E D I T O R ' S   N O T E

This issue marks the end of eight years of service by Alan Tomkins as the coeditor of Court Review. While serving as a professor of law and psychology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the director of the University of Nebraska Public Policy Center, Alan has helped us both improve the quality of the articles in Court Review and get us current on this quarterly publication.

Alan's contributions have been vast, but I will mention a few. He edited our 2007 special issue on procedural justice; organized a special issue on Indian law, including an overview of the Indian Child Welfare Act; recruited the nation's leading experts on eyewitness evidence to contribute to a special issue tailored for judges; and regularly recruited leading experts to make their work accessible to judges through articles specially adapted for Court Review.

Alan is now taking on a new assignment as Deputy Division Director for the National Science Foundation's Division of Social and Economic Sciences. I will miss his help as coeditor, but we all wish him well on his new assignment.

I'm pleased to announce that another talented academic, Eve Brank, has agreed to come on board as the coeditor going forward. Eve is an associate professor in the University of Nebraska Law-Psychology Program. She also serves as the treasurer of the American Psychology-Law Society, a division of the American Psychological Association. Having the continued help of a scholar who is well connected to others working in areas of law and social science is a great asset for Court Review and the judges who read it.

We're pleased to have three articles we think you will find valuable:
• Professor Charles Weisselberg presents his annual review of the criminal decisions in the past Term of the United States Supreme Court. As always, he provides some analysis of the decisions and a discussion of key cases already on the schedule for the present Term.
• Colorado trial judge David Prince considers ways to mold the management of civil litigation around procedural-justice and organizational-management research findings. Prince discusses how these findings should frame a judge's thinking about case management and makes specific suggestions.
• Two recent graduates of the University of Iowa College of Law, Kate Ono Rahel and Justin Shilhanek, devoted much of their work in an immigration-law course during their third year to preparing an article for Court Review. They and I agreed that a review of potential ramifications of the Padilla v. Kentucky case, with guidelines for trial judges, would be useful. Their excellent product concludes this issue.—Steve Leben
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