The cognitive load on anyone asked to perform a new task or draft a new type of document is significant even when the person has examples to try to learn from. When the novice learner has to expend effort trying to identify basic characteristics of the task from scratch, the cognitive load increases. And worse, many of the neophyte's efforts to reduce that load aren't specifically directed at completing the task satisfactorily as much as learning what the task fundamentally entails. It's simply neither efficient nor effective in terms of productivity or learning.

Fortunately, in many instances, supervising attorneys can easily provide samples of work to help new attorneys learn what they need to prepare. If time permits, a supervisor can model how to perform a skill, which can be as simple as taking a young attorney to observe the supervisor's court hearing, deposition, or negotiation session. Of course, providing models or samples becomes even more effective when coupled with an explanation of *why* the sample is worth emulating. Admittedly, providing a sample might not always be practical (there might not be any upcoming opportunities for a supervisor to model a skill or technique, for example), and useful high-quality samples might not come readily. Further, a student or young lawyer can become wedded to a model and erroneously conclude that the model's approach is the only way to resolve a particular task. Still, in many cases, demonstrating a new skill for new attorneys via models or samples can be an effective way for them to both start to develop that skill in the present and see how it can be applied in different contexts in the future.

Practice, practice, practice

For legal skills, practice makes perfect—sometimes. From a transfer perspective, providing multiple opportunities to apply knowledge and develop a particular skill helps students build stronger mental scaffolding to aid recall months and years into the future.[8] An important caveat, however: without guidance, practice may not be as effective as it could be. Novice learners need to understand exactly what it is they're practicing. For example, novice learners may not recognize the deeper structure underlying two separate research exercises in a legal-writing class. Instead, they might focus on surface similarities or differences. In doing so, students may miss how the same broad research approach—say, beginning with secondary sources to get a handle on the basic legal principles applicable to the issue—likely applies equally well to a different research project that, at first glance, seems to raise completely different topics from those in exercises they have already completed.

Part 2—Reaching backward

Part 2 of this article will discuss backward-facing techniques for assisting knowledge transfer. Watch for it in the March 2019 issue. ∎

Ted Becker is a clinical professor of law and the director of the Legal Practice Program at the University of Michigan Law School. He teaches Legal Practice, Transactional Drafting, and Research and Analysis in American Law. He is a member of the Executive Committee of the Institute for Continuing Legal Education in Ann Arbor.

ENDNOTES

1. Bransford et al, *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School* (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 2000), p 51 <https://www.nap.edu/read/9853/chapter/6>. All websites cited in this article were accessed December 12, 2018.
2. Capulong et al, *The New 1L: First-Year Lawyering with Clients* (Durham: Carolina Academic Press, 2015), p 41.
3. E.g., Bowman & Brodoff, *Cracking Student Silos: Linking Legal Writing and Clinical Learning through Transference*, Clin L Rev (forthcoming Spring 2019), p 2 <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3234384>.
4. *The New 1L* at 41.
5. Any discussion of the science underlying human learning, memory, and brain processes will likely be outdated almost as soon as it's written. With that caveat, an accessible description can be found in Archer et al, *Reaching Backward and Stretching Forward: Teaching for Transfer in Law School Clinics*, 64 J Leg Ed 258, 260–268 (2014) <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2495575> [https://perma.cc/2ZCH-6FDM].
6. For a thorough discussion of transfer in legal education, see Kowalski, *True North: Navigating for the Transfer of Learning in Legal Education*, 34 Seattle U L Rev 51 (2010) <https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1961&context=sulr> [https://perma.cc/SH9U-DXTB].
7. See *Cracking Student Silos* at 24 and *Reaching Backward and Stretching Forward* at 281–282.
8. *Reaching Backward and Stretching Forward* at 281.

SBM | MONEY JUDGMENT INTEREST RATE

MCL 600.6013 governs how to calculate the interest on a money judgment in a Michigan state court. Interest is calculated at six-month intervals in January and July of each year, from when the complaint was filed, and is compounded annually.

For a complaint filed after December 31, 1986, the rate as of July 1, 2018 is 3.687 percent. This rate includes the statutory 1 percent.

But a different rule applies for a complaint filed after June 30, 2002 that is based on a written instrument with its own specified interest rate. The rate is the lesser of:

(1) 13 percent a year, compounded annually; or

(2) the specified rate, if it is fixed—or if it is variable, the variable rate when the complaint was filed if that rate was legal.

For past rates, see http://courts.mi.gov/Administration/SCAO/Resources/Documents/other/interest.pdf.

As the application of MCL 600.6013 varies depending on the circumstances, you should review the statute carefully.