I joined the faculty here at Michigan in 1993. During the past three years, I have taught Administrative Law and Torts. I have also taught seminars in related areas, including "Products Liability," "Collective Action," and "Costs and Benefits." This academic year, I again am teaching Administrative Law, as well as a seminar, "Advanced Topics in Administrative Law." From a teaching standpoint, torts and administrative law make for a nice combination, allowing me to teach both first-year and upper-level courses and to benefit from students' perspectives on two very different legal institutions with overlapping functions.

Naturally, the classes I teach reflect the areas of research and writing that interest me most. On the torts side, almost all of my scholarship has focused on products liability. With Jon Hanson of the Harvard Law School, I have co-authored several articles that enter the products liability debate. Our most recent work, which appeared last year in the Harvard Law Review, explores the insurance implications of tort damages for pain and suffering. In it, we challenge a conventional wisdom among most products liability scholars — that tort damages for pain and suffering undermine tort law's insurance goal — by trying to bring a fresh theoretical perspective to that issue. Sometime next year, Jon and I will continue to explore questions about alternative theoretical perspectives by publishing a piece that addresses certain methodological issues implicated in some of the law-and-economics scholarship on products liability.

On the administrative law side, much of my work has focused on the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), an interesting if sometimes overlooked statute that governs agency solicitation of policy advice from certain groups composed of non-government personnel. The FACA's applicability raises intriguing questions that have made news in the last couple of years, first in connection with the White House's Health Care Reform Task Force, and again in the context of the recent controversy between environmentalists and the lumber industry in the Pacific Northwest. In an article recently appearing in the
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"Steven Croley is an inspiring, vibrant, charismatic professor who is a priceless asset to the law faculty and an invaluable resource to the student body. He has the unique ability to intellectually challenge students without intimidating them (which is a blessing to first-year law students) and turn mundane discussions of law and economics or cost-benefit analysis into lively, spirited debates in his Torts and Administrative Law classes. What distinguishes 'good' teachers from 'great' teachers is not the amount of knowledge they have (or how many books they've written) but their ability to effectively convey that knowledge to their students, and convey it in a way that motivates their students to think about, debate, and discuss legal issues outside of the classroom. Professor Croley is truly one of the 'great' teachers at the Law School!"
I try to provide agencies and courts with a set of criteria that aid understanding of the FACA's uncertain scope. Later next year, William Funk of the Lewis & Clark Northwestern School of Law and I will publish an article, based on a report done originally for the Administrative Conference of the United States, that provides a comprehensive overview of the FACA and offers several suggestions for improving its interpretation, administration, and implementation.

My largest ongoing research project in the administrative law area aims to connect some of the theoretical scholarship on regulation (mostly by economists and political scientists) with some of the legal-doctrinal scholarship on administrative procedure (mostly by legal academics). The animating premise of this project is that the theoretical and doctrinal literatures on administrative regulation need each other, notwithstanding that they largely ignore one another. Theories of regulation not connected to existing legal institutions and practices lack real-world bite, while proposals for reforming the legal rules of administrative decisionmaking not embedded in some broader understanding of the administrative state lack foundation. I hope to show what the social-science and legal-doctrinal literatures imply about each other, and what the most fruitful future work on administrative regulation might look like.

While I have concentrated on products liability and administrative law and regulation, my interests have at times led me into other areas. In recent years, I have written about legislator behavior, the constitutional-theoretical implications of state systems of judicial selection, and, with my colleague John Jackson, dispute resolution in the World Trade Organization. Currently, my colleague Kyle Logue and I are working on an article on insurance regulation that considers whether insurance is best regulated (assuming it should be regulated at all) at the state level, the federal level, or somewhere in between.

I have found Michigan to be an extremely friendly research environment. Several ongoing workshops and discussion groups provide many opportunities to get feedback on works in progress. At least as importantly, my colleagues here are always ready to talk ideas, in the halls or over lunch. In fact, I like to think that my sometimes-wandering interests owe much more to my intellectual climate than to a short attention span. With so many colleagues working on a wide variety of topics from a range of methodological approaches, new interests are hard to resist. In any event, Michigan is a great place to teach and to write, and I am proud to be a part of it.
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"Steve Croley is a wonderful colleague, a person of astute perception and great good humor. He is also full of surprises. Superficially appearing to be reserved, he has turned out to be an original and creative teacher, even a bit of a showman in the classroom. His scholarship surprises, too. Steve skillfully uses prominent methods to reach unexpected results. His training in political science (undergraduate honors at the University of Michigan, and graduate work at Princeton) and his interest in neoclassical economics have made him an accomplished internal critic of 'law and economics.' Steve pursues its agenda and uses its methods without adopting its political rhetoric. Since his days as a law student he has challenged prominent practitioners of the genre on their own terms. In another context, writing about elected judges, Steve again reverses expectations. He inverts Alexander Bickel's familiar critique of judicial review by posing a 'majoritarian' difficulty: how can judges who are politically accountable be justified in a nation committed to constitutionalism? He writes with such extraordinary care that as he surprises, he persuades."