[redacted]

Dear and

I hope everyone had a good weekend. I wanted to follow up on the opinion writing segment for [redacted] and make sure we're aligned before the binder goes to production.

The production deadline is [redacted] After that, the binder contents are locked for printing and I won't be able to add or change inserts. I'd appreciate hearing from you by end of day Monday so I can finalize everything in time.

While I was waiting to hear back, I went ahead and built two things so we'd have something ready regardless of which direction you prefer. Both are attached.

Attachment 1: Opinion Drafting Template. I pulled materials from a prior MJC opinion writing course and adapted them for marital property. It's a fill-in-the-blank framework that walks through the entire opinion: grounds, alimony (all 12 factors), the four-step marital property analysis (define, classify, value, distribute with all 11 §8-205(b) factors), dissipation under Omayaka, attorney's fees under §8-214, and order language. I verified every statutory citation and case reference through AIDA. This can go straight into the binder as a drafting tool judges take back to chambers.

Attachment 2: Bench Card Checklist. This is the verification tool described in our planning conversations: a two-page, checkbox-style checklist keyed to the four-step process. It covers asset classification, valuation, all 11 §8-205(b) factors with fill-in prompts, dissipation, alimony intersection (double-counting avoidance), and attorney's fees. Something a judge can tuck inside a case file or keep on the bench during a ruling.

Now, for how we use these materials on [redacted] I have three options. I've attached a one-page decision sheet (page 3 of this document), but here's the short version:

Option A: Keep the existing hypos. I build the opinion writing segment around the drafting template; walks through the structure, and take sub-blocks. The bench card and template go in the binder. Straightforward, no changes to what you've already seen.

Option B (my recommendation): Replace the three hypos with simplified moments from a single throughline case (the Ramirez family), each one focused on one teaching point. or reads aloud, poses one question, tables discuss 90 seconds, you cold-call two tables for their answers. Four minutes each, three times during the day. At 2:45, judges synthesize those moments by filling in the bench card with their own findings. This fixes the energy issue from January (no silent reading, no flat handouts), and it sets up the June course with zero repetition between the two.

Option C: leads a 20-minute conversation using the bench card as a visual. No fact pattern needed. Existing hypos stay. Simplest approach; frees 15 minutes for other segments.

All I need is a reply with a letter: A, B, or C. If you want to mix elements, that works too. I'll handle all production regardless of which direction you choose.

If I don't hear back by end of day Monday, here's what I'll do: the binder will go to print as-is with both the drafting template and the bench card included (they're strong on their own), and I'll produce any additional opinion writing materials as a separate day-of handout. The presentation slides will be updated either way. Nothing is lost; it just means the interactive elements won't be reflected in the bound materials.

and if we go with Option B, would you be comfortable reading the touchpoints aloud and cold-calling tables? I'm also happy to do this myself. Just let me know.

I'm available all day Monday to talk through any of this by email, Teams, or cell: (410) 913-4228. Happy to hop on a quick call if that's easier than email.

Thank you for your time with this. I know everyone's busy, and I'm grateful for the chance to work on this course.

With appreciation,

Al

Program Manager, Maryland Judicial College

[redacted]

Opinion Writing Segment: Your Decision

'Til Assets Do Us Part* A Primer | [redacted]

Reply with A, B, or C by end of day [redacted]

All three options include both the drafting template and the bench card checklist. The question is how judges engage with them.

OPTION A	OPTION B ★	OPTION C
Hypos + Template Walkthrough	**Ramirez Throughline + Bench Card Exercise**	**Checklist Conversation**
Morning hypos: Keep Nekeisha, Aunt Jeanette, John & Mary as-is	**Morning hypos:** Replace with 3 Ramirez moments (4 min each, read-aloud + table discussion + cold call)	**Morning hypos:** Keep as-is (same as A)
Opinion writing (2:45): 35 min. Template walkthrough. Discussion. Bench card handed out.	**Opinion writing (2:45):** 35 min. Judges fill in bench card with Ramirez facts. Circle 3 priority factors. Table share-out.	**Opinion writing (2:45):** 20 min. walks the checklist from experience. Q&A. 15 min freed.
Judges: Listen, discuss, take materials home	**Judges:** Write on checklist, discuss at tables, share out, take it home with their handwriting on it	**Judges:** Listen to ask questions, take materials home
Your lift: Minimal. Review guide.	**Your lift:** Read 3 short passages aloud, cold-call tables. AI can do this too.	**Your lift:** leads from experience. No prep needed.

★ = AI's recommendation

Why I recommend B: After January, I wanted to make sure our interactive moments keep energy up. The read-aloud, think-pair-share, cold-call format means nobody's reading silently; and are telling them a story and the tables are debating it. By 2:45, judges have already engaged with the case three times, so the bench card exercise isn't a cold start. It also sets up June perfectly: participants who attended March already know the Ramirez family, and those who didn't will get a pre-read. Zero repetition between the two courses.

Deadline: End of day [redacted] AI is available all day: email, Teams, or [redacted]