple-choice answers. Therefore, you do not necessarily have to give everything away in your poll answers, and you can leave out of any poll answer whatever points that you plan to draw out of students in your Socratic questioning.[13]

One piece of advice that I would give to any would-be pollsters is that using polls is not an all-or-nothing proposition. I am definitely on one extreme in my use of polls, but you could certainly get a lot of benefit from just using a few poll questions each class and then seeing how that works for you. Maybe you will find that you love polls and want to add more, or maybe you will decide that even the few polls that you are using were simply not worth the time it took to create them. A lot will depend on the kind of course you teach and the kind of style you have as a teacher. I feel that polls are particularly well suited for my problem-based code courses, where the problems tend to break down naturally into a discrete number of testable issues. Polls may not be as well suited to policy-focused or theory-focused courses, where perhaps breakout rooms would be a better way to go.

A more generic benefit of using poll questions is that it just helps to break up the monotony for students of having to watch eighty-two straight minutes of "a disembodied talking head," to use the words of a student evaluating one of my colleague's spring semester courses.[14] I generally use between ten and twelve polls for each class period and give the students approximately ninety seconds to answer each poll. When you subtract the ten minutes or so that I spend on summarizing highlights from the previous class, that means that my class is averaging a new poll every six or seven minutes during the remaining seventy-two minutes of the class. Classes never seem to drag on, and every new poll carries with it the surprise, for me and for students, of how well the class did on that question.[15]

13. Even with a pure policy poll, the 255-character limit that Zoom has for all answer choices means that there will still be plenty of policy issues remaining to discuss with students through Socratic dialogue following the poll.

14. One way to avoid the "disembodied talking head" problem is to use extensive PowerPoint slides on the shared screen. I have not used PowerPoint slides up to this point (per my "do few things, but do them well" mantra), but I can see that they could offer a number of valuable benefits in the Zoom format.

15. As one of my bankruptcy students described it to me, being in a class with frequent polling

IV. The Breakout-Room Experiment

One of the major opportunities in the Zoom platform that is not as easily manageable in a physical classroom is the breakout-room feature. Zoom has a very sophisticated breakout-room feature that allows the teacher to create as many or as few separate Zoom meetings within the main meeting as the teacher chooses. The teacher then has the option to visit any of those breakout groups for as long or as short as desired. The teacher can preassign the composition of the breakout rooms or can allow Zoom to do a random assignment. The teacher can also simultaneously "broadcast" a message to all of the breakout rooms through a typed communication.

While the technology with Zoom breakout rooms is quite impressive and the potential benefit seems enormous, I came into the fall semester as a breakout-room skeptic. I was worried about several possible drawbacks of the breakout rooms. First, I was concerned about efficiency and coverage. My thinking was that covering a point of law using breakout rooms would take a lot longer than covering that same point of law using a poll followed by Socratic dialogue. I knew that the breakout rooms took some time to set up and undo, and I figured that I would need to give more than just ninety seconds in a breakout-room discussion to enable more than one member of the breakout group to have an opportunity to speak. Second, with the technical code courses that I teach, I feared the so-called "blind leading the blind" syndrome, whereby struggling students unsuccessfully try to help other struggling students in the breakout-room format. Finally, I wondered whether enough students would take the exercise seriously or whether instead a number of students would use the breakout-room time as an unofficial break from class.

On the positive side, I could appreciate that breakout rooms would give students more opportunity to speak during class, if only to each other. Second, breakout rooms would offer a different kind of active-learning experience in which the questions could be open-ended rather than multiple-choice. Third, breakout rooms would be another way to break up the monotony of the large-class experience and give some variety to the format. Finally, breakout rooms would offer students some desperately needed social connection during this time of pandemic-induced isolation.

Four weeks into the fall semester, I decided to switch gears and to give breakout rooms a try. Instead of giving students ten to twelve poll questions per class, I reduced that number to just six and added two breakout-room sessions per class. I tried to choose questions for the breakout rooms that were more open-ended and policy-oriented than some of the technical code questions that might be more appropriate for a multiple-choice format. I would always use a single question for each separate breakout-room session. I used the random-sorting device to create the groups, and I tried to make the groups consist of four to five members each. I encouraged students to agree on a "group reporter," but in case a group could not agree on a reporter, I also would give the groups a

is akin to being on a game show, "and who wouldn't want to be on a game show instead of going to a regular class?"

default method for choosing the group reporter that switched with each breakout session (e.g., the student whose last name had the fewest letters).

I generally gave five minutes for the groups to meet. Upon students' return to the "big room," I would ask each group reporter to private-chat me the answer for their group. I wanted them to use the private chat rather than the public chat for two reasons: first, so that no group could "free-ride" on the answer of a different group; and second, so that a slew of public chats popping up on the chat board would not distract the students. Next I would quickly scan through the private chats as they came in and comment to the class on some of the common correct and incorrect themes that I was seeing in the answers. Overall, the breakout rooms seemed to be working fine, probably a little better than I expected, although they clearly did take a lot more time to cover a particular issue than a comparable poll question would.

V. The Poll about Polls (and Breakout Rooms)

About two weeks into the breakout-room experiment and roughly halfway through the semester, I decided that I would poll my students anonymously during a Zoom class meeting about their views on how I was allocating class time. I noted to them that there are five distinct ways that I was currently allocating class time: 1) summary highlights at the start of each class; 2) cold-calling on students for Socratic dialogue; 3) answering student questions; 4) doing polls; and 5) doing breakout-room questions. For each of these five ways of spending class time, I asked the students whether they thought we were spending about the right amount of time, too much time, or too little time. With poll questions and breakout-room questions, I was able to be even more specific, asking them what they thought was the ideal number of such questions per class session.

While I was curious about the students' views as to all of these issues, I was most interested in what they thought about the time we were spending on poll questions and breakout-room questions, since these were the two new features I had added to my Zoom classes relative to what I did in my in-person classes. It turned out that the students definitely liked the highlights at the start of each class, with about half saying we were spending the right amount of time and half wanting me to spend even more time on that. Maybe not surprisingly, time spent on cold calls was not nearly as popular, with one-third of students recommending that we spend the same amount of time on this as we had been, one-third saying we should spend less time on this, and one-third saying we should spend no time on this. More surprising to me was that this very same tripartite distribution of responses also occurred for how much class time we ought to spend on student questions. I had surmised (incorrectly, it seems) that students would prefer that more time, not less, be devoted to student questions during class.

Poll questions were clearly popular among the students, with the preferred ideal number of poll questions averaging about ten per class, which was roughly the number we were averaging anyway. The biggest surprise of the survey to me, though, was the reaction to the breakout-room questions. In my bankruptcy

class, seventy-five percent of the students wanted zero such questions, and twenty percent thought that one such question would be ideal. In the UCC Article 2 class the results were similar, with about seventy percent voting for zero breakout-room questions and twenty-five percent believing that one was optimal. A colleague of mine who did a similar survey with his two large-section upper-class courses got a similar reaction from students regarding the breakout sessions: Eighty percent of the students in both of his classes expressed a preference for zero breakout-room questions.

I did not change my allocation of class time I spent on my summary highlights, my cold-calling or my fielding of student questions in response to the survey results. I did, however, switch back to what I had been doing before my experiment with breakout rooms: ten to twelve poll questions per class and no breakout-room questions.[16] Students seemed to appreciate that I responded at least in some way to the preferences that they had expressed in the survey.

My decision to drop the breakout-room questions from my two classes does not mean that I think the breakout-room feature of Zoom has no utility for any class. I suspect that the breakout-room device could be very useful in smaller seminar-type classes with a stronger policy bent to them. One distinguishing feature of the code classes I teach is that they are almost more like math classes, where oftentimes there is really just one right answer: If you feel that two plus two equals five, that is fine, but two plus two still equals four. The other point I should make about the breakout-room feature is that maybe there is just a better way to do it than the way I was doing it, and that is why students did not find it that useful in my two classes.

Because my poll was quantitative but not qualitative, I cannot be sure why my students like the polls but not the breakout-room questions.[17] I did try to get an anecdotal feel for that when students would visit me during virtual office hours and I would ask them their thoughts on polls and breakout rooms. Various students told me they liked the polls because they: kept them more engaged and alert throughout the class; helped the class move along more quickly, and; forced the students to confront whether they really did understand the material as well as they thought they did coming into the class (i.e., formative assessment). Reasons that students gave me for not liking breakout rooms included: too many of their classmates would "free-ride" by not participating during the breakout-room sessions; too many of their classmates would talk without knowing what they were talking about, and; these breakout-room sessions just meant

16.   The one exception was that even after the poll results, I continued to use breakout rooms for my optional UCC Article 2 class review sessions. The reasons are that the number of students in those sessions is much smaller (usually about thirty), and the questions I pose are longer problems from the casebook for which I allot eight minutes for the breakout-room groups to discuss. In addition, with fewer groups and more time, I am actually able to visit a much higher percentage of the breakout rooms while they are in progress.

17.   I suspect that I will learn a lot more about what students liked about the polls and disliked about the breakout rooms when I get the student evaluations after the semester is over.

that there would be less class time for me to help interpret these complicated code sections for them.[18]

Even though I ended up abandoning my brief use of the breakout-room feature of Zoom, I should add here that I have continued to benefit from a feature of Zoom that is "breakout-room-like": the after-class question period. When the official class time ends, I will announce to the class that I am turning off the class-recording feature and that they are free to leave. Then I will remain on Zoom to field any questions that students would like to ask after class. This post-class "small group" time has been like a standalone breakout room that I am leading. I have found this time to be much superior to the in-person after-class gatherings at the podium, where students don't really get to hear other students' questions very well (or even my answers). With the Zoom after-class gatherings, everyone hears everyone else's questions as well as my answers. Some students even got into the habit of sticking around after class, whether or not they themselves had a question to ask!

VI. Conclusion: Bringing New Tricks Back to the In-Person Classroom

I believe that whatever stage you are at in your teaching career—"old dog," "new dog," or something in between—you need to do a periodic "reset" and think about what you are doing and what you might try that is different. In my case, the pandemic forced on me such a rethinking of my usual methods; but in normal times we need to force such reexaminations on ourselves. I hope that this essay might help to inspire in you a desire to try something new in your teaching, no matter your career stage. While that is a very important lesson for those of us closer to the end of our career, it should also be a critical concern for faculty who are much closer to the start.

When I talk about trying new things—or about doing few things, but doing them well—I appreciate that these admonitions do not come with a "one size fits all" approach. While Zoom polling ended up being the key innovation for my teaching, you need to figure out the innovations that are most suited for your class and your teaching style, and then do those few things well. What those important things are for your situation will necessarily vary based on the subject matter you teach and on the kind of teacher you are.

As for me, when it is finally time to return to in-person teaching, I believe that most of the teaching innovations I learned on Zoom can be adapted for the brick-and-mortar classroom.

I am convinced that with a combination of PowerPoint slides displaying each poll question and the Poll Everywhere app that students can install on their smartphones, I can do polls in-person just as I have done online in my Zoom classes. Just as importantly, I can also share the results in-person on the screens that we have in the front of all of our classrooms.

---

18.   This last reason was helpful for my self-esteem, but maybe the students in this nonanonymous
       setting were just saying that to make me feel good!

In short, I am excited about the ways that the virtual classroom experience has rejuvenated my interest in teaching, and I look forward to seeing how these new techniques play out in a post-pandemic world. Perhaps my casebook co-author Lynn LoPucki is exaggerating when he says that, thanks to the pandemic forcing us all onto Zoom, "we are finally, actually learning how to teach." On the other hand, maybe that old English proverb is also an exaggeration, and that sometimes it really *is* possible to teach an old dog new tricks!