

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey

Report of the 2016-2017 Survey



Survey Revision Subcommittee

Jodi Wilson (Chair)

Members Serving 2013-2018

Meredith Aden

Ted Becker

Peter Nemerovski

Members Serving 2013-2016

Jan Levine

Ben Bratman

Michael Oeser

Members Serving 2013-2014

Judy Rosenbaum

Lead Author for Revised Survey Instrument

Ken Chestek

2016-2017 Survey Administration Subcommittee

Alyssa Dragnich (Chair)

Raul Fernandez-Calienes

Kristin Knudsen

Gail Mullins

Dyane O'Leary

Judy Rosenbaum

Marci Rosenthal

Susie Salmon

For more information or questions about these results, contact
Jodi Wilson at jlwolson2@memphis.edu.

2016-2017 Survey Results

Association of Legal Writing Directors & Legal Writing Institute

This report presents the results of the ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey for 2016-2017. These results provide information about the legal research and writing faculty, programs, and courses at 182 North American law schools, representing approximately 88% of the law schools eligible to complete the survey and 89% of the law schools solicited to complete the survey.¹

Although ALWD and LWI have jointly conducted an annual survey of legal writing programs for more than two decades, this report is the product of a multi-year project to overhaul the Annual Survey with the goal of modernizing it and expanding the scope of information collected. With this overhaul, we believe the information provided in this report does a better job of reflecting the varied, complex, and unique circumstances at our institutions. Although the report is still admittedly an inexact composite of those circumstances, the survey results nevertheless show common practices and provide other valuable information about the current state of legal writing education in American law schools.

Overhauling the Annual Survey, collecting data with an entirely new survey instrument, and then reporting that data has been a major endeavor, requiring the efforts of many people over several years. The endeavor is described in more detail in the History of the Annual Survey section of this report, but we cannot pass up this opportunity to recognize those who dedicated their time and energy to this significant undertaking: Meredith Aden (University of Memphis Law School), Ted Becker (University of Michigan Law School), Ben Bratman (University of Pittsburgh Law School), Kim Chanbonpin (The John Marshall Law School), Ken Chestek (University of Wyoming College of Law), Maria Crist (University of Dayton School of Law), Kristin Knudsen (University of Alaska Anchorage), Jan Levine (Duquesne University School of Law), John Mollenkamp (Cornell Law School), Gail Mullins (University of Oklahoma College of Law), Peter Nemerovski (University of North Carolina School of Law), Dyane O’Leary (Suffolk University Law School), Michael Oeser (Stetson University College of Law), Sharon Pocock (Touro College Law Center), Raul Fernandez-Calienes (St. Thomas University School of Law), Judy Rosenbaum (Northwestern University School of Law), Marci Rosenthal (Florida International University Law School), Susie Salmon (University of Arizona College of Law), Mary Rose Strubbe (IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law), and Tori Tabor (University of Houston Law Center).

Finally, we thank all of the designated responders from each school who took the time to respond to the 2016-2017 Survey. The valuable information this report provides would not be possible if it were not for the time and effort of those designated responders.

Jodi Wilson, University of Memphis Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law
Alyssa Dragnich, Arizona State University Sandra Day O’Connor College of Law
Co-Chairs, Survey Committee

¹ See the Respondent Pool section on page iv for a more detailed discussion of which schools were eligible to complete the survey, which schools were solicited, and why some schools were not solicited.

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey
Report of the 2016-2017 Survey

Table of Contents

History of the Annual Survey.....	ii
Survey Structure.....	iv
Respondent Pool.....	iv
Definitions.....	v
Navigating this Report & Asking Questions.....	ix
The Inevitable Caveats.....	ix
Part A. School Profiles.....	1
Part B. Semester Structure.....	3
Part C. LRW Program(s) Structure.....	7
Part D. LRW Program Policies in Programs with Full-time Faculty.....	14
Part E. LRW Required Curriculum.....	19
Part F. LRW Elective Curriculum.....	36
Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes.....	57
Part H. Directors.....	59
Part I. Faculty Governance & Professional Development for Full-time Faculty.....	78
Part J. Hiring, Promotion, Retention & Tenure Policies for Full-time Faculty.....	91
Part K. Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty).....	137
Part L. Faculty Salary Comparisons (Full-time Faculty).....	142
Part M. Teaching Fellows.....	154
Part N. Part-time Faculty.....	163
Part O. Adjunct Faculty.....	175
Part P. Teaching Assistants.....	190
Part Q. Writing Specialists.....	197
Part R. Recent Changes.....	205
Part S. Writing Across the Curriculum.....	208
Appendix.....	210

History of the Annual Survey

Over the past two decades, ALWD and LWI have jointly conducted an annual survey to gather information about legal writing programs and legal writing faculty. This information allows us to better understand the evolution of our field and to support arguments in favor of strengthening the legal writing curriculum and improving the citizenship rights of legal writing faculty.

After sporadic informal surveys about the legal writing field going back as far as 1959, the Legal Writing Institute's first systematic effort to survey schools about their legal writing programs started in 1990 with Jill J. Ramsfield, then director at Georgetown University Law Center, serving as reporter. Professor Ramsfield repeated her efforts in 1992 and 1994. In 1995, concomitant with the beginnings of the Association of Legal Writing Directors, Jan Levine, now Director of Legal Research and Writing at Duquesne University School of Law, assisted by Louis J. Sirico, Director of Legal Writing Programs at Villanova University School of Law, drafted and tested a pilot survey. Their goal was to create a survey instrument that paid greater attention to gathering detailed information more consistent with the ABA Sourcebook. The pilot became the template for a greatly expanded 1997 survey of legal writing programs conducted by Lou Sirico under the auspices of the Association of Legal Writing Directors. The next year, 1998, ALWD and LWI collaborated to create a jointly sponsored annual survey of legal writing programs. That survey was modified slightly when the survey migrated from print to internet-based data gathering. That version of the survey was conducted jointly by both ALWD and LWI through the 2014-2015 academic year.

During that time, despite the growth and changing status of legal writing programs, the increasing longevity of legal writing faculty and rapid changes in technology, the questions remained virtually unchanged. The reason for keeping the questions constant over the years was to enhance comparability of data over time. Recently, growing out of the changes described above, many leaders in the legal writing community came to believe that the pendulum had shifted enough that it had become more important for the Survey to correspond to the reality of the legal writing field in the 21st century than to retain consistent questions.

In 2011, the presidents of ALWD and LWI created a joint Survey Task Force, which included Maria Crist (Chair), Ben Bratman, Kim Chanbonpin, John Mollenkamp, Sharon Pocock, Judy Rosenbaum, Mary Rose Strubbe, and Tori Tabor. The report of that task force called for a substantial overhaul to the existing survey.

In 2013, the ALWD and LWI Boards charged the Survey Committee with implementing the report's recommendations and seeking out a new, more robust platform to host the survey. The Survey Committee created a Survey Revision Subcommittee to undertake this project. From 2013 to 2015, the Survey Revision Subcommittee vetted multiple survey platforms and service providers, selected a new survey platform, and selected a consultant to assist with the survey design. Additionally, after a blind grant process, the subcommittee selected Ken Chestek to serve as the lead author who would work with the consultant and the subcommittee to revise the survey instrument. During this time period, the

Survey Revision Subcommittee included Jodi Wilson (Chair), Meredith Aden, Ted Becker, Ben Bratman, Jan Levine, Peter Nemerovski, Michael Oeser, and Judy Rosenbaum.

In 2015, the Survey Revision Subcommittee, the lead author, and the consultant began working to revise the structure, scope, and content of the survey instrument. From 2015 to 2017, the subcommittee and the lead author worked together to create an expanded and modernized survey instrument that reflected the complex realities of legal writing programs and legal writing faculty in the 21st century. In late spring 2016 and continuing into the spring of 2017, the subcommittee worked with Qualtrics, the survey platform provider, to build the survey on the platform, modify the survey instrument to conform to the requirements of the platform, and test the survey to ensure that it functioned appropriately. For 2015-2016, the subcommittee included Jodi Wilson (Chair), Meredith Aden, Ted Becker, Ben Bratman, Jan Levine, Peter Nemerovski, and Michael Oeser, working with Ken Chestek as lead author. For 2016-2017, the subcommittee included Jodi, Meredith, Ted, and Peter, working with Ken as lead author.

The new and improved Annual Survey now has two phases. The first phase is the Institutional Phase, which focuses on broad information about legal writing faculty and the legal writing curriculum at each responding school. The second phase is the Individual Phase, which seeks more detailed information from individual faculty members who teach legal writing courses.

In the spring of 2017, the Survey Administration Subcommittee began collecting data for the 2016-2017 Survey, focusing on the Institutional Phase.² After the data was collected, the Survey Committee began the work of determining how best to report the expanded data collected through the Institutional Phase of the Annual Survey. In April 2018, the Survey Committee completed that work, resulting in this report. The Survey Administration Subcommittee for the 2016-2017 Survey included Alyssa Dragnich (Chair), Raul Fernandez-Calienes, Kristin Knudsen, Gail Mullins, Dyane O'Leary, Judy Rosenbaum, Marci Rosenthal, and Susie Salmon. After the data was collected, Jodi Wilson and Alyssa Dragnich prepared a report for the new survey instrument and incorporated the data from the survey platform, with feedback and support from Meredith Aden, Ted Becker, Peter Nemerovski, and Dyane O'Leary.

² Due to the complexities of the process and the timing of the completion of the Institutional Phase, the Survey Committee did not collect Individual Phase data for 2016-2017. The Individual Phase will be implemented for the first time with the 2017-2018 Survey.

Survey Structure

The Annual Survey now has two phases. The first phase is the Institutional Phase, which focuses on broad information about legal writing faculty and the legal writing curriculum at each responding school. Before the Survey Committee begins collecting data each year, each school in the Respondent Pool identifies a designated responder who will answer the Institutional Phase on behalf of the school. Among other questions, the Institutional Phase asks the designated responder to provide contact information for the individual faculty members who teach legal writing courses at the school. The second phase is the Individual Phase, which seeks more detailed information from individual faculty members who teach legal writing courses. The Individual Phase will be distributed to the individual faculty members identified by each school in the Institutional Phase.

For the 2016-2017 Survey, the Survey Committee only collected data for the Institutional Phase. The Survey Committee will implement the Individual Phase with the 2017-2018 Survey.

Respondent Pool

The respondent pool for the Annual Survey is primarily based on ABA accreditation and provisional accreditation. At the time the 2016-2017 Survey was administered, there were 206 ABA-accredited and provisionally accredited law schools.³ For the 2016-2017 Survey, the Survey Committee solicited Institutional Phase responses from 204 North American Law schools, including 202 ABA-accredited and provisionally accredited law schools and 2 additional law schools that are not ABA-accredited but have historical connections to ALWD, LWI, or the Annual Survey.⁴ The Survey Committee did not solicit responses from those schools that have historically not responded to the survey.⁵ Additionally, the Survey Committee did not solicit a response from a provisionally accredited law school that had closed at the time the survey was administered.⁶ For the 2016-2017 Survey, 182 law schools responded, representing approximately 88% of the law schools eligible to complete the survey and 89% of the law schools solicited to complete the survey.

³ For purposes of the 2016-2017 Survey, the following schools were counted separately and each was asked to submit its own response to the 2016-2017 Survey: Rutgers Law School – Camden Campus, Rutgers Law School – Newark Campus, Atlanta’s John Marshall Law School, and Savannah Law School (a branch of Atlanta’s John Marshall Law School).

⁴ Those two schools are the University of Windsor in Ontario, Canada, and the Massachusetts School of Law at Andover.

⁵ At the time the 2016-2017 Survey was administered, the ABA list of accredited and provisionally accredited law schools included three law schools located in Puerto Rico: Inter American University of Puerto Rico School of Law; Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico School of Law; and University of Puerto Rico School of Law. The list also included the Judge Advocate General’s Legal Center and School as an ABA-approved institution, although it is not eligible for formal accreditation. The Survey Committee stopped soliciting responses from these four schools with the 2013-2014 Survey after determining that the schools had not responded to the survey in the last decade or more. Consistent with this history, the Survey Committee for the 2016-2017 Survey did not solicit responses from these schools.

⁶ Indiana Tech Law School announced in October 2016 that it was closing at the end of the academic year. The Survey Committee began collecting data for the 2016-2017 Survey in mid-May of 2016. Accordingly, the Survey Committee did not solicit a response from this school.

Definitions

As part of the redesign of the Annual Survey, many of the terms used throughout the Annual Survey were defined. The definitions were provided to respondents in a document posted online and hyperlinked at the beginning of the survey. Additionally, defined terms were presented as underlined blue text on the survey platform. Respondents could hover their cursor over the defined term to see the definition in a pop-up text box. The definition for each defined term in the 2016-2017 Survey is provided in this section.

405(c)-track	A faculty member hired with an expectation that, upon satisfactory performance of specified duties, the faculty member will be awarded a presumptively renewable contract of at least five years' duration in accordance with ABA Standard 405(c).
Academic Year	Includes all semesters, shortened semesters, or intersession during any 12-month period defined by your school.
Adjunct	A faculty member hired to teach one or more courses, who may or may not have substantial outside employment. As distinguished from Part-Time faculty, an Adjunct faculty member is typically obligated to teach one or more specific courses but does not typically have an obligation to work a set number of hours in a given time period (e.g., per week or per semester).
Blended LRW Course	A first-year course in which the teaching of legal research, communication (including both written and oral communication), or any combination of these skills is taught in conjunction with another required 1L substantive law topic (e.g., Torts, Criminal Law, Contracts or any other typical first-year course) and taught by a single professor.
Current Academic Year	The Academic Year in which you are responding to this survey.
Elective LRW Course	An LRW Course that is offered to all students but is not required for graduation. This includes any LRW Course that satisfies a graduation requirement that a student must take a certain number of LRW Courses from an approved list of such courses.

Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	A faculty member hired to perform full-time duties on a contract of five years or more in length but not presumptively renewable.
Full-time, Short-term	A faculty member hired to perform full-time duties on a contract lasting four years or less, whether the contract is presumptively renewable or not. This term does not include Visitors or Teaching Fellows.
Legal Writing Assignment	A writing assignment of at least three pages or 750 words in which at least one of the pedagogical objectives is to evaluate the ability of the student to communicate legal ideas in writing, and which is graded and counts towards the student's final grade.
LRW Program	Any grouping of LRW Courses, whether required or elective, that are part of a coordinated legal writing curriculum. This term includes programs that are coordinated through an LRW Director (as defined) as well as programs that are coordinated through collaboration among faculty teaching in the LRW Program, including collaboration among faculty in an autonomous program, whether such coordination involves the curriculum as a whole, details of a specific course, or both. This term does not include LRW Courses that are offered outside of a coordinated curriculum.
LRW Course	A course whose principal pedagogical objective is to teach mastery of legal research, communication skills (including both written and oral communication), or any combination of these skills. This term includes both Required LRW Courses and Elective LRW Courses.
LRW Director	Any faculty member or administrator who directs, coordinates, or supervises other members of the LRW Faculty for the purpose of assuring the quality or coordination of teaching in LRW Courses.
LRW Faculty	A faculty member (regardless of employment status) who ordinarily spends at least 50% of his or her teaching and/or administrative efforts at the school engaged in teaching LRW Courses , directing or administering such courses, or a combination of teaching and directing or administering such courses.

Major Writing Assignment	A writing assignment which accounts for at least 20% of a student's final grade for the course.
Non-LRW Course	A course whose principal pedagogical objective is to teach mastery of an area of substantive law, performance skills other than research and communication, or representation of clients (either simulated or live). The fact that such courses may be evaluated wholly or partly on the basis of written work by student does not make the course an LRW course.
Non-LRW Faculty	A faculty member (regardless of employment status) who ordinarily spends less than 50% of his or her teaching and/or administrative efforts at the school engaged in teaching LRW Courses , directing or administering such courses, or a combination of teaching and directing or administering such courses.
Part-time	A faculty member, regardless of other status, who is hired to perform duties less than what is considered a normal full teaching or administrative load at the school. As distinguished from Adjunct faculty, a Part-Time faculty member is typically obligated to work a set number of hours in a given time period (e.g., per week or per semester). This term does not include other types of faculty who have reduced loads on a temporary basis for whatever reason.
Programmatic Tenure	Tenure that is achieved through a separate track/using different standards than traditional tenure awarded to doctrinal faculty.
Required LRW Course	An LRW Course that all students must take in order to graduate (including a Blended LRW Course). This does not include an elective LRW Course that satisfies a graduation requirement that a student must take a certain number of LRW Courses from an approved list of such courses.
Teaching Assistant	An upper-level student who is assigned to work with individual LRW Faculty member to assist in class preparation, class teaching, review of student papers or other tasks in support of the LRW Faculty member's teaching responsibilities. This does not include research assistants who have no teaching responsibilities or

interactions with students in the faculty member's classes, even though the research assistant may assist the faculty member in preparing to teach those courses.

Teaching Fellow

A faculty member hired to perform full-time duties for a period not greater than two years (not renewable), at least some of which include teaching LRW courses, but who is in training to seek full-time teaching opportunities on either a tenure track or 405(c) track after completion of the fellowship, or who is seeking an advanced degree.

Tenure-Track

A faculty member hired with an expectation that, upon satisfactory performance of specified duties, the faculty member will be awarded employment that will presumptively continue indefinitely into the future.

Visitor

A faculty member hired to perform full-time duties but whose employment at the school is understood at the outset of the employment by both the faculty member and the school to be temporary, usually to cover a temporary need for course coverage at the school.

Navigating this Report & Asking Questions

For those of you who are familiar with the previous reports from the Annual Survey, you will notice that this report is considerably longer. As reflected in the Table of Contents, we have separated the results into topical parts. This report is provided in PDF format with bookmarks to help you easily navigate between each part.

As part of the redesign, the Annual Survey is now conducted using a new survey platform. The new platform, Qualtrics, allows for the results for each question to be analyzed in several different ways. We have attempted here to provide the results in the most user-friendly format. The Survey Committee may supplement this report with additional reports providing more complex analyses (e.g., breaking out the responses to one question based upon the responses to another question), aggregating data, or looking at the data from a different perspective. If you would like to see the results analyzed in a different manner or have questions about the Survey, please contact Jodi Wilson, Director of Legal Methods at University of Memphis School of Law, at jlwilson2@memphis.edu.

Please note, however, that for the 2016-2017 Survey, the Survey Committee cannot provide any school-specific information, even for non-salary questions. The question giving the Survey Committee permission to release such information was inadvertently omitted from the 2016-2017 Survey. Adding this question back in is one of the small changes that will be made for the 2017-2018 Survey.

Finally, please note that direct comparisons to previous years of the Annual Survey are difficult because the questions have changed in the new version. Annual Survey results from 2004 – 2015 are hosted by ALWD [here](#) and LWI [here](#).

The Inevitable Caveats

For many years, Professor George Mader served as the co-chair of the Survey Committee. Each year, Professor Mader authored a note providing caveats about the data reflected in the report of the Annual Survey. The new survey platform was selected in part to resolve or at least mitigate some of those caveats, and the new survey instrument was designed with the same goal in mind. Nevertheless, inevitable caveats remain. Thus, the Survey Committee has retained a revised version of Professor Mader's note in this report.

Numbers can sound very definite, and we tend to grab onto them when the amount of discrete information is overwhelming. Sometimes, in fact, we have to do that. This can lead to numbers having unwarranted authority, though. The goal of this note is to give you some guidance and insight for better understanding and assessing the reliability of the information in the tables. We encourage you to

read these two pages of explanation, but if you want to skip to the take-aways, they begin at the bottom of page xi.

In any survey, the input will at least occasionally fail to match reality exactly.

- Some questions are hard for the respondent to interpret, so the response reflects their best understanding of the question. The revised Annual Survey attempts to reduce interpretation difficulties by adding defined terms and using more precise questions. Nevertheless, some ambiguities are inevitable,⁷ and it's inevitable that some responders will not cross reference the definitions when responding.
- Some questions may offer response options that do not exactly capture the answer the respondent would like to give (“Well, it’s a little (b), but also maybe (d), and I can choose only one.” or “I don’t really know the answer.”). The revised Annual Survey attempts to reduce this problem by aligning the answer options with modern practices and trends and including “other” and “I don’t know” as answer options on appropriate questions. Nevertheless, completely avoiding this difficulty is likely impossible given the scope of the survey and the complexity of the circumstances the survey sought to capture.
- Sometimes there is a simple input error (a yearly salary of \$7,000, or \$700,000). The revised Annual Survey attempts to reduce the likelihood of input error by using validation methods provided by the survey platform. But not every input error can be avoided with such methods.
- Sometimes responders will decline to provide an answer. Given the length and complexity of the revised Annual Survey, responders were allowed to skip most questions without providing an answer. Additionally, for certain questions, the revised Annual Survey allowed responders to indicate that they preferred not to provide a response (e.g., salary). As a result, to the extent that there is a real answer to the question, but it is not provided, the response data provide an incomplete picture. Whether or not the information supplied by those who did respond is reflective and descriptive of those who did not respond is unknown and largely unknowable. Thus, the response rate to a question offers an indication of how confident one should feel about the response data for that question.

These inevitable input problems mean any statistics drawn from the data (averages, medians, etc., or trends in those statistics) have errors—errors we cannot estimate with numerical specificity. Don’t get

⁷ The Survey Committee is grateful to everyone who provided feedback during the first administration of the new Annual Survey. We know that the first few years of the new Annual Survey will be a time for learning and reflection. We have already learned a great deal from your feedback and our experience creating this report. Recognizing the benefit of answers that roll over from year to year, we anticipate making small revisions to some questions in the 2017-2018 Survey, where it is possible to resolve ambiguities without making major structural changes. At the appropriate time, the Survey Committee will consider additional changes based on the information learned during the first few administrations of the revised Survey.

us wrong, the responses to and corresponding raw data in this survey are useful, worthwhile, even good, but they do not necessarily provide a perfect or complete picture.

For example, in 2016-2017, 52 responders (out of 182) indicated that their school employs LRW Faculty with the status of Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure in response to Q8.2. All 52 of those responders saw and answered Q12.2, which asked whether the responder knew the annual, entry-level base salary for LRW Faculty with that status. Of those 52, 15 responded “Yes” and provided the information in response to Q12.3, and 10 responded that there was no typical entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty with that status. But 20 responders indicated that they did not know the answer, and 7 responders indicated that they preferred not to provide the information. So, we are left to wonder how the 27 schools who could not or would not provide the information would have affected the numbers reported in Q12.3. And what about the schools that didn’t respond to the survey at all? Are higher-paying schools under-represented in the responses? Lower-paying schools? We don’t know. Certainly, the data from 15 schools is useful, and it is unlikely that every non-responding school is at one or the other end of the spectrum, but could a full report of schools change the numbers meaningfully? Yes. So, in reviewing the numbers, you should be mindful of the number of schools who *could* have responded to a given question and the number of schools that actually did respond to the question.⁸

In an effort to provide more reliable information, the revised Annual Survey frequently asks “qualifying” questions and then uses display logic so that the follow-up questions are only displayed to responders for whom the questions are applicable. For example, if a responder indicated that the school did not appoint Teaching Assistants for LRW Faculty or the responder did not know whether the school hired Teaching Assistants for LRW Faculty, then the responder did not see the follow-up questions about Teaching Assistants. Similarly, if the responder indicated that the responder preferred not to provide certain information (e.g., salary), the responder did not see the follow-up question.

Thus, for some questions, you may find it helpful to look at a series of questions to better understand the response rate to the final question. For example, in Part P, 182 responders answered Q17.2, with 132 of them indicating that their school appoints Teaching Assistants for LRW Faculty. All 132 saw and answered Q17.3, with 78 indicating that the number of hours each Teaching Assistant is expected to spend on Teaching Assistant duties during the semester is consistent. All 78 saw Q17.4#1, which asked how many hours each Teaching Assistant is expected to spend on Teaching Assistant duties each semester, but only 73 answered the question for the first semester of 2016-2017. And so on.

The Take-Aways

- Pay attention to the number of schools responding to a given question. One can have more confidence that the responses to a question accurately reflect reality when the response rate is

⁸ The Individual Phase of the Annual Survey will provide more granular detail about individual faculty member circumstances, such as current salary. The Individual Phase will be implemented with the 2017-2018 Annual Survey.

very high. If the question is directed at a subset of schools, pay attention to how many schools responded out of the total number of schools to whom the question is directed. The information about the number of schools in the subset may be provided in a previous question or series of questions.

- Realize that even with a perfect response rate, input errors can mean the resulting data only approximates reality (though maybe very closely) rather than being a perfect description of it.
- Pay attention to the definitions for the defined terms.
- One can draw valid inferences from the data in the tables; one just needs to qualify one's statements.

Part A. School Profiles

Q2.3 - Region of Country

Answer	Responses per Answer
Region I: Far West –AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA	31
Region II: Northwest & Great Plains –ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY	7
Region III: Southwest & South Central –AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX	25
Region IV: Great Lakes/Upper Midwest –IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI	34
Region V: Southeast –AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV	27
Region VI: Mid-Atlantic –DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA	32
Region VII: Northeastern –CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (excluding New York City and Long Island), RI, VT	17
Region VIII: New York City and Long Island	9
Total Responses	182

Q2.4 - Entering 1L Class Size for the First Semester of the Current Academic Year

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
30	565	180	182

Class Size Range	Total Responses per Class Size Range
Less Than 100	23
100 to 150	60
151 to 200	41
201 to 250	31
251 to 300	10
301 to 350	10
More than 350	7
Total Responses	182

Q2.5 - School Location

Answer	Responses per Answer
Urban center (6 miles or less from the center of a city with a population of 100,000 or more)	129
Suburban area (between 6 and 25 miles from the center of a city with a population of 100,000 or more)	30
Small town (6 miles or less from the center of a town with a population between 10,000 and 100,000)	20
Rural area (more than 6 miles from the center of a city with a population under 100,000, or 25 miles or more from the center of a city with a population of 100,000 or more)	3
Total Responses	182

Part B. Semester Structure

Q3.2 - How many full-length semesters did or will your school have during the Current Academic Year?

“Full-length semester” means the longest semester offered (in terms of weeks).

Answer	Responses per Answer
2	175
3	6
4	1
Total Responses	182

Q3.3 - How many weeks of classroom instruction were included in the full-length semesters offered during the Current Academic Year?

Note: This question focuses on the length of the law school's semester. Thus, “weeks of classroom instruction” means weeks during which classes were regularly scheduled in the law school, within the meaning of ABA Standard 304. This question is not limited to weeks during which LRW Courses were scheduled. So, if the law school's full-length semester includes 14 weeks during which classes are regularly scheduled, but LRW Courses only meet for 10 of those weeks, the answer would be 14.

Schools with 2 Full-Length Semesters

Answer	Responses per Answer
12	2
13	37
13.5	1
14	112
14.5	1
15	20
16	2
Total Responses	175

Q3.3 - Continued

Schools with 3 Full-Length Semesters

Answer	Responses per Answer
9	1
10	1
11	1
13	1
14	2
Total Responses	6

Schools with 4 Full-Length Semesters

Answer	Responses per Answer
9	1
Total Responses	1

Q3.4 - In addition to full-length semesters, did or will your school offer the following short semesters or sessions during the Current Academic Year?

Schools with 2 Full-Length Semesters

	Yes		No		No formal course offerings but for-credit experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics or externships) are available.		Unknown		Total Responses per Semester Type
Summer Semester	80.6%	141	12.0%	21	6.9%	12	0.6%	1	175
Intersession, Maymester, or other short semester or session	50.9%	89	42.3%	74	2.3%	4	4.6%	8	175

Schools with 3 Full-Length Semesters

	Yes		No		No formal course offerings but for-credit experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics or externships) are available.		Unknown		Total Responses per Semester Type
Summer Semester	50.0%	3	33.3%	2	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	6
Intersession, Maymester, or other short semester or session	50.0%	3	33.3%	2	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	6

Q3.4 - Continued

Schools with 4 Full-Length Semesters

	Yes		No		No formal course offerings but for-credit experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics or externships) are available.	Unknown		Total Responses per Semester Type	
Summer Semester	0.0%	0	100.0%	1		0.0%	0		0.0%
Intersession, Maymester, or other short semester or session	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1

Q3.5 - Select the option that best describes your summer semester.

Schools with 2 Full-Length Semesters

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Summer semester is shorter than full-length semesters, but class sessions are longer or occur more often each week so that students have the same number of contact hours with professors as they would in a full-length semester.	90.7%	127
Summer semester does not have a set length; the length of summer semester courses varies depending upon the professor, subject matter, or other considerations.	6.4%	9
Other	2.9%	4
Total Responses		140

Schools with 3 Full-Length Semesters

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Summer semester is shorter than full-length semesters, but class sessions are longer or occur more often each week so that students have the same number of contact hours with professors as they would in a full-length semester.	66.7%	2
Summer semester does not have a set length; the length of summer semester courses varies depending upon the professor, subject matter, or other considerations.	0.0%	0
Other	3.3%	1
Total Responses		3

Schools with 4 Full-Length Semesters – N/A per response to Q3.4

Q3.5 - “Other” Explanation

Other – Text
<i>Parentheticals indicate whether the responder’s school has 2 full-length semesters or 3 full-length semesters.</i>
The summer semester is a summer quarter, which is two weeks shorter than a semester. (2 FLS)
Don't know (2 FLS)
There are a couple of different summer course options. (2 FLS)
We do not offer the full Lawyering and Legal Writing course in the summer term. However, our part-time JD students begin in the summer term. We offer this group of students uncredited, large group sessions covering some beginning LLW basics and several writing assignments that are returned with individual comments and are followed by individual conferences. (2 FLS)
Summer semester is exactly the same as the fall and spring semesters. (Our school runs on a trimester schedule.) (3 FLS)

Q3.6 - During the Current Academic Year, did or will your school offer LRW Courses during the following semesters?

	Yes	No	Unknown	Total Responses per Semester Type
Full-length semester 1	180	1	1	182
Full-length semester 2	182	0	0	182
Full-length semester 3	7	0	0	7
Full-length semester 4	1	0	0	1
Summer semester	60	82	2	144
Intersession/Maymester/Other short session or semester	16	69	7	92

Part C. LRW Program(s) Structure

Q4.2 - Which of the following components are included in the structure of the LRW Program(s) at your school?⁹

Select all that apply.¹⁰

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
First-Year LRW Program (coordinated separately from any upper-level courses or program)	81.9%	149
Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated separately from the first-year courses or program)	32.4%	59
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated as a single, cohesive program)	20.3%	37
Other	7.7%	14
None; all of the LRW Courses at my school are offered outside of an LRW Program	0.0%	0
Total Responses		182

Q4.2 - “Other” Explanations

Other – Text
Legal Research Practicum (required for 1Ls)
Upper-level writing courses that are not part of a program.
Upper-Level LRW courses taught by LRW faculty; coordination is developing
One optional advanced legal writing course offered to upper-level students
Advanced Research requirement
Upper Level (Advanced) Legal Writing Course
Additional Legal Writing Skills required for upper level students who received a 1.9 or below in the first-year course.
LL.M. LRW Program
Seminar Courses, which include a 25+ page paper
Our upper level courses are not formally coordinated but are loosely coordinated

⁹ For purposes of the 2016-2017 Survey, “LRW Program” was defined as follows: Any grouping of LRW Courses, whether required or elective, that are part of a coordinated legal writing curriculum. This term includes programs that are coordinated through an LRW Director (as defined) as well as programs that are coordinated through collaboration among faculty teaching in the LRW Program, including collaboration among faculty in an autonomous program, whether such coordination involves the curriculum as a whole, details of a specific course, or both. This term does not include LRW Courses that are offered outside of a coordinated curriculum.”

¹⁰ The Survey instrument provided two “other” answer options, allowing responders to enter up to two other LRW Programs. Those entries have been aggregated in the report.

Undergraduate courses
Some LRW Courses are offered outside of an LRW Program
Intro. to Legal Research
Masters courses

Q4.3 - For the Current Academic Year, have one or more individuals been designated as LRW Director(s) for some or all of the:¹¹

	Yes		No		Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	65.8%	98	34.2%	51	149
Upper-Level LRW Program	57.6%	34	42.4%	25	59
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	73.0%	27	27.0%	10	37
Other Programs (aggregated)	28.6%	4	71.4%	10	14

¹¹ The LRW Program descriptions shown for this question and subsequent questions omit the parenthetical explanations included in the Survey instrument. The parenthetical explanations are provided in full in Q4.3.

Q4.4 - For the Current Academic Year, please identify the answer below that best describes the staffing model your school uses for the listed program(s).

If an individual has been designated as LRW Director for the program, do not consider that person's status in responding to this question.

	Full-Time Faculty (regardless of status or teaching/administration focus)		Teaching Fellows		Part-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Graduate Students		Students (only if these are upper-level students who provide a substantial portion of individualized feedback on papers or have substantial responsibility for classroom teaching)		Complex hybrid involving more than one of these staffing models		Other		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
First-Year LRW Program	67.8%	101	2.0%	3	2.7%	4	4.7%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	22.1%	33	0.7%	1	149
Upper-Level LRW Program	33.9%	20	0.0%	0	3.4%	2	25.4%	15	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	37.3%	22	0.0%	0	59
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	56.8%	21	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.8%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	29.7%	11	2.7%	1	37
Other Programs	50.0%	7	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	21.4%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	21.4%	3	7.1%	1	14

Q4.10 - For the Current Academic Year, you indicated [in Q4.4] that the staffing model was a “complex hybrid” for the programs listed below. Which of the following staffing components are part of this program?

Select all that apply; if an individual has been designated as LRW Director for the program, do not consider that person's status in responding to this question.

Question	Full-Time Faculty (regardless of status or teaching/administration focus)	Teaching Fellows	Part- time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Graduate Students	Students (only if these are upper-level students who provide a substantial portion of individualized feedback on papers or have substantial responsibility for classroom teaching)	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	31	5	7	23	0	2	3	33
Upper-Level LRW Program	20	0	4	20	0	1	1	22
Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program	10	0	2	11	0	0	0	11
Other Programs	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	3

Q4.11 - For the Current Academic Year, please identify the answer below that best describes the status of full-time faculty teaching in each program.

Select all that apply, regardless of whether a faculty member is LRW Faculty or Non-LRW Faculty. If an individual has been designated as LRW Director for the program, do not consider that person's status in responding to this question.

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)		Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)		405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)		Full-time, Short-Term		Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status		Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	21.20%	28	6.80%	9	43.20%	57	28.00%	37	18.20%	24	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	45.00%	18	7.50%	3	35.00%	14	17.50%	7	12.50%	5	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	32.30%	10	6.50%	2	35.50%	11	29.00%	9	25.80%	8	31
Other Programs	37.50%	3	12.50%	1	25.00%	2	12.50%	1	12.50%	1	8

Q4.12 - For the Current Academic Year, please identify the answer below that best describes the focus of the teaching and administrative load for the full-time faculty with the specified contract status in each program.

Select all that apply; if an individual has been designated as LRW Director for the program, do not consider that person's status in responding to this question.¹²

Contract Status: Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	10	17	5	1	28
Upper-Level LRW Program	2	7	7	2	17
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	3	8	2	0	10
Other Programs	0	2	1	0	3

Contract Status: Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	2	8	0	0	9
Upper-Level LRW Program	0	3	0	0	3
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	2	1	0	0	3
Other Programs	0	0	1	0	1

¹² This question provides information about the teaching and administrative load for full-time faculty teaching in a specific LRW Program. Each table provides the information for faculty with a specific contract status. Each contract status was a defined term for purposes of the Survey. The definitions are provided at the beginning of this report. For example, the first table provides information about faculty who are tenured or on tenure-track with traditional tenure. As shown in Q4.11, 28 schools have tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching in the First-Year LRW Program. As shown in the first table for Q4.12, at 10 of those schools, the faculty members are LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses; at 17 of those schools, the faculty members are LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses; at 5 of those schools, the faculty members are Non-LRW Faculty; and at 1 of those schools, the faculty member(s) have some other teaching and administrative load.

Q4.12 - Continued

Contract Status: 405(c) or 405(c)-track Faculty (Full-time)

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	37	42	2	0	60
Upper-Level LRW Program	9	11	4	0	17
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	10	7	0	1	14
Other Programs	2	2	1	0	2

Contract Status: Full-time, Short-term

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	24	24	0	0	39
Upper-Level LRW Program	5	4	1	0	8
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	6	7	0	0	10
Other Programs	2	0	0	1	3

Contract Status: Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	20	7	1	2	25
Upper-Level LRW Program	2	1	2	0	5
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	4	6	0	1	8
Other Programs	0	1	1	0	1

Part D. LRW Program Policies in Programs with Full-time Faculty

Q5.2 - For Required LRW Courses¹³ that are offered as part of an LRW Program, if the same Required LRW Course is offered in more than one section and different full-time faculty teach some or all of those sections, please select the answer that best describes the extent to which each aspect of that course must be consistent across all sections taught by full-time, non-visiting, non-Teaching Fellow faculty.¹⁴

Syllabus

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
First-Year LRW Program	15.9%	21	15.9%	21	39.4%	52	27.3%	36	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	12.5%	5	5.0%	2	10.0%	4	47.5%	19	17.5%	7	0.0%	0	7.5%	3	0.0%	0	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	16.1%	5	6.5%	2	48.4%	15	12.9%	4	16.1%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	40.0%	4	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

¹³ “LRW Course” and “Required LRW Course” were defined terms for purposes of the 2016-2017 Survey. The definitions for the 2016-2017 Survey are provided on pages v through viii of this report.

¹⁴ The Survey instrument used extended descriptions for the listed LRW Programs. Those extended descriptions were as follows:

- First-Year LRW Program (coordinated separately from any upper-level courses or program);
- Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated separately from the first-year courses or program);
- Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated as a single, cohesive program); and
- Other LRW Program(s), with a text box to allow the responder to identify the program.

Q5.2 - Continued

Content of Class/Lectures

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N			
First-Year LRW Program	6.1%	8	10.6%	14	18.9%	25	62.1%	82	1.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	5.0%	2	5.0%	2	10.0%	4	55.0%	22	15.0%	6	0.0%	0	7.5%	3	2.5%	1	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	3.2%	1	0.0%	0	32.3%	10	51.6%	16	12.9%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	40.0%	4	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Textbooks

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N			
First-Year LRW Program	28.0%	37	4.5%	6	8.3%	11	55.3%	73	3.0%	4	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	10.0%	4	0.0%	0	5.0%	2	57.5%	23	15.0%	6	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	2.5%	1	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	25.8%	8	0.0%	0	12.9%	4	51.6%	16	9.7%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	60.0%	6	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Q5.2 - Continued

Citation Text

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
First-Year LRW Program	50.0%	66	4.5%	6	6.8%	9	37.1%	49	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.5%	2	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	27.5%	11	5.0%	2	2.5%	1	45.0%	18	2.5%	1	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	7.5%	3	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	48.4%	15	0.0%	0	6.5%	2	38.7%	12	6.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	60.0%	6	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Number of Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
First-Year LRW Program	47.0%	62	6.8%	9	23.5%	31	21.2%	28	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	15.0%	6	2.5%	1	7.5%	3	45.0%	18	17.5%	7	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	2.5%	1	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	51.6%	16	0.0%	0	19.4%	6	16.1%	5	12.9%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	5	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Q5.2 - Continued

Substance of Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
First-Year LRW Program	26.5%	35	8.3%	11	17.4%	23	43.2%	57	3.0%	4	0.8%	1	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	10.0%	4	7.5%	3	5.0%	2	50.0%	20	15.0%	6	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	2.5%	1	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	19.4%	6	9.7%	3	22.6%	7	35.5%	11	12.9%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	5	30.0%	3	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Deadlines for Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
First-Year LRW Program	40.9%	54	6.8%	9	21.2%	28	28.8%	38	1.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	10.0%	4	2.5%	1	5.0%	2	52.5%	21	15.0%	6	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	5.0%	2	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	41.9%	13	3.2%	1	22.6%	7	19.4%	6	12.9%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	60.0%	6	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Q5.2 - Continued

Length of Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N			
First-Year LRW Program	28.0%	37	10.6%	14	30.3%	40	29.5%	39	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	7.5%	3	2.5%	1	10.0%	4	50.0%	20	15.0%	6	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	5.0%	2	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	32.3%	10	6.5%	2	25.8%	8	22.6%	7	12.9%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	60.0%	6	20.0%	2	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Number of Minor Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N			
First-Year LRW Program	12.9%	17	9.8%	13	18.2%	24	56.1%	74	1.5%	2	0.8%	1	0.8%	1	0.0%	0	132
Upper-Level LRW Program	7.5%	3	2.5%	1	2.5%	1	60.0%	24	12.5%	5	0.0%	0	10.0%	4	5.0%	2	40
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	9.7%	3	3.2%	1	16.1%	5	61.3%	19	9.7%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	31
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	70.0%	7	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10.0%	1	10

Part E. LRW Required Curriculum¹⁵

Q6.2 - How many Required LRW Courses (including Blended LRW Courses) does your school have?

Note: Do not include any Elective LRW Course that satisfies a generic graduation requirement—for example, elective courses that satisfy a graduation requirement to take an additional LRW Course chosen from a list of approved LRW Courses. A later question will gather information about such courses.)

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
1.0	8.0	2.4	182

Number of Required LRW Courses	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
1	12.6%	23
2	52.2%	95
3	24.7%	45
4	7.1%	13
5	2.2%	4
6	0.5%	1
8	0.5%	1
Total Responses		182

¹⁵ “LRW Course,” “Required LRW Course,” “Elective LRW Course,” and “Blended LRW Course” were defined terms for purposes of the 2016-2017 Survey. The definitions for the 2016-2017 Survey are provided on pages v through viii of this report.

Q6.3 - How many credits do those Required LRW Courses represent?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
2.0	12.0	6.0	182

Number of Credits for Required LRW Courses	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
2	1.6%	3
3	2.7%	5
4	17.6%	32
5	17.0%	31
6	32.4%	59
7	11.5%	21
8	8.2%	15
9	3.3%	6
10	2.2%	4
11	1.1%	2
12	2.2%	4
Total Responses		182

Q6.4 - What are the Required LRW Courses (including Blended LRW Courses) at your school?

Note 1: Do not include any Elective LRW Course that satisfies a generic graduation requirement—for example, elective courses that satisfy a graduation requirement to take an additional LRW Course chosen from a list of approved LRW Courses. (A later question will gather information about such courses.)

Note 2: If a course spans more than one semester, please use one of the “other” answer options to identify the additional semester(s) of the course (e.g., “Course focusing on principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing - second semester”).¹⁶

Select all that apply.

Course	% of Total Responses	Total Responses per Course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	96.7%	176
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the first required course in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when the students take the course.)	89.6%	163
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the second required course (if any) in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when students take the course.)	22.0%	40
Blended LRW Course (substantive law topic)	1.6%	3
Introduction to legal research (if taught independently of any of the above)	19.2%	35
Advanced legal research (if taught independently of any of the above)	7.1%	13
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.) (if required as a separate course)	7.7%	14
Contract drafting (if required as a separate course)	6.0%	11
Other (identify course name)	22.5%	41
Total Responses		182

Q6.4 - Explanatory text for “Blended LRW Course”

Blended LRW Course Descriptions
Integrated with torts and criminal law
Students take one of: Torts, Civil Procedure, Criminal Law
Academic Support

¹⁶ The Survey instrument provided four “other” answer options, allowing responders to enter up to four other courses. Those entries have been aggregated in the report.

Q6.4 - Explanatory text for “Other” Required LRW Courses

Responders identified a wide variety of other Required LRW Courses. The following chart summarizes the responses.

Other Courses	
1L LRW second semester	Legal Drafting, required 2L course that combines litigation and contract drafting.
A second Advanced legal research course (each are 0,5 credits)	Legal Process
Advanced Writing	Legal Research & Writing (year-long) - research in both; objective writing in fall; persuasive writing in spring
course focusing mostly on persuasive writing	Legal Research II
course focusing on persuasive writing and oral advocacy - 2nd semester	Legal Skills and Values III
Course focusing primarily on persuasive legal analysis and writing - second semester	Legal Writing IV
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing - second semester	must take a practical writing course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing -- second course	must take a seminar course
Criminal Law drafting	Objective course starts in fall quarter, continues to winter quarter with focus on statutes
Discovery	Second semester first-year focusing principally on persuasive writing.
Foundations of Legal Analysis	seminars or courses designated as W
In the first year courses identified above, students also learn legal research and litigation drafting.	STEPPS - Skill Training for Ethical Practice and Professional Satisfaction
Interviewing, Counseling, and Negotiation	Students are required to complete two semesters of LRW. The first semester focuses on objective writing while the second semester introduces advocacy.
Introductory course focusing principally on fundamentals of effective legal writing	The 1L Lawyering and Legal Writing course is a two semester course that includes objective legal analysis and writing, persuasive writing, introduction to legal research, a litigation drafting assignment, lawyering skills including interviewing, client counseling, negotiation and oral and written advocacy.
Law Practice 1 is the fall semester course and is experiential, based on client simulations, in which the writing component is predictive and representative of law practice genres.	Transactional Practice
Law Practice 2 in the spring is the designated writing course with the major focus on advocacy documents.	Trial Advocacy
Lawyering - first semester of course that blends the above elements of research and writing with interactive simulation work.	Various specialty drafting courses
Lawyering - second semester of course that blends the above elements of research and writing with interactive simulation work.	Writing for Judges
Lawyering Skills I (teaching wide range of skills)	Writing for Law Practice
Lawyering Skills II (teaching wide range of skills)	Year-long course. First semester covers objective writing, and second semester covers persuasive writing
Legal Communications	

Q6.5 - For each Required LRW Course, please select the status(es) of the professor(s) who taught the course during the Current Academic Year.

Select all that apply. E.g., if three professors taught this course, and two professors were adjuncts and one professor was a tenured or tenure-track professor with traditional tenure, select “adjunct” and “tenured or tenure-track with traditional tenure.”¹⁷

	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	49	46	13	2
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	11	11	3	0
405(c) or 405(c)-track	70	57	9	0
Full-time, Short-term	47	42	6	0
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	32	31	5	1
Teaching Fellow	6	4	1	0
Part-time	14	13	2	0
Adjunct	45	43	18	1
Visitor	15	10	1	1
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Course	175	152	38	3

	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	10	3	5	5	6
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	6	2	0	0	4
405(c) or 405(c)-track	6	1	5	3	14
Full-time, Short-term	8	3	2	0	8
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	6	2	1	0	6
Teaching Fellow	0	0	0	0	1
Part-time	1	0	1	1	3
Adjunct	3	0	6	4	11
Visitor	0	0	0	1	2
I don't know.	2	0	0	1	1
Total Responses per Course	34	10	13	11	N/A

¹⁷ The course names/descriptions shown for this question and subsequent questions omit the parenthetical explanations included in the Survey instrument. The parenthetical explanations are provided in full in Q6.4. As reflected in Q6.4, in addition to specifically listed courses, the Survey instrument collected information about “other” elective courses. Given the wide variety of courses reported in that category, the details for such courses have been omitted for some of the following questions. If you are interested in information about a particular category of “other” course, contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available for that category.

Q6.6 - For each Required LRW Course, please select the answer that best describes the focus of the teaching and administrative load of the professor(s) who taught the course during the Current Academic Year.

Select all that apply. E.g., if three professors taught this course, and two professors were LRW Faculty, as that term is defined for this survey, and one professor is Non-LRW Faculty, as that term is defined for this survey, whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian, select “LRW Faculty” and “Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian.”

	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
LRW Faculty	170	145	34	2
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	9	2	3	1
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	11	6	0	1
Other Non-LRW Faculty	12	16	7	0
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	5	4	0	0
Other administrator/staff member	3	3	1	1
I don't know.	1	1	0	0
Total Responses per Course	174	149	37	3

	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
LRW Faculty	10	1	11	8	32
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	0	0	0	0	2
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	21	7	0	0	3
Other Non-LRW Faculty	0	0	2	2	5
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	8	3	0	0	0
Other administrator/staff member	2	0	0	0	3
I don't know.	0	0	1	1	0
Total Responses per Course	35	10	14	11	N/A

Q6.7#1 - For each Required LRW Course, please select the semester in which the course is typically taught.

Semester	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
1L First Full Semester	164	1	0	1
1L Second Full Semester	5	151	5	0
1L Third Full Semester	1	2	4	0
1L Fourth Full Semester	0	0	0	0
1L Summer Semester	0	0	0	0
2L First Full Semester	0	4	16	0
2L Second Full Semester	0	0	2	0
2L Third Full Semester	0	0	0	0
2L Fourth Full Semester	0	0	2	0
2L Summer Semester	0	0	0	0
3L First Full Semester	0	0	0	0
3L Second Full Semester	0	0	0	0
3L Third Full Semester	0	0	1	0
3L Fourth Full Semester	0	0	0	0
Varies	1	2	10	1
Other	4	2	0	1
I don't know.	1	1	0	0
Total Responses per Course	176	163	40	3

Semester	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
1L First Full Semester	26	0	0	0	7
1L Second Full Semester	3	2	0	0	12
1L Third Full Semester	0	0	3	2	0
1L Fourth Full Semester	0	0	0	0	1
1L Summer Semester	0	0	0	0	0
2L First Full Semester	1	2	3	0	3
2L Second Full Semester	0	1	3	2	1
2L Third Full Semester	0	0	0	0	0
2L Fourth Full Semester	0	0	0	0	0
2L Summer Semester	0	0	0	0	0
3L First Full Semester	0	0	0	0	2
3L Second Full Semester	0	0	0	0	0
3L Third Full Semester	0	0	0	0	0
3L Fourth Full Semester	0	0	0	0	0
Varies	0	8	5	6	8
Other	5	0	0	1	7
I don't know.	0	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Course	35	13	14	11	41

Q6.7#2 - For each Required LRW Course, which LRW Program (if any) is this course part of?

Course	First-Year LRW Program		Upper-Level LRW Program		Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program		Other		None: offered outside of a coordinated curriculum		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	90.9%	160	0.0%	0	8.5%	15	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	1	176
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	89.0%	145	1.8%	3	8.6%	14	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.6%	1	163
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	15.0%	6	52.5%	21	30.0%	12	0.0%	0	2.5%	1	0.0%	0	40
Blended LRW Course	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3
Introduction to legal research	68.6%	24	0.0%	0	8.6%	3	17.1%	6	5.7%	2	0.0%	0	35
Advanced legal research	7.7%	1	15.4%	2	7.7%	1	23.1%	3	46.2%	6	0.0%	0	13
Litigation or pretrial drafting	0.0%	0	71.4%	10	28.6%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14
Contract drafting	0.0%	0	63.6%	7	27.3%	3	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11
Other (aggregate)	--	23	--	12	--	3	--	1	--	1	--	1	N/A

Q6.7#3 - For each Required LRW Course, does the course fulfill ABA Standard 303(a)(2) for upper-level writing experience?

Question	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	4.0%	7	91.5%	161	4.5%	8	176
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	6.1%	10	87.1%	142	6.7%	11	163
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	62.5%	25	32.5%	13	5.0%	2	40
Blended LRW Course	0.0%	0	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	3
Introduction to legal research	5.7%	2	88.6%	31	5.7%	2	35
Advanced legal research	0.0%	0	92.3%	12	7.7%	1	13
Litigation or pretrial drafting	50.0%	7	50.0%	7	0.0%	0	14
Contract drafting	54.5%	6	45.5%	5	0.0%	0	11
Other (aggregate)	--	11	--	28	--	2	N/A

Q6.8-6.9 - For each Required LRW Course, please provide the following information: (1) typical number of credits; (2) average number of in-class hours per week; and (3) average number of students in each section of the course.

Note 1: If you are unable to answer the question (or any part of it), you may leave the appropriate text box(es) blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. If the answer is 0, please enter 0 so that the system will include that answer in the results.

As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to these questions. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. For those questions, the parenthetical number indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, in the first table below, if 0s are included, the minimum typical number of credits is 0.0, the mean typical number of credits is 2.6, and there were 174 responses to that question for the course. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of typical number of credits is 1.0, the mean typical number of credits is 2.6, and there were 173 responses to that question for the course.

Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	5.0	2.6 (2.6)	174 (173)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (0.3)	4.0	2.6 (2.6)	171 (170)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (9.0)	55.0	21.8 (22.0)	174 (172)

Q6.8-6.9 - Continued

Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	5.0	2.4 (2.5)	161 (160)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.4 (2.5)	158 (157)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (9.0)	47.0	21.3 (21.6)	161 (159)

Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	4.0	2.3	40
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	4.0	2.2	40
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (10.0)	40.0	18.3 (18.8)	40 (39)

Blended LRW Course

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	3.0	2.3	3
Average number of in-class hours per week	2.0	3.0	2.5	2
Average number of students in each section of the course	21.0	30.0	25.3	3

Introduction to legal research

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	5.0	1.3 (1.4)	32 (29)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.3 (1.4)	31 (30)
Average number of students in each section of the course	11.0	65.0	27.9	32

Q6.8-6.9 - Continued

Advanced legal research

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.5	2.0	1.3	11
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	2.0	1.3 (1.4)	11 (10)
Average number of students in each section of the course	10.0	34.0	18.2	11

Litigation or pretrial drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	4.0	2.1	14
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	4.0	2.2	14
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (8.0)	38.0	16.8 (18.1)	14 (13)

Contract drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	4.0	2.1	11
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	4.0	2.2	11
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (10.0)	38.0	17.2 (19.1)	10 (9)

Q6.10 - For each Required LRW Course, please indicate whether the course is graded.

Course	Graded, counts toward GPA	Graded, not counted toward GPA	Pass/Fail	Enhanced Pass/Fail (e.g., “high pass/pass/ fail” and similar options)	Varies	Other	I don't know.	Total Responses per Course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	164	0	3	8	0	0	0	175
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	152	0	2	5	0	0	1	160
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Blended LRW Course	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Introduction to legal research	28	0	3	1	1	0	0	33
Advanced legal research	9	0	1	0	1	0	0	11
Litigation or pretrial drafting	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	14
Contract drafting	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Other (aggregate)	33	0	3	4	0	0	0	N/A

Q6.11 - For each Required LRW Course, is the course is graded anonymously?

Question	Yes, all assignments	Yes, most assignments	Only the final Major Assignment	Varies	No	Other	I don't know	N/A	Total Responses per Course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	22	38	28	33	50	1	1	1	174
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	18	40	25	30	44	1	2	1	161
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	3	8	4	6	18	0	0	0	39
Blended LRW Course	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Introduction to legal research	4	3	3	3	12	0	8	1	34
Advanced legal research	1	1	0	1	2	0	6	1	12
Litigation or pretrial drafting	2	4	1	4	1	0	1	1	14
Contract drafting	2	2	0	6	0	0	1	0	11
Other (aggregate)	5	4	6	8	11	1	2	3	N/A

Q6.12 - For each Required LRW Course, please select the grade normalization policy applicable to the course.

Select all that apply.

Grade Normalization Policy	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	22	22	12	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	50	37	4	1
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses	32	33	8	2
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	6	7	2	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	21	19	1	1
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	16	13	0	0
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	13	11	2	0
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	20	16	4	0
Other	9	9	3	0
None	19	17	5	0
I don't know.	1	2	2	0
Total Responses per Course	175	156	40	3

Q6.12 - Continued

Grade Normalization Policy	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	4	0	2	2
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	6	1	0	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses	4	1	5	2
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	1	0	1	1
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	6	0	0	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	0	0	0	0
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	0	0	2	2
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	0	0	3	3
Other	1	1	0	1
None	11	2	0	0
I don't know.	2	7	2	2
Total Responses per Course	32	12	14	11

Q6.13 - You previously indicated that the Required LRW Courses for first-year students do not include a separate introduction to legal research course. Which of the following courses provide legal research instruction during the first-year?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	88.2%	135
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the first required course in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when the students take the course.)	78.4%	120
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the second required course (if any) in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when students take the course.)	7.8%	12
Blended LRW Course (Please identify the substantive law topic.)	2.6%	4
Other (specify):	9.2%	14
None	0.0%	0
Total Responses		153

Q6.13 - Explanatory text for “Blended LRW Courses” that provide legal research instruction during the first-year

Blended LRW Course Descriptions for Courses Providing First-Year Legal Research Instruction
Torts and criminal law
LRW
Students take one of: Torts, Civ Pro, Crim
Varies

Q6.13 - Explanatory text for “Other” courses that provide legal research instruction during the first year.

The explanatory text for the “other” answer option indicated that most of the responders selecting “other” integrate legal research with required first-year legal writing courses. A small number of responders have an elective legal research course. Finally, three responders indicated that they *do* have a required first-year stand-alone legal research course. (This question was displayed to these responders because they indicated that the typical semester for the course varies; thus, the survey system did not recognize the course as a first-year course.)

Q6.14 - Regardless of whether legal research instruction is taught separately or integrated with another first-year course, who provides the legal research instruction in first-year courses?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
LRW Faculty	68.1%	124
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	51.6%	94
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	17.0%	31
Teaching Assistant	7.1%	13
Other (specify):	11.0%	20
Total Responses		182

Q6.14 - Explanatory text for “Other”

Others Providing First-Year Legal Research Instruction
Both library faculty and LRW faculty
CALR Representatives (9 responses exclusively identifying vendor representatives)
Director of Law Library (Clinical faculty member) and law librarians
Law Librarians (2 responses exclusively identifying librarians)
Lexis and Westlaw representatives do some of it. Our librarians offer their own certificate program and some LRW professors require their students to participate.
Librarians, CALR representatives
LRW faculty with assistance from librarians and vendor representatives
Non-LRW Faculty who teach doctrinal courses
Occasionally, Westlaw/Lexis/Bloomberg reps -- this varies by professor
Other Non-LRW Faculty
The difficulty with this question is that we do not distinguish “LRW faculty” from “non-LRW faculty”

Part F. LRW Elective Curriculum¹⁸

Q7.2 - During the Current Academic Year and the past two Academic Years, has your school offered any Elective LRW Courses?

Note: Per ABA Standard 509, your school’s website should identify the current curricular offerings, limited to courses offered during the Current Academic Year and the past two Academic Years.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Yes	81.3%	148
No	12.6%	23
I don't know.	6.0%	11
Total Responses		182

¹⁸ “LRW Course” and “Elective LRW Course” were defined terms for purposes of the 2016-2017 Survey. The definitions for the 2016-2017 Survey are provided on pages v through viii of this report.

Q7.3 - Which Elective LRW Courses has your school offered during the Current Academic Year and the past two Academic Years?

Note: If your school offers more than one course that falls within a specific category below (e.g., two elective appellate advocacy courses), select “other” for each additional course in that category.¹⁹

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Advanced advocacy (focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	27.7%	41
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both), other than any required course in persuasive writing	72.3%	107
Contract drafting (general)	54.1%	80
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	23.0%	34
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	50.7%	75
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	16.9%	25
Judicial opinion writing	22.3%	33
Legislation	21.6%	32
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	67.6%	100
Other (identify course name)	59.2%	87
Other transactional drafting (please explain)	14.9%	22
Scholarly writing	36.5%	54
Wills/estate planning drafting	25.0%	37
Total Responses		148

¹⁹ The Survey instrument provided four “other” answer options, allowing responders to enter up to four other courses. Those entries have been aggregated in the report.

Q7.3 - Explanatory text for “Other transactional drafting” Elective LRW Courses

Responders identified a wide variety of other transactional drafting courses. The following chart summarizes the information provided.

Other Transactional Drafting Courses	
Business Planning	Sales
Contracts	Specialized contract drafting (e.g., structured finance)
Drafting Licensing Agreements; Researching Copyright Law	The School offers a number of experiential courses with significant writing requirements
Drafting survey course (Online version)	Transaction LW is one of our 2L required options.
IP Drafting (3 responses)	Transaction survey course
Miscellaneous drafting assignments -Intensive Legal Writing & Drafting	Transactional Drafting (2 responses)
Practical Business Transactions Course	Wide range of upper level writing courses are offered
Real estate (6 responses)	

Q7.3 - Explanatory text for “Other” Elective LRW Courses

Responders identified a wide variety of other Elective LRW Courses. The following chart summarizes the information provided.

Other Courses	
Advanced Legal Research (13 responses with this specific title, and many other comparable variations, some of which are limited to specific jurisdictions (e.g. California) or substantive areas of law (e.g. tax))	International Business Transactions
Advanced Legal Writing (7 responses with this specific title)	Law & Literature
Advanced Legal Writing Bar Exam	Law, Language and Leadership
Advanced Legal Writing: Craft and Style	Legal Argument & Appellate Practice
Advanced Legal Writing: Insurance Coverage	Legal Journalism (2 responses with this title)
Advanced Legal Writing: Natural Resources	Legal Letters
Advanced Persuasion and Rhetoric	Legal Writing for Moot Court or International Moot Court
Advanced Writer's Group	Legal Writing for the Government Client
Brandeis Practicum - Ideas to Action	LRW for International L.L.M. Students
Briefs That Changed the World	Memo & Brief Writing
Business Collections	Patent Licensing
Business Organizations Drafting	Patents/Trademark Drafting
Business Planning Drafting	Persuasion
Civil Litigation Drafting	Persuasive Writing
Criminal Law Drafting (4 responses with this or a comparable title)	Practice-Ready writing
Depositions	Preparation for Clerkships
Directed Practicum: reentry community support (documents for pro se litigants)	Professional Communication
Discovery	Professional writing workshop
Dispute Resolution/Mediation/Negotiation	Public Policy Drafting
Drafting: Litigation Focus (separate from pretrial litigation already identified)	Real Estate Drafting (2 responses with this title)
Elder Law Planning	Real Property Planning
Employee Benefits Drafting	Spanish for Lawyers
Employment and Labor Drafting	Statutory Interpretation
Entertainment Law Planning	Style and Composition in Legal Writing
Environmental Litigation Drafting	Supreme Court litigation
Federal Appellate Project	Writing Colloquium
Federal Criminal Law Planning	Writing for Practice
Federal Tax Research and Writing	Writing for the Court
Immigration Appellate Clinic	Writing in arbitration
Intensive Legal Writing Workshop	

Q7.4 - Are any of the courses listed below online courses?²⁰

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
Advanced advocacy	4.9%	2	95.1%	39	0.0%	0	41
Appellate advocacy	0.0%	0	100.0%	107	0.0%	0	107
Contract drafting	3.8%	3	95.0%	76	1.3%	1	80
Corporate document drafting	0.0%	0	97.1%	33	2.9%	1	34
Drafting survey course	5.3%	4	93.3%	70	1.3%	1	75
Family law drafting	0.0%	0	100.0%	25	0.0%	0	25
Judicial opinion writing	3.0%	1	97.0%	32	0.0%	0	33
Legislation	0.0%	0	100.0%	32	0.0%	0	32
Litigation or pretrial drafting	1.0%	1	96.0%	96	3.0%	3	100
Other (aggregated)	5.7%	5	94.3%	82	0.0%	0	87
Other transactional drafting	4.5%	1	95.5%	21	0.0%	0	22
Scholarly writing	0.0%	0	98.1%	53	1.9%	1	54
Wills/estate planning drafting	0.0%	0	100.0%	37	0.0%	0	37

²⁰ The course names shown for this question and subsequent questions omit the parenthetical explanations included in the Survey instrument. The parenthetical explanations are provided in full in Q7.3. As reflected in Q7.4, in addition to specifically listed courses, the Survey instrument collected information about “other” elective courses. Given the wide variety of courses reported in that category, the details are not reported here. If you are interested in information about a particular type of course, contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available for that type of course.

Q7.5 - For each Elective LRW Course, please provide the following information: (1) typical number of credits; (2) average number of in-class hours per week; and (3) average number of students in each section of the course.

Note 1: For online courses, if any, “in-class hours” include interactions that are similar to the classroom component of a traditional course.

Note 2: If you are unable to answer the question (or any part of it), you may leave the appropriate text box(es) blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. If the answer is 0, please enter 0 so that the system will include that answer in the results.

As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to these questions. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. For those questions, the parenthetical number indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, in the second table below, if 0s are included, the minimum typical number of credits is 0.0, the mean typical number of credits is 2.3, and there were 91 responses to that question for the course. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of typical number of credits is 1.0, the mean typical number of credits is 2.4, and there were 90 responses to that question for the course.

Advanced advocacy

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	2.0	3.0	2.4	31
Average number of in-class hours per week	2.0	3.0	2.3	29
Average number of students in each section of the course	8.0	24.0	15.0	28

Appellate advocacy

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.3 (2.4)	91 (90)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	2.2 (2.2)	82 (80)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (4.0)	42.0	15.2 (16.4)	80 (74)

Contract drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	4.0	2.2 (2.3)	67 (64)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.7)	15.0	2.3 (2.5)	65 (61)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (10)	58.0	15.2 (17.2)	58 (51)

Q7.5 - Continued

Corporate document drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	7.0	2.6 (2.7)	24 (21)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (2.0)	6.0	2.4 (2.6)	23 (21)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (6.0)	24.0	12.8 (14.8)	22 (19)

Drafting survey course

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	2.3 (2.4)	61 (59)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.7)	3.0	2.2 (2.4)	59 (56)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	30.0	13.9 (15.5)	58 (52)

Family law drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	7.0	2.5 (2.6)	18 (17)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	6.0	2.3 (2.5)	18 (17)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	20.0	11.1 (13.5)	17 (14)

Judicial opinion writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	4.0	2.2 (2.4)	29 (27)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (2.0)	4.0	2.1 (2.3)	28 (26)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (6.0)	20.0	11.9 (12.9)	26 (24)

Q7.5 - Continued

Legislation

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	2.0	7.0	2.7	26
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (2.0)	20.0	3.2 (3.4)	22 (21)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (7.0)	30.0	14.2 (16.8)	19 (16)

Litigation or Pretrial Drafting Courses

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	4.0	2.5 (2.5)	84 (83)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.7)	4.0	2.4 (2.4)	77 (75)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (7.0)	40.0	15.4 (16.0)	75 (72)

Other transactional drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	2.0	4.0	2.4	20
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.2 (2.3)	18 (17)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (9.0)	30.0	14.6 (17.5)	18 (15)

Scholarly writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	2.1 (2.2)	41 (39)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	12.0	2.2 (2.4)	31 (29)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (4.0)	30.0	12.6 (14.2)	28 (25)

Q7.5 - Continued

Wills/estate planning drafting

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	3.0	2.4	28
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	4.0	2.4	26
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	24.0	11.7 (14.2)	23 (19)

Q7.6 - For each Elective LRW Course, please select the status(es) of the professor(s) who taught the course during the Current Academic Year.

Select all that apply. E.g., if three professors taught this course, and two professors were adjuncts and one professor was a tenured or tenure-track professor with traditional tenure, select “adjunct” and “tenured or tenure-track with traditional tenure.”

Status	Advanced advocacy	Appellate advocacy	Contract drafting	Corporate document drafting	Drafting survey course	Family law drafting
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	9	26	19	12	16	7
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	3	3	6	3	7	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track	4	18	11	3	12	3
Full-time, Short-term	4	11	7	0	10	0
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	4	8	4	1	4	0
Visitor	0	2	2	1	4	1
Teaching Fellow	0	1	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	2	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	13	49	33	15	37	15
Others of Unknown Status	0	1	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	4	6	7	2	5	1
Total Responses per Course	37	99	75	29	72	22

Q7.6 - Continued

Status	Judicial opinion writing	Legislation	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Scholarly writing	Wills/estate planning drafting	Other transactional drafting	Other (aggregated)
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	7	12	23	35	17	3	21
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	3	1	5	4	1	0	3
405(c) or 405(c)-track	4	2	14	11	2	6	14
Full-time, Short-term	8	2	12	2	0	2	8
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	3	1	7	3	2	2	8
Visitor	0	0	2	1	0	0	1
Teaching Fellow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Adjunct	8	10	53	10	14	9	38
Others of Unknown Status	0	0	1	0	1	0	3
I don't know.	1	4	9	1	4	0	3
Total Responses per Course	30	31	94	48	35	19	N/A

Q7.7 - For each Elective LRW Course, please select the answer that best describes the focus of the teaching and administrative load of the professor(s) who taught the course during the Current Academic Year.

Select all that apply. E.g., if three professors taught this course, and two professors were LRW Faculty, as that term is defined for this survey, and one professor is Non-LRW Faculty, as that term is defined for this survey, whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian, select “LRW Faculty” and “Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian.”

Status	Advanced advocacy	Appellate advocacy	Contract drafting	Corporate document drafting	Drafting survey course	Family law drafting
I don't know.	6	10	9	4	14	2
LRW Faculty	16	34	22	3	33	2
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	2	9	11	6	6	5
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	1	0	1	2	0
Other Non-LRW Faculty	7	31	28	12	17	8
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other administrator/staff member	1	1	1	0	1	0
Others - Unknown	5	20	5	4	6	4
Total Responses per Course	34	94	73	27	70	19

Q7.7 - Continued

Status	Judicial opinion writing	Legislation	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Scholarly writing	Wills/estate planning drafting	Other transactional drafting	Other (aggregated)
LRW Faculty	17	4	37	18	6	7	43
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	1	5	10	10	4	2	4
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Other Non-LRW Faculty	6	10	28	21	18	11	19
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Other administrator/staff member	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Others - Unknown	5	4	12	6	4	2	5
I don't know.	1	6	16	7	4	2	4
Total Responses per Course	29	30	91	45	33	20	N/A

Q7.8#1 - Is demand for this course usually greater than the seats available?

Type of Course	Yes		No		Varies		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
Advanced advocacy	26%	10	21%	8	21%	8	32%	12	38
Appellate advocacy	26%	26	32%	32	20%	20	23%	23	101
Contract drafting	40%	31	18%	14	14%	11	27%	21	77
Corporate document drafting	17%	5	20%	6	13%	4	50%	15	30
Drafting survey course	31%	22	19%	14	26%	19	24%	17	72
Family law drafting	8%	2	33%	8	17%	4	42%	10	24
Judicial opinion writing	32%	10	23%	7	19%	6	26%	8	31
Legislation	13%	4	30%	9	10%	3	47%	14	30
Litigation or pretrial drafting	34%	32	17%	16	22%	20	27%	25	93
Other (aggregated)	--	24	--	40	--	12	--	10	N/A
Other transactional drafting	25%	5	35%	7	15%	3	25%	5	20
Scholarly writing	14%	7	38%	19	14%	7	34%	17	50
Wills/estate planning drafting	9%	3	31%	11	11%	4	49%	17	35

Q7.8#2 - How frequently is this course typically offered?

Type of Course	Every other academic year		Once per academic year		More than once per academic year		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	20.6%	7	35.3%	12	17.6%	6	5.9%	2	20.6%	7	34
Appellate advocacy	8.5%	8	53.2%	50	26.6%	25	2.1%	2	9.6%	9	94
Contract drafting	4.3%	3	36.2%	25	42.0%	29	1.4%	1	15.9%	11	69
Corporate document drafting	0.0%	0	29.2%	7	29.2%	7	0.0%	0	41.7%	10	24
Drafting survey course	6.3%	4	48.4%	31	25.0%	16	1.6%	1	18.8%	12	64
Family law drafting	0.0%	0	52.4%	11	19.0%	4	0.0%	0	28.6%	6	21
Judicial opinion writing	14.3%	4	57.1%	16	0.0%	0	10.7%	3	17.9%	5	28
Legislation	14.3%	4	50.0%	14	10.7%	3	0.0%	0	25.0%	7	28
Litigation or pretrial drafting	4.5%	4	47.7%	42	35.2%	31	1.1%	1	11.4%	10	88
Other (aggregated)	--	11	--	49	--	28	--	3	--	7	NA
Other transactional drafting	11.8%	2	58.8%	10	17.6%	3	0.0%	0	11.8%	2	17
Scholarly writing	4.3%	2	32.6%	15	43.5%	20	0.0%	0	19.6%	9	46
Wills/estate planning drafting	3.2%	1	58.1%	18	3.2%	1	9.7%	3	25.8%	8	31

Q7.9#1 - Which LRW Program (if any) is this course part of?

Type of Course	First-Year LRW Program		Upper-Level LRW Program		Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program		Other		None: offered outside of a coordinated curriculum		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	2.6%	1	28.9%	11	5.3%	2	2.6%	1	55.3%	21	5.3%	2	38
Appellate advocacy	1.0%	1	26.2%	27	1.0%	1	7.8%	8	62.1%	64	1.9%	2	103
Contract drafting	0.0%	0	26.7%	20	4.0%	3	9.3%	7	57.3%	43	2.7%	2	75
Corporate document drafting	0.0%	0	19.4%	6	0.0%	0	3.2%	1	77.4%	24	0.0%	0	31
Drafting survey course	1.4%	1	23.6%	17	4.2%	3	5.6%	4	62.5%	45	2.8%	2	72
Family law drafting	0.0%	0	30.4%	7	4.3%	1	13.0%	3	47.8%	11	4.3%	1	23
Judicial opinion writing	0.0%	0	31.3%	10	6.3%	2	12.5%	4	50.0%	16	0.0%	0	32
Legislation	0.0%	0	22.6%	7	6.5%	2	6.5%	2	61.3%	19	3.2%	1	31
Litigation or pretrial drafting	1.1%	1	22.1%	21	5.3%	5	5.3%	5	63.2%	60	3.2%	3	95
Other (aggregated)	--	0	--	28	--	7	--	3	--	46	--	2	NA
Other transactional drafting	0.0%	0	23.8%	5	4.8%	1	0.0%	0	71.4%	15	0.0%	0	21
Scholarly writing	0.0%	0	16.0%	8	8.0%	4	8.0%	4	62.0%	31	6.0%	3	50
Wills/estate planning drafting	0.0%	0	17.6%	6	2.9%	1	8.8%	3	70.6%	24	0.0%	0	34

Q7.9#2 - Does the course fulfill ABA Standard 303(a)(2) for upper-level writing experience?

Type of Course	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
Advanced advocacy	45.7%	16	20.0%	7	34.3%	12	35
Appellate advocacy	53.3%	49	20.7%	19	26.1%	24	92
Contract drafting	38.2%	26	25.0%	17	36.8%	25	68
Corporate document drafting	29.6%	8	33.3%	9	37.0%	10	27
Drafting survey course	32.3%	21	36.9%	24	30.8%	20	65
Family law drafting	30.4%	7	34.8%	8	34.8%	8	23
Judicial opinion writing	48.1%	13	14.8%	4	37.0%	10	27
Legislation	26.7%	8	33.3%	10	40.0%	12	30
Litigation or pretrial drafting	45.3%	39	22.1%	19	32.6%	28	86
Other (aggregated)	--	34	--	26	--	18	N/A
Other transactional drafting	38.9%	7	27.8%	5	33.3%	6	18
Scholarly writing	60.9%	28	15.2%	7	23.9%	11	46
Wills/estate planning drafting	36.4%	12	24.2%	8	39.4%	13	33

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
 Part F. LRW Elective Curriculum

Q7.10 - Is the course is graded?

Type of Course	Graded, counts toward GPA		Graded, not counted toward GPA		Pass/Fail		Enhanced Pass/Fail (e.g., "high pass/pass/fail")		Varies		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	94.4%	34	2.8%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.8%	1	36
Appellate advocacy	81.4%	83	1.0%	1	7.8%	8	1.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.8%	9	102
Contract drafting	89.6%	69	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.4%	8	77
Corporate document drafting	90.6%	29	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.3%	2	32
Drafting survey course	86.1%	62	0.0%	0	4.2%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.7%	7	72
Family law drafting	91.7%	22	0.0%	0	4.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.2%	1	24
Judicial opinion writing	90.6%	29	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.4%	3	32
Legislation	90.6%	29	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.4%	3	32
Litigation or pretrial drafting	85.3%	81	1.1%	1	2.1%	2	1.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.5%	10	95
Other (aggregated)	--	68	--	2	--	7	--	2	--	1	--	0	--	7	N/A
Other transactional drafting	95.2%	20	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.8%	1	21
Scholarly writing	70.6%	36	0.0%	0	7.8%	4	5.9%	3	2.0%	1	0.0%	0	13.7%	7	51
Wills/estate planning drafting	86.5%	32	0.0%	0	2.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10.8%	4	37

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
 Part F. LRW Elective Curriculum

Q7.11 - For each Elective LRW Course, is the course is graded anonymously?

	Yes, all assignments		Yes, most assignments		Only the final major Assignment		Varies		No		Other		I don't know		N/A		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	5.6%	2	2.8%	1	2.8%	1	16.7%	6	38.9%	14	0.0%	0	33.3%	12	0.0%	0	36
Appellate advocacy	4.9%	5	4.9%	5	3.9%	4	7.8%	8	32.4%	33	0.0%	0	45.1%	46	1.0%	1	102
Contract drafting	2.6%	2	9.1%	7	1.3%	1	13.0%	10	22.1%	17	0.0%	0	50.6%	39	1.3%	1	77
Corporate document drafting	3.2%	1	6.5%	2	0.0%	0	12.9%	4	22.6%	7	0.0%	0	54.8%	17	0.0%	0	31
Drafting survey course	2.7%	2	4.1%	3	1.4%	1	19.2%	14	24.7%	18	0.0%	0	46.6%	34	1.4%	1	73
Family law drafting	4.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	16.7%	4	20.8%	5	0.0%	0	58.3%	14	0.0%	0	24
Judicial opinion writing	0.0%	0	9.4%	3	0.0%	0	15.6%	5	40.6%	13	0.0%	0	34.4%	11	0.0%	0	32
Legislation	6.3%	2	3.1%	1	3.1%	1	21.9%	7	15.6%	5	0.0%	0	50.0%	16	0.0%	0	32
Litigation or pretrial drafting	4.2%	4	7.3%	7	1.0%	1	12.5%	12	28.1%	27	0.0%	0	45.8%	44	1.0%	1	96
Other (aggregated)	--	6	--	3	--	1	--	9	--	27	--	0	--	37	--	4	N/A
Other transactional drafting	4.8%	1	14.3%	3	0.0%	0	9.5%	2	28.6%	6	0.0%	0	42.9%	9	0.0%	0	21
Scholarly writing	2.0%	1	4.1%	2	2.0%	1	8.2%	4	40.8%	20	0.0%	0	42.9%	21	0.0%	0	49
Wills/estate planning drafting	8.1%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.1%	3	21.6%	8	0.0%	0	62.2%	23	0.0%	0	37

Q7.12 - For each Elective LRW Course, please select the grade normalization policy applicable to the course.

Select all that apply.

	Advanced advocacy	Appellate advocacy	Contract drafting	Corporate document drafting	Drafting survey course	Family law drafting
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	12	34	33	11	21	8
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	0	1	0	0	0	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses)	0	3	2	1	2	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	0	6	6	1	7	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	0	2	1	0	2	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	0	0	0	0	0	0
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	4	6	6	3	8	4
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	5	13	7	4	8	1
Other	1	9	4	1	7	2
None	11	18	12	7	14	6
I don't know.	5	15	10	3	10	4
Total Responses per Course	36	101	75	30	72	23

Q 7.12 - Continued

	Judicial opinion writing	Legislation	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Scholarly writing	Wills/estate planning drafting	Other (identify course name)	Other transactional drafting
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	7	14	35	13	13	28	11
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	2	2	5	4	2	6	1
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	2	2	8	2	6	9	1
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	3	3	10	5	4	4	1
Other	4	3	10	7	2	14	4
None	8	4	16	12	6	21	2
I don't know.	4	7	15	9	6	12	3
Total Responses per Course	31	32	93	48	35	N/A	21

Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

Q8.2 - For each status listed below, please indicate whether your school employs LRW Faculty with that status.

Status	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	28.6%	52	71.4%	130	0.0%	0	182
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	8.2%	15	90.7%	165	1.1%	2	182
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	44.5%	81	54.4%	99	1.1%	2	182
Full-time, Short-term	39.0%	71	58.8%	107	2.2%	4	182
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	20.9%	38	76.4%	139	2.7%	5	182

Q8.3 - For each status listed below, please indicate whether your school employs faculty with that status who teach one or more LRW Courses.

Status	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Teaching Fellow	5.5%	10	94.0%	171	0.5%	1	182
Part-time	15.9%	29	83.0%	151	1.1%	2	182
Adjunct	54.9%	100	44.0%	80	1.1%	2	182

Q8.4 - During the Current Academic Year, has your school employed one or more Visitors to teach one or more LRW Courses?

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Yes	23.6%	43
No	76.4%	139
I don't know.	0.0%	0
Total Responses		182

Q8.5 - For each status listed below, are any of the LRW Faculty with that status LRW Director(s)?

Question	None of the LRW Faculty with this status are LRW Director(s).		All of the LRW Faculty with this status are LRW Director(s).		One or more (but not all) of the LRW Faculty with this status are LRW Director(s).		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	13.5%	5	29.7%	11	56.8%	21	37
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	33.3%	4	16.7%	2	50.0%	6	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	28.1%	16	12.3%	7	59.6%	34	57
Full-time, Short-term	56.3%	27	2.1%	1	41.7%	20	48
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	27.6%	8	27.6%	8	44.8%	13	29

Part H. Directors

Q4.2 asked responders to identify which LRW Programs are included in the responding school's LRW curriculum. Q4.3 asked responders to indicate whether the LRW Programs identified in Q4.2 had one or more LRW Director(s). As reflected in Part C, the responses to Q4.2 and Q4.3 indicate that 98 of 149 First-Year LRW Programs (66%) have one or more LRW Directors, 34 of 59 Upper-Level LRW Programs (58%) have one or more LRW Directors, and 27 of 37 Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Programs (73%) have one or more LRW Directors.

This part of the report, Part H, provides additional information about the LRW Directors in these programs. The questions reported in Part H repeated for each type of LRW Program at the school with an LRW Director, based on the responder's answers to Q4.2 and Q4.3. In the report, the question will be stated once followed by a unified table reflecting the information for each type of LRW Program or a separate table for each type of LRW Program. Given the wide variety of programs included in the "Other LRW Programs" category, as reflected in the Explanatory Text table for Q4.2, the reported responses are limited to the responses for First-Year LRW Programs, Upper-Level LRW Programs, and Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Programs. Finally, if an LRW Program had more than one LRW Director, the survey instrument requested information on *each* LRW Director. That information has been aggregated for this report.

The Survey also asked LRW Director-focused questions in the series of questions focused on hiring, promotion, retention, and tenure policies for full-time LRW Faculty. Those questions are included in Part J of this report (Q11.39 through Q11.53).

Q9.2 - Indicate the number of individuals who are designated as LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s).

Number of LRW Director(s) for the First-Year LRW Program

	%	Responses per Answer
1 LRW Director	88.8%	87
2 LRW Directors	10.2%	10
3 LRW Directors	1.0%	1
Total Responses		98

Number of LRW Director(s) for the Upper-Level LRW Program

	%	Responses per Answer
1 LRW Director	94.1%	32
2 LRW Directors	5.9%	2
Total Responses		34

Q9.2 - Continued

Number of LRW Director(s) for the Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	%	Responses per Answer
1 LRW Director	81.5%	22
2 LRW Directors	14.8%	4
3 LRW Directors	3.7%	1
Total Responses		27

Q9.4#1 - Please provide the position description for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s).

	Director, coordinator, or administrator	Co-director, co-coordinator, co-administrator	Associate/assistant director, associate/assistant coordinator, associated/assistant administrator
First-Year LRW Program	94	12	4
Upper-Level LRW Program	33	1	2
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	29	0	4

Q9.4#2 - What was the term of the position for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s)?

Question	1 year	2 years	3 or more years	Unlimited
First-Year LRW Program	6	4	17	83
Upper-Level LRW Program	0	1	1	34
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level Program	1	0	5	27

Q9.4#3 - For the specified LRW Programs, were the LRW Director positions permanent or rotating?

Question	Permanent	Rotating
First-Year LRW Program	102	8
Upper-Level LRW Program	33	3
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	29	4

Q9.5#1 - How do the teaching responsibilities of the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) compare to those of other full-time teachers in the program?

	Same as other full-time teachers in the program	Less than other full-time teachers in the program	No teaching responsibilities	Other	N/A (e.g., no other full-time teachers in the program)	I don't know.
First-Year LRW Program	56	42	0	7	4	1
Upper-Level LRW Program	11	13	2	0	9	1
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	19	7	0	2	5	0

Q9.5#1 - Explanatory Text for “Other” Teaching Responsibility Comparisons

Responders who answered “other” to describe the teaching responsibilities for an LRW Director relative to other full-time teachers in the program were asked to explain. Responders provided detailed explanations. The following tables summarize those explanations.

First-Year LRW Programs

“Other” Explanatory Text – Teaching Responsibilities
The LRW Director’s teaching responsibilities are different (without characterizing the responsibilities as more or less); e.g., the LRW Director teaches different classes either in addition to or in lieu of teaching in the program and/or administrative responsibilities beyond the LRW Program. (6 responses)
More. The Director teaches two sections of legal writing in addition to curriculum development.

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Programs

“Other” Explanatory Text – Teaching Responsibilities
The LRW Director’s teaching responsibilities are different (without characterizing the responsibilities as more or less); e.g., the LRW Director teaches different classes in addition to teaching in the program and/or administrative responsibilities beyond the LRW Program. (2 responses)

Q9.5#2 - What is the status of the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s)?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	33	14	8
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	5	4	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	39	8	12
Full-time, Short-term	16	5	6
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	16	3	4
Visitor	0	1	1
Other	1	0	0
I don't know.	0	1	0

Q9.5#3 - Which of the following best describes the focus of the teaching and administrative load of the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s)?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
LRW Faculty	102	28	29
Non-LRW Faculty	7	7	2
Administrator/Staff Member	1	0	2
I don't know.	0	1	0

Q9.6 - How many years, including the Current Academic Year, has the LRW Director been in the LRW Director position for the specified LRW Program?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Program Type ²¹
First-Year LRW Program	1.0	34.0	9.2	110
Upper-Level LRW Program	1.0	29.0	7.7	36
Combined LRW Program	1.0	17.0	5.9	33

²¹ Since responders entered an answer for each LRW Director, the Total Responses per Program Type for Q9.6 also reflects the total number of LRW Directors for whom information was provided.

Q9.11#1 - Do LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) receive a salary increase based on their position as an LRW Director?

First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		No		No, but the LRW Director(s) have a different status than other LRW Faculty and receive a higher salary based on that status.		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	37.4%	34	36.3%	33	18.7%	17	7.7%	7	91
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	16.7%	1	50.0%	3	16.7%	1	16.7%	1	6
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		No, but the LRW Director(s) have a different status than other LRW Faculty and receive a higher salary based on that status.		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	24.2%	8	36.4%	12	21.2%	7	18.2%	6	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		No, but the LRW Director(s) have a different status than other LRW Faculty and receive a higher salary based on that status.		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	37.0%	10	51.9%	14	3.7%	1	7.4%	2	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3

Q9.11#2 - Do LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) receive a stipend for serving as an LRW Director?

First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	30.7%	27	64.8%	57	4.5%	4	88
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50.0%	2	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	2	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	32.3%	10	51.6%	16	16.1%	5	31
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	25.9%	7	66.7%	18	7.4%	2	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	66.7%	2	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	3

9.12#1 - What is the nature of the salary increase that LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) receive based on their position as an LRW Director?

First-Year LRW Program

	Fixed Amount		Percentage of Existing Salary		Varies		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	67.6%	23	11.8%	4	8.8%	3	11.8%	4	34
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Fixed Amount		Percentage of Existing Salary		Varies		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	50.0%	4	12.5%	1	12.5%	1	25.0%	2	8
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Fixed Amount		Percentage of Existing Salary		Varies		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	40.0%	4	10.0%	1	30.0%	3	20.0%	2	10
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1

9.12#2 - For LRW Director(s) who receive salary increases based on their position as an LRW Director, is the amount of the salary increase generally consistent across all LRW Director(s) in this position?

First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	48.3%	14	0.0%	0	51.7%	15	29
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	37.5%	3	0.0%	0	62.5%	5	8
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	33.3%	3	22.2%	2	44.4%	4	9
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1

9.12#3 For LRW Director(s) who receive salary increases based on their position as an LRW Director, if the amount is generally consistent, do you know the fixed amount or percentage?

First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide.		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	26.7%	8	13.3%	4	26.7%	8	33.3%	10	30
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide.		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	37.5%	3	12.5%	1	25.0%	2	25.0%	2	8
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide.		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	11.1%	1	22.2%	2	22.2%	2	44.4%	4	9
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1

Q9.13 - What is the amount of the salary increase that LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) receive based on their position as an LRW Director?

First-Year LRW Program

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	4500	40000	13196	7
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0	0	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0	0	0	0

The Survey Committee determined that responses to this question should not be reported unless there were at least 5 responses for a given category. For the Upper-Level LRW Program and the Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program, this threshold was not met.

Q9.14 - What is the percentage of the salary increase that LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) receive based on their position as an LRW Director?

The Survey Committee determined that responses to this question should not be reported unless there were at least 5 responses for a given category. This threshold was not met for any program.

Q9.15#1 - For LRW Director(s) who receive a stipend for serving as an LRW Director, is the amount of the stipend generally consistent across all LRW Director(s) in this position?

First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	52.0%	13	4.0%	1	44.0%	11	25
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	2

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	40.0%	4	10.0%	1	50.0%	5	10
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	42.9%	3	0.0%	0	57.1%	4	7
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	2

Q9.15#2 - For LRW Director(s) who receive a stipend for serving as an LRW Director, if the amount is generally consistent, do you know the amount of the stipend?

First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide.		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	42.3%	11	23.1%	6	0.0%	0	34.6%	9	26
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	2

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide.		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	20.0%	2	40.0%	4	0.0%	0	40.0%	4	10
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide.		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	57.1%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	42.9%	3	7
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	2

Q9.16 - What is the amount of the stipend that LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) receive for serving as an LRW Director?

First-Year LRW Program

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	5000	30000	12536	11
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0	0	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0	0	0	0

The Survey Committee determined that responses to this question should not be reported unless there were at least 5 responses for a given category. This threshold was not met for any program.

Q9.17#1 - How does the compensation for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) compare to the salary Non-Director LRW Faculty with similar status and years of service?

Note: For purposes of this question, “compensation” includes salary and any stipend the faculty member receives while serving as LRW Director.

First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	20.7%	19	44.6%	41	4.3%	4	9.8%	9	20.7%	19	92
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	20.0%	1	40.0%	2	0.0%	0	40.0%	2	0.0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	21.2%	7	42.4%	14	3.0%	1	12.1%	4	21.2%	7	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	33.3%	9	33.3%	9	0.0%	0	18.5%	5	14.8%	4	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3

Q9.17#2 - How does the compensation for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) compare to the salary Non-LRW Faculty with similar status and years of service?

Note: For purposes of this question, “compensation” includes salary and any stipend the faculty member receives while serving as LRW Director.

First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	35.9%	33	6.5%	6	22.8%	21	5.4%	5	29.3%	27	92
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	20.0%	1	60.0%	3	0.0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	24.2%	8	9.1%	3	21.2%	7	6.1%	2	39.4%	13	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	25.9%	7	7.4%	2	29.6%	8	0.0%	0	37.0%	10	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	66.7%	2	3

Q9.17#3 - How does the compensation for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s) compare to the salary Non-LRW Faculty with similar years of service but BETTER status?

Note: For purposes of this question, “compensation” includes salary and any stipend the faculty member receives while serving as LRW Director.

First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	8.7%	8	1.1%	1	47.8%	44	18.5%	17	23.9%	22	92
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	60.0%	3	40.0%	2	0.0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	12.1%	4	0.0%	0	42.4%	14	18.2%	6	27.3%	9	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	3.7%	1	0.0%	0	51.9%	14	18.5%	5	25.9%	7	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	3	3

Q9.18#1 - How do the personnel benefits (e.g., health insurance, retirement) for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Programs compare to the personnel benefits of Non-Director LRW Faculty with similar status and years of service?

First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	84.9%	79	3.2%	3	0.0%	0	6.5%	6	5.4%	5	93
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50.0%	3	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	33.3%	2	0.0%	0	6
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	81.8%	27	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.1%	2	12.1%	4	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	85.2%	23	3.7%	1	0.0%	0	11.1%	3	0.0%	0	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3

Q9.18#2 - How do the personnel benefits (e.g., health insurance, retirement) for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Programs compare to the personnel benefits of Non-LRW Faculty with similar status and years of service?

First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	84.9%	79	2.2%	2	0.0%	0	2.2%	2	10.8%	10	93
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	66.7%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	2	0.0%	0	6
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	84.8%	28	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3.0%	1	12.1%	4	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	81.5%	22	0.0%	0	11.1%	3	3.7%	1	3.7%	1	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3

Q9.18#3 - How do the personnel benefits (e.g., health insurance, retirement) for the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Programs compare to the personnel benefits of Non-LRW Faculty with similar years of service but BETTER status?

First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	71.0%	66	1.1%	1	4.3%	4	12.9%	12	10.8%	10	93
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	66.7%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	2	0.0%	0	6
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	4

Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	69.7%	23	0.0%	0	3.0%	1	15.2%	5	12.1%	4	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	2

Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	70.4%	19	0.0%	0	7.4%	2	14.8%	4	7.4%	2	27
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	3

Part I. Faculty Governance & Professional Development for Full-time Faculty

Q10.2 - Please select the option that best describes the voting rights for the following categories of LRW Faculty:

Question	Full voting rights		No voting rights		Vote on everything except matters related to tenure or promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions		Vote on everything except matters related to tenure or promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions AND matters related to tenure or promotion of any Non-LRW Faculty, regardless of status		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	98.0%	50	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	51
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	53.3%	8	0.0%	0	40.0%	6	6.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	15
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	7.5%	6	2.5%	2	66.3%	53	12.5%	10	11.3%	9	0.0%	0	80
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	50.0%	34	27.9%	19	11.8%	8	5.9%	4	4.4%	3	68
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	5.1%	2	46.2%	18	17.9%	7	20.5%	8	7.7%	3	2.6%	1	39

Q10.5 - You selected “Other” as the best description of the voting rights for LRW Faculty who have 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track positions. Please describe the voting rights for LRW Faculty with that status.

Other Voting Rights Descriptions – 405(c) or 405(c)-track
The Director can vote on everything except appointments and promotions for TT faculty; the other LRW faculty currently can vote on matters unrelated to personnel of any kind, but the Rules are very messy and in the process of being redone.
Full voting rights except on promotion of professors of higher status
Very complicated and depends on status of faculty member and issue. All LRW faculty vote on 403 faculty in hiring and promotion/retention at same or lower level. Do not vote on bylaws.
Vote on everything except matters related to hiring or tenure/promotion of faculty with traditional tenure/tenure-track positions
Voting rights are connected to where one is on the 405(c) track. Initial hire is by the Dean on the advice of the LRW Committee, without a faculty vote at the rank of Associate Professor of LRW. For the first three years, faculty are on year-to-year contracts with no vote at faculty meetings. In the third year, faculty are reviewed by the LRW committee and may be granted a three-year contract still at the rank of Associate Professor of LRW by vote of the full faculty. During the three-year contract, they may vote on all matters except tenure and promotion They may vote on candidates for initial hire to the tenure track. They may vote on promotion of LRW faculty junior to them, but not senior to themselves. In year six, faculty are reviewed by the Rank and Tenure committee, and they may be granted the rank of Professor of LRW with seven-year presumptively renewable contracts, again by vote of the full faculty. At this point, they may vote on all matters (including promotion of LRW faculty and hire of candidates onto the tenure track) except for matters relating to tenure.
They serve on committees and vote as members of those committees but do not vote at faculty meetings.
Vote on everything except 1) tenure/promotion of traditional tenure matters; 2) promotion decisions for some clinical professors (this depends on the length of contract that the clinical prof is up for AND the length of contract that the LRW prof currently has), and 3) an internal budget item that by its terms applies only to traditional tenure profs.
Vote regarding anything that is in relation to the program directed.
Vote on all except traditional promotion rights. So, if only an associate, cannot vote on promotions to full professor.

Q10.6 - You selected “Other” as the best description of the voting rights for LRW Faculty who have Full-time, Short-term positions. Please describe the voting rights for LRW Faculty with that status.

Other Voting Rights Descriptions – Full-time, Short-term
Faculty members on the Teaching Professor track have some voting rights; those with Lecturer status do not.
Voting rights on everything except tenure and promotion for all faculty and academic catalog changes
No right to vote on appointments, R&T, dean selection, election of faculty committees, votes of “no-confidence,” and matters affecting the legal research and writing curriculum.
Only the Director can vote except on matters related to tenure/promotion. Other LRW faculty members cannot vote.

Q10.7 - You selected “Other” as the best description of the voting rights for LRW Faculty who have Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions. Please describe the voting rights for LRW Faculty with that status.

Other Voting Rights Descriptions – Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Vote on everything except hiring, tenure, promotion of anyone, including LRW faculty.
All voting rights but for appointments and rank and tenure.
Vote on everything except matters relating to hiring, tenure, and promotion of regular-title series (tenure track) and library-title series (programmatic tenure of sorts).

Q10.8 - For LRW Faculty with each listed status, is committee service permitted or required?

Status	Permitted		Required		Expected		Not allowed		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	1.9%	1	94.2%	49	3.8%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	52
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	6.7%	1	80.0%	12	13.3%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	15
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2.5%	2	80.2%	65	13.6%	11	0.0%	0	3.7%	3	81
Full-time, Short-term	22.9%	16	45.7%	32	12.9%	9	7.1%	5	11.4%	8	70
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	20.0%	8	55.0%	22	12.5%	5	5.0%	2	7.5%	3	40

Q10.9#1 - What limitations, if any, are there on the committees on which the faculty member may serve?

Question	None		Any committee except those related to tenure/promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions		Any committee except those related to tenure/promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions AND matters related to tenure/promotion of any Non-LRW Faculty, regardless of status		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	98.1%	51	1.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	52
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	70.6%	12	17.6%	3	11.8%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	17
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	17.9%	14	52.6%	41	17.9%	14	7.7%	6	3.8%	3	78
Full-time, Short-term	5.3%	3	45.6%	26	24.6%	14	7.0%	4	17.5%	10	57
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	45.7%	16	42.9%	15	2.9%	1	8.6%	3	35

Q10.9#2 - When the faculty member serves on a committee, may the faculty member vote?

Status	Yes		Yes, but the vote is only advisory		No		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	98.1%	51	1.9%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	52
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100.0%	17	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	17
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	96.2%	75	2.6%	2	0.0%	0	1.3%	1	0.0%	0	78
Full-time, Short-term	71.9%	41	7.0%	4	3.5%	2	5.3%	3	12.3%	7	57
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	74.3%	26	11.4%	4	2.9%	1	5.7%	2	5.7%	2	35

Q10.10 - Are the following professional development benefits regularly available to any faculty members at your school?

Professional Development Benefits	Yes		No		I don't know.		Total Responses per Benefit
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Paid Sabbatical	58.0%	102	29.5%	52	12.5%	22	176
Unpaid Sabbatical	38.6%	68	23.9%	42	37.5%	66	176
Travel/Professional Development Funds	95.5%	168	3.4%	6	1.1%	2	176
Scholarship/Research Stipends	73.3%	129	21.6%	38	5.1%	9	176
Research Assistants	90.9%	160	7.4%	13	1.7%	3	176

Q10.12 - With regard to the following professional development benefits, how does the availability/amount of the benefit for LRW Faculty compare to the availability/amount of the benefit for with Non-LRW Faculty?

Paid Sabbatical

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	97.3%	36	2.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	37
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	78.6%	11	7.1%	1	14.3%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	26.5%	13	6.1%	3	51.0%	25	4.1%	2	12.2%	6	49
Full-time, Short-term	9.1%	3	15.2%	5	63.6%	21	0.0%	0	12.1%	4	33
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	8.7%	2	13.0%	3	69.6%	16	0.0%	0	8.7%	2	23

Unpaid Sabbatical

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	96.0%	24	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.0%	1	25
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	80.0%	8	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	10
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	20.7%	6	17.2%	5	24.1%	7	3.4%	1	34.5%	10	29
Full-time, Short-term	4.5%	1	13.6%	3	31.8%	7	0.0%	0	50.0%	11	22
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	6.3%	1	6.3%	1	31.3%	5	0.0%	0	56.3%	9	16

Q10.12 - Continued

Scholarship/Research Stipends

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	97.7%	42	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.3%	1	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	84.6%	11	7.7%	1	7.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	13
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	61.9%	39	14.3%	9	15.9%	10	0.0%	0	7.9%	5	63
Full-time, Short-term	31.9%	15	19.1%	9	23.4%	11	0.0%	0	25.5%	12	47
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	13.8%	4	37.9%	11	24.1%	7	0.0%	0	24.1%	7	29

Travel/Professional Development Funds

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	100.0%	50	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	87.5%	14	12.5%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	16
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	78.9%	60	18.4%	14	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.6%	2	76
Full-time, Short-term	43.3%	29	28.4%	19	6.0%	4	0.0%	0	22.4%	15	67
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	39.5%	15	39.5%	15	0.0%	0	2.6%	1	18.4%	7	38

Q10.12 - Continued

Research Assistants

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	95.8%	46	2.1%	1	0.0%	0	2.1%	1	0.0%	0	48
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	93.3%	14	6.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	15
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	83.8%	62	5.4%	4	5.4%	4	1.4%	1	4.1%	3	74
Full-time, Short-term	52.4%	33	14.3%	9	14.3%	9	1.6%	1	17.5%	11	63
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	52.6%	20	23.7%	9	13.2%	5	0.0%	0	10.5%	4	38

Q10.14 - With regard to scholarship/research stipends, you indicated that the benefit for LRW Faculty is available to a more limited degree than for Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions. How does the availability/amount of the benefit differ for LRW Faculty as compared to Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions?

Select all that apply.

Status	Lower amounts for LRW Faculty		Less frequently for LRW Faculty		Only available with approval of administration (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Only available if funds remain after all Non-LRW Faculty requests are fulfilled		Other limitations		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	66.7%	6	22.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	33.3%	3	9
Full-time, Short-term	66.7%	6	22.2%	2	22.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	54.5%	6	0.0%	0	18.2%	2	9.1%	1	18.2%	2	11

Q10.15 - With regard to travel/professional development funds, you indicated that the benefit for LRW Faculty is available to a more limited degree than for Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions. How does the availability/amount of the benefit differ for LRW Faculty as compared to Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions?

Select all that apply.

Status	Lower amounts for LRW Faculty		Less frequently for LRW Faculty		Only available with approval of administration (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Only available if giving a presentation (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Other limitations		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	78.6%	11	35.7%	5	14.3%	2	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	14
Full-time, Short-term	84.2%	16	21.1%	4	15.8%	3	10.5%	2	5.3%	1	19
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	80.0%	12	26.7%	4	33.3%	5	13.3%	2	6.7%	1	15

Q10.16 - With regard to research assistants, you indicated that the benefit for LRW Faculty is available to a more limited degree than for Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions. How does the availability/amount of the benefit differ for LRW Faculty as compared to Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions?

Select all that apply.

Status	Only available with approval of administration (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Only available if funds remain after all Non-LRW Faculty requests are fulfilled		Other limitations		Total Responses per Status
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Short-term	22.2%	2	0.0%	0	77.8%	7	9
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	33.3%	3	0.0%	0	66.7%	6	9

Q10.17 - To what extent do LRW Faculty with the following status(es) have the opportunity to teach Non-LRW Courses at your school?

Status	Not allowed		Allowed, but only as an overload/summer course		Periodically allowed as part of normal course load		Regularly allowed as part of normal course load		Other		Varies by professor		I don't know		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	19.6%	10	54.9%	28	7.8%	4	15.7%	8	2.0%	1	51
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	6.3%	1	18.8%	3	25.0%	4	43.8%	7	0.0%	0	6.3%	1	0.0%	0	16
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	3.7%	3	16.0%	13	22.2%	18	17.3%	14	3.7%	3	32.1%	26	4.9%	4	81
Full-time, Short-term	9.7%	7	16.7%	12	13.9%	10	20.8%	15	1.4%	1	22.2%	16	15.3%	11	72
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	17.9%	7	17.9%	7	15.4%	6	12.8%	5	7.7%	3	17.9%	7	10.3%	4	39

Q10.18 - For LRW Faculty with the following status(es) who teach LRW Courses and do not have additional administrative duties, what is the average number of students per semester the faculty member will have in LRW Courses?

Note: If some or all of this question is inapplicable to your school (e.g., because all LRW Faculty also teach Non-LRW Courses), please leave the inapplicable text box(es) blank. If the student load is too variable to provide a meaningful average, please leave the text box(es) blank. The platform will read a blank as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. The Individual Phase of the Survey will gather more individualized data.

As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to this question. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. The parenthetical number in the table below indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, if 0s are included, the minimum number of students in LRW Courses for Tenured or Tenure-track LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure is 0.0, the mean number of students is 29.3, and there were 27 responses for this status category. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of students in LRW Courses for Tenured or Tenure-track LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure is 12, the mean number of students is 31.7, and there were 25 responses for this status category.

Status	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0 (12.0)	75.0	29.3 (31.7)	27 (25)
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0 (15.0)	40.0	26.9 (29.4)	12 (11)
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0 (12.0)	90.0	36.3 (37.5)	59 (57)
Full-time, Short-term	0.0 (15.0)	90.0	32.8 (35.4)	55 (51)
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0 (15.0)	50.0	32.2 (33.2)	32 (31)

Student Load Range	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	Combined – All Status Categories
0 Students	2	1	2	4	1	10
1-10 Students	0	0	0	0	0	0
11-20 Students	6	3	5	3	5	22
21-30 Students	7	4	10	16	7	44
31-40 Students	8	4	23	24	14	73
41-50 Students	3	0	15	5	5	28
51-60 Students	0	0	3	2	0	5
61-70 Students	0	0	0	0	0	0
71-80 Students	1	0	0	0	0	1
81-90 Students	0	0	1	1	0	2
Total Responses per Status	27	12	59	55	32	--

Part J. Hiring, Promotion, Retention & Tenure Policies for Full-time Faculty

Q11.2 - Do any LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below have contracts that are subject to a limit on the number of years the faculty member may teach at the school?

Status	Yes		No		I don't know		Responses per Status
Full-time, Short-term	8.5%	6	81.7%	58	9.9%	7	71
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	94.9%	37	5.1%	2	39

Q11.3 - What is the limit on the number of years the LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below may teach at the school?

Status	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Status
Full-time, Short-term	2.0	4.0	2.7	6
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
 Part J. Hiring, Promotion, Retention & Tenure Policies for Full-time Faculty

Respondents were instructed to answer Q11.5 through Q11.37 based on the procedures and standards applicable to LRW Faculty generally. To the extent the respondent's school had procedures or standards specifically applicable to LRW Director(s), based on their role as LRW Director(s), a separate set of questions (Q11.39 through Q11.53) addressed those procedures or standards.

Q11.5 - What is the typical length of the annual contract for LRW Faculty with each status listed below?

Status	9 mos		10 mos		11 mos		12 mos		Varies too much to say		Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenure or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	42.0%	21	14.0%	7	0.0%	0	32.0%	16	4.0%	2	8.0%	4	50
Tenure or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	40.0%	6	6.7%	1	0.0%	0	40.0%	6	6.7%	1	6.7%	1	15
405(c) or 405(c)-track	37.0%	30	16.0%	13	1.2%	1	38.3%	31	2.5%	2	4.9%	4	81
Full-time, Short-term	40.6%	28	18.8%	13	2.9%	2	30.4%	21	5.8%	4	1.4%	1	69
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	45.9%	17	8.1%	3	0.0%	0	29.7%	11	5.4%	2	10.8%	4	37

Q11.6 - Which of the following statements best describes who holds hiring authority for the following categories of LRW Faculty?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)		Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)		405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)		Full-time, Short-term		Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
One or more individual(s) have the power to unilaterally hire without approval from the faculty.	1.9%	1	6.3%	1	3.7%	3	25.4%	18	25.6%	10
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty as a whole.	73.1%	38	43.8%	7	59.3%	48	28.2%	20	23.1%	9
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have higher status.	3.8%	2	0.0%	0	1.2%	1	4.2%	3	10.3%	4
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have the same or higher status.	11.5%	6	25.0%	4	13.6%	11	4.2%	3	5.1%	2
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of Non-LRW Faculty.	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.2%	1	2.8%	2	0.0%	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of Non-LRW Faculty.	1.9%	1	0.0%	0	6.2%	5	14.1%	10	2.6%	1
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of LRW Faculty.	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1.2%	1	1.4%	1	0.0%	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of LRW Faculty.	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.8%	2	5.1%	2
Other	1.9%	1	12.5%	2	3.7%	3	11.3%	8	15.4%	6
I don't know.	3.8%	2	6.3%	1	6.2%	5	4.2%	3	2.6%	1
Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors.	1.9%	1	6.3%	1	3.7%	3	1.4%	1	10.3%	4
Total Responses per Status		52		16		81		71		39

Q11.7 - Who has the power to hire the following categories of LRW Faculty unilaterally (i.e., without approval of the candidate from the faculty)?

Select all that apply.

Status	Dean		Associate Dean		LRW Director(s)		Other		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	1
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	100.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3
Full-time, Short-term	83.3%	15	33.3%	6	22.2%	4	0.0%	0	18
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	50.0%	5	30.0%	3	40.0%	4	0.0%	0	10

Q11.8 - Who is responsible for evaluating the LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below for purposes of promotion?

Select all that apply.

Status	Dean or associate dean		LRW Director(s)		Faculty Committee		Other		Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		I don't know.		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	51.9%	27	5.8%	3	63.5%	33	7.7%	4	5.8%	3	3.8%	2	52
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	12.5%	2	12.5%	2	62.5%	10	12.5%	2	6.3%	1	6.3%	1	16
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	47.5%	38	31.3%	25	75.0%	60	6.3%	5	2.5%	2	3.8%	3	80
Full-time, Short-term	59.2%	42	23.9%	17	33.8%	24	8.5%	6	0.0%	0	7.0%	5	71
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	59.0%	23	30.8%	12	38.5%	15	10.3%	4	5.1%	2	5.1%	2	39

Q11.9 - Who is eligible to serve on the Faculty Committee responsible for evaluating the LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below for purposes of promotion?

Status	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought		Other		I don't know.		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	60.6%	20	3.0%	1	24.2%	8	12.1%	4	0.0%	0	33
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	90.0%	9	0.0%	0	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	10
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	58.3%	35	1.7%	1	30.0%	18	10.0%	6	0.0%	0	60
Full-time, Short-term	29.2%	7	0.0%	0	41.7%	10	25.0%	6	4.2%	1	24
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	60.0%	9	0.0%	0	26.7%	4	13.3%	2	0.0%	0	15

Q11.10 - Who is responsible for evaluating LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below for purposes of tenure or retention?

Status	Dean or associate dean		LRW Director(s)		Faculty Committee		Other		Varies depending on purpose		Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		I don't know.		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	33.8%	26	2.6%	2	49.4%	38	9.1%	7	0.0%	0	3.9%	3	1.3%	1	77
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	23.8%	5	14.3%	3	47.6%	10	4.8%	1	0.0%	0	4.8%	1	4.8%	1	21
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	29.4%	40	16.2%	22	45.6%	62	5.1%	7	0.7%	1	1.5%	2	1.5%	2	136
Full-time, Short-term	43.5%	40	14.1%	13	25.0%	23	5.4%	5	1.1%	1	0.0%	0	10.9%	10	92
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	38.9%	21	18.5%	10	27.8%	15	3.7%	2	1.9%	1	3.7%	2	5.6%	3	54

Q11.11 - Who is eligible to serve on the Faculty Committee responsible for evaluating the LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below for purposes of tenure or retention?

Status	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought		Other		I don't know.		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	60.5%	23	0.0%	0	31.6%	12	7.9%	3	0.0%	0	38
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	60.0%	6	10.0%	1	20.0%	2	10.0%	1	0.0%	0	10
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	59.7%	37	4.8%	3	24.2%	15	11.3%	7	0.0%	0	62
Full-time, Short-term	47.8%	11	0.0%	0	34.8%	8	17.4%	4	0.0%	0	23
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	60.0%	9	0.0%	0	33.3%	5	6.7%	1	0.0%	0	15

Q11.12 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, are there written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure that are based on the faculty member's role as an LRW Faculty (rather than the faculty member's status (e.g., 405(c)-track))?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)		Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)		405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)		Full-time, Short-term		Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
No, the standards are the same for all faculty with similar status.	80.8%	42	43.8%	7	28.4%	23	19.7%	14	17.9%	7
No, there are no standards applicable to LRW Faculty, although standards are being developed.	1.9%	1	0.0%	0	2.5%	2	7.0%	5	10.3%	4
No, there are no standards applicable to LRW Faculty, and none are being developed.	0.0%	0	6.3%	1	2.5%	2	9.9%	7	10.3%	4
Yes, there are specific standards for LRW Faculty.	1.9%	1	31.3%	5	53.1%	43	29.6%	21	30.8%	12
Yes, by default; LRW Faculty are the only faculty with this status.	0.0%	0	6.3%	1	0.0%	0	8.5%	6	5.1%	2
Other	3.8%	2	0.0%	0	7.4%	6	7.0%	5	2.6%	1
Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.	9.6%	5	6.3%	1	3.7%	3	0.0%	0	7.7%	3
I don't know.	1.9%	1	6.3%	1	2.5%	2	18.3%	13	15.4%	6
Total Responses per Status		52		16		81		71		39

The following questions focus on how the written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure for various categories of faculty compare to the written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of LRW faculty, regardless of whether those standards are based on the faculty member's role as an LRW Faculty or the faculty member's status (e.g., 405(c)-track). The questions will address standards for teaching, service, and scholarship separately.

Q11.14-11.16 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, how do the standards in each category compare to those for Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who teach primarily doctrinal courses?

**Teaching Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Doctrinal Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	4.4%	2	82.2%	37	8.9%	4	2.2%	1	0.0%	0	2.2%	1	45
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	35.7%	5	57.1%	8	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1.4%	1	33.3%	24	33.3%	24	15.3%	11	8.3%	6	8.3%	6	72
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	26.1%	12	32.6%	15	19.6%	9	4.3%	2	15.2%	7	46
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	13.6%	3	45.5%	10	18.2%	4	4.5%	1	18.2%	4	22

Q11.14-11.16 - Continued

**Service Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Doctrinal Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standard related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per Status
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2.2%	1	86.7%	39	6.7%	3	4.4%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	45
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	50.0%	7	35.7%	5	14.3%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1.4%	1	38.9%	28	37.5%	27	5.6%	4	4.2%	3	9.7%	7	2.8%	2	72
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	23.9%	11	41.3%	19	10.9%	5	2.2%	1	10.9%	5	8.7%	4	46
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	9.1%	2	45.5%	10	18.2%	4	0.0%	0	13.6%	3	13.6%	3	22

Q11.14-11.16 - Continued

**Scholarship Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Doctrinal Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standard related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.5%	1	40.9%	9	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	54.5%	12	22
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	1.4%	1	5.6%	4	12.5%	9	37.5%	27	4.2%	3	4.2%	3	34.7%	25	72
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2.2%	1	0.0%	0	6.5%	3	37.0%	17	6.5%	3	2.2%	1	45.7%	21	46
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	21.4%	3	42.9%	6	28.6%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	14
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	6.7%	3	82.2%	37	8.9%	4	2.2%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	45

Q11.17-11.19 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, how do the standards in each category compare to those for Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who teach primarily clinical courses?

**Teaching Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2.3%	1	61.4%	27	9.1%	4	2.3%	1	0.0%	0	9.1%	4	15.9%	7	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	50.0%	7	14.3%	2	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	28.6%	4	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	25.0%	18	23.6%	17	16.7%	12	2.8%	2	16.7%	12	15.3%	11	72
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	6.5%	3	30.4%	14	13.0%	6	2.2%	1	23.9%	11	21.7%	10	46
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	9.1%	2	22.7%	5	9.1%	2	0.0%	0	31.8%	7	27.3%	6	22

Q11.17-11.19 - Continued

**Service Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standards related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2.3%	1	65.9%	29	9.1%	4	2.3%	1	0.0%	0	2.3%	1	2.3%	1	15.9%	7	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	50.0%	7	14.3%	2	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	28.6%	4	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	29.2%	21	40.3%	29	5.6%	4	1.4%	1	9.7%	7	0.0%	0	13.9%	10	72
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	15.2%	7	30.4%	14	13.0%	6	0.0%	0	13.0%	6	6.5%	3	19.6%	9	46
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	4.5%	1	27.3%	6	9.1%	2	0.0%	0	22.7%	5	9.1%	2	27.3%	6	22

Q11.17-11.19 - Continued

**Scholarship Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standards related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count			
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	6.8%	3	56.8%	25	9.1%	4	2.3%	1	2.3%	1	4.5%	2	2.3%	1	15.9%	7	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	28.6%	4	28.6%	4	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	28.6%	4	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	9.9%	7	16.9%	12	23.9%	17	2.8%	2	15.5%	11	14.1%	10	16.9%	12	71
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	4.3%	2	10.9%	5	17.4%	8	0.0%	0	15.2%	7	28.3%	13	23.9%	11	46
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	9.1%	2	22.7%	5	0.0%	0	13.6%	3	27.3%	6	27.3%	6	22

Q11.20-11.22 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, how do the standards in each category compare to those for Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track positions who teach primarily clinical courses?

**Teaching Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2.3%	1	36.4%	16	9.1%	4	2.3%	1	0.0%	0	11.4%	5	38.6%	17	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	64.3%	9	28.6%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	9.9%	7	21.1%	15	7.0%	5	1.4%	1	15.5%	11	45.1%	32	71
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	4.3%	2	19.6%	9	2.2%	1	2.2%	1	30.4%	14	39.1%	18	46
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	4.5%	1	18.2%	4	4.5%	1	0.0%	0	36.4%	8	36.4%	8	22

Q11.20-11.22 - Continued

**Service Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standards related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count			
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	38.6%	17	9.1%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11.4%	5	2.3%	1	38.6%	17	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	71.4%	10	21.4%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	15.5%	11	21.1%	15	1.4%	1	2.8%	2	12.7%	9	1.4%	1	45.1%	32	71
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	4.4%	2	17.8%	8	4.4%	2	0.0%	0	26.7%	12	6.7%	3	37.8%	17	45
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	4.5%	1	9.1%	2	9.1%	2	0.0%	0	31.8%	7	9.1%	2	36.4%	8	22

Q11.20-11.22 - Continued

**Scholarship Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standards related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count			
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	31.8%	14	13.6%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	11.4%	5	4.5%	2	38.6%	17	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	42.9%	6	35.7%	5	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	7.1%	1	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	1.4%	1	9.9%	7	15.5%	11	1.4%	1	12.7%	9	9.9%	7	49.3%	35	71
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6.7%	3	11.1%	5	0.0%	0	24.4%	11	17.8%	8	40.0%	18	45
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.5%	1	13.6%	3	0.0%	0	13.6%	3	31.8%	7	36.4%	8	22

Q11.23-11.25 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, how do the standards in each category compare to those for Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) or 405(c)-track positions who teach primarily clinical courses?

**Teaching Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) or 405(c)-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0.0%	0	29.5%	13	9.1%	4	6.8%	3	0.0%	0	15.9%	7	38.6%	17	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	29.5%	13	9.1%	4	6.8%	3	0.0%	0	15.9%	7	38.6%	17	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	28.6%	4	28.6%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	35.7%	5	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	30.6%	22	29.2%	21	5.6%	4	1.4%	1	15.3%	11	18.1%	13	72
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	11.1%	5	13.3%	6	6.7%	3	4.4%	2	26.7%	12	35.6%	16	45
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	19.0%	4	23.8%	5	14.3%	3	0.0%	0	28.6%	6	14.3%	3	21

Q11.23-11.25 - Continued

**Service Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) or 405(c)-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standards related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	29.5%	13	15.9%	7	4.5%	2	0.0%	0	11.4%	5	0.0%	0	38.6%	17	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	35.7%	5	21.4%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	35.7%	5	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	33.3%	24	27.8%	20	4.2%	3	1.4%	1	12.5%	9	2.8%	2	18.1%	13	72
Full-time, Short-term	2.2%	1	11.1%	5	15.6%	7	4.4%	2	2.2%	1	22.2%	10	6.7%	3	35.6%	16	45
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	14.3%	3	33.3%	7	4.8%	1	0.0%	0	23.8%	5	9.5%	2	14.3%	3	21

Q11.23-11.25 - Continued

**Scholarship Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) or 405(c)-track Positions
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		No written standards related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	18.2%	8	6.8%	3	20.5%	9	0.0%	0	13.6%	6	2.3%	1	38.6%	17	44
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	28.6%	4	7.1%	1	0.0%	0	7.1%	1	14.3%	2	35.7%	5	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	16.9%	12	19.7%	14	8.5%	6	1.4%	1	16.9%	12	12.7%	9	23.9%	17	71
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	4.4%	2	11.1%	5	4.4%	2	2.2%	1	24.4%	11	13.3%	6	40.0%	18	45
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	9.5%	2	23.8%	5	4.8%	1	0.0%	0	14.3%	3	33.3%	7	14.3%	3	21

For the following questions, the responding schools indicated that there are specific written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure for LRW Faculty based on the faculty member's role as an LRW Faculty (rather than the faculty member's status (e.g., 405(c)-track)). The following questions focus on how those standards compare to the standards for various categories of Non-LRW Faculty. The questions address standards for teaching, service, and scholarship separately.

Q11.27-11.29 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, how do the specific written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure based on the faculty member's role as an LRW Faculty (rather than the faculty member's status (e.g., 405(c)-track)) compare to the written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of Non-LRW Faculty with the same status who teach primarily doctrinal courses?

**Teaching Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with the Same Status
 Who Teach Primarily Doctrinal Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		There are no written standards related to teaching that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2.4%	1	40.5%	17	7.1%	3	4.8%	2	14.3%	6	2.4%	1	28.6%	12	42
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
Full-time, Short-term	5.0%	1	20.0%	4	15.0%	3	0.0%	0	15.0%	3	0.0%	0	45.0%	9	20
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	18.2%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	27.3%	3	9.1%	1	45.5%	5	11

Q11.27-11.29 - Continued

**Service Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with the Same Status
 Who Teach Primarily Doctrinal Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		There are no written standards related to service that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2.4%	1	54.8%	23	2.4%	1	0.0%	0	7.1%	3	4.8%	2	28.6%	12	42
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	27.3%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	18.2%	2	9.1%	1	45.5%	5	11
Full-time, Short-term	5.0%	1	25.0%	5	15.0%	3	0.0%	0	10.0%	2	0.0%	0	45.0%	9	20
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0

Q11.27-11.29 - Continued

**Scholarship Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with the Same Status
 Who Teach Primarily Doctrinal Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		There are no written standards related to scholarship that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2.4%	1	19.0%	8	21.4%	9	0.0%	0	7.1%	3	19.0%	8	31.0%	13	42
Full-time, Short-term	5.0%	1	5.0%	1	20.0%	4	0.0%	0	5.0%	1	15.0%	3	50.0%	10	20
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	18.2%	2	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	9.1%	1	18.2%	2	45.5%	5	11

Q11.30-11.32 - For LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below, how do the specific written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure based on the faculty member's role as an LRW Faculty (rather than the faculty member's status (e.g., 405(c)-track)) compare to the written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of Non-LRW Faculty with the same status who teach primarily clinical courses?

**Teaching Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with the Same Status
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		There are no written standards related to teaching that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	60.5%	26	11.6%	5	2.3%	1	11.6%	5	2.3%	1	11.6%	5	43
Full-time, Short-term	5.0%	1	25.0%	5	5.0%	1	5.0%	1	35.0%	7	0.0%	0	25.0%	5	20
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	36.4%	4	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	36.4%	4	9.1%	1	9.1%	1	11

Q11.30-11.32 - Continued

**Service Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with the Same Status
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		There are no written standards related to service that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	69.8%	30	2.3%	1	0.0%	0	11.6%	5	4.7%	2	11.6%	5	43
Full-time, Short-term	5.0%	1	20.0%	4	5.0%	1	5.0%	1	35.0%	7	5.0%	1	25.0%	5	20
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	36.4%	4	9.1%	1	0.0%	0	36.4%	4	9.1%	1	9.1%	1	11

Q11.30-11.32 - Continued

**Scholarship Standards
 compared to
 Non-LRW Faculty with the Same Status
 Who Teach Primarily Clinical Courses**

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors.		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		I don't know.		There are no written standards related to scholarship that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status.		N/A		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	0.0%	0	32.6%	14	14.0%	6	0.0%	0	16.3%	7	18.6%	8	18.6%	8	43
Full-time, Short-term	5.0%	1	10.0%	2	5.0%	1	5.0%	1	30.0%	6	15.0%	3	30.0%	6	20
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	45.5%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	27.3%	3	18.2%	2	9.1%	1	11

Q11.33 - Select the options that best describe the scholarship requirements/expectations for Non-LRW Faculty with the listed status:

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Required for promotion	151	40	24	4	5
Expected for promotion	3	3	9	2	0
Required for retention	28	7	8	3	0
Expected for retention	12	3	5	3	1
Required for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	9	1	1	0	1
Expected for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	2	0	0	0	0
Not required or expected	0	1	29	41	29
Not required or expected, but encouraged or rewarded	1	4	24	19	11
Other	0	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	16	28	33	42	48
My school does not have Non-LRW Faculty with this status.	6	93	54	60	77
Total Responses per Status	175	168	172	170	170

Q11.34 - Select the options that best describe the scholarship requirements/expectations for LRW Faculty with the listed status:

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Required for promotion	49	11	17	1	2
Expected for promotion	2	2	8	2	0
Required for retention	10	2	2	1	0
Expected for retention	2	2	5	2	1
Required for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	2	1	0	0	1
Expected for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	1	0	0	0	0
Not required or expected	0	0	23	30	19
Not required or expected, but encouraged or rewarded	1	4	30	28	12
Other	0	0	1	0	2
I don't know.	1	1	1	8	3
Total Responses per Status	68	23	87	72	40

Q11.35-11.36 - For each listed category of LRW Faculty, do the following writings qualify as “scholarship” for promotion or retention purposes?

Articles about doctrinal subjects

Status	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	98.0%	48	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2.0%	1	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100.0%	12	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	84.0%	21	4.0%	1	8.0%	2	4.0%	1	25
Full-time, Short-term	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Articles about pedagogy (LRW)

Status	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	79.6%	39	4.1%	2	12.2%	6	4.1%	2	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	83.3%	10	0.0%	0	16.7%	2	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	91.7%	22	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.3%	2	24
Full-time, Short-term	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Articles about pedagogy (non-LRW)

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	79.6%	39	4.1%	2	12.2%	6	4.1%	2	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	83.3%	10	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	8.3%	1	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	84.0%	21	0.0%	0	8.0%	2	8.0%	2	25
Full-time, Short-term	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Articles about legal writing theory or practice

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	87.8%	43	2.0%	1	6.1%	3	4.1%	2	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	91.7%	11	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	95.8%	23	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4.2%	1	24
Full-time, Short-term	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Articles about other skills

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	77.6%	38	2.0%	1	14.3%	7	6.1%	3	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	83.3%	10	0.0%	0	16.7%	2	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	80.0%	20	0.0%	0	8.0%	2	12.0%	3	25
Full-time, Short-term	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	50.0%	2	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Textbooks

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	65.3%	32	8.2%	4	16.3%	8	10.2%	5	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	83.3%	10	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	16.7%	2	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	72.0%	18	8.0%	2	12.0%	3	8.0%	2	25
Full-time, Short-term	75.0%	3	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Articles in practice-oriented publications

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	40.8%	20	32.7%	16	16.3%	8	10.2%	5	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	58.3%	7	33.3%	4	8.3%	1	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	80.0%	20	12.0%	3	0.0%	0	8.0%	2	25
Full-time, Short-term	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Briefs, court documents, or other writings for practice

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	14.3%	7	53.1%	26	18.4%	9	14.3%	7	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	16.7%	2	75.0%	9	8.3%	1	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	36.0%	9	28.0%	7	24.0%	6	12.0%	3	25
Full-time, Short-term	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Teaching materials (simulations, writing problems, etc.)

	Yes		No		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	10.2%	5	71.4%	35	10.2%	5	8.2%	4	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	8.3%	1	83.3%	10	8.3%	1	0.0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	32.0%	8	24.0%	6	32.0%	8	12.0%	3	25
Full-time, Short-term	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2

Q11.37 - For each listed category of LRW Faculty, which option best describes the scholarship requirement/expectation as compared to the scholarship requirement/expectation for Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions?

Number of Works Required in a Given Time Period

	Same		More for LRW Faculty		Fewer for LRW Faculty		Varies too much to compare		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses Per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	81.6%	40	0.0%	0	6.1%	3	0.0%	0	6.1%	3	6.1%	3	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	41.7%	5	0.0%	0	50.0%	6	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	12.0%	3	0.0%	0	56.0%	14	0.0%	0	16.0%	4	16.0%	4	25
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	75.0%	3	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	2

Type of Works that Qualify

	Same		Broader for LRW Faculty		Narrower for LRW Faculty		Varies too much to compare		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses Per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0%	0	100.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	0.0%	0	4
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	12.0%	3	64.0%	16	0.0%	0	4.0%	1	8.0%	2	12.0%	3	25
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	50.0%	6	41.7%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	12
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	77.6%	38	6.1%	3	0.0%	0	2.0%	1	6.1%	3	8.2%	4	49

Q11.37 - Continued

Length of Works that Qualify

	Same		Shorter for LRW Faculty		Longer for LRW Faculty		Varies too much to compare		Unclear		I don't know.		Responses Per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	12.0%	3	52.0%	13	0.0%	0	4.0%	1	16.0%	4	16.0%	4	25
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	81.6%	40	2.0%	1	0.0%	0	2.0%	1	6.1%	3	8.2%	4	49
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	58.3%	7	33.3%	4	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	8.3%	1	12
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	2

The following questions focus on standards or procedures that are applicable to LRW Director(s) based on the LRW Director designation. Q11.39 was shown only to responders who indicated that their school had one or more non-visiting LRW Faculty serving as an LRW Director. If the responder answered “no” or “I don’t know.” the survey platform skipped Q11.40 through Q11.53 for that responder.

Q11.39 - You previously indicated that one or more non-visiting LRW Faculty serve as LRW Director(s). Does your school have standards or procedures that are applicable specifically to LRW Director(s) based on the LRW Director designation?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	25.4%	29
No	69.3%	79
I don't know.	5.3%	6
Total		114

Q11.40 - What is the typical length of the annual contract for LRW Faculty who serve as LRW Directors for each status listed below?

Status	Same as for non-Director LRW Faculty with this status	9 mos	10 mos	11 mos	12 mos	Varies too much to say	Responses per Answer
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2	1	1	0	3	1	8
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2	1	0	0	6	0	9
Full-time, Short-term	1	1	0	0	1	2	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	2	1	0	0	3	1	7

Q11.41 - For LRW Faculty who serve as LRW Directors, which of the following statements best describes who holds hiring authority for each category based on the LRW Director designation?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
There are no specific procedures based on LRW Director designation; the answer is the same as for other LRW Faculty with this status.	1	0	1	0	2
One or more individual(s) have the power to unilaterally hire without approval from the faculty.	0	0	1	2	2
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty as a whole.	4	1	5	1	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have higher status.	0	1	0	0	1
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have the same or higher status.	1	0	1	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of Non-LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	1
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of Non-LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
Other	1	0	1	1	1
I don't know.	1	0	0	1	1
Total Responses per Status	8	2	9	5	8

Q11.42 - For LRW Faculty who serve as LRW Directors, who has the power to hire unilaterally (i.e., without approval of the candidate from the faculty) based on the LRW Director designation?

Select all that apply.

	Dean	Associate Dean	Other LRW Director(s)	Other	Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	0	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	0	0	0
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1	0	0	0	1
Full-time, Short-term	2	0	0	0	2
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	2	0	0	0	2

Q11.43 - Who is responsible for evaluating LRW Faculty designated as LRW Director(s) for purposes of promotion?

Select all that apply.

	Same as for non-Director LRW Faculty with this status.	Dean or Associate Dean	Faculty Committee	Varies depending on the specific position	Other	I don't know.	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2	2	3	0	0	1	8
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2	4	6	0	0	0	9
Full-time, Short-term	0	4	1	0	0	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	2	5	3	0	1	0	8

Q11.44 - For LRW Faculty designated as LRW Director(s), who is eligible to serve on the Faculty Committee responsible for evaluating the LRW Faculty for purposes of promotion?

	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought		Other		I don't know.		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	50.0%	2	25.0%	1	25.0%	1	4
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	50.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	16.7%	1	0.0%	0	83.3%	5	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	6
Full-time, Short-term	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	1
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	66.7%	2	0.0%	0	33.3%	1	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	3

Q11.45 - Who is responsible for evaluating LRW Faculty designated as LRW Director(s) for purposes of tenure or retention?

Select all that apply.

	Same as for non-Director LRW Faculty with this status.	Dean or Associate Dean	Faculty Committee	Varies depending on the specific position	Other	I don't know.	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	3	1	4	0	0	1	8
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2	4	6	0	0	0	9
Full-time, Short-term	0	3	1	1	0	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	2	6	3	0	0	0	8

Q11.46 - For LRW Faculty designated as LRW Director(s), who is eligible to serve on the Faculty Committee responsible for evaluating the LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below for purposes of tenure or retention?

	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought	Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought	All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought	Other	I don't know.	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	3	1	1	5
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1	0	5	0	0	6
Full-time, Short-term	0	0	1	0	0	1
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	2	0	1	0	0	3

Q11.47 - Are there specific written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of LRW Faculty designated as LRW Director(s)?

	No.	No, but standards are currently being developed.	Yes	I don't know.	Other	Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	3	0	4	1	0	8
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1	0	8	0	0	9
Full-time, Short-term	4	0	0	1	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	3	0	4	0	1	8

Q11.48 - How do the specific written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of LRW Directors with the below status(es) compare to the specific written standards, if any, regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of faculty members who direct, coordinate, or administer programs other than LRW Programs:

Question	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Substantially similar standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators with the same status regardless of type of program	1	1	1	0	0
Substantially similar standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators regardless of status or type of program	0	0	1	0	0
Substantially different standards based on type of program	1	1	2	0	0
Same standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators with the same status regardless of type of program	0	0	1	0	1
Same standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators regardless of status or type of program	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
N/A because there are no specific written standards for directors, coordinators, or administrators of other programs	0	0	1	0	0
N/A because there are no directors, coordinators, or administrators for other programs	0	0	0	0	0
N/A Other	0	0	1	0	1
I don't know.	1	0	1	0	2
Total Responses per Status	4	2	8	0	4

Q11.49 - How do the specific written standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of LRW Director(s) compare to the standards regarding the evaluation for promotion and retention or tenure of LRW Faculty with the same status who are not LRW Directors?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Substantially similar standards	1	0	0	0	1
Substantially similar standards EXCEPT for an added administrative component	2	0	2	0	1
Substantially different standards	0	1	1	0	0
Other	0	0	1	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	1	0	1
N/A because the only LRW Faculty with this status is/are LRW Director(s).	1	1	3	0	1
N/A Other	0	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Status	4	2	8	0	4

Q11.50 - You indicated that the standards for at least one LRW Director substantially differs from the standards for non-Director LRW Faculty with the same status. Thinking only of the standards for LRW Director(s) that differ in this way, how do those standards compare to the standards applicable to Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach doctrinal courses?

Select all that apply.

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Status	0	1	1	0	0

Q11.51 - You indicated that the standards for at least one LRW Director substantially differs from the standards for non-Director LRW Faculty with the same status. Thinking only of the standards for LRW Director(s) that differ in this way, how do those standards compare to the standards applicable to Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	1	0	0
Total Responses per Status	0	1	1	0	0

Q11.52 - You indicated that the standards for at least one LRW Director substantially differs from the standards for non-Director LRW Faculty with the same status. Thinking only of the standards for LRW Director(s) that differ in this way, how do those standards compare to the standards applicable to Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	1	0	0
Total Responses per Status	0	1	1	0	0

Q11.53 - You indicated that the standards for at least one LRW Director substantially differs from the standards for non-Director LRW Faculty with the same status. Thinking only of the standards for LRW Director(s) that differ in this way, how do those standards compare to the standards applicable to Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) or 405(c)-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses?

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	1	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	1	0	0
Total Responses per Status	0	1	1	0	0

Part K. Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty)

Q12.2 - For Current Academic Year do you know the annual base salary your school typically would pay to entry-level LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below?

Question	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Varies; there is no typical entry-level annual base salary for an LRW Faculty with this status.	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	15	7	20	10	52
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	5	1	6	4	16
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	29	5	36	11	81
Full-time, Short-term	23	4	26	17	70
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	16	3	12	8	39

As shown above, Q12.2 asked each institutional responder to indicate whether he or she knew the entry-level salaries for LRW Faculty in the specified status categories. As reflected in the answer options, Q12.2 also allowed the institutional responder to indicate that he or she preferred not to provide known information or that the school did not have a typical entry-level salary for LRW Faculty in the specified status category. The next question, Q12.3, was only presented to institutional responders who answered “Yes” to Q12.2. Thus, the information provided in Q12.3 must be reviewed with the understanding that the number of institutions providing information for each status category is limited to those who have a typical entry-level salary for LRW Faculty with that status and whose institutional responder knew the information and opted to provide it.

Q12.3 - What is the annual base salary your school typically pays to entry-level LRW Faculty with the status(es) listed below?

Status	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	65000	120000	94353	15
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	65000	155000	92600	5
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	58000	90000	72448	29
Full-time, Short-term	50000	90000	68609	23
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	50000	110000	71625	16

Q12.3 - Continued

**Salary Ranges for Entry-Level LRW Faculty
 Tenured or Tenure-Track with Traditional Tenure**

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
65,000-80,000	4
80,001-95,000	5
95,001-110,000	4
110,001-120,000	2
Total	15

**Salary Ranges for Entry-Level LRW Faculty
 Tenured or Tenure-Track with Programmatic Tenure**

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
65,000-80,000	3
80,001-95,000	1
95,001-110,000	0
110,001-125,000	0
125,001-140,000	0
140,001-155,000	1
Total	5

**Salary Ranges for Entry-Level LRW Faculty
 405(c) or 405(c)-track**

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
58,000-70,000	16
70,001-80,000	9
80,001-90,000	4
Total	29

Q12.3 - Continued

**Salary Ranges for Entry-Level LRW Faculty
 Full-time, Short-term**

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
50,000-60,000	8
60,001-70,000	4
70,001-80,000	9
80,001-90,000	2
Total	23

**Salary Ranges for Entry-Level LRW Faculty
 Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status**

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
50,000-65,000	5
65,001-80,000	9
80,001-95,000	1
95,001-110,000	1
Total	16

Q12.4 - Do you know the annual base salary your school typically pays to the following types of faculty members for entry-level positions?

	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Varies; there is no typical entry-level annual base salary for faculty members of this type.	My school does not hire entry-level faculty members of this type.	Total Responses per Faculty Type
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach doctrinal courses	36	5	118	15	2	176
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	15	3	109	12	37	176
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	9	2	99	6	60	176
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	11	2	110	8	45	176
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions who primarily teach clinical courses	4	2	117	9	44	176
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions who primarily teach clinical courses	4	3	107	7	55	176

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
 Part K. Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty)

As shown above, Q12.4 asked each institutional responder to indicate whether he or she knew the entry-level salaries for Non-LRW Faculty in the specified categories. As reflected in the answer options, Q12.4 also allowed the institutional responder to indicate that he or she was willing to provide known information or that there is no typical entry-level salary for faculty in the specified category. The next question, Q12.5, was only presented to institutional responders who answered “Yes” to Q12.4. Thus, the information provided in Q12.5 must be reviewed with the understanding that the number of institutions providing information for each category is limited to those who have a typical entry-level salary for faculty in that category and whose institutional responder knew the information and opted to provide it.

Q12.5 - What is the annual base salary your school typically pays to the following types of faculty members for entry-level positions?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Faculty Category
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach doctrinal courses	79000	155000	105495	37
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	79000	135000	97125	16
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	68000	155000	99778	9
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	60000	91300	79209	11
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions who primarily teach clinical courses	50000	60000	57500	4
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions who primarily teach clinical courses	60000	105000	83750	4

Part L. Faculty Salary Comparisons (Full-time Faculty)

The questions reported in Part K sought specific entry-level salaries, if the responder knew that information and was willing to provide it. The questions reported in Part L sought broader comparisons. The questions reported in Part L repeated for each category of full-time, entry-level Non-LRW Faculty hired by the responder’s school, based on the responder’s answer to Q12.4. In the report, the question will be stated once followed by separate response tables for each category of full-time, entry-level Non-LRW Faculty.

Q13.2 - For each category of LRW Faculty, please indicate the extent to which the entry-level annual base salary typically differs from the entry-level annual base salary for the specified category of Non-LRW Faculty at your school.

Is there a difference?

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-Track Positions
who Primarily Teach Doctrinal Courses
compared to . . .**

	No.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher.		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say.		I don't know.		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	43%	22	8%	4	0%	0	6%	3	27%	14	16%	8	51
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	18%	3	41%	7	0%	0	12%	2	18%	3	12%	2	17
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	0%	0	63%	50	0%	0	1%	1	28%	22	8%	6	79
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	6%	4	56%	39	0%	0	0%	0	33%	23	6%	4	70
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	3%	1	59%	23	0%	0	3%	1	31%	12	5%	2	39

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	No.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher.		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say.		I don't know.		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	17%	2	8%	1	8%	1	17%	2	33%	4	17%	2	12
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0%	0	35%	11	0%	0	6%	2	48%	15	10%	3	31
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	33%	13	8%	3	3%	1	5%	2	45%	18	8%	3	40
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	2%	1	31%	20	2%	1	3%	2	55%	35	8%	5	64
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	5%	3	40%	23	0%	0	0%	0	47%	27	9%	5	58

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-Track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	No.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher.		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say.		I don't know.		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	35%	6	0%	0	6%	1	12%	2	35%	6	12%	2	17
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	11%	3	0%	0	4%	1	7%	2	63%	17	15%	4	27
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	6%	3	22%	11	0%	0	2%	1	55%	28	16%	8	51
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	0%	0	13%	7	2%	1	2%	1	62%	32	21%	11	52
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0%	0	38%	11	0%	0	10%	3	45%	13	7%	2	29

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	No.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher.		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say.		I don't know.		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	13%	4	3%	1	6%	2	6%	2	52%	16	19%	6	31
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	10%	1	0%	0	10%	1	10%	1	50%	5	20%	2	10
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	4%	3	26%	19	3%	2	6%	4	57%	41	4%	3	72
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	4%	2	17%	9	0%	0	4%	2	65%	35	11%	6	54
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	3%	1	20%	6	0%	0	7%	2	67%	20	3%	1	30

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

**Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	No.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher.		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say.		I don't know.		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	6%	2	3%	1	0%	0	6%	2	65%	20	19%	6	31
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	9%	1	9%	1	0%	0	18%	2	45%	5	18%	2	11
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	2%	1	8%	5	3%	2	5%	3	72%	47	11%	7	65
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	6%	4	11%	7	0%	0	3%	2	74%	46	5%	3	62
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0%	0	6%	2	6%	2	9%	3	68%	23	12%	4	34

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

**Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	No.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower.		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher.		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say.		I don't know.		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	7%	2	0%	0	3%	1	3%	1	69%	20	17%	5	29
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	9%	1	0%	0	9%	1	9%	1	45%	5	27%	3	11
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	0%	0	8%	5	3%	2	5%	3	66%	39	17%	10	59
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	2%	1	10%	5	0%	0	2%	1	73%	38	13%	7	52
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	3%	1	19%	7	0%	0	8%	3	64%	23	6%	2	36

Q13.2 - Continued: For each category of LRW Faculty, please indicate the extent to which the entry-level annual base salary typically differs from the entry-level annual base salary for the specified category of Non-LRW Faculty at your school.

If there is a difference, do you know the amount of the difference?

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-Track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Doctrinal Courses
 compared to . . .**

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	39	0	2	10	51
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	6	1	0	10	17
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	24	13	4	38	79
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	22	9	3	36	70
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	10	5	2	22	39

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	29	0	1	10	40
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	7	0	0	5	12
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	33	3	2	26	64
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	24	5	4	25	58
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	15	3	1	12	31

Q13.2 - Continued: If there is a difference, do you know the amount of the difference?

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-Track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	17	0	1	9	27
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	11	0	0	6	17
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	32	1	0	19	52
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	23	1	1	26	51
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	13	1	1	14	29

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	37	6	1	28	72
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	22	0	1	8	31
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	26	0	1	27	54
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	7	0	0	3	10
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	15	0	1	14	30

Q13.2 - Continued: If there is a difference, do you know the amount of the difference?

**Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	22	0	1	8	31
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	7	0	0	4	11
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	40	1	1	23	65
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	30	1	0	31	62
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	17	0	0	17	34

**Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide.	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	22	0	1	6	29
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	8	0	0	3	11
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	38	0	0	21	59
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	26	0	0	26	52
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	17	1	1	17	36

Q13.3 - Please indicate how much LOWER the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is when compared to the entry-level annual base salary for the specified category of Non-LRW Faculty at your school.

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-Track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Doctrinal Courses
 compared to . . .**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	40000	40000	40000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	15000	73000	37071	14
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	18000	50000	37222	9
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	45000	90000	60400	5

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	25000	30000	28333	3
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	10000	40000	24000	5
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	7000	55000	34000	3

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-Track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	30000	30000	30000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	100000	100000	100000	1

13.3 - Continued

**Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	2000	30000	14400	5
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0	0	0	0

**Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	30000	30000	30000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	40000	40000	40000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0	0	0	0

**Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status Positions
 who Primarily Teach Clinical Courses
 compared to . . .**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	10000	10000	10000	1

Q13.4 - Please indicate how much HIGHER the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is when compared to the entry-level annual base salary for the specified category of Non-LRW Faculty at your school.

As reflected in the responses to Q13.2, LRW Faculty with certain statuses have a higher entry-level annual base salary when compared to certain categories of Non-LRW Faculty at some schools. The responders for those schools did not provide the amount of the difference.

Part M. Teaching Fellows

Q14.2 - For the Current Academic Year, do you know the annual base salary your school typically would pay to a Teaching Fellow?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	50.0%	5
Yes, but prefer not to provide.	10.0%	1
No	40.0%	4
Varies	0.0%	0
Total Responses		10

Q14.3 - What is the annual base salary your school typically would pay to a Teaching Fellow?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
54000	70000	59800	5

Q14.4 - What is the typical number of courses a Teaching Fellow will teach each academic year?

For purposes of this question, if a Teaching Fellow will teach two sections of the same course, count each section as a single course.

Course Type	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Course Type
LRW Courses	1.0	4.0	2.1	7
Non-LRW Courses	0.0	1.0	0.6	4

Q14.5 - What is the total number of students the Teaching Fellow will typically teach in LRW Courses each semester?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Semester
Full-length semester 1	1.0	57.0	29.6	8
Full-length semester 2	1.0	57.0	28.1	8
Full-length semester 3	22.0	27.0	24.5	2
Full-length semester 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Summer semester	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Intersession/Maymester/Other short session or semester	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

Q14.6 - For each of the listed programs, which of the following statements best describes the Teaching Fellow teaching model?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Teaching Fellow and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	1	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching; the Teaching Fellow is solely responsible for grading and critiquing.	0	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is solely responsible for all classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	5	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.7 - For each of the listed programs, which of the following supervisory actions does the person responsible for supervising Teaching Fellows regularly undertake?

Select all that apply.

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	2	0	0	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	3	0	0	0
Surprise class observation	0	0	0	0
Announced class observation	4	0	0	0
Review of end-of-semester evaluations	6	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.8 - To what extent does the Teaching Fellow have autonomy in creating the course syllabus?

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Teaching Fellow is expected to create the course syllabus.	1	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is permitted to create the course syllabus but has the option to use a syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is not permitted to create the course syllabus; the Teaching Fellow must use the course syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	3	0	0	0
Varies by course	1	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.9 - To what extent does the Teaching Fellow have autonomy in creating the Major Assignments for the course?

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Teaching Fellow is expected to create the assignments.	0	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is permitted to create the assignments but has the option to use assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	1	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is not permitted to create the assignments; the Teaching Fellow must use the assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	4	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.10-14.12 - To what extent does the Teaching Fellow have autonomy in the following areas:

Deadlines for Major Assignments

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	5	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Number of Major Assignments

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	5	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Length of Major Assignments

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	5	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.10-14.12 - Continued

Number of Minor Assignments

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	5	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	1	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Citation Text

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	5	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Textbooks

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	5	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.10-14.12 - Continued

Content of Class/Lectures

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	1	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	5	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	0	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	6	0	0	0

Q14.13 - Do Teaching Fellows teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program?

Answer	Responses per Answer
Yes	1
No	8
I don't know.	1
Total Responses	10

The Survey instrument asked follow up questions regarding Teaching Fellows who teach an LRW Course offered outside of an LRW Program. Since only one responder indicated that Teaching Fellows teach LRW Courses offered outside of an LRW Program, only one responder answered those questions. Accordingly, the follow-up questions and the responses have been omitted from this report.

Q14.16 - In response to a previous question, you indicated that the following courses were taught in whole or in part by Teaching Fellows. For these courses, please provide the following information:

Note: If you are unable to answer the question (or any part of it), you may leave the text box blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. If the answer is 0, please enter 0 so that the system will include that answer in the results.

Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
How many students, on average, did each Teaching Fellow teach in this course?	17.0	40.0	26.2	6
What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Teaching Fellow must have to teach this course?	0.0	5.0	2.5	4

Course focusing principally on basic persuasive

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
How many students, on average, did each Teaching Fellow teach in this course?	17.0	40.0	27.0	4
What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Teaching Fellow must have to teach this course?	0.0	3.0	1.7	3

Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
How many students, on average, did each Teaching Fellow teach in this course?	22.0	22.0	22.0	1
What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Teaching Fellow must have to teach this course?	3.0	3.0	3.0	1

Other course

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
How many students, on average, did each Teaching Fellow teach in this course?	57.0	57.0	57.0	1
What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Teaching Fellow must have to teach this course?	2.0	2.0	2.0	1

Part N. Part-time Faculty

Q15.2 - How does the pay for Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses compare to the pay for Part-time faculty who have similar years of service and teach Non-LRW Courses?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Equivalent to Most/All	14.8%	4
Higher than Most/All	7.4%	2
Lower than Most/All	7.4%	2
Varies too much to say	0.0%	0
My school does not hire Part-time faculty to teach Non-LRW Courses.	18.5%	5
I don't know.	51.9%	14
Total Responses		27

Q15.3 - What is the unit of pay for Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Per credit hour	6.9%	2
Per course	17.2%	5
Per semester	20.7%	6
Annual salary	27.6%	8
Other	10.3%	3
I don't know.	27.6%	8
Total Responses		29

Q15.4 - Is the amount of pay per unit of pay generally consistent for Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses?

Question	Yes	Yes, but I don't know the amount.	Yes, but I prefer not to provide the amount.	No	I don't know.	Total
Per credit hour	2	0	0	0	0	2
Per course	1	0	3	1	0	5
Per semester	1	1	2	1	1	6
Annual salary	2	2	0	0	4	8
Other	1	0	0	0	1	2
I don't know.	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q15.5 - What is the amount of pay per unit of pay for Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses?

The Survey Committee determined that responses to this question should not be reported unless there were at least 5 responses for a given category. This threshold was not met for this question.

Q15.6 - Which of the following is typically required before a Part-time faculty member will be hired to teach an LRW Course?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Personal Interview	79.3%	23
Writing Sample	55.2%	16
J.D. Transcript	58.6%	17
Reference Letter(s)	48.3%	14
Sample Critiqued Memo/Brief	31.0%	9
Other	13.8%	4
I don't know.	17.2%	5
Total Responses		29

Q15.7 - To what extent do Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses typically teach Non-LRW Courses in the same semester?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Never	41.4%	12
Sometimes	34.5%	10
About half the time	3.4%	1
Most of the time	0.0%	0
Always	0.0%	0
I don't know.	20.7%	6
Total Responses		29

Q15.8 - To what extent is the following information consistent across Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses?

	Generally consistent	Generally consistent, but I don't know the number.	Varies	I don't know.	Responses per Answer
Number of hours the Part-time faculty member is expected to spend each week	12	0	10	7	29
Total number of students the Part-time faculty member will typically teach in LRW Courses each semester	14	0	8	7	29
Whether the Part-time faculty member is permitted to have another job	14	1	3	11	29

Q15.9 - How many hours is the Part-time faculty member expected to spend each week?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
3.0	25.0	17.8	12

Q15.10 - What is the total number of students each Part-time faculty member will typically teach in LRW Courses each semester?

Semester	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Semester
Full-length semester 1	10.0	40.0	21.9	14
Full-length semester 2	10.0	40.0	21.9	14
Full-length semester 3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Full-length semester 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Summer semester	0.0	14.0	4.7	3
Intersession/Maymester/Other short session or semester	0.0	10.0	5.0	2

Q15.11 - Are Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses permitted to have another job?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	85.7%	12
Yes, but only another part-time job.	7.1%	1
Yes, but it is discouraged.	7.1%	1
No	0.0%	0
Other	0.0%	0
I don't know.	0.0%	0
Total Responses		14

Q15.12 - For each of the listed programs, is there a minimum number of years of legal practice that a Part-time faculty member must have to be hired to teach in the program?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Yes	2	0	1	0
Yes, but I don't know the number.	0	0	0	0
No.	6	3	1	0
Varies	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	3	1	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Q15.13 - What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Part-time faculty member must have to be hired to teach in the program?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
First-Year LRW Program	3.0	5.0	4.0	2
Upper-Level LRW Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	2.0	2.0	2.0	1
Other LRW Program(s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

Q15.14 - For each of the listed programs, who is primarily responsible for supervising, mentoring, and/or training the Part-time faculty teaching in the program?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
LRW Director(s) for the program	6	1	2	0
Non-Director LRW Faculty	1	0	0	0
Dean	1	0	0	0
Associate dean	0	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	3	1	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	3	2	0

Q15.15 - For each of the listed programs, which of the following supervisory actions does the person responsible for supervising Part-time faculty regularly undertake?

Select all that apply.

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	1	0	0	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	1	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	1	1	2	0
Surprise class observation	2	0	1	0
Announced class observation	4	1	2	0
Review of end-of-semester evaluations	6	1	2	0
Other	3	0	1	0
I don't know.	4	2	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	3	2	0

Q15.16 - To what extent does a Part-time faculty member have autonomy in creating the course syllabus?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Part-time faculty member is expected to create the course syllabus.	2	2	0	0
The Part-time faculty member is permitted to create the course syllabus but has the option to use a syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	0	1	1	0
The Part-time faculty member is not permitted to create the course syllabus; the Part-time faculty member must use the course syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	3	0	1	0
Varies by course	1	0	0	0
Other	2	0	0	0
I don't know.	3	1	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Q15.17 - To what extent does the Part-time faculty member have autonomy in creating the Major Assignments for the course?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Part-time faculty member is expected to create the assignments.	2	2	1	0
The Part-time faculty member is permitted to create the assignments but has the option to use assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	1	0	1	0
The Part-time faculty member is not permitted to create the assignments; the Part-time LRW Faculty must use the assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	3	1	0	0
Varies by course	1	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	0
I don't know.	3	1	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Q15.18-15.20 - To what extent does the Part-time faculty member have autonomy in the following areas:

Number of Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	1	2	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	4	0	1	0
No or limited autonomy	5	1	1	0
Varies by course	0	1	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Q15.18-15.20 - Continued

Deadlines for Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	2	2	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	3	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	4	1	1	0
Varies by course	0	1	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	10	4	1	0

Length of Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	0	1	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	5	1	1	0
No or limited autonomy	5	1	1	0
Varies by course	0	1	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Number of Minor Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	2	3	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	4	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	3	0	1	0
Varies by course	0	1	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	10	4	1	0

Q15.18-15.20 - Continued

Citation Text

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	3	2	1	0
Some autonomy within established range	0	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	6	1	1	0
Varies by course	1	1	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Textbooks

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	4	4	2	0
Some autonomy within established range	2	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	4	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	11	4	2	0

Content of Lectures/In-Class Exercises

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	6	4	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	3	0	1	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0	0
I don't know.	1	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	10	4	1	0

Q15.21 - For Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, is there a minimum number of years of legal practice the Part-time faculty member must have to teach an LRW Course?

	Responses per Answer
Yes	1
Yes, but I don't know the number.	1
No	7
Varies	3
No Part-time LRW Faculty teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program.	10
I don't know.	7
Total Responses	29

Q15.22 - For Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, what is the minimum number of years of legal practice that the Part-time faculty member must have to teach an LRW Course?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
5.0	5.0	5.0	1

Q15.23 - For Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, who is responsible for supervising, mentoring, and/or training the Part-time faculty member?

Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
Dean	1
Associate Dean	9
LRW Director(s)	4
Non-Director LRW Faculty	0
Varies by course	1
Other	1
I don't know.	3
Total Responses	19

Q15.24 - For Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, which of the following supervisory actions does the person responsible for supervising the Part-time faculty members regularly undertake?

Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	2
Surprise class observation	0
Announced class observation	3
Review of end-of-semester evaluations	5
Other	0
Varies significantly by course and/or supervisor	2
I don't know.	12
Total Responses	19

Part O. Adjunct Faculty

Q16.2 - How does the pay for Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses compare to the pay for Adjuncts who have similar years of service and teach Non-LRW Courses?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Equivalent to most/all	48.0%	48
Higher than most/all	26.0%	26
Lower than most/all	7.0%	7
Too much variation to say.	2.0%	2
I don't know.	17.0%	17
Total Responses		100

Q16.3 - What is the unit of pay for Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses? Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Per credit hour	41.0%	41
Per course	40.0%	40
Other:	3.0%	3
I don't know.	17.0%	17
Total Responses		100

Q16.3 - Explanatory text for “Other” units of pay

Other Units of Pay
Per academic year
Per student
\$3000

Q16.4 - Is the amount of pay per unit of pay generally consistent for Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses?

Question	Yes	Yes, but I don't know the amount.	Yes, but I prefer not to provide the amount.	No.	I don't know.	Total
Per credit hour	31	5	2	1	2	41
Per course	18	4	6	6	6	40
Other:	3	0	0	0	0	3
I don't know.	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q16.5 - What is the amount of pay per unit of pay for Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses?

As the tables below reflect, one responder entered 1 in response to the amount of pay per credit hour for Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses. This answer is likely an error. Accordingly, the parenthetical numbers indicate the results if that answer is excluded from the analysis.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Per credit hour	1 (700)	3000	1715 (1772)	31 (30)
Per course	2000	22000	6839	18
Other Units of Pay	1000	18000	7333	3

**Adjunct Pay Range
Per Credit Hour**

Pay Range	Total Responses per Range
1-500	1
501-1000	5
1001-2000	18
2001-3000	7
Total Responses	31

Q16.5 - Continued

**Adjunct Pay Range
 Per Course**

Pay Range	Total Responses per Range
2,000-5,000	10
5,001-10,000	6
10,001-15,000	1
15,000-20,000	0
20,001-22,000	1
Total Responses	18

Q16.6 - For each of the listed programs, who is responsible for supervising, mentoring, and/or training the Adjuncts teaching in the program?

	First-Year LRW Program		Upper-Level LRW Program		Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program		Other LRW Program(s)	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
LRW Director(s) for the program	75.9%	22	63.3%	19	86.7%	13	40.0%	2
Non-Director LRW Faculty	10.3%	3	6.7%	2	0.0%	0	20.0%	1
Dean	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Associate dean	0.0%	0	20.0%	6	0.0%	0	40.0%	2
Other	10.3%	3	3.3%	1	13.3%	2	0.0%	0
I don't know.	3.4%	1	6.7%	2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0
Total Responses per Program Type		29		30		15		5

Q16.7 - For each of the listed programs, is there a minimum number of years of legal practice that an Adjunct must have to be hired to teach in the program?

Question	Yes		Yes, but I don't know the number.		No		Varies		I don't know.		Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	41.4%	12	0.0%	0	31.0%	9	20.7%	6	6.9%	2	29
Upper-Level LRW Program	26.7%	8	3.3%	1	33.3%	10	16.7%	5	20.0%	6	30
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	40.0%	6	6.7%	1	33.3%	5	20.0%	3	0.0%	0	15
Other LRW Program(s)	20.0%	1	0.0%	0	40.0%	2	20.0%	1	20.0%	1	5

Q16.8 - What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that an Adjunct must have to be hired to teach in the program?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Program
First-Year LRW Program	1.0	5.0	2.8	12
Upper-Level LRW Program	1.0	5.0	3.1	8
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	2.0	5.0	3.2	6
Other LRW Program(s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	1

Q16.9 - For each of the listed programs, which of the following is typically required before the Adjunct will be hired to teach in the program?

Select all that apply. If something is required by the school, but not considered by the person(s) evaluation the candidate during the hiring process, do not include it.

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Personal Interview	23	22	15	3
Writing Sample	21	16	9	1
J.D. Transcript	9	11	8	2
Reference Letter(s)	12	11	8	2
Sample Critiqued Memo/Brief	4	5	6	0
Co-Teaching with a full-time LRW Faculty	0	0	1	0
Co-Teaching with a more experienced Adjunct	0	0	0	0
Other	7	5	5	0
I don't know.	3	7	0	2
Total Responses per Program Type	29	29	15	5

Q16.10 - For each of the listed programs, which of the following supervisory actions does the person responsible for supervising Adjuncts teaching in the program regularly undertake?

Select all that apply.

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	4	1	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	4	3	4	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	1	1	1	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	9	6	4	1
Surprise class observation	4	4	2	0
Announced class observation	18	12	12	2
Review of end-of-semester evaluations	24	20	13	3
Other	9	7	6	0
I don't know.	3	8	0	2
Total Responses	29	30	15	5

Q16.11 - For each of the listed programs, which of the following statements best describes the Adjunct teaching model?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Adjunct and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	0	0	0	0
The Adjunct and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching; the Adjunct is solely responsible for grading and critiquing.	1	1	0	0
The Adjunct is solely responsible for all classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	24	24	9	5
Varies by Course	0	1	3	0
Other	3	3	2	0
I don't know.	0	1	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	28	30	14	5

Q16.12 - For each of the listed programs, to what extent does the Adjunct have autonomy in creating the course syllabus?

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Adjunct is expected to create the course syllabus.	1	7	0	3
The Adjunct is permitted to create the course syllabus but has the option to use a syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	5	8	2	1
The Adjunct is not permitted to create the course syllabus; the Adjunct must use the course syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	18	9	8	1
Varies by Course	0	4	3	0
Other	3	1	1	0
I don't know.	1	1	0	0
Total	28	30	14	5

Q16.13 - For each of the listed programs, to what extent does the Adjunct have autonomy in creating the Major Assignments for the course?

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
The Adjunct is expected to create the assignments.	4	9	0	3
The Adjunct is permitted to create the assignments but has the option to use assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	7	7	4	2
The Adjunct is not permitted to create the assignments; the Adjunct must use the assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	12	9	6	0
Varies by Course	1	3	3	0
Other	4	0	1	0
I don't know.	0	2	0	0
Total	28	30	14	5

Q16.14 - For each of the listed programs, to what extent does the Adjunct have autonomy in the following areas:

Number of Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	2	5	0	3
Some autonomy within established range	2	9	2	0
No or limited autonomy	25	10	9	1
Varies by course	0	3	3	0
I don't know.	0	3	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	29	30	14	5

Deadlines for Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	4	7	0	3
Some autonomy within established range	4	7	2	0
No or limited autonomy	20	8	7	1
Varies by course	0	3	4	0
I don't know.	0	4	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	28	29	13	5

Length of Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	2	5	0	2
Some autonomy within established range	6	9	3	1
No or limited autonomy	20	9	7	1
Varies by course	1	4	4	0
I don't know.	0	3	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	29	30	14	5

Q16.14 - Continued

Number of Minor Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	6	8	1	3
Some autonomy within established range	9	5	4	0
No or limited autonomy	13	8	5	1
Varies by course	0	4	4	0
I don't know.	0	4	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	28	29	14	5

Citation Text

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	4	13	0	3
Some autonomy within established range	1	1	2	0
No or limited autonomy	23	8	10	1
Varies by course	0	5	3	0
I don't know.	0	3	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	28	30	15	5

Textbooks

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	5	11	3	3
Some autonomy within established range	2	2	1	0
No or limited autonomy	22	9	7	1
Varies by course	0	6	4	0
I don't know.	0	2	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	29	30	15	5

Q16.14 - Continued

Content of Class/Lectures

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Other LRW Program(s)
Complete autonomy	7	12	2	3
Some autonomy within established range	16	9	9	1
No or limited autonomy	5	4	0	0
Varies by course	0	3	4	0
I don't know.	0	2	0	1
Total Responses per Program Type	28	30	15	5

Q16.17 - For Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, is there a minimum number of years of legal practice the Adjunct must have to be hired to teach an LRW Course?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	8.0%	8
Yes, but I don't know the number	5.0%	5
No	30.0%	30
Varies	13.0%	13
No Adjuncts teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program.	22.0%	22
I don't know.	22.0%	22
Total Responses		100

Q16.18 - For Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, what is the minimum number of years of legal practice that an Adjunct must have to be hired to teach an LRW Course?

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
2.0	5.0	3.9	8

Q16.19 - For Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, which of the following is typically required before the Adjunct will be hired to teach an LRW Course?

Select all that apply. If something is required by the school, but not part of what the person responsible for hiring considers, do not include it.

Answer	%	Count
Personal Interview	42.3%	33
Writing Sample	26.9%	21
J.D. Transcript	26.9%	21
Reference Letter(s)	21.8%	17
Sample Critiqued Memo/Brief	6.4%	5
Co-Teaching with full-time LRW Faculty	3.8%	3
Co-Teaching with a more experienced Adjunct	2.6%	2
Other	23.1%	18
I don't know.	47.4%	37
Total Responses		78

Q16.19 - Explanatory text for “Other” items requires before the Adjunct will be hired to teach an LRW Course

The following table summarizes the explanatory text provided for this question.

Other Items Required Before Hiring
Agreement with Associate Dean, not based upon particular hiring criteria
Clerkship experience
Cover letter
CV/resume (2 responses)
Experience/recommendation from someone on faculty.
Mock class
Prior teaching experience
Recommendation by faculty, generally
Reference list
Substantial practice experience; audit of course to be taught
The only person who fits this category is a former state Supreme Court justice.
Varies (2 responses)
N/ A (3 responders indicated that this question was not applicable or that that no Adjuncts teach LRW Courses offered outside of the LRW Program, although the response to Q16.17 did not indicate this)

Q16.20 - For Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, who is responsible for supervising, mentoring, and/or training the Adjunct?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Dean	1.3%	1
Associate Dean	48.7%	38
LRW Director(s)	7.7%	6
Non-Director LRW Faculty	1.3%	1
Other	10.3%	8
Varies by course	11.5%	9
I don't know.	19.2%	15
Total Responses		78

Q16.20 - Explanatory text for “Other”

The following table summarizes the explanatory text provided for this question.

Other Individuals Responsible for Supervising/Mentoring/Training Adjuncts
Adjunct Faculty Committee or individual professor in subject area
Associate Dean, Director, as well as other faculty (including non-LRW faculty)
Director of Upper Level Writing Electives
Director of Academic and Bar Support
N/A (4 responders indicated that this question was not applicable or that that no Adjuncts teach LRW Courses offered outside of the LRW Program, although the response to Q16.17 did not indicate this)

Q16.21 - For Adjuncts who teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, which of the following supervisory actions does the person responsible for supervising the Adjunct regularly undertake?

Answer	%	Count
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0.0%	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	2.6%	2
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	1.3%	1
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	2.6%	2
Surprise class observation	3.8%	3
Announced class observation	17.9%	14
Review of end-of-semester evaluations	23.1%	18
Other	10.3%	8
Varies significantly by course and/or supervisor	17.9%	14
I don't know.	50.0%	39
Total		78

Q16.21 - Explanatory text for “Other”

The following table summarizes the explanatory text provided for this question.

Other Supervisory Actions
Review of syllabi, review of assignments (not the papers, the assignments)
Review of proposed syllabus and proposed assignments before semester begins
There are no formal reviews; academic dean is responsible; this is very problematic when the adjunct is problematic
N/A (4 responders indicated that this question was not applicable or that no Adjuncts teach LRW Courses offered outside of the LRW Program, although the response to Q16.17 did not indicate this)

Part P. Teaching Assistants

Q17.2 - Does your school appoint (or do individual LRW Faculty hire) upper-level law students as Teaching Assistants to assist individual LRW Faculty (whether Full-time, Part-time, or Adjunct) or the LRW Program(s) generally in teaching any Required LRW Course?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	72.5%	132
No	27.5%	50
I don't know.	0.0%	0
Total Responses		182

Q17.3 - To what extent is the number of hours each Teaching Assistant is expected to spend on Teaching Assistant duties during the semester consistent?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Generally consistent	59.1%	78
Varies by professor or course	40.2%	53
I don't know.	0.8%	1
Total Responses		132

Q17.4#1 - On average, how many hours is each Teaching Assistant expected to spend on Teaching Assistant duties each semester?

If the semester has not yet begun, please provide an estimate.

Semester	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Semester
First semester of the Current Academic Year	1.0	300.0	66.7	73
Second semester of the Current Academic Year	0.0	300.0	64.5	74
Third semester of the Current Academic Year	4.0	30.0	17.0	2
Fourth semester of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

Q17.4#2 - How many Teaching Assistants were selected to teach or assist with Required LRW Courses each semester?

If the semester has not yet begun, please provide an estimate.

Semester	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Semester
First semester of the Current Academic Year	0.0	84.0	12.7	127
Second semester of the Current Academic Year	0.0	84.0	12.8	129
Third semester of the Current Academic Year	1.0	34.0	12.3	4
Fourth semester of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

Q17.5 - What is the approximate percentage of the total class hours taught by a Teaching Assistant with no or minimal supervision by an LRW Faculty member?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
100%: The TA is the only instructor	0.0%	0
75-99% of the class is taught by a TA	0.0%	0
50-74% of the class is taught by a TA	0.0%	0
25-49% of the class is taught by a TA	2.3%	3
0-24% of the class is taught by a TA	24.2%	32
Never (the TAs' duties are limited to non-classroom teaching and assistance)	56.1%	74
Varies by professor	17.4%	23
Total Responses		132

Q17.6 - Do the Teaching Assistants' responsibilities include providing feedback to students on their work?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	50.0%	66
No	18.9%	25
Varies by professor or course	31.1%	41
Total Responses		132

Q17.7 - In each of the listed semesters, on average, how many students were assigned to each Teaching Assistant whose responsibilities included providing feedback to students on their work?

Semester	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Semester
First semester of the Current Academic Year	4.0	45.0	15.2	65
Second semester of the Current Academic Year	1.0	45.0	15.0	66
Third semester of the Current Academic Year	7.0	15.0	11.0	2
Fourth semester of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

TA Student Load Ranges for First Semester of the Current Academic Year

Range	%	Total Responses per Range
4-10 Students	35.4%	23
11-20 Students	47.7%	31
21-30 Students	12.3%	8
31-40 Students	3.1%	2
41-45 Students	1.5%	1
Total Responses		65

TA Student Load Ranges for Second Semester of the Current Academic Year

Range	%	Total Responses per Range
1-10	37.9%	25
11-20	45.5%	30
21-30	10.6%	7
31-40	3.0%	2
41-45	3.0%	2
Total Response		66

Q17.8 - When providing feedback on student work, what subjects do the Teaching Assistants cover?

Check all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Research	69.7%	46
Writing (generally)	78.8%	52
Legal analysis	68.2%	45
Reviewing citations	93.9%	62
General law school questions	60.6%	40
Other:	9.1%	6
I don't know.	0.0%	0
Total Responses		66

Q17.8 - Explanatory text for “Other” subjects covered by Teaching Assistants

The following chart summarizes the “other” subjects identified by responders.

Other Courses
Citation (2 responses)
Limited review of organization/structure
Oral Advocacy, other lawyering skills, varies by professor
Some supplementary writing/analysis feedback, varies by professor

Q17.9 - Are the Teaching Assistants compensated?

For purposes of this question, compensation includes course credit.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	86.4%	114
No	10.6%	14
Varies	3.0%	4
Total Responses		132

Q17.10 - How are the Teaching Assistants compensated?

Choose all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
With course credit (graded)	9.6%	11
With course credit (pass/fail, including modified or enhanced pass/fail)	25.4%	29
Offset against tuition	5.3%	6
Payment per semester	28.1%	32
Payment per hour reported	49.1%	56
Other	0.0%	0
Total Responses		114

Q17.11 - How many credits does a Teaching Assistant typically earn per semester?

Credit Type	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Credit Type
Graded Course Credits	1.0	3.0	2.1	11
Pass/Fail (including modified or enhanced pass/fail) Course Credits	1.0	3.0	1.6	28

Q17.12 - Is the amount of training provided to each Teaching Assistant over the course of a semester generally consistent across Teaching Assistants in the following categories:

TA Category	Yes		Varies by professor		Varies based on other factors		I don't know.		Total Responses per TA Category
New TAs	39.4%	52	52.3%	69	1.5%	2	6.8%	9	132
Returning TAs (e.g., second semester or second year)	34.8%	46	52.3%	69	2.3%	3	10.6%	14	132

Q17.13 - How many hours of training are typically provided for each Teaching Assistant over the course of a semester?

TA Category	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per TA Category
for New TAs	2.0	50.0	12.2	49
for Returning TAs	0.0	45.0	8.7	42

Hours of Training for New TAs

Hours of Training	Total Responses per Range
0 to 10	28
11 to 20	16
21 to 30	1
31 to 40	2
41 to 50	2
Total Responses	49

Hours of Training for Returning TAs

Hours of Training	Total Responses per Range
0 to 10	30
11 to 20	11
21 to 30	0
31 to 40	0
41 to 50	1
Total Responses	42

Q17.14 - What level of education is required in order to serve as a Teaching Assistant?

Answer	%	Count
Only 2L students serve as TAs.	2.3%	3
Only 3L students serve as TAs.	8.3%	11
Both 2L and 3L students may serve as TAs.	82.6%	109
Varies by professor	5.3%	7
Varies based on other factors	0.8%	1
I don't know.	0.8%	1
Total Responses		132

Q17.14 - Explanatory text for “Varies based on other factors”

Other Courses
Both 2Ls and 3Ls may serve as TAs in first year writing course; only 3Ls may serve as TAs in Upper Level Writing course

Part Q. Writing Specialists

Q18.2 - Does the law school plan on hiring one or more writing specialists for the upcoming Academic Year?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	16.5%	30
No	78.6%	143
I don't know.	4.9%	9
Total Responses		182

Q18.3 - Does the law school employ one or more writing specialists?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	30.2%	55
No	69.8%	127
Total Responses		182

Q18.4 - How many writing specialists does the law school employ in each of the following categories?

Note 1: If a person works full time but only devotes some of that time to writing specialist duties, please count that person as a part-time writing specialist.

Note 2: If you are unable to answer the question (or any part of it), you may leave the appropriate text box(es) blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. If the answer is 0, please enter 0 so that the system will include that answer in the results.

Full-Time Writing Specialists by Faculty/Staff Category

	Schools Leaving this Category Blank	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	32	23	0	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	32	23	0	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term	30	20	5	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	28	22	4	1	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term	32	21	2	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Part-time	31	21	3	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Adjunct	32	22	0	1	0	0
Staff Administrator	30	19	5	0	1	0
Other Category	38	16	1	0	0	
Unknown Category	40	14	1	0	0	0

Q18.4 - Continued

Part-Time Writing Specialists by Faculty/Staff Category

	Schools Leaving this Category Blank	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	31	22	2	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	32	23	0	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term	33	21	1	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	30	22	3	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term	31	22	2	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Part-time	30	18	6	0	0	1
Faculty Member: Adjunct	30	19	6	0	0	0
Staff Administrator	28	18	9	0	0	0
Other Category	33	16	5	1	0	0
Unknown Category	41	14	0	0	0	0

All Writing Specialists

Although Q18.4 focused categorizing the writing specialists, responses entered for this question also provide the information about the total number of writing specialists at the institution. These tables include only those institutions that employ one or more writing specialists, based upon the response to Q18.3. Thus, the two schools listed below with 0 writing specialists did not provide information in response to Q18.4.

Number of Writing Specialists (Full-time and Part-time)	Responses per Answer
0	2
1	44
2	6
3	1
4	1
5	1
Total Responses	55

Q18.4 - Continued

Number of Full-time Writing Specialists	Responses per Answer
0	33
1	18
2	3
4	1
Total Responses	55

Number of Part-time Writing Specialists	Responses per Answer
0	20
1	32
2	2
4	1
Total Responses	55

Q18.5 - How many writing specialists does the law school employ with the following degrees?

Note 1: If a person works full time but only devotes some of that time to writing specialist duties, please count that person as a part-time writing specialist.

Note 2: If you are unable to answer the question (or any part of it), you may leave the appropriate text box(es) blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. If the answer is 0, please enter 0 so that the system will include that answer in the results.

Full-Time Writing Specialists by Degree

	Schools Leaving this Category Blank	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
J.D.	30	18	6	1	0	0
Ph.D. in English	36	16	3	0	0	0
Other Advanced Degree	36	14	5	0	0	0
J.D. & Ph.D. in English	37	18	0	0	0	0
Other Combination of Degrees	38	16	0	1	0	0
Degrees Unknown	37	15	3	0	0	0

Part-Time Writing Specialists by Degree

	Schools Leaving this Category Blank	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
J.D.	25	13	15	0	0	2
Ph.D. in English	29	15	11	0	0	0
Other Advanced Degree	38	14	3	0	0	0
J.D. & Ph.D. in English	36	17	2	0	0	0
Other Combination of Degrees	38	16	1	0	0	0
Degrees Unknown	38	15	2	0	0	0

Q18.6 - Which of the following components of the curriculum do the writing specialist(s) support?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
First-year LRW Courses	90.7%	49
Upper-level LRW Courses	64.8%	35
First-year Non-LRW Courses	29.6%	16
Upper-level Non-LRW Courses	57.4%	31
Career Services Office	25.9%	14
Academic Support/Bar Pass program(s)	18.5%	10
Students who seek assistance for work that is not connected to a course or program (e.g., assistance with a writing sample)	50.0%	27
Other; please describe:	11.1%	6
I don't know.	0.0%	0
Total Responses		54

Q18.6 - Explanatory text for “Other” components of the curriculum supported by the writing specialist(s)

Other Components of the Curriculum
Available to help any student with general writing skills; any professor can refer students to the Writing Specialist for help.
As requested by students or professors
Workshops offered to general student population; law review support
student organizations, journals, law review
Foreign LLM students

Q18.7 - Which of the following activities are included in the writing specialists' responsibilities?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Provide workshops or other programming during new student orientation	31.5%	17
Provide optional workshops during the Academic Year	59.3%	32
Provide mandatory workshops during the Academic Year	16.7%	9
Hold optional student conferences	92.6%	50
Hold mandatory student conferences	18.5%	10
Review written work that will be turned in for a grade	59.3%	32
Review upper-level seminar papers	46.3%	25
Teach one or more courses as sole or co-teacher	20.4%	11
Guest lecture/teach	16.7%	9
Assist ESL and international students	48.1%	26
Train LRW Faculty	3.7%	2
Train upper-level students to assist the writing specialist(s)	14.8%	8
Train upper-level students to assist LRW Faculty	3.7%	2
Serve on committees	27.8%	15
Publish	5.6%	3
Present at conferences	18.5%	10
Other; please describe:	5.6%	3
I don't know.	0.0%	0
Total Responses		54

Q18.7 - Explanatory text for “Other” activities

Other Activities
Can review written work after it has been graded---voluntary
Limited review of work to be turned in for a grade; review of work after it has been graded.
publishing and assisting ESL are not required by contract, so possibly don't apply

Q18.9 - If the law school is affiliated with a university, does the university have a writing center or other writing specialists that law students may take advantage of?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	56.0%	102
No	4.4%	8
The university has a writing center, but it is not available to law students.	21.4%	39
N/A; my law school is not affiliated with a university.	10.4%	19
I don't know.	7.7%	14
Total Responses		182

Q18.10 - How often do LRW Faculty recommend that students take advantage of the university writing center?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Frequently	10.8%	11
Occasionally	25.5%	26
Rarely	42.2%	43
Never	13.7%	14
I don't know.	7.8%	8
Total Responses		102

Part R. Recent Changes

Q19.2 - Has there been any major change for LRW Faculty or LRW Courses at your school in the Current Academic Year, compared to the previous Academic Year, or has such a change been approved for a future year?

Major Changes in the Current Academic Year

Question	Increase/ Improvement		Decrease/ Reduction		No Change		N/A		Responses per Answer
Number of full-time LRW Faculty (excluding Visitors)	5.5%	10	10.4%	19	84.1%	153	0.0%	0	182
Employment status of LRW Director(s)	1.1%	2	2.7%	5	87.9%	160	8.2%	15	182
Employment status of all non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	2.7%	5	0.0%	0	96.7%	176	0.5%	1	182
Employment status of some non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	3.8%	7	2.7%	5	90.1%	164	3.3%	6	182
Number of credits for at least some Required LRW Courses	4.9%	9	0.5%	1	94.5%	172	0.0%	0	182
Number of Required LRW Courses	1.6%	3	0.5%	1	97.8%	178	0.0%	0	182
Other Change 1	1.1%	2	0.0%	0	0.5%	1	98.4%	179	182
Other Change 2	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	182	182

Q19.2 - Continued

Major Changes Approved for a Future Year

Question	Increase/ Improvement		Decrease/ Reduction		No Change		N/A		Responses per Answer
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Number of full-time LRW Faculty (excluding Visitors)	11.0%	20	8.2%	15	79.7%	145	1.1%	2	182
Employment status of LRW Director(s)	2.2%	4	1.1%	2	89.0%	162	7.7%	14	182
Employment status of all non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	4.4%	8	1.1%	2	92.9%	169	1.6%	3	182
Employment status of some non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	3.3%	6	2.7%	5	90.1%	164	3.8%	7	182
Number of credits for at least some Required LRW Courses	3.3%	6	0.0%	0	96.2%	175	0.5%	1	182
Number of Required LRW Courses	1.6%	3	1.1%	2	96.7%	176	0.5%	1	182
Other Change 1	2.2%	4	0.0%	0	0.5%	1	97.3%	177	182
Other Change 2	0.0%	0	0.5%	1	0.0%	0	99.5%	181	182

Q19.7#1 - In comparison to the offices of Non-LRW Faculty, are the offices of LRW Faculty integrated or segregated with other faculty?

Status	Integrated		Segregated		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	88.2%	45	11.8%	6	51
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	81.3%	13	18.8%	3	16
Tenured or Tenure-track with 405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	79.0%	64	21.0%	17	81
Tenured or Tenure-track with	66.2%	47	33.8%	24	71
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	46.2%	18	53.8%	21	39

Q19.7#2 - In comparison to the offices of Non-LRW Faculty, are the offices of LRW Faculty larger, smaller, or comparable?

Status	Larger		Smaller		Comparable		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	5.9%	3	2.0%	1	92.2%	47	51
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	100.0%	16	16
Tenured or Tenure-track with 405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1.2%	1	6.2%	5	92.6%	75	81
Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	1.4%	1	25.4%	18	73.2%	52	71
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	5.1%	2	17.9%	7	76.9%	30	39

Q19.7#3 - In comparison to the offices of Non-LRW Faculty, is the location of the offices of LRW Faculty more desirable, less desirable, or comparable?

Status	More desirable		Less Desirable		Comparable		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2.0%	1	5.9%	3	92.2%	47	51
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0.0%	0	6.3%	1	93.8%	15	16
Tenured or Tenure-track with 405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1.2%	1	13.6%	11	85.2%	69	81
Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	5.6%	4	19.7%	14	74.6%	53	71
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	5.1%	2	28.2%	11	66.7%	26	39

Q19.8 - Why are the LRW Faculty offices segregated from the Non-LRW Faculty offices?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Our school has a dedicated space for legal writing and/or advocacy, and all legal writing faculty offices are located in that space.	70.0%	35
Other	30.0%	15
Total Responses		50

Part S. Writing Across the Curriculum

Q20.2 - Has your school adopted a “writing across the curriculum” program or required Legal Writing Assignments in any Non-LRW Courses other than seminars?

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes, our school requires a writing assignment in all Non-LRW Courses.	2.7%	5
Yes, our school requires a writing assignment in some Non-LRW Courses that are not seminars.	8.8%	16
No, our school has no such requirement, but some professors choose to include such assignments in their Non-LRW Courses.	61.0%	111
No.	18.1%	33
I don't know.	5.5%	10
Other	3.8%	7
Total Responses		182

Q20.3 - Approximately what percentage of non-seminar, Non-LRW Courses are required to include writing assignments?

Answers	Number of Responses Giving this Answer
0%	1
2%	1
3%	1
10%	1
20%	2
50%	1
Total Responses	7

Q20.4 - What types of Legal Writing Assignments do these non-seminar Non-LRW Courses include?

Select all that apply.

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Advanced advocacy	34.4%	45
Client/opinion letters	41.2%	54
Drafting-legislation	36.6%	48
Drafting-litigation	67.2%	88
Drafting-transactional (contracts, wills, real estate, corporate/business, etc.)	67.9%	89
I don't know.	22.9%	30
Judicial opinions	24.4%	32
Office memoranda	36.6%	48
Other	6.9%	9
Total Responses		131

Q20.4 - Explanatory text for “Other” Legal Writing Assignments

Other Components of the Curriculum
We believe that other courses also include such assignments, but we do not have that information.
Email analysis
Exam-like essays
Paper of some sort in Evidence class.
General research papers
Emails

Appendix

Law Schools Responding to the Survey (182 Total):

Name of School	
1.	Albany Law School
2.	American University, Washington College of Law
3.	Appalachian School of Law
4.	Arizona State University Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law
5.	Ave Maria School of Law
6.	Baylor Law School
7.	Belmont University College of Law
8.	Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University
9.	Boston College Law School
10.	Boston University School of Law
11.	Brooklyn Law School
12.	BYU Law School
13.	California Western School of Law
14.	Campbell University School of Law
15.	Capital University Law School
16.	Case Western Reserve University School of Law
17.	Chapman University School of Law, Dale E. Fowler School of Law
18.	Charleston School of Law
19.	Chicago-Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology
20.	Cleveland Marshall College of Law
21.	Concordia University School of Law
22.	Cornell University Law School
23.	Creighton University School of Law
24.	Cumberland School of Law, Samford University
25.	CUNY School of Law
26.	Delaware Law School, Widener University

27.	DePaul University College of Law
28.	Drake University Law School
29.	Duke University School of Law
30.	Duquesne University School of Law
31.	Elon University School of Law
32.	Faulkner University Jones School of Law
33.	Florida A&M University College of Law
34.	Florida Coastal School of Law
35.	Florida International University
36.	Florida State University College of Law
37.	Fordham Law School
38.	George Washington University Law School
39.	Georgetown University Law Center
40.	Georgia State University College of Law
41.	Golden Gate University School of Law
42.	Gonzaga University School of Law
43.	Harvard Law School
44.	Hastings College of the Law
45.	Hofstra Law
46.	Howard University School of Law
47.	Indiana University Maurer School of Law
48.	Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law
49.	Lewis and Clark Law School
50.	Lincoln Memorial University, Duncan School of Law
51.	Loyola University Chicago School of Law
52.	Loyola University New Orleans College of Law
53.	Marquette University Law School
54.	Massachusetts School of Law at Andover
55.	McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific
56.	Mercer University School of Law

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
 Appendix

57.	Michigan State University College of Law
58.	Mississippi College School of Law
59.	Mitchell Hamline School of Law
60.	Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University
61.	New England Law Boston
62.	New York Law School
63.	North Carolina Central University School of Law
64.	Northeastern University School of Law
65.	Northern Illinois University College of Law
66.	Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law
67.	Notre Dame Law School
68.	Nova Southeastern University Shepard Broad Law Center
69.	NYU School of Law
70.	Ohio Northern University Pettit College of Law
71.	Oklahoma City University School of Law
72.	Paul M. Hebert Law Center Louisiana State University
73.	Penn State Law (University Park)
74.	Pepperdine University School of Law
75.	Quinnipiac University School of Law
76.	Regent University Law School
77.	Roger Williams University School of Law
78.	Rutgers Law School - Camden Campus
79.	Rutgers Law School - Newark Campus
80.	Santa Clara University Law
81.	Savannah Law School
82.	Seattle University School of Law
83.	Seton Hall University School of Law
84.	South Texas College of Law Houston
85.	Southern Illinois University School of Law
86.	Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
 Appendix

87.	Southern University Law Center
88.	Southwestern Law School
89.	St. John's University School of Law
90.	St. Louis University School of Law
91.	St. Mary's University School of Law
92.	St. Thomas University School of Law (Miami)
93.	Stetson University College of Law
94.	Suffolk University Law School
95.	Syracuse University College of Law
96.	Temple University Beasley School of Law
97.	Texas A&M University School of Law
98.	Texas Tech University School of Law
99.	The John Marshall Law School (Chicago)
100.	Thomas Jefferson School of Law
101.	Thomas R. Kline School of Law, Drexel University
102.	Thurgood Marshall School of Law, Texas Southern University
103.	Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center
104.	Tulane Law School
105.	UCLA School of Law
106.	UDC David A. Clarke School of Law
107.	University at Buffalo School of Law
108.	University of Akron School of Law
109.	University of Alabama School of Law
110.	University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law
111.	University of Arkansas at Little Rock, William H. Bowen School of Law
112.	University of Arkansas School of Law
113.	University of Baltimore School of Law
114.	University of California Davis School of Law
115.	University of California, Berkeley School of Law
116.	University of California, Irvine School of Law

117.	University of Chicago Law School
118.	University of Cincinnati College of Law
119.	University of Colorado Law School
120.	University of Dayton School of Law
121.	University of Denver Sturm College of Law
122.	University of Detroit Mercy School of Law
123.	University of Florida Levin College of Law
124.	University of Houston Law Center
125.	University of Idaho College of Law
126.	University of Illinois College of Law
127.	University of Kansas School of Law
128.	University of Kentucky College of Law
129.	University of La Verne College of Law
130.	University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law
131.	University of Maine School of Law
132.	University of Maryland, Carey School of Law
133.	University of Massachusetts School of Law - Dartmouth
134.	University of Memphis, Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law
135.	University of Miami School of Law
136.	University of Michigan Law School
137.	University of Minnesota Law School
138.	University of Mississippi School of Law
139.	University of Missouri School of Law (Columbia)
140.	University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law
141.	University of Nebraska College of Law
142.	University of New Hampshire School of Law
143.	University of New Mexico School of Law
144.	University of North Carolina School of Law
145.	University of North Dakota School of Law
146.	University of Oklahoma College of Law

147.	University of Oregon School of Law
148.	University of Pennsylvania Law School
149.	University of Pittsburgh School of Law
150.	University of Richmond School of Law
151.	University of San Diego School of Law
152.	University of San Francisco School of Law
153.	University of South Carolina School of Law
154.	University of South Dakota School of Law
155.	University of Southern California Gould School of Law
156.	University of St. Thomas School of Law (Minnesota)
157.	University of Tennessee College of Law
158.	University of Texas School of Law
159.	University of Toledo College of Law
160.	University of Tulsa College of Law
161.	University of Utah SJ Quinney School of Law
162.	University of Virginia School of Law
163.	University of Washington School of Law
164.	University of Wisconsin Law School
165.	University of Wyoming College of Law
166.	Valparaiso University School of Law
167.	Vanderbilt University Law School
168.	Vermont Law School
169.	Villanova University School of Law
170.	Wake Forest University School of Law
171.	Washburn University School of Law
172.	Washington University School of Law
173.	Wayne State University Law School
174.	West Virginia University College of Law
175.	Western Michigan University Cooley Law School
176.	Western New England University School of Law

ALWD/LWI Annual Legal Writing Survey - Report of the 2016-2017 Survey
Appendix

177.	Western State College of Law
178.	Whittier Law School
179.	Widener University Commonwealth Law School
180.	Willamette University College of Law
181.	William and Mary Law School
182.	William S. Boyd School of Law, UNLV