

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey, 2020-2021

Report of the Individual Survey

ALWD

Association of Legal
Writing Directors



2020-2021 Survey Committee

Ted Becker (Co-Chair)
Marci A. Rosenthal (Co-Chair)
Catherine DuBois
Sonia Green
Kimberly Holst
Carol Knoepfler
Jennifer Mitchell
Gail Mullins
Martha Pagliari
Shakira Pleasant
Monte Smith

For questions or more information about these results,
contact Ted Becker (tbecker@umich.edu) or Marci Rosenthal (marciros@fiu.edu)

2020-2021 Survey Results

Association of Legal Writing Directors & Legal Writing Institute

This report presents the results of the Individual Survey component of the ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey for 2020-2021. These results provide information collected from over 330 legal research and writing professors across the country.

This report is the latest iteration of a multi-year project that overhauled the decades-old Annual Survey with the goal of modernizing it and expanding the scope of information collected. No survey instrument can perfectly capture the varied, complex, and unique circumstances at every law school or of the many individual professors who teach legal research and writing at those schools.

Although the report is 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.

We thank all of the respondents who took the time to complete the 2020-2021 Individual Survey. The valuable information this report provides would not be possible if it were not for the time and effort of those individuals.

Ted Becker, University of Michigan Law School
Marcia A. Rosenthal, Florida International University College of Law

Table of Contents

History of the Survey.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Survey Structure.....	iii
Respondent Pool.....	iii
Definitions.....	vi
Navigating This Report & Asking Questions.....	x
The Inevitable Caveats.....	x
Part A. Employment Background.....	1
Part B. Education and Experience.....	6
Part C. Faculty Contracts.....	11
Part D. LRW Course Details.....	15
Part E. Research Instruction in Required Courses.....	65
Part F. Non-LRW Courses.....	76
Part G. Work Load.....	78
Part H. Part-Time Faculty.....	100
Part I. Committee Service.....	111
Part J. Directors of LRW Programs.....	118
Part K. Demographics.....	123
Part L. Compensation.....	126

History of the Survey

For more than two decades, ALWD and LWI have jointly conducted surveys 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, around the same time as the Association of Legal Writing Directors was beginning, Jan Levine, now Director of Legal Research and Writing at Duquesne University School of Law, assisted by Louis J. Sirico, then 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 ALWD. 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, and 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. Eventually, though, 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. 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. From 2013 to 2015, the Survey Committee 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 Committee selected Ken Chestek to serve as the lead author who would work with the consultant and the Committee to revise the survey instrument.

From 2015 to 2017, the Committee 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. The Committee also 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.

The new 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.¹

Acknowledgements

Special thanks are due as always to Jodi Wilson (Memphis), who co-chaired the Committee for many years while the Annual Survey was being revamped, and whose institutional knowledge has proved invaluable time and time again. We also wish to thank Megan Moore and Heather VanderWal, administrative assistants at the University of Michigan Law School, for their assistance in preparing this year's report.

¹ For a more detailed description of the multi-year process for revising the Survey, including the names of the many people involved, please see the 2016-2017 Report.

Survey Structure

As mentioned, the 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. That phase of the survey is administered every two years, most recently for the 2019-2020 academic year, and will be administered later this summer of 2022 to collect information about the 2021-2022 academic year that recently concluded. The second phase is the Individual Phase, which seeks more detailed information from individual faculty members who teach legal writing courses. You are reading the first report prepared for the Individual Phase. We anticipate that this phase will also be administered every two years, alternating with the Institutional Survey.

Respondent Pool

In the summer of 2021, the Survey Committee collected the names and email addresses of faculty who taught an LRW course during the 2020-2021 Academic Year. Specifically, the Committee sent a short Qualtrics survey to either the person who submitted information about a law school for the 2019-2020 Institutional Survey during the summer of 2020, or who the Committee's records otherwise indicated was the designated respondent for that school for ALWD/LWI surveys. The Committee asked the respondent to provide the names and email addresses for all full-time, part-time, and visiting professors who taught one or more LRW courses at that school during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.²

The Committee received responses from 182 schools. Based on the information received from those schools, the Committee sent invitations to 999 individual professors in August 2021 to complete the Individual Survey. Ultimately, 332 individuals completed the Survey.³

By way of comparison, approximately 85% of the law schools eligible to complete the 2019-2020 Institutional Survey did so. This is a bit of an apples and oranges comparison, however. The Institutional Survey is sent to one respondent per school, typically a director or other senior faculty member, who provides responses on behalf of the entire school. The Individual Survey, in contrast, is sent to all eligible respondents at all schools, who provide responses only about themselves. The Committee is not surprised at the drop in response rate, which it believes to be attributable to several factors, most notably the understandable and unprecedented demands on respondents' time and attention related to the COVID-19 pandemic that continued to be ongoing at the same time as we were administering the Individual Survey. We are also aware that the length of the Survey may have proven an impediment to some prospective respondents, especially considering that most of the eligible respondents were not the designated

² The Committee decided to limit the categories of faculty from whom we would be soliciting responses, and thus did not ask respondents to provide information about adjunct faculty who provide LRW instruction in some form. The Committee might expand the Individual Survey to solicit information about adjunct faculty in the future.

³ At the start of the Survey, respondents were given the option to decline to participate or to indicate that they had received an invitation in error. Fourteen respondents chose one of these options and exited the Survey as a result. In addition, 57 respondents started to complete the Survey but did not finish. Their responses have not been included in this report

respondents for their schools for purposes of the Institutional Survey and thus were not accustomed to completing a survey of such length. All that said, the Committee will be considering how to improve the overall response rate in future iterations of the Individual Survey.

Another way to approach this issue is to compare the demographics of the Survey's respondents to information we have from other sources about the demographics of LRW professors. One such source is the 2019-2020 Institutional Survey, which asked each school's designated respondent to provide certain types of information about all the full-time LRW faculty at their school. The 169 respondents were first asked to identify how many full-time professors taught LRW at their school in 2019-2020. The percentages of faculty falling within each of the five full-time categories identified in the 2019-2020 Institutional Survey are generally similar to the results in this year's Individual Survey, suggesting that this year's respondent pool is representative in this important respect of the larger group of all full-time LRW professors at all law schools:

	2020-2021 Individual Survey Q3.5		2019-2020 Institutional Survey Q8.16 ⁴	
	# of Professors	%	# of Professors	%
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	64	21.3%	153	20.1%
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	23	7.7%	50	6.6%
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	120	40.0%	269	35.3%
Full-time, Short-term	54	18.0%	204	26.8%
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	39	13.0%	86	11.3%
Total	300	100%	762	100%

Turning to demographic information such as age and sex, 109 respondents to the 2019-2020 Institutional Survey agreed to provide such information about their school's full-time LRW faculty.⁵ The responses to

⁴ For the purposes of creating this table, any entries in the "10-15" columns for the Q8.16 tables of last year's Institutional Survey have been treated as though the respondent's school had 10 professors in that category.

⁵ The Institutional Survey asked respondents to provide this information only about full-time LRW faculty, excluding part-time and visiting faculty. This year's Individual Survey solicited that information from all respondents, including part-time and visiting faculty. Of note, only 21 of this year's Individual Survey's 332 respondents were part-time or visitors. See Q3.2 of this year's Survey.

comparable questions between the 2019-2020 Institutional Survey and the 2020-2021 Individual Survey reveal the following differences of note, which users of this Report may wish to keep in mind:

- The Individual Survey respondent pool skews older: 72% of the respondents were between 40-59, compared to 62% of professors identified as being in that age range in the previous year's Institutional Survey.⁶ This may impact interpreting the data for such topics as salary and other areas, at least if one assumes that age is a proxy for a person's experience teaching LRW.
- The Individual Survey respondent pool has a larger percentage of women: 76.6% of the respondents were women, as compared to 69.8% of professors so identified in last year's Institutional Survey.⁷
- Other differences exist for some other aspects of demographic categories like race and sexual orientation.

Taking into account all of this comparative information as a whole, as well as the discussion in the "The Inevitable Caveats" section below, the Survey Committee believes this year's Individual Survey is a representative sample of the complete universe of full-time LRW faculty.

⁶ Compare Q16.2 of this year's Individual Survey to Q8.18 of last year's Institutional Survey (62.4%/321 professors in the 41-60 age range).

⁷ Compare Q16.3 of this year's Individual Survey to Q8.19 of last year's Institutional Survey.

Definitions

As part of the redesign of the Survey, many of the terms used throughout the 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 2020-2021 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 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.
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.
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 students 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

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.

The survey platform we now use for the Annual Survey, Qualtrics, allows for the results for each question to be analyzed in several different ways. We have attempted here to provide the results in what we believe to be the most user-friendly format. The Survey Committee may be able to 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 Ted Becker (tbecker@umich.edu) or Marci Rosenthal (marciros@fiu.edu).

As noted earlier, this is the first Individual Phase report, and thus the data presented here cannot be compared directly to earlier reports. That said, some of the questions in the Individual Survey derive from earlier Institutional Surveys, although direct comparisons may still be difficult because the questions have frequently changed in ways large and small. Institutional Survey results beginning in 2004 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 xii.

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 Survey attempts to reduce interpretation difficulties by adding defined terms and using more precise questions. Nevertheless, some ambiguities are inevitable, especially the first time the Survey is administered (see, for example, Q5.3 and Q5.4), and it's also inevitable that some respondents 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 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 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 respondents will decline to provide an answer. Given the length and complexity of the revised Survey, respondents were allowed to skip most questions without providing an answer. Additionally, for certain questions, the revised Survey allowed respondents to indicate that they preferred not to provide a response. 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 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.

As an extreme example of this, in 2020-2021, 7 respondents (out of 332) indicated in response to Q3.2 that “Part-Time Faculty” best described their employment status. All 7 respondents saw the subsequent series of questions in Part H about Part-Time Faculty. But we are left to wonder how representative those 7 respondents are of the complete cohort of part-time faculty across the country in 2020-2021 (or, indeed, even how large that complete cohort is). How would a higher response rate to the Individual Survey as a whole, which presumably would have brought along with it additional part-time faculty, have affected the numbers reported in Part H?

We don’t know. Certainly, the data from the 7 respondents is useful, but could a larger amount of respondents change the numbers meaningfully? Yes. So, in reviewing the numbers, you should be mindful of the number of people who *could* have responded to a given question and the number of people that actually did respond to the question.

In an effort to provide more reliable information, the revised Survey frequently asks “qualifying” question

and then uses display logic so that the follow-up questions are displayed only to respondents for whom the questions are applicable. For example, if respondents did not indicate in Q6.2 that they taught an appellate advocacy course during 2020-2021, then they did not see the follow-up questions later in the Survey (Q6.17, Q6.39-Q6.42) about appellate advocacy courses. Similarly, if the respondent indicated that the respondent preferred not to provide certain information, the respondent frequently 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 L, 321 respondents answered Q17.15, with 131 of them indicating that they taught a course overload during 2020-2021. All 131 saw and answered Q17.16, with 23 indicating that they received no compensation for teaching the overload. All 23 saw Q17.17, which asked whether non-LRW faculty would be compensated for teaching an overload, but only 22 answered the question. And so on.

The Take-Aways

- As noted earlier, when you review the data, bear in mind that the responses represent approximately one-third of identified legal writing faculty.
- Pay attention to the number of people responding to a given question. One can have more confidence that the responses to a question accurately reflect reality when the response rate is very high. If the question is directed at a subset of respondents, pay attention to how many people responded out of the total number of people to whom the question is directed. The information about the number of people 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. Employment Background

Q3.2 - Which of the following best describes your employment status?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full-time	94%	311
Part-time	2%	7
Visitor	4%	14
Total	100%	332

Q3.3 - Which of the following best describes your position?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Faculty	99%	328
Non-faculty administrator/staff member	1.2%	4
Total	100%	332

Q3.4 - Which of the following best describes your primary responsibilities?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
LRW Faculty	90%	300
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	0%	1
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0%	0
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are in academic support	0%	0
Other Non-LRW Faculty	0%	3
Non-faculty administrator/staff member primarily engaged in teaching or administering LRW Courses	1%	4
Non-faculty administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0%	0
Non-faculty administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are in academic support	0%	0
Non-faculty administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are in another area; please specify:	0%	0
Other ⁸	7%	24
Total	100%	332

⁸ The Survey instrument asked respondents to provide a textual explanation about the “other” answer option in this table. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available.

Q3.5 - Which of the following best describes your appointment type?⁹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Tenured with Traditional Tenure	14%	45
Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	6%	19
Tenured with Programmatic Tenure	5%	16
Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	2%	7
405(c) Status	25%	83
405(c)-track	11%	37
Full-time, Short-term	16%	54
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	12%	39
Visitor	4%	14
Part-time	2%	6
Other ¹⁰	2%	8
Total	100%	328

Q3.6 - For the 2020-2021 Academic Year, did you have the following responsibilities at your school?

Question	Yes		No		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	
Teaching one or more LRW Course(s)	97%	321	3%	11	332
Teaching one or more Non-LRW Course(s)	53%	175	47%	157	332
Scholarship	41%	135	59%	197	332
Service	89%	295	11%	37	332
Serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program(s)	25%	83	75%	249	332
Administration in connection with the law school or university other than administration of an LRW Program(s)	23%	75	77%	257	332
Other; please describe	6%	20	94%	312	332

Other, please describe ¹¹	
"Professional development" is part of our promotion standards and includes scholarship	I had the responsibility of producing scholarship because I had a research stipend for the summer.
Academic support	I was on paternity leave and then research leave
Acting Director, Family Law Program	Law school committee assignments
Administration of other courses, and academic support.	Member of the Dean's Executive Committee
Chaired a faculty committee	Moot court (4 respondents)
Co-designed curriculum reform of LRW program	Not required by written standards to do service/scholarship; but was expected in terms of annual review.

⁹ This question was displayed to all respondents who answered that they were “Faculty” in Q3.3.

¹⁰ The Survey instrument asked respondents to provide a textual explanation about the “other” answer option in this table. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available.

¹¹ For the text response tables, certain responses have been consolidated for efficiency (e.g., the “moot court” responses in this table). The Committee has also when needed lightly edited some responses to revise obvious spelling, capitalizations, and punctuation issues. In general, however, the responses have been reproduced as they appeared in respondents’ original responses.

Director of a new Center	On sabbatical
Director of Academic Success Program	Tenure track just became available to LRW this year
Director of Advocacy	Vice Dean of Student Affairs
Director of Transactional Boot Camp held over winter intersession	Work in Academic Success and with LL.M. students
Externship	Working with Moot court program, but not as director
For the fall 2020 semester, I was Acting Chair of our Legal Practice program. (We do not have a Director, but instead have a rotating chair.)	

Q3.7 - Are you eligible for promotion as a faculty member?¹²

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No, I am fully promoted.	46%	150
No, the position I hold does not have ranks.	18%	59
No, other; please explain	4%	14
Yes	32%	105
Total	100%	328

No, other; please explain
I am a visitor, my contract needs to be renewed every year.
I am fully promoted as a Professor of Law
I am fully promoted to 405(c) status. I can apply for tenure at a time when I have attained a tenure-worthy portfolio of scholarship.
I am waiting to hear if I will get on the continuing-status track.
I can be reviewed and have a "continuing appointment" (2 year contract instead of 1), but that's the upper limit so far.
I have attained the highest "rank" for my track (Senior Professor of Practice). This title affords no additional salary or security of position benefits
I would need to compete in a national search to become contract faculty beyond one year.
I'm a visitor on a one-year contract.
No, I have an annual, renewable contract to teach.
Part time, adjunct, though teach 2 sections so work functionally full time during the academic year. No promotion or change in status available.
Position is term-limited.
This changes in the coming year due to newly granted tenure track status for LRW faculty
Visiting Position / Fellowship
While we had written standards when I was hired 21 years ago, shortly thereafter the written ones were deemed inapplicable and have yet to be replaced. Thus, despite being more than qualified for the full rank, I still have my entry-level rank. Presently, no written standards exist to allow promotion to a higher rank.

¹² This question was displayed to all respondents who answered that they were "Faculty" in Q3.3.

Q3.8 - Were you on leave from your school during some or all of the 2020-2021 Academic Year? For purposes of this question, “on leave” means you were not teaching during an academic term (e.g., semester, trimester) in which you would normally teach.¹³

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	5%	17
No	95%	301
Total	100%	318

Q3.9 - What was the reason for your leave? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Medical leave	6%	1
Parental leave	18%	3
Sabbatical/research leave	76%	13
Release time (e.g., compensation for previous semester overloads)	0%	0
Other; please explain⁶	6%	1
Visitor at another law school	0%	0
Total # of Respondents		17 ¹⁴

Q3.10 - How long was your leave?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full Academic Year	12%	2
One Full Academic Term (e.g., semester, trimester)	76%	13
Other; please explain¹⁵	12%	2
Total	100%	17

Other; please explain
Final 2 months of the spring (retired)
Part of fall semester

¹³ This question was asked of all respondents who did not select “Visitor” as their answer to Q3.5.

¹⁴ For this and all other questions that allow respondents to “select all that apply,” the “total # of respondents” refers to the number of respondents who selected at least one answer option. This amount will frequently differ from the total amount of responses for all answer options; if at least one respondent selects more than one option, the amounts will differ. For example, 17 respondents selected at least one of the answer options for Q3.9 (the figure provided in the bottommost right cell), while the total number of responses for all the options is 18 (calculated by adding all the amounts for the answer options in the far-right column), meaning in this case that one respondent selected two options. For an example with a greater difference, see Q4.2, where the total number of respondents who selected at least one answer option is 332, while the total number of responses for all options is 429.

¹⁵ We have not included the single text response for the “other” category to avoid inadvertently identifying an individual respondent.

Q3.11 - How long was your Visitorship at this school?¹⁶

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full Academic Year	50%	7
One Full Academic Term (e.g., semester, trimester)	0%	0
Other; please explain	50%	7
Total	100%	14

Other; please explain¹⁷
Six respondents indicated that their visitorship was two years

¹⁶ This question was asked of all respondents who selected “Visitor” as their answer to Q3.5.

¹⁷ We have omitted one text response for the “other” category to avoid inadvertently identifying an individual respondent.

Part B. Education and Experience

Q4.2 - Which degrees do you hold? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
JD	99%	330
LL.M.	6%	19
S.JD	0%	1
Ph.D	5%	15
Other advanced non-library degree; please specify	17%	56
MLS	0%	0
MLIS	2%	8
Other library advanced degree; please specify	0%	0
None of the above.	0%	0
Prefer not to answer.	0%	0
Total # of Respondents		332

Other advanced non-library degree; please specify	
Ed.S	Master of Arts in Education
Graduate School Certificate	Masters Degree (4 respondents)
M. Ed. in Counseling	Masters in English
M.A. (15 respondents)	Masters in Professional Accounting
M.A.; M.Ed.	Masters in Teaching
M.Ed. (7 respondents)	MAT
M.F.A. in English (Creative Writing)	MBA (3 respondents)
M.S. Chemistry, M. Div. Theology	MDiv
M.S.S.A.	MFA - Creative Writing
M.S.W.	MSc (6 respondents)
M.U.P.	MSJ
MA in East Asian Studies	MSN
MA in Sociology	

Q4.3 - In what year did you earn your JD?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1974-1979	2%	8
1980-1984	5%	17
1985-1989	12%	38
1990-1994	18%	60
1995-1999	17%	55
2000-2004	21%	69
2005-2009	15%	48
2010-2014	8%	25
2015-2019	1%	4
2020+	0%	1
Total	100%	325

The following questions (Q4.5 through Q4.10) asked how many years of teaching, administrative, and practice experience that respondents have. Respondents were given the option to skip these questions. 325 out of 332 respondents elected to answer them.

Q4.5 - At the beginning of the 2020-2021 Academic Year, how many years of law school teaching experience did you have, whether at this institution or another?¹⁸

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Years of Full-Time experience	0	40	12.9	325
Years of Part-Time experience	0	30	0.6	310
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	25	1.4	325

Year Range ¹⁹	Respondents with this amount of Full-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of Part-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of experience as an Adjunct
0	12	269	209
1-2	31	28	63
3-5	39	4	29
6-9	33	5	11
10-14	86	1	8
15-19	53	1	2
20-24	36	0	2
25-29	19	1	1
30+	16	1	0
Total	325	310	325

¹⁸ Questions Q4.5 through Q4.8 contained the following explanatory note: “Full-time and part-time refer to whether you are a full-time employee or a part-time employee. If you have simultaneously had teaching and administrative responsibilities for some or all of your employment, please include those years here.”

¹⁹ For questions Q4.5 through Q4.10, non-integer responses were rounded down. For example, a response of 0.5 was treated as 0, 2.5 was treated as 2, and so on.

Q4.6 - At the beginning of the 2020-2021 Academic Year, how many years of law school teaching experience did you have at your school?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Years of Full-Time experience	0	40	10.7	324
Years of Part-Time experience	0	25	0.3	325
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	25	0.9	325

Year Range	Respondents with this amount of Full-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of Part-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of experience as an Adjunct
0	28	302	264
1-2	43	15	27
3-5	45	2	19
6-9	35	3	5
10-14	77	1	5
15-19	46	1	3
20-24	30	0	1
25-29	11	1	1
30+	9	0	0
Total	324	325	325

Q4.7 - At the beginning of the 2020-2021 Academic Year, how many years of law school administration experience did you have, whether at this institution or another?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Years of Full-Time experience	0	39	3.1	324
Years of Part-Time experience	0	26	0.2	325
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	1	0.0	325

Year Range	Respondents with this amount of Full-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of Part-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of experience as an Adjunct
0	215	313	324
1-2	25	4	1
3-5	25	4	0
6-9	16	1	0
10-14	18	2	0
15-19	13	0	0
20-24	7	0	0
25-29	2	1	0
30+	3	0	0
Total	324	325	325

Q4.8 - At the beginning of the 2020-2021 Academic Year, how many years of law school administration experience did you have at your school?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Years of Full-Time experience	0	39	2.6	325
Years of Part-Time experience	0	26	0.2	324
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	0	0.0	325

Year Range	Respondents with this amount of Full-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of Part-Time experience	Respondents with this amount of experience as an Adjunct
0	229	313	325
1-2	22	4	0
3-5	21	3	0
6-9	18	1	0
10-14	20	2	0
15-19	7	0	0
20-24	3	0	0
25-29	2	1	0
30+	3	0	0
Total	325	324	325

Q4.9 - At the beginning of the 2020-2021 Academic Year, how many years of experience as a practicing attorney did you have?²⁰

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Years of full-time practice	0	45	8.0	321
Years of part-time practice	0	30	1.1	322
Years of occasional or de minimis practice (e.g., occasional pro bono work)	0	36	2.1	322

Year Range	Years of full-time practice	Years of part-time practice	Years of occasional or de minimis practice (e.g., occasional pro bono work)
0	17	254	254
1-2	29	24	18
3-5	94	24	14
6-9	85	12	6
10-14	51	4	9
15-19	22	2	9
20-24	11	1	6
25-29	7	0	2
30+	5	1	4
Total	321	322	322

Q4.10 - How many years of experience as a practicing attorney did you have before you began teaching and/or working as an administrator or staff member in a law school setting?

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Years of full-time practice	0	36	6.7	323
Years of part-time practice	0	15	0.4	322
Years of occasional or de minimis practice (e.g., occasional pro bono work)	0	17	0.3	322

Year Range	Years of full-time practice	Years of part-time practice	Years of occasional or de minimis practice (e.g., occasional pro bono work)
0	36	285	310
1-2	36	14	4
3-5	92	16	2
6-9	82	6	2
10-14	44	0	2
15-19	16	1	2
20-24	8	0	0
25-29	6	0	0
30+	3	0	0
Total	323	322	322

²⁰ This and the following question were asked of all respondents who selected “JD” as one of their answers to Q4.2.

Part C. Faculty Contracts

Q5.2 - What was your academic rank and title during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

Classification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Clinical	24%	65
Visiting	1%	4
Other	41%	114
N/A	33%	92
Total	100%	275

Rank

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full	46%	140
Associate	16%	50
Assistant	15%	46
Senior	3%	10
Master	0%	0
Other	12%	38
N/A	7%	21
Total	100%	305

Title

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Professor	81%	253
Lecturer	11%	34
Instructor	5%	17
Other	2%	7
N/A	0%	0
Total	100%	311

Qualification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
of Law	43%	130
of Legal Writing (or equivalent)	36%	108
of the Practice (or equivalent)	6%	19
Other	7%	21
N/A	8%	24
Total	100%	302

Q5.3 - How long was your appointment for the 2020-2021 Academic Year?²¹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
9 months	41%	127
10 months	12%	38
11 months	2%	6
12 months	34%	107
Other	11%	35
Total	100%	313

Q5.4 - Which of the following best describes the term of your contract in effect for the 2020-2021 Academic Year?²²

	% of Total Responses	Responses
My contract does not have a set length.	23%	71
My contract is for a specific number of years.	62%	192
Other; please explain	16%	49
Total	100%	312

²¹ The Survey Committee intends to clarify this and the following question the next time this survey is administered. The intent of Q5.3 is to determine whether faculty are appointed to a term of service lasting 9 months of the year (or 10, or 11, or 12), regardless of the length of their current contract. The details of such arrangements can obviously vary greatly from school to school. For example, a professor with a seven-year contract might have a 10-month appointment under which that professor is expected to work only 10 months of the year and is nominally paid for only those 10 months. In such a case, the appropriate response to Q5.3 would be “10 months.” The “other” textual responses to Q5.3 indicated, however, that many respondents interpreted this question as though it was asking how long their current contracts are. For example, many respondents answered along the lines of “I am in the second year of a three-year contract.” Additional textual responses expressed uncertainty about how to respond: “Our contracts each year are for 12 months, but we only have to teach 9 of those months. Summer school or study abroad is optional. I wasn't sure whether to answer this question with 9 months or 12 months.” As a result of the uncertainty on the part of many respondents, the Survey Committee has decided to omit the textual responses from this report. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the Survey Committee.

²² Like the previous question, the Survey Committee intends to clarify and restructure this question in subsequent surveys. The intent of Q5.4 is to determine the length of a professor’s current contract, focusing on professors who do not have tenure and focusing only on the length of the contract regardless of how it might be renewed. For example, returning to the “seven-year contract with a 10-month appointment” scenario in the explanatory note for Q5.3, the appropriate answer for that scenario would have been “My contract is for a specific term of years.” The textual responses indicated, however, that many respondents interpreted arrangements such as tenure or presumptively renewable contracts for a term of years to fall within the “other” category, providing answers along the lines of “5 years with presumptive renewability” or “Tenured with annual contracts.” Other respondents provided information that the Survey Committee had intended to elicit in Q5.3 about appointment length. As a result of the uncertainty on the part of many respondents, the Survey Committee has decided to omit the textual responses from this report. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the Survey Committee.

Q5.5 - In response to Q5.4, you indicated that your contract in effect for the 2020-2021 Academic Year has a term of a specific number of years. How long is/was the contract? Note: Please provide the total length of your contract, not the number of years you have left on it.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1	20%	38
2	4%	7
3	27%	52
4	1%	2
5	39%	74
6	1%	2
7	7%	14
9	1%	2
12	1%	1
Total	100%	192

Q5.6 - In response to Q5.4, you indicated that your contract in effect for the 2020-2021 Academic Year has a term of a specific number of years. What expectation do (or did) you have for continued employment after your contract term is (or was) complete?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
I am hired year-to-year and have no promise or expectation of continued employment after this year.	5%	9
I am not/was not eligible for continued employment after my contract term is/was complete.	0%	0
I will be/was eligible for renewal at the end of my contract term, but there is no presumption in favor of renewal.	30%	57
The contract is/was presumptively renewable.	61%	117
Other; please explain	5%	9
Total	100%	192

Other; please explain
Hired year-to -year with a disclaimer in the contract of no expected renewal but a verbal assurance of annual renewal depending on circumstances
I am eligible for renewal, and I receive 1 year's notice if my contract will not be renewed.
My contract was previously presumptively renewable. The rules changed so that if I do not apply for tenure and am not awarded tenure by the end of my contract, I will no longer be employed.
One-year contracts for up to three years
Purported to be presumptively renewable but submission of full renewal docket and faculty vote required
The contracts are for one-year terms, with the presumption of renewal for up to three years total.
Three-year contract renews annually (rolling three-year contract).
Upon successful mid-term review, contract will renew for another three-year appointment until going up for tenure
Was presumptively renewable, but faculty and board voted to extend tenure track status to LRW faculty in mid-2021

Q5.7 - Was your contract for the 2020-2021 Academic Year subject to a limit on the number of years you may teach at the school?²³

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	5%	5
No	94%	94
I don't know	1%	1
Total	100%	100

Q5.8 - What is (or was) the limit on the number of years you may teach at the school?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1	40%	2
3	60%	3
Total	100%	5

²³ This question was displayed to respondents who selected one of the following answers to Q3.5 about their appointment type: Full-time, Short-term; Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status; or Other.

Part D. LRW Course Details

Q6.2 - Which LRW Courses did you teach during the 2020-2021 Academic Year? Select all that apply. The answer options below are not intended to be course names; rather, the answer options are intended to generally describe the focus of the course.²⁴

	Respondents
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	188
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	157
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	145
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	23
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	61
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	9
Blended LRW Course; substantive law topic:	6
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0
Judicial opinion writing	9
Scholarly writing	9
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	6
Contract drafting (general)	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	2
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0
Other transactional drafting; please identify Course	7
Legislation	3
Other (aggregated); please identify Course	38
Total # of Respondents	321

Other transactional drafting; please identify course
Corporate Dealmaking
Criminal Litigation Drafting
Drafting Healthcare Documents
I also taught Advanced Legal Analysis
I taught a criminal litigation drafting course. I do that twice each year.
Introduction to Transactional Skills
Lawyering Lab

²⁴ The Survey instrument provided multiple “other” answer options, allowing respondents to enter multiple courses. Those entries have been aggregated in the report for this and other comparable questions below.

Blended LRW Course; substantive law topic:
Business of Law Seminar Course which requires a paper
Civil rights scholarly writing
Environmental Law
Lawyering Lab - Transactional Course
Social justice lawyering/systemic oppression

Other	
Advanced Legal Writing--General	Legal Foundations
Advanced LW Survey Course	LL.M. Legal Analysis and Writing
Advanced Writing Seminar for Teaching Assistants	LRW blend with social justice component
Applied Legal Composition	LRW course for undergraduates, covering both objective and persuasive writing.
Blended - Academic Support and basic objective writing	LRW for International Students
Both the above subjects were part of ONE course	LRW in the context of simulated skills
Course blending objective, persuasive, contract drafting, and legislative drafting	Negotiation
Course for entering first-year law students	Practical Lawyering & MPTs
Criminal Procedure	Pretrial Litigation
Ethics	Privacy Law
I also teach Texas Criminal Procedure once a year.	Public Speaking for Lawyers
Immigration clinic	Research is taught separately by librarians, but LWA Faculty is charged with supplementing and assessing students' research skill
Indian Legal Research	Scholarly Writing Workshops
Interviewing & Counseling	Seminar for TAs in 1L course
Introduction to US Law (LL.M. "orientation" course)	Seminar on race & migration
Law & Literature	Undergraduate pipeline course
LAWR for international lawyers	Writing for Practice, focusing on advanced objective and persuasive writing
Lawyering at [school] has a large writing component (objective and persuasive), but also surveys a few other skills, including client interviewing, counseling, mediation, negotiation, and oral advocacy	Writing for the Bar
Legal Analysis & Methods (bar essay writing)	Writing Seminar as part of 15 sections of LRW courses

Q6.3 - Was the course required?

	No		No, but the course was one of the options that a student may use to satisfy a more general graduation requirement (e.g., an upper-level writing requirement).	Yes		I don't know		Total	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1%	2	1%	1	98%	184	0%	0	187
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	0%	0	0%	0	99%	155	1%	1	156
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	3%	5	0%	0	97%	138	0%	0	143
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	52%	12	30%	7	13%	3	4%	1	23
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	20%	12	15%	9	63%	38	2%	1	60
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	22%	2	44%	4	22%	2	11%	1	9
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	35%	6	59%	10	6%	1	0%	0	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	83%	5	17%	1	0%	0	0%	0	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	25%	4	31%	5	44%	7	0%	0	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	43%	3	0%	0	57%	4	0%	0	7
Blended LRW Course	33%	2	17%	1	50%	3	0%	0	6

Judicial opinion writing	33%	3	67%	6	0%	0	0%	0	9
Legislation	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	0%	0	3
Scholarly writing	22%	2	67%	6	0%	0	11%	1	9
Other (aggregated)	57%	21	16%	6	27%	10	0%	0	37

Q6.4 - How many sections of each course did you teach during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	1	1.5	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	96	1	84	6	1	0	0	0	0	188
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	82	1	72	2	0	0	0	0	0	157
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	72	0	62	6	2	1	1	1	0	145
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	21	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	38	0	19	3	1	0	0	0	0	61
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	9
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	13	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	12	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other transactional drafting	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Blended LRW Course	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Judicial opinion writing	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Legislation	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Scholarly writing	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Other (aggregated)	29	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	38

Q6.5 - Were the students in the course first-year students or upper-level students?

	First-Year		Upper-Level		Both		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	98%	184	1%	1	1%	2	187
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	97%	151	2%	3	1%	2	156
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	93%	135	6%	8	1%	2	145
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	5%	1	95%	21	0%	0	22
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	61%	36	36%	21	3%	2	59
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	25%	2	75%	6	0%	0	8
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	75%	3	25%	1	0%	0	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	100%	17	0%	0	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	83%	5	17%	1	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	6%	1	94%	15	0%	0	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	29%	2	71%	5	0%	0	7
Blended LRW Course	50%	3	50%	3	0%	0	6
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	100%	9	0%	0	9
Legislation	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	3
Scholarly writing	0%	0	100%	9	0%	0	9
Other (aggregated)	33%	12	64%	23	3%	1	36

Q6.6 - How many students were enrolled in the course? Include all students enrolled in sections for which you had teaching responsibility, even if the course was co-taught. If you had teaching responsibility for more than one section of a course, include students from all sections for which you had teaching responsibility.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	# of Responses
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1	112	32.0	185
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1	58	29.8	153
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	125	33.8	139
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	64	19.1	22
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	1	112	30.7	57
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	64	23.4	8
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	20	76	44.7	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0.0	0
Contract drafting (general)	12	40	21.1	16
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	16	16	16.0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	7	32	19.5	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0	0	0.0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	4	60	20.8	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0.0	0
Other transactional drafting	4	60	27.6	7
Blended LRW Course	20	70	43.5	4
Judicial opinion writing	9	20	14.2	9
Legislation	9	25	19.3	3
Scholarly writing	2	34	18.2	9
Other (aggregated)	1	225	30.6	36

Q6.7 - How many students in each course did you have grading/feedback responsibility for? If you had grading/feedback responsibility for students in more than one section of a course, include students from all sections. Note: It is possible that the number of students enrolled is the same as the number of students for whom you had grading responsibility. Requesting these numbers separately accounts for those situations where the numbers might not match up (e.g., co-taught classes).

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	# of Responses
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	8	112	32.2	185
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1	58	30.3	155
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	225	35.1	140
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	40	17.0	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	1	112	31.0	56
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	40	20.0	6
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	20	67	41.7	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0.0	0
Contract drafting (general)	12	40	21.1	16
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	16	16	16.0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	7	32	19.5	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0	0	0.0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	4	60	20.8	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0.0	0
Other transactional drafting	4	60	27.6	7
Blended LRW Course	15	54	29.7	3
Judicial opinion writing	9	20	14.2	9
Legislation	9	25	19.3	3
Scholarly writing	2	32	14.3	7
Other (aggregated)	1	225	27.9	34

Q6.8 - How was the teaching responsibility for the course allocated?

	Co-Taught	Solo Instruction	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	8	178	186
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	5	148	153
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	10	131	141
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	21	22
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	5	50	55
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0	8	8
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	3	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	1	16	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	2	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0	6	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0	1	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	2	14	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0
Other transactional drafting	4	3	7
Blended LRW Course	3	3	6
Judicial opinion writing	0	9	9
Legislation	0	3	3
Scholarly writing	1	8	9
Other (aggregated)	5	33	38

Q6.9 - Did you coordinate to any degree with other sections of the same course taught by a different professor? If you were required to coordinate or collaborate on some components and chose to coordinate or collaborate on other components, select both applicable answers.

	Yes, coordination /collaboration was required.		Yes, I chose to coordinate /collaborate.		No		I taught the only section of the course.		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	27%	50	38%	71	33%	61	2%	4	186
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	35%	55	40%	62	24%	37	1%	2	156
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	44%	62	33%	47	20%	28	3%	4	141
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	9%	2	5%	1	18%	4	68%	15	22
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	42%	24	23%	13	23%	13	12%	7	57
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	25%	2	13%	1	25%	2	38%	3	8
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	67%	2	33%	1	0%	0	0%	0	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	6%	1	0%	0	41%	7	53%	9	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	17%	1	83%	5	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	19%	3	13%	2	25%	4	44%	7	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	29%	2	14%	1	14%	1	43%	3	7
Blended LRW Course	17%	1	0%	0	33%	2	50%	3	6
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	11%	1	89%	8	9
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	3	3
Scholarly writing	11%	1	11%	1	22%	2	56%	5	9
Other (aggregated)	16%	6	16%	6	19%	7	49%	18	37

Q6.10 - For each course in which you were required to coordinate or collaborate with another professor teaching a section of the same course, to what extent were you required to coordinate or collaborate?

	Extensive coordination /collaboration (e.g., shared syllabus and shared assignments)		Moderate coordination /collaboration (e.g., collaboration on some assignments and roughly coordinated deadlines)		Minimal coordination /collaboration (e.g., agreement on number and type of assignments)		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	60%	30	30%	15	10%	5	50
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	53%	29	35%	19	13%	7	55
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	68%	42	26%	16	6%	4	62
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	79%	19	17%	4	4%	1	24
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1	2
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	3
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey—2020-2021 Individual Survey
 Part D. LRW Course Details

Other transactional drafting	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Blended LRW Course	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Other (aggregated)	50%	4	50%	2	0%	0	6

Q6.11 - For each course in which you chose to coordinate or collaborate with another professor teaching a section of the same course, to what extent did you voluntarily coordinate or collaborate?

	Extensive coordination / collaboration (e.g., shared syllabus and shared assignments)		Moderate coordination / collaboration (e.g., collaboration on some assignments and roughly coordinated deadlines)		Minimal coordination / collaboration (e.g., agreement on number and type of assignments)		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	34%	24	44%	31	23%	16	71
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	32%	20	50%	31	18%	11	62
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	28%	13	51%	24	21%	10	47
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	23%	3	54%	7	23%	3	13
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey—2020-2021 Individual Survey
 Part D. LRW Course Details

Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	2
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Blended LRW Course	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Other (aggregated)	0%	0	67%	4	33%	2	6

Q6.12 - In a previous question (Q6.5), you indicated that the students in the below course(s) were first-year students. Did you or another person acting on your behalf coordinate the reading and/or writing assignments with other first-year courses?

	Yes		No		I don't know		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	20%	36	76%	138	4%	8	182
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	24%	36	70%	105	5%	8	149
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	28%	37	69%	91	3%	4	132
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	17%	6	80%	28	3%	1	35
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	2
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	2
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	2
Blended LRW Course	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	3
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other (aggregated)	8%	1	83%	10	8%	1	12

Q6.13 - To what extent did you (or a person acting on your behalf) coordinate the reading and/or writing assignments of the course with other first-year courses? Note: By coordinated topics, we mean that the professor teaching the LRW Course and the professor teaching the other first-year course jointly decide to address particular subjects as part of their respective courses. By coordinated teaching, we mean that the two professors jointly decide when to address those subjects and/or what to teach the students about those subjects. This coordination can occur at any time, whether before the semester begins or as the semester proceeds.

	The topics and teaching of at least some assignments are coordinated.		The topics of at least some assignments are coordinated, but the teaching is not coordinated.		Other		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	39%	14	44%	16	17%	6	36
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	31%	11	56%	20	14%	5	36
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	38%	14	41%	15	22%	8	37
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	20%	1	60%	3	20%	1	5
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey—2020-2021 Individual Survey
 Part D. LRW Course Details

Blended LRW Course	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other (aggregated)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1

Q6.14 - Did you or another person acting on your behalf coordinate or collaborate with a clinic in connection with one or more course assignments?

	Yes		No		I don't know		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	2%	4	98%	184	0%	0	188
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1%	2	99%	153	0%	0	155
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1%	2	98%	139	1%	1	142
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	100%	23	0%	0	23
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0%	0	100%	59	0%	0	59
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	100%	9	0%	0	9
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	100%	17	0%	0	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	100%	6	0%	0	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0%	0	100%	16	0%	0	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	14%	1	86%	6	0%	0	7
Blended LRW Course	0%	0	100%	6	0%	0	6
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	100%	9	0%	0	9
Legislation	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	3
Scholarly writing	0%	0	100%	9	0%	0	9
Other (aggregated)	3%	1	97%	37	0%	0	38

Q6.15 - Did you require rewrites of Major Writing Assignment(s) in this course?

	Yes, all or most Major Writing Assignments require at least one rewrite after faculty critique.		Yes, at least one Major Writing Assignment requires at least one rewrite after faculty critique, although most Major Writing Assignments do not.		No		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	51%	95	35%	65	15%	28	188
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	53%	82	30%	47	17%	27	156
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	47%	66	30%	42	23%	32	140
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	48%	11	22%	5	30%	7	23
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	51%	30	24%	14	25%	15	59
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	44%	4	11%	1	44%	4	9
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	33%	1	0%	0	67%	2	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	12%	2	35%	6	53%	9	17
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	17%	1	33%	2	50%	3	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	31%	5	31%	5	38%	6	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	43%	3	57%	4	7
Blended LRW Course	50%	3	33%	2	17%	1	6

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey—2020-2021 Individual Survey
 Part D. LRW Course Details

Judicial opinion writing	33%	3	33%	3	33%	3	9
Legislation	67%	2	0%	0	33%	1	3
Scholarly writing	56%	5	11%	1	33%	3	9
Other (aggregated)	30%	11	30%	11	41%	15	37

Q6.16 - For Major Writing Assignments that required rewrites, did you assign a grade or score that was included in the final grade calculation to both the draft and the rewrite?

	No, only drafts were assigned a grade or score that is included in the final grade calculation.		No, only rewrites were assigned a grade or score that is included in the final grade calculation.		Yes, both drafts and rewrites were assigned a grade or score that is included in the final grade calculation.		Varied by assignment.		Other		Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	3%	5	37%	59	35%	55	17%	27	8%	12	158
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	5%	6	33%	43	39%	50	16%	21	7%	9	129
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	3%	3	25%	27	42%	45	18%	19	13%	14	108
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	44%	7	19%	3	25%	4	13%	2	16
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	14%	6	25%	11	36%	16	16%	7	9%	4	44
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	20%	1	40%	2	20%	1	20%	1	5
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	25%	2	50%	4	25%	2	0%	0	8

Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	67%	2	33%	1	0%	0	3
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	20%	2	30%	3	40%	4	0%	0	10%	1	10
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	3
Blended LRW Course	0%	0	20%	1	60%	3	0%	0	20%	1	5
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	50%	3	17%	1	33%	2	0%	0	6
Legislation	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	2
Scholarly writing	0%	0	33%	2	50%	3	0%	0	17%	1	6
Other (aggregated)	9%	2	36%	8	9%	2	27%	6	18%	4	22

Q6.17 - In a previous question (Q6.2) you indicated that you taught the following course(s). Please indicate the extent to which you taught research as a part of each course.

	This course included explicit instruction on research, including assignments and course materials/class time.		This course did not include explicit instruction on research, although students were expected to conduct research and received feedback on the research reflected in their work.		Students did not conduct research in connection with this class.		Other		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	76%	143	12%	23	7%	14	4%	8	188
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	72%	113	22%	34	2%	3	4%	6	156
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	72%	104	15%	22	5%	7	8%	11	144
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	35%	8	35%	8	26%	6	4%	1	23
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	51%	30	37%	22	3%	2	8%	5	59

Questions 6.19 through 6.22 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing.

Q6.19 - Did the course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing include the following types of writing assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	24%	44	76%	137	181
Office Memo - Closed Universe	92%	170	8%	15	185
Office Memo - Open Universe	90%	165	10%	19	184
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	59%	107	41%	75	182
Transactional Document	3%	5	97%	160	165
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	33%	35	67%	70	105

Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	
Bench Memo- closed universe; Judicial Opinion- open universe	Numerous short emails/memos instead of the closed-universe memo
Billing entries	Outlines, research logs, client counseling plans.
Case brief	Performance test
Case charts, outlines, blog post, client interview, oral report to "partner"	Real client memo in conjunction with a school clinic
Case illustration	Reflection assignments on meetings and research assignments
Citation exercises, research reports	Research chart
Collaboration Exercise	Research report, separate submission of draft QP/BA and Statement of Facts for final memo
Comprehensive research journal.	Research summary
Court observation reports; "mini-memos" before more substantial office memos	Rule outline
Critical thinking analysis	Short in-class practice exercises
Demand letter	Short research memo
Email, talking points, letter assigned in subsequent course	"Single Case Analysis" -- finding rule in case and applying to facts; "Multiple Case Analysis" -- synthesizing rule from a series of cases and applying rule to facts
Judicial bench memo was used in lieu of a second intra-office memo	Small assignments requiring students to submit synthesized rule statements, analysis on one legal issue (i.e. one CREAC)
Judicial Opinion - Closed Universe	Smaller assignments feeding into closed universe memo
Just the discussion section of a memorandum	Story with milestones, syllogism for "question presented" portion of memo, practice one-page IRAC on closed problem, multiple short answer or multiple choice assignments (individual and group)

Law firm website update	Summary of facts; outlines
Memo in collaboration with a clinic partner.	Timed Exam-Portion of Closed Memo
Movie review that used steps of a legal analysis	Trial Brief; Practice MPT
Multiple short IREAC assignments weekly, all written after students conducted research.	We have three writing assignments: the closed memo, the open memo, and the final memo. The first 2 are pass/fail and the 3rd is the largest grade (we also have a final exam) in the class.

Q6.20 - Did the course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing include the following types of speaking assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	22%	40	78%	143	183
In-class Presentation - Group	24%	44	76%	139	183
In-class Presentation - Individual	17%	30	83%	151	181
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	26%	48	74%	134	182
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	32%	57	68%	123	180
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	8%	10	92%	108	118

Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	
A mini bar performance test	Negotiation Group Exercise
Class participation is graded and students are encouraged to make contributions during class discussions.	Oral Argument (2 respondents)
Client counseling and negotiation exercises	Oral argument before outside judge
Group: Advising client after completion of research and draft memo.	Oral argument of trial brief
Negotiation	Regular argument by students working individually and in groups.
Negotiation Exercise with a Partner	Students are required to answer questions asked. There are research questions or general questions regarding the writing assignments.

Q6.21 - In a previous question (Q6.17), you indicated that the course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing included explicit instruction on research. Did this course include the following types of research assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	98%	138	2%	3	141
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	72%	102	28%	39	141
Research Journal	32%	43	68%	93	136
Research Memo	34%	46	66%	90	136
Research Quiz	42%	57	58%	80	137
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	21%	17	79%	63	80

Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	
An email research assignment	Preliminary list of authorities
Annotated outline	Reports on research, either team or individual tasks
I gave them the citations for the closed-universe memo and they had to go find them	Research log (4 respondents)
In class structured group research exercises.	Research Report
Lexis Learn and West Knowledge Center videos and assessments (2 respondents)	Short answer research assignments
Online interactive writing and research exercises.	Status update on research
Online modules	Weekly small research quizzes
Our students complete 3 research assignments: one on caselaw, one on statutory law, and one on secondary sources. I tie the secondary source assignment to a writing assignment, whereas the other 2 are not tied to a writing assignment. Each professor has the freedom to choose.	

Q6.22 - Did you use the following types of feedback in the course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing? Note: The reference to written comments refers to both handwritten comments and typed electronic comments.

	Yes		No		Total
General feedback memo or common comments memo addressed to all students	73%	135	27%	50	185
Individualized comments written on the paper itself and in the margins	97%	183	3%	5	188
Individualized comments written at the beginning or end of the paper	90%	164	10%	19	183
Individualized feedback memos	30%	53	70%	121	174
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	72%	133	28%	52	185
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	94%	176	6%	12	188
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	30%	53	70%	124	177
Individualized comments given in person during conference	91%	169	9%	17	186
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	14%	25	86%	148	173
Other; please describe	6%	6	94%	91	97

Other; please describe	
Detailed rubrics	Live feedback
Group feedback via video	Peer review through Eli Review
I do live conferences and write on the memo with the student there in addition to recording the conference and giving oral feedback	Some of us use live grading. Some of us do not.

Questions 6.24 through 6.27 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing.

Q6.24 - Did the course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing include the following types of writing assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	32%	46	68%	96	142
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	39%	57	61%	90	147
Pre-trial/Trial Brief	76%	116	24%	36	152
Appellate Brief	62%	92	38%	57	149
Other Writing Assignment(s)	32%	33	68%	70	103

Other writing assignment(s)	
Analysis of initial research, with arguments for both sides set out	Outlines, case charts
Annotated outline of argument	Outlines, research logs, negotiation plan
Bylaws exercise	Outlines; transactional document (contract)
Case charts/notes	Performance test
Complaint	Petition, answer, bench memo
Complaint; Evidence Analysis	Preliminary Citation List
Components building into trial brief	Research chart
Cover letter	Research memo related to trial brief
Demand letter (8 respondents)	Research Project
Due diligence email assignment (transactional context)	Research Reports and other Interim Assignments
Example MPT; revision of an actual trial brief	Settlement Agreement
Memo	Short story
Motion to Dismiss, Motion for Summary Judgment	Statement of Facts
MPT Practice Test	Trial Memorandum for Substantive Motion

Q6.25 - Did the course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing include the following types of speaking assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	11%	17	89%	133	150
In-class Presentation - Group	26%	38	74%	111	149
In-class Presentation - Individual	24%	36	76%	112	148
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	24%	35	76%	113	148
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	22%	32	78%	113	145
Pre-trial Argument	36%	52	64%	94	146
Trial Argument	25%	36	75%	110	146
Appellate Argument	59%	90	41%	62	152
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	17%	17	83%	81	98

Other speaking assignment(s)	
By pre-trial argument, I mean argument on a motion for summary judgment	Oral Argument
Court hearing on a TRO, ex parte	Practice round for appellate argument
In-class oral argument exercise.	Regular in-class argument presented individually and working in groups.
Multiple Negotiation Exercises	Short in-class arguments that were tied to supreme court cases.
Negotiation (4 respondents)	Status conference with judge
Negotiation -- group	They had to negotiate their settlement agreements in small groups, which I observed.
Negotiation on behalf of a client in a mediation	We have a game where students answer questions orally, in teams
Opening statement	

Q6.26 - In a previous question (Q6.17), you indicated that the course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing included explicit instruction on research. Did this course include the following types of research assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	99%	111	1%	1	112
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	46%	49	54%	57	106
Research Journal	30%	31	70%	74	105
Research Memo	21%	22	79%	83	105
Research Quiz	26%	27	74%	78	105
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	20%	13	80%	53	66

Other research assignment(s)	
Annotated outline of argument (with citations to authority).	Research log (4 respondents)
Capstone research memo	Research reports, not quizzes.
Group in class research exercises	Short answer and group research exercises
I have my students do advanced research training. Most professors do this, but not all.	Status update on research
Leading classmates in research exercise for which a small group became experts	Written research project
Research for bylaws project	

Q6.27 - Did you use the following types of feedback in the course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing? Note: The reference to written comments refers to both handwritten comments and typed electronic comments.

	Yes		No		Total
General feedback memo or common comments memo addressed to all students	70%	107	30%	46	153
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	97%	151	3%	5	156
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	85%	131	15%	24	155
Individualized feedback memos	30%	44	70%	105	149
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	70%	108	30%	47	155
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	94%	146	6%	9	155
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	28%	42	72%	107	149
Individualized comments given in person during conference	90%	139	10%	16	155
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	14%	20	86%	127	147
Other; please describe	10%	9	90%	84	93

Other, please describe	
Detailed rubrics	Live feedback
Group feedback via audio recording	Live oral argument feedback
I record feedback on specific portions of the paper and post that video for all students.	Peer review comments using Eli Review
I use live conferences in which I write comments and give oral feedback with the student present and they are recorded at the student's option	Some of us do live grading in this course too.
Individual written comments for oral arguments.	

Questions 6.29 through 6.32 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing.²⁵

Q6.29 - Did the course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing include the following types of writing assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	45%	62	55%	75	137
Office Memo - Closed Universe	86%	120	14%	19	139
Office Memo - Open Universe	84%	117	16%	22	139
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	74%	101	26%	35	136
Pre-trial/Trial Brief	83%	115	17%	24	139
Appellate Brief	45%	60	55%	72	132
Transactional Document	22%	28	78%	102	130
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	38%	29	62%	47	76

Q6.30 - Did the course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing include the following types of speaking assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	30%	41	70%	94	135
In-class Presentation - Group	36%	48	64%	86	134
In-class Presentation - Individual	32%	43	68%	91	134
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	29%	39	71%	96	135
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	37%	49	63%	83	132
Pre-trial Argument	42%	56	58%	76	132
Trial Argument	26%	34	74%	98	132
Appellate Argument	44%	59	56%	74	133
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	14%	11	86%	65	76

²⁵ The Survey Committee chose not to include textual responses describing the various “other” answer options for this series of questions dealing with courses focusing on both objective and basic persuasive writing. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available.

Q6.31 - In a previous question (Q6.17), you indicated that the course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing included explicit instruction on research. Did this course include the following types of research assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	100%	102	0%	0	102
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	72%	69	28%	27	96
Research Journal	34%	30	66%	59	89
Research Memo	44%	41	56%	52	93
Research Quiz	48%	44	52%	47	91
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	20%	12	80%	47	59

Q6.32 - Did you use the following types of feedback in the course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing? Note: The reference to written comments refers to both handwritten comments and typed electronic comments.

	Yes		No		Total
General feedback memo or common comments memo addressed to all students	73%	102	27%	37	139
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	99%	141	1%	2	143
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	90%	126	10%	14	140
Individualized feedback memos	32%	42	68%	90	132
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	69%	96	31%	43	139
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	94%	131	6%	9	140
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	28%	37	72%	94	131
Individualized comments given in person during conference	89%	125	11%	15	140
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	16%	21	84%	113	134
Other; please describe	7%	5	93%	65	70

Questions 6.34 through 6.37 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing.²⁶

Q6.34 - Did the course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing include the following types of writing assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	41%	9	59%	13	22
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	36%	8	64%	14	22
Pre-trial/Trial Brief	61%	14	39%	9	23
Appellate Brief	30%	6	70%	14	20
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	42%	5	58%	7	12

Q6.35 - Did the course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing include the following types of speaking assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	18%	4	82%	18	22
In-class Presentation - Group	36%	8	64%	14	22
In-class Presentation - Individual	32%	7	68%	15	22
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	14%	3	86%	19	22
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	27%	6	73%	16	22
Pre-trial Argument	14%	3	86%	19	22
Trial Argument	9%	2	91%	21	23
Appellate Argument	18%	4	82%	18	22
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	15%	2	85%	11	13

²⁶ The Survey Committee chose not to include textual responses describing the various “other” answer options for this series of questions dealing with advanced persuasive writing courses. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available.

Q6.36 - In a previous question (Q6.17), you indicated that the course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing included explicit instruction on research. Did this course include the following types of research assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	100%	8	0%	0	8
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	14%	1	86%	6	7
Research Journal	29%	2	71%	5	7
Research Memo	29%	2	71%	5	7
Research Quiz	0%	0	100%	7	7
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	0%	0	100%	4	4

Q6.37 - Did you use the following types of feedback in the course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing? Note: The reference to written comments refers to both handwritten comments and typed electronic comments.

	Yes		No		Total
General feedback memo or common comments memo addressed to all students	50%	11	50%	11	22
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	87%	20	13%	3	23
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	73%	16	27%	6	22
Individualized feedback memos	27%	6	73%	16	22
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	50%	11	50%	11	22
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	77%	17	23%	5	22
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	14%	3	86%	19	22
Individualized comments given in person during conference	62%	13	38%	8	21
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	0%	0	100%	21	21
Other; please describe	0%	0	100%	14	14

Questions 6.39 through 6.42 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course on appellate advocacy.²⁷

Q6.39 - Did the appellate advocacy course include the following types of writing assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	8%	4	92%	46	50
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	17%	9	83%	43	52
Appellate Brief	95%	56	5%	3	59
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	34%	11	66%	21	32

Q6.40 - Did the appellate advocacy course include the following types of speaking assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	6%	3	94%	48	51
In-class Presentation - Group	21%	11	79%	41	52
In-class Presentation - Individual	38%	20	62%	32	52
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	8%	4	92%	48	52
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	12%	6	88%	46	52
Appellate Argument	97%	57	3%	2	59
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	6%	2	94%	32	34

²⁷ The Survey Committee chose not to include textual responses describing the various “other” answer options for this series of questions dealing with appellate advocacy courses. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available.

Q6.41 - In a previous question (Q6.17), you indicated that the appellate advocacy course included explicit instruction on research. Did this course include the following types of research assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	100%	29	0%	0	29
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	22%	5	78%	18	23
Research Journal	13%	3	87%	20	23
Research Memo	13%	3	88%	21	24
Research Quiz	9%	2	91%	21	23
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	13%	2	87%	13	15

Q6.42 - Did you use the following types of feedback in the appellate advocacy course?
Note: The reference to written comments refers to both handwritten comments and typed electronic comments.

	Yes		No		Total
General feedback memo or common comments memo addressed to all students	70%	39	30%	17	56
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	93%	55	7%	4	59
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	84%	49	16%	9	58
Individualized feedback memos	20%	11	80%	43	54
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	69%	40	31%	18	58
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	83%	48	17%	10	58
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	23%	13	77%	43	56
Individualized comments given in person during conference	88%	51	12%	7	58
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	6%	3	94%	51	54
Other; please describe	0%	0	100%	37	37

Q6.43 - In a previous question (Q6.2), you indicated that you taught introduction to legal research during the 2020-2021 Academic Year. Did this course include the following types of assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	75%	3	25%	1	4
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	50%	2	50%	2	4
Research Journal	75%	3	25%	1	4
Research Memo	100%	4	0%	0	4
Research Quiz	100%	4	0%	0	4
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	0%	0	100%	3	3

Q6.45 - To what extent did you provide instruction on citation in the LRW Course(s) that you taught in the 2020-2021 Academic Year? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
I taught at least one LRW Course in which I provided explicit instruction on citation.	89%	286
I taught at least one LRW Course in which I expected students to use correctly formatted citations in their submitted work and provided feedback on those citations.	70%	225
I taught at least one LRW Course in which I expected students to use correctly formatted citations in their submitted work, although I did not provide feedback on those citations.	7%	22
Other; please explain	7%	22
Total # of Respondents		320

Other; please explain	
Also required completion of ICW exercises in Lexis's Interactive Citation Workstation.	LRW profs I work with teach citation, but I do not.
I had citation exercises in class.	My dean's fellows (essentially TAs) provided citation instruction and graded citations.
I had exercises on citation and students were required to do lessons in an electronic system on citations	My teaching assistant teaches three sessions on citations. She also grades the assignments for citations.
I provide asynchronous online materials on citation. I require accurate cites. I grade it very minimally. I require only a reasonable effort.	Not in 2020 but in the year before
I provided feedback on citations with support from student teaching assistants who ensured compliance with Bluebook form in all respects.	Quizzes
I taught at least one LRW Course in which students submitted citations that were "scored" by a computer program designed by the assignment's creator	Student teaching assistant taught citation.
I taught LRW courses in which a TA provided explicit instruction on citation.	Students also taught specific rules in small group oral presentations
I use ICW to teach citation	Teaching Assistants provided explicit instruction on citation, students were expected to use correctly formatted citations in their final paper, and the teaching assistant graded their citations and provided feedback on earlier work.
I use prerecorded videos for initial instruction and then teaching assistants provide follow up instruction and grade the citations in assignments.	The Dean's Fellows teach weekly citation classes
In the predictive writing course, I began each class with a "Bluebook Rule of the Day," which was relevant to the assignment the students were working on at the time.	We also require students to independently complete ICW exercises on Lexis.
Librarian taught class	We used the ICW and supplemented some in class.

Q6.46 - For the LRW Course(s) in which you provided explicit instruction on citation, did you assign the following citation texts as either required or recommended texts?

	Yes		No		Total
ALWD Guide to Legal Citation	18%	51	82%	235	286
Bluebook	85%	244	15%	42	286
State Citation Manual	15%	43	85%	243	286
Other citation text; please describe	8%	23	92%	263	286

Other citation text; please describe
An in-house created citation guidebook.
Barris, Guide to Understanding and Mastering the Bluebook (mentioned by 7 respondents)
Bluebook Uncovered by Dionne Anthon (mentioned by 5 respondents)
I have created a citation manual to address Louisiana citation format. I also have created and assigned an extensive PowerPoint and recorded video series addressing citation.
Indigo Book (3 respondents total; 1 indicated that it was optional)
Kentucky citation - in a state civil rule of procedure
LEXIS Interactive Citation Workbook (6 respondents total; 4 who didn't indicate whether this was for ALWD or Bluebook; 1 each for ALWD and Bluebook)
Local appellate court citation rules.
Online exercises and quizzes
MBIE (on-line system)
Students are required to learn about Florida's specific appellate rule on citation.

Q6.47 - For the LRW Course(s) in which you assigned the following citation text(s), was it a required text or a recommended text?

	Required		Recommended		Varies by Course		Total
ALWD Guide to Legal Citation	92%	47	8%	4	0%	0	51
Bluebook	96%	225	3%	6	2%	4	235

Q6.50 - How often did you employ the following teaching activities throughout the semester in the LRW Courses that you taught during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	Never		Rarely		Occasionally		Frequently		Total
Demonstrations	7%	21	12%	39	41%	130	40%	125	315
Lecture	0%	0	8%	25	24%	76	69%	220	321
In-class exercises, individual	4%	12	13%	42	32%	100	51%	163	317
In-class exercises in pairs	9%	29	16%	49	32%	99	42%	130	307
In-class exercises in groups of three or more	5%	15	6%	20	28%	90	60%	191	316
In-class writing and critiquing	6%	19	16%	52	49%	154	29%	92	317
Q & A and class discussion	0%	0	0%	1	12%	40	87%	280	321

Q6.51 - The preceding block of questions has asked you to provide various details about the LRW Courses you taught during 2020-2021. To the extent that you have not already done so in response to earlier questions, we invite you to use the following space to describe how the COVID-19 pandemic affected the details of your courses, focusing on whatever points are of importance to you. Please feel free to use as much space as you wish.²⁸

A lot of the group work was done using apps instead of in person.
All classes were conducted online from the middle of the Spring 2020 semester, Summer 2020, Fall 2020, Spring 2021, and Summer 2021 semesters. Most of our major assignments (closed memos, open memo, appellate brief) remained the same. We began creating new content for the Summer 2020 semester, including videos on various topics (such as CREAC, the Statement of Facts, objective v. persuasive writing, holdings v. rules, etc.) along with accompanying quizzes. This helped to limit the "straight lecture" time on video and introduced the topics to students prior to class. We did many more asynchronous assignments. Spring semesters, we canceled oral arguments for Spring 2020, but did them online for Spring 2021 (not ideal). We created some additional videos and quizzes and did more in-class exercises. Group exercises for both semesters were done in breakout rooms instead of in class, which worked well.
All courses for the 2020-2021 academic year were taught on Zoom, which required substantial adjustments to all teaching techniques. Exercises are more difficult to run online rather than in the classroom. Lack of a whiteboard was challenging. Trying to teach (and still learning how) was made even more difficult when trying to keep students engaged in the online platform.
All courses were taught remotely. I utilized breakout groups more in this setting as well as polls and other techniques to avoid student burnout.
All LRW courses were taught over Zoom but the online courses mimicked the course as traditionally taught in the classroom.
All my class sessions, student conferences, oral arguments, etc., were via Zoom.
All of my classes were online last year so I lectured more frequently and did less group/pairs work.
All of my courses and office hours were moved to Zoom. Though the format changed, the curriculum and delivery was very similar.
All of my in-class activities worked fine in Zoom, even in a hybrid type of Zoom in which some students were in the classroom (with me) and some were remote. By "worked fine" I mean that I had to do more work than in the past to account for the lack of paper handouts, and tech glitches sometimes affected my ability to join small groups. But even during covid, I was able to hit my two goals for every class meeting: have at least 2 active learning experiences and get as many people talking (even if just to one other person) as possible.
Although I was able to use the break-out function of Zoom for exercises, it was not as good as in-person assessment of the classroom where you can get the feel of how the students are doing or they can quickly ask a question for clarification. "Dropping in" to a room was sort of creepy and didn't really accomplish much, so I stopped doing it. Zoom was okay, but you lost the entire class when you showed something on screen and thus couldn't detect confusion or interest as you can do when you've got a class sitting in front of you. With people muted, I sometimes wondered whether I had lost a connection as I looked for movement or any reaction. I suppose it was somewhat like the Olympics -- performing in front of no one.

²⁸ As noted earlier, for many text response tables in this report, the Committee has consolidated identical responses, see, e.g., Q3.6 and 4.2, and, when needed, lightly edited certain responses. For this and other questions later in the Survey that ask open-ended questions about how COVID-19 affected the respondent, however, we have with very limited exceptions included every response because each response represents that respondent's individual experience and what they chose to disclose. The exceptions: We have on occasion edited or omitted responses to the COVID-19 or other questions if we thought they might personally identify a respondent or were non-responsive to the question.

<p>As a result of the pandemic, both of my courses were offered as hybrid courses, meaning that students could choose to either attend in person or participate virtually through synchronous lectures conducted on Blackboard Collaborate. All conferences were conducted virtually, and in-class group exercises were conducted using social distancing procedures (for those students who attended in person) and using breakout rooms (for those students who attended virtually).</p>
<p>Because we were online for the entire year, the teaching was more difficult. In particular, to foster professional relationships and to give adequate support to out of class learning.</p>
<p>Both courses were entirely on Zoom. It was a challenge, but the students adapted well.</p>
<p>Classes and all office hours and conferences were entirely remote via Zoom. The remote learning required quite a bit more preparation and work for me. But, overall the teaching and learning was more efficient than in person activities. The students performed well and gave very high evaluations for their remote learning with me.</p>
<p>Courses were taught synchronously online.</p>
<p>COVID did not impact my course due to the flexibility of zoom and ability of breakout groups. But the students did not get to know each other as well.</p>
<p>Covid forced us into a hybrid class, which I hated. With some students online, there were always technical issues. Also, I didn't effectively include the online students. I felt I was doing two things badly instead of one thing well. However, the oral arguments were stellar. The students rose to the challenge. Also, I do live grading and that worked well online.</p>
<p>Covid protocols resulted in moving many conferences and group activities online and limited the degree to which we used them during regular class meetings. But we were able to adapt most of our activities to accommodate the year's unusual circumstances.</p>
<p>Covid-19 did not affect my assignments. Covid-19 affected the mode of classroom instruction (it was via Zoom), but I was able to replicate all my modes of instruction via Zoom.</p>
<p>COVID-19 led me to cut back on some of my assignments and to focus my time and attention on the major assignments. I also assigned online exercises to limit group work during class time. Since I had been gradually moving components of my class online over the last ten years, I did not have to change much to teach online during the 2020-2021 academic year.</p>
<p>COVID-19 pandemic affected the rooms in which I taught (they were non-traditional rooms), plus the amount of handouts I could provide to the students. Instead, everything was posted online. The pandemic limited the ability for face-to-face office hours. The pandemic cause me to be creative with in-class, group activities (but they could still be done!).</p>
<p>COVID-19 required me to teach the spring trimester in coordination with the other LRW faculty because they had coordinated the first trimester courses and desired to do so for the second trimester. I was not a fan of the coordination because it did not allow me to teach the course in the way I had developed the course over the years I had been teaching. I was able to teach the course on my own in the fall and thought it went much better than the spring trimester. I understand why my colleagues chose to coordinate the course, but I would not want to do so in the future.</p>
<p>COVID19 did not affect the class significantly. Some meetings with students were held on Zoom rather than in person. Papers were emailed to students rather than distributed in paper. We did small groups in break-outs to review other students' work, which was very helpful.</p>
<p>Did exclusively on-line zoom classes. I think zoom is more effective than live teaching for R&W because it is easier to share material, break into working groups and get comments from students via chat that otherwise students might not feel comfortable making.</p>
<p>Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, I taught solely online during the 2020-2021 academic year. Thus, I learned how to use Zoom to conduct class and conferences. I became accustomed to screen sharing, making short video lectures, using group annotation, etc. I also found breakout groups to be helpful for class discussion and group conferences.</p>
<p>Due to the pandemic, I used a flipped classroom and relied on Canvas more.</p>
<p>Due to the pandemic, we had a flipped classroom. Online short lectures followed by synchronous class time dedicated to exercises and questions.</p>
<p>During Fall 2020 my courses were all on-line. During Spring 2021 my courses were in person, with masks. Teaching on-line has drawbacks-and some benefits.</p>

During fall semester 2020, I taught in a hybrid method, with in-person students and students on Zoom in every class period.
During the 2020-2021 academic year I held classes online and in-person, using a hybrid instructional method. I would normally ask students to do paired or group work when meeting face-to-face. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and social distancing requirements, I did not ask students to engage in paired or group work.
First-year legal analysis & writing classes were entirely remote. I included both asynchronous and synchronous elements in the course.
Group activities were particularly challenging (and many did not happen at all) as a result of the pandemic restrictions.
Group work and exercises took substantially more thought and planning. We taught in a hybrid/hyflex format.
Group work was more difficult because we were in-person but socially distanced. It was easier to do group discussions during the classes we held via Zoom.
Group work was not possible in a socially distanced classroom.
Had to innovate through pivoting to all Zoom classes and office hours
Hybrid teaching cut down on the amount of in-class groupwork that was possible.
I actually provided less individual critique and more in class to keep their attention, while wearing masks in large rooms.
I answered never to most of the above questions because we were not permitted to have the students work closely in the classroom last year due to the pandemic. Usually I do group work. Just not last year.
I created asynchronous Bluebook videos of approximately 5-12 minutes for students to watch outside of class. These were shared with other members of the program. In collaboration with one colleague, we created a podcast series on people they should know from the law school, alumni and how they got started in their careers, and other topics of interest. We also started something called Night Court and invited students one evening a week to make oral arguments on issues of their choosing with professors, upper-level students, and practitioners giving comments. We also had upper-level students who taught trial skills before the law school's mock trial competition. We wrote newsletters to supplement class materials. In further efforts to create community engagement and support isolated students, we assigned students to Case or Litigation Teams for key assignments so the students had repeated contact with a variety of students. We also shared recordings of visitors to our classes to give students access to more members of the broader [school] community.
I dramatically revised my syllabus to intentionally include both group work to foster collaboration and individual meetings to observe student growth and development. Specifically, I required multiple required individual writing conferences in both Fall and Spring at several stages of the research and writing process and used breakout rooms and google docs to foster collaborative work.
I flipped my classroom, so that all my lectures were available online and before class. I also moved my course from TWEN to Blackboard and then put all handouts and/or links to handouts on Blackboard.
I found it difficult to create the kind of collaborative space that I would normally have created in an in-person class. For example, BC, I would have asked all students to write, pair and share, rewrite and then I would have shared their responses with the class for an all-class critique. I know that theoretically this is possible and I can hear people screaming "I did that" but the Covid reality is that I spent so much time trying to manage the tech that I never really felt like I was much of a teacher any more. It took much more time to "be prepared" for class and so much of that time was attempting to predict what students might need so that it could "appear" that I was totally prepared. Also, we were not allowed to require students to turn on their cameras so often I was teaching into a void with comments/questions running up the chat but no one actually verbally participating unless it was a voice from the darkness. Surprisingly perhaps, I never used power points BC. I believe students should come to class, take notes, ask questions and not rely on my notes later. Because I spent so much time preparing all these materials, I really felt like I had less time to actually review and critique my students' work in a meaningful way. Did it all matter? I don't know
I found zoom teaching really hard. I did find that breakout rooms worked fairly well and that zoom conferences were a good option that I will probably continue to offer as a choice even once we are back in person.
I generally followed my typical course plan while teaching remotely, with an extra emphasis on small group work so that students could spend time with peers they did not otherwise get to see.

I generally used larger groups for exercises on Zoom than I would in a classroom setting (I typically used groups of 4, and kept them static so that students had a regular team of students they interacted with and developed relationships with).
I had a hybrid accommodation, so I had to rely on Zoom for instruction. I was able to replicate most of my exercises online using breakout rooms, etc.
I had to incorporate hybrid teaching, with changing numbers of students online. I had to adapt group work to that reality. I went slower than in pre-covid years.
I hated teaching by zoom. I did learn to love individual conferences with students by zoom. Being able to share the screen of their paper and go through it when they had to focus on what I wanted them to focus on was awesome.
I learned how to love the flipped classroom! Prerecorded lecture content for homework with in-class activities for practice and feedback made the lengthy class meetings go by much more quickly.
I learned that recording individual draft conferences and making the recording available to the student was very valuable. The students can watch the feedback as many times as necessary and the recording is there in case we need to revisit what the student "thought the professor said." It is obviously difficult to teach this course online because you cannot tell who is paying good attention or understanding the material.
I moved much of my lecture material to video and incorporated more in-class exercises.
I ordinarily do partner or group exercises in class, but did not during the 2020-21 year due to social distancing in the classroom.
I pushed everything on Moodle in a format that would have allowed my course to function (on the fly) as an asynchronous course if necessary. I was fortunate to teach in person, despite the pandemic, but I did have several students attend synchronously through Zoom. This made some of the group activities and discussions more challenging, but I still managed to maintain normalcy in what I achieved in terms of teaching. I spent a ton of time recording lectures for students to view before class, effectively flipping the classroom at a higher level as in past years, the pre-class assignments included textbook and PowerPoint viewing instead of recorded lectures. Student evaluations indicate the students loved the recordings over the PowerPoints, including their ability to rewatch them after class. The problem on my end is that this "move" of information really took too much time, and it was time that was already scarce because of the depth and type of feedback that I supply to my students.
I significantly improved my use of electronic resources in the classroom - research exercises, for example, and quick google form quizzes to instantly assess student comprehension. But I struggled to incorporate the traditional in-class group exercises I once used daily. I never really felt comfortable with Zoom breakout rooms.
I spent an extensive amount of time revising my course materials and class plans to adapt to the online teaching format.
I streamlined the class a bit to focus on the absolute essential material so as not to overwhelm students.
I taught all courses online. The courses were essentially identical to in-person courses. My evaluations were the same (extremely high).
I taught all courses using Zoom. I found some aspects to be better and easier (overall attendance, office hours, better use of Blackboard and online tools) and other aspects more difficult (creating sense of community).
I taught completely on-line during the 2020-2021 academic years. I did not do the peer critiques that I usually do. I also just had students perform their Oral Arguments directly to me rather than before a panel of 3 judges. They otherwise did just as much group work since I regularly put them in Breakout rooms on Zoom.
I taught in a hybrid format (one week in person; one week online). I found Zoom to be effective for group work, but it was harder to connect to the class online generally. In the end, because of the extensive individual feedback in my course, I don't think the pandemic was a major obstacle to student learning.
I taught in person, so I was more limited in terms of putting students in groups during class time for exercises. I would have to pivot to Zoom and use break out rooms for those types of exercises. For other exercises where I usually have them work in groups during class time, I had them work alone.
I taught largely via Zoom (a few "hybrid" meetings of the course also, in the fall). Individual conferences were also via Zoom. On the whole, everything worked out quite well--I ended the year confident that my students had acquired the skills I intended them to.
I taught remotely and most of my students were remote, so the class operated somewhat differently.

<p>I taught synchronous online. The law school building was shut down. I used low-stakes quizzes for various concepts that I previously taught in person (ex: hierarchy of authority, citation basics). I also had to move some conferences that normally are in-person to a group format because zoom burnout is so real. I lost my voice during the first set of individual fall-semester conferences and was so exhausted that in the spring I cut back to only one individual conference and did the rest as group conferences.</p>
<p>I taught the class entirely online (on zoom) and conducted student feedback conferences virtually as well. Aside from technological snafus and glitches, I was able to convert the course into the new format and the students performed well on their final briefs and oral arguments. Zoom breakout rooms provided opportunities for group work with a variety of partners that is sometimes hard to accomplish in the classroom. Of course, zoom fatigue and the impersonal nature of learning on the screen slowed down progress at time and required creative ways to engage the students.</p>
<p>I tend to avoid lecturing too much as LRW is a skills course. The limitations placed by COVID-19, caused me to limit the in-class activities.</p>
<p>I think the most challenging aspect of the pandemic was translating the teaching of skills that cannot be replicated over zoom. For the most part, I was able to translate most of the class assignments to an on-line remote learning format, however, replicating oral argument or client interviews or presentations was difficult. Specifically, it is hard to give feedback in these virtual spaces where some of the interaction feels contrived and less authentic. The delay in response over the zoom format creates a challenge of a more organic experience.</p>
<p>I transitioned my course entirely online. I found that it translated well, to be honest. I found breakout rooms were really helpful, among other things. I have also continued doing conferences online, even though we are teaching in person this year.</p>
<p>I tried to replicate my in-person approach to class while teaching via Zoom though I had to simplify and eliminate some exercises and material due to the limitations of teaching via a videoconferencing platform.</p>
<p>I typically teach two sections of 18, but during 2020-21, I taught one section of 37. Additionally, I did far fewer in-class partner or group drafting exercises because the logistics were difficult -- the class was hyflex.</p>
<p>I used less group work because of the difficulty of monitoring the progress of all groups simultaneously in a way that students were aware of my presence. Instead, I monitored Google Docs the students were working on as they worked. However, this still left me feeling separated from the class. I didn't use motivational contests/races/challenges because I wasn't able to hand out prizes at the end (pencils, stress balls, chapstick, etc.).</p>
<p>I used less group work to reflect the hybrid format and safety protocols.</p>
<p>I usually record a podcast on statutory codes (federal and state (NY)) that each student is to listen to while going to the various books. That wasn't possible during Covid, so our IT department did two videos showing me talking and going through the steps of what students would have done had they been looking at the various statutory codes.</p>
<p>I usually teach using team-based learning. But it was difficult to do during the pandemic because so many students were asynchronous or had to miss various classes. So I did away with permanent teams and the group quizzes. I had students take the quizzes individually and formed ad-hoc groups to do in-class exercises.</p>
<p>I utilized Canvas and Zoom for the first time. I found them to be very effective after receiving training from my university.</p>
<p>I was required to teach via Zoom for the entire year. For regular weekly classes, I used lecture with PowerPoint slides and in-class interactive exercises. I often used the breakout room feature to have students complete short activities in small groups before returning to the main session to go over feedback. Due to the remote class structure, I had to send the students instructions for the small group work before class. All of the writing and research assignments were the same as when I taught previously in person. I conducted individual conferences with each student via Zoom using the screen share feature to put feedback on their draft during the meeting. Finally, we also conducted oral argument rounds via Zoom with attorney volunteers serving as the judges. To ensure sufficient collaboration with my colleagues, we implemented weekly meetings via Zoom as well. I also shifted my course site to Blackboard, which provided more robust features for organizing and posting materials for the students.</p>
<p>I wasn't able to call on students as frequently as I would in a normal course because of the technical delays. I prefer to have constant eye-contact. Secondly, it was difficult to teach legal research without access to hard copy (books).</p>

I worked to ensure all my materials could be delivered electronically. I recorded many short videos and assigned those rather than teach everything via zoom.
I would have done much more pair-square-share exercises in class than I could do in Zoom. The "breakout rooms" that were initially used for this purpose proved unwieldy and unhelpful. On the other hand, without remote learning, I would not have used Loom to record my direct observations of individual student work.
In both classes, a significant percentage of the class was attending via Zoom. All of my classes were approximately 50% live and 50% zoom. This caused me to reevaluate and find new ways to deliver the material that would work simultaneously with each format.
In Fall 2020, I was not able to use as many in-class group exercises because I was teaching in person but we had to observe social distancing and masking. We also had to conclude our semester two weeks earlier than usual, so my assignments were simplified.
In place of in-person, individual conferences to review drafts, I used live Zoom sessions. During the spring 2021 semester, I provided students the option of attending in-person or Zoom individual conferences. Approximately 50% of the students chose in-person conferences.
In retrospect, COVID-19 made me make my first-year courses have more active learning and less lecture, which I think has been a great change. I moved away from the lecture model and towards a "with me, with others, with self" model where I would have them read about the skill before class, do an activity to prep for class, we'd briefly cover the reading, and then we would have me demonstrate, then break into groups, then do individual work.
It forced me to use Web Ex and have students participate virtually, which apparently they did not like according to student evals. Having students answer workbook exercises virtually was not conducive to learning.
It was easier to get to know each other and establish an unusual professional intimacy than in person. I think the physical separation of online video gives us permission, and seeing the individual faces up close with their names helped me get to know the students better as individuals. I used a lot of breakout room time for small groups, which allowed us to get to know each other better.
Most conducted by Zoom and emails
Most of my classes were conducted via Zoom. This had some downsides, of course, but I enjoyed using the chat function, screen share, Zoom polls, and breakout rooms, all of which operated a little differently and in some ways better than their in-person counterparts.
Much less group work.
My class was in person and online. The tech worked very well, so there was not much disruption. Individual conferences were all via zoom, but I actually found this to improve the quality of the conferences.
My classes were entirely online. Because of that, I adjusted a number of approaches to assignments and in-class exercises. Most significantly, I shifted about a third of each class to an asynchronous activity that generally required teams of students to interact and either submit a joint assignment or complete the assignment in preparation for full class discussion.
My classes were hybrid most of the time, with some students in person and some on Zoom. To the extent possible and the extent to which I was allowed, I moved all of us online for class sessions that involved group exercises or peer editing, since we were socially distanced in the room and collaborating across hybrid tech was challenging. Other faculty were given the opportunity to seek fully online accommodations.
My classes were small because I teach only LLM students who earned their first law degrees from non-US law schools. The classes were "hybrid" -- I had students in the classroom and simultaneously on Zoom -- so discussions often required repeating the questions so everyone was aware of what was asked.
My course includes multiple, lengthy conferences to review drafts of briefs. I found these difficult to do remotely because I had not been able to develop the same familiarity and comfort level with the students as in past years. Some conferences felt stilted, and the students and I both had difficulty reading each other and forming connections.
My course was fully online and all student feedback conferences were via zoom. I modified my materials, assignments and feedback conferences due to the virtual format.
My LRW I and II courses met on TEAMS. I added small group meetings via TEAMS that I had never held before. I taught my Journal Writing course asynchronously, but I did have multiple round table and small group meetings via TEAMS.

<p>My yearlong LRW-practice course in 2020-21 year was all remote. Based on feedback from my students in semester 1, I used fewer group exercises in breakout rooms in semester 2. I was also more prescriptive on certain elements of memos and briefs, e.g., headings, so I could focus more on substantive writing and legal analysis.</p>
<p>Online both semestersa wonderful experience. Will stay online for many semesters to come.</p>
<p>Online teaching did not change my use of groups or exercises in class. I still did them. I likely lectured a little more but I have always relied on a lot of Q&A and that continued.</p>
<p>Only procedure of distributing the information changed. Objectives were the same</p>
<p>Ordinarily, I use regular, but short, in-class group and pair-up exercises. I did not do that during the pandemic because of social distancing requirements while my class was in person. When we went online for two weeks in September, I did one small-group exercise, using online "breakout rooms" on BB Collaborate.</p>
<p>Our 2020-2021 Legal Skills I and II program was taught as a new, unified course, driven by the pandemic and online teaching. All 1Ls often met together for some part of the class day and were taught by some or all of our LRW professors before they would break into their individual sections with one professor for the remainder of the class time.</p>
<p>Our legal writing department coordinated much more of the program than we had done in previous years.</p>
<p>Our school cut class time by 10-15 minutes, depending on the length of the class, to accommodate students safely getting to and from the bathroom and to and from class. This required me to flip more content. I was the only professor who agreed to teach a live class. Professors and 1L students were given the option of attending class virtually or live. I had about 2/3 of the students in my class choose to attend live in the fall. In the spring, because no other professor on the day I taught was live, only 1-7 students showed up live on any given day. So I always had live and online students, which had challenges. I think Covid made me think long and hard what works in my class, what needs to be cut, what could be taught flipped or not at all, and how to use my class time most effectively. I had really positive responses from students, so I think it ended up making me a better professor.</p>
<p>Pandemic caused me to have to teach to three live students in class while 15 students were on the computer screen via Zoom. Less-than-ideal teaching environment.</p>
<p>Remote learning was a disaster for student morale. It also impaired the development of the usual 1L esprit de corps and professional acculturation. I taught evening students during the lockdown year, and I had a hard time breaking them of their business culture and substituting it with the law's professional culture.</p>
<p>Remote teaching made some small group exercises more difficult. Also, free-flowing back and forth discussions between professor and student and between students in class was inhibited. Distracted students were much more of a problem than ever.</p>
<p>Still did group work and group writing exercises. Group work was much harder because I couldn't hear all the groups at once -- had to pop individually into each breakout room to check in on them. Did use more (non-counting) quizzes and polling and used the chat to allow quick responses.</p>
<p>Students were encouraged to use the chat function during online instruction and most did so. I actually had a fairly positive experience where students who normally wouldn't speak in class would feel more comfortable talking using the chat function. It was difficult to keep students engaged and connect with the students in the same way as we did in person. I felt the need to give my students more breaks and end classes earlier when I would normally work to encourage more discussion in class because that discussion just wasn't happening online.</p>
<p>Taught 100% online.</p>
<p>Taught fully online in 2020-21.</p>
<p>Taught in person and online (one section of each per semester). Both formats had 1/3 of course delivered in asynchronous format per school mandate.</p>
<p>Teaching online was, of course, a challenge, but I was able to continue the heavy use of exercise through Zoom breakout rooms and Google Docs.</p>

<p>Teaching students remotely made it more difficult for me to determine whether students were struggling or checked-out. By simply muting their mics and cameras, they could disappear from my view, which made it difficult to reengage them. The ability to "read the room" was also difficult when teaching remotely. I did not have as much of a sense of the "personality" of the class because I never shared the same physical space with them. On the other hand, I did like some aspects of remote conferencing. Live review and editing of students' writing was easier using Zoom's shared screen function. Students could also record these meetings for future reference. I also made it easier for my students to set-up one-on-one meetings throughout the semester by creating a recurring meeting link for each student. Whenever a student wanted to meet with me (or I wanted to meet with a student), we used that personalized meeting link to communicate.</p>
<p>Teaching via Zoom went remarkably well. The learning curve was hard for me, but my students enjoyed the class and learned what they needed.</p>
<p>The course was online (Zoom - synchronous) rather than in-person. But the substance of the course did not change as a result, and I mostly adapted the teaching techniques I had used to the online environment (e.g., using share screen, breakout rooms for small-group exercises, etc.).</p>
<p>The course was primarily in-person but socially distanced, so I had more individual work, and far more lecture, than I would have liked. I used up my ABA Rules limit of online classes to allow the students to work in groups/pairs in Zoom breakout rooms.</p>
<p>The COVID-19 pandemic affected the details of the course in terms of the in-class instruction. I taught in a hyflex format where one class each week was taught in person, and one class was taught online. During the in-person class, several students typically attended online, requiring me to deliver both modes of instruction at the same time. Additionally, during in-person teaching days, social distancing requirements limited the opportunities for in-class exercises. As a result, I transformed a number of the classes from my typical mix of in-class exercises to more direct instruction in the form of lecture. And, generally, I covered less material than I had previously.</p>
<p>The COVID-19 pandemic made teaching our very dynamic course challenging. Since we often place students in small groups, the hardest part were occasional tech issues when using breakout rooms (pre-assigned breakout rooms not populating correctly, some students not appearing on the list of students available to be placed in breakout rooms, sound and connectivity issues with individual students, etc.). Teaching in the virtual format also made various lesson plans take longer (because of tech issues and transitions between breakout rooms and screen-sharing and so on), which meant less class time to cover the same material. However, I did see an uptick in office hours attendance - I'm not sure if that is because students needed more support given this challenging time, or that virtual office hours are more accessible, or some combination of both.</p>
<p>The Covid-19 protocols required that most of the pair-and-share and group work had to occur in Zoom breakout rooms. Some activities, such as taping parts of documents together had to be changed where the students told me the order of the documents and I would have to tape them together. All in all, a few less opportunities for the students to get up out of their seats and have fun, but not a total loss of active learning opportunities.</p>
<p>The law school took a week long break for us to transition to online learning in March 2020. This break happened just as students were rewriting their appellate briefs. We extended the deadline on the appellate briefs. Also, the school decided that students would either receive a pass or a no credit final score in the course. We therefore graded the appellate briefs as either a pass or no credit. We also canceled our in-person oral arguments with practitioners and instead had students do their oral arguments via zoom with the Professor and TA serving as judges. Those oral arguments were also graded pass/no credit. We taught and held office hours via zoom for the remainder of the semester. We also had to transition to Blackboard as our learning platform instead of TWEN.</p>
<p>The LRW course I taught during the 2020-2021 academic year was taught remotely to international students. Considerably fewer students were enrolled in the course than in previous years. A typical class size would be 28-30 students.</p>
<p>The LRW courses were taught "hybrid," meaning that I showed up in person, and the students chose to attend online or in person on an ad hoc basis. The students who attended many or most of the classes in person did substantially better than those who did not - in fact.</p>
<p>The main thing was having to rethink and restructure some of the group work so that it could be done in breakout rooms on Zoom.</p>
<p>The pandemic did not affect the substance of my instruction, but it affected the format. For example, I used breakout rooms on Zoom so that the students could collaborate more so than they collaborated in a normal year.</p>

<p>The pandemic had two main effects. First, I held all conferences virtually using Zoom. Second, I did not utilize any pair or group work during the 2020-2021 year because our Covid precautions required a certain spacing between students, and students were not supposed to move during class sessions. This meant that any pair or group work was not possible.</p>
<p>Though we were separated and online, I increased the amount of time students spent in small groups working together. I wanted students to do engage as much as possible, to work together as much as possible, and to have to listen to Zoom lectures as little as possible. I also used a somewhat more "flipped" approach than usual, with short videos to deliver content that I would have typically delivered in class so that we could use class time for the interactive exercises.</p>
<p>To clarify, I taught two sections of the objective writing course in the fall (30 students in two sections), and I taught two sections of the persuasive writing course in the spring (the same 30 students in two sections). In the spring, the librarians taught the research portion of the course.</p>
<p>Turned all of my lectures into YouTube videos, leaving all class time for active learning</p>
<p>Used many more google docs and could not ban laptops!</p>
<p>Used to do more think-pair-share exercises. In this, most group discussions were in Zoom breakouts, and students stayed in same small (4 or 5 member) groups for the whole semester for those.</p>
<p>Used Zoom exclusively for all office hours and conferences. Sharing screen function worked well to review and discuss drafts. Teaching in person and also on zoom to several students each class who were quarantined or had on-line accommodations was very challenging.</p>
<p>Using Zoom and breakout rooms, I was able to hold class in a way that was much closer to normal than I expected.</p>
<p>We did group work on Zoom (using break out rooms), and because my classes were often in person, that meant less group work this year than in previous years. We also did our appellate oral arguments virtually via zoom.</p>
<p>We had to be on-line. Peer review is normally a very valuable tool. Peer review on line is much more awkward. Being on-line made it much harder to form good relationships with students. Normally, if I need to cajole or reinforce a student I can bump into the student in the hall or cafeteria. There is no comparable way to do that on-line. Requiring attendance at a Zoom meeting is much more formal and intimidating.</p>
<p>We managed to do the same amount of in-class quizzing and groupwork using Zoom features. No real changes - just not in person contact. I significantly increased my office hours to be fully available (via Zoom) to my students.</p>
<p>We moved exclusively online for the 2020-2021 year. I used more PowerPoints than I had ever done before. I did more meetings for just connection purposes than I had before. I also included workshopping of writing and held conferences on the weekend to further discuss.</p>
<p>We normally spend several class meetings engaging in structured peer review. This was challenging during 2020-21 due to concerns with sharing student work electronically versus in hard copy. I also divided students into smaller groups less frequently just because I couldn't oversee the students like in a classroom to make sure they were staying on task.</p>
<p>We provided hybrid instruction (some in person, some on Zoom). I utilized the learning management system more extensively to avoid paper handouts, and had to consider "distancing" requirements during any group work. I also showed fewer samples of past work to avoid the possibility of recorded or copied examples.</p>
<p>We taught hybrid, some students in class, some on zoom so it was challenging. Employed zoom for individual conferences which was positive. Challenging times.</p>
<p>We taught in person at [school], with students whose health pass prevented them from coming to campus participating by zoom. The constraints imposed on peer review and workshopping by social distancing requirements meant that I experimented with other ways to engage in peer review and workshopping -- shared google docs, peer review outside of class -- which were successful and I will use in a non-social distancing environment.</p>
<p>We taught the class entirely online, requiring considerable rethinking of how to make exercises that had been effective in person work in an online setting.</p>
<p>We used prerecorded asynchronous instruction about basic concepts. Students were required to view those before class so that we did not have to lecture as much over zoom</p>
<p>We were able to hold classes in-person, although some group exercises and meetings had to be adjusted to limit numbers of people congregating.</p>

We were using zoom for all classes, so obviously we had to incorporate a lot more technology to teach and to provide feedback to students. It was challenging to learn to use all the technology but it pushed us to "modernize" which was good. Some of the techniques we used and the means of communication will continue to be used even after we get back to in person.

Zoom limited the amount of group in-class work that I usually do. Still did some but not as often as I normally would.

Zoom made student conferencing more efficient and allowed each student to be an active participant in showing the professor their work. The use of technology also helped me to more easily blend editing/feedback + substance -- both logic/reasoning and research. It was so convenient to go back and forth between modes of teaching. Seamless. Loved it.

Zoom modality, shorter classes. Zoom conferences worked out better than in person meetings

Part E. Research Instruction in Required Courses

The questions in this Part (Q7.3 through Q7.16) were displayed to all respondents who, based on their answers to Q3.6, Q6.3, and Q6.17, indicated that they taught at least one required stand-alone research course or at least one Required LRW Course that included explicit instruction on research during the 2020-2021 Academic Year. The following tables provide information about the research instruction in such courses.

Q7.3 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, what level of students did you teach in a required stand-alone research course or a Required LRW Course that included explicit instruction on research?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
First-Year Students	92%	233
Upper-Level Students	4%	10
Both	4%	9
Total	100%	252

Q7.5 - For required research instruction for first-year students, which of the following best describes the division of research instruction between print sources and electronic research services?²⁹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Research instruction focuses exclusively on print sources.	0%	0
Research instruction focuses exclusively on electronic research services.	32%	77
Initially, most research instruction focuses on print sources with limited instruction on electronic research services, but students receive additional instruction on electronic research services later in their 1L year.	2%	5
Research instruction focuses equally on print sources and electronic research services.	4%	9
Most research instruction focuses on electronic research services, but students receive some instruction on print sources.	59%	143
Other; please describe	3%	7
Total	100%	241

Other; please describe
Although normally I would introduce students to print resources, that did not occur during the pandemic year.
I teach research in a format-neutral way.
Normally, it is 50/50 between online and books, but during this academic year it was 100% online
Pandemic / remote classes basically eliminated our print instruction
Print sources are made available for review, so the students can understand what types of sources they are viewing online (i.e. Federal Reporters)
Research instruction was provided by my co-teacher, a member of the Library Faculty.
Typically, I teach print research in class, and students receive instruction in WL and Lexis by the respective reps and training modules.

²⁹ Questions Q7.5 through Q7.9 were displayed to respondents who selected either “first-year students” or “both” as their answer to Q7.3.

Q7.6 - You indicated previously (Q7.5) that the required research instruction for first-year students includes some amount of discussion of print sources. To what extent are students permitted to use electronic research services?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Students may not use electronic research services at all.	0%	0
Students may use electronic research services only for limited purposes (e.g., updating authorities, finding/printing cases).	1%	1
Initially, students may use electronic research services only for limited purposes, but they may use electronic research services freely later in their 1L year.	8%	13
Students may use electronic research services freely at any time in their 1L year.	88%	138
Other; please describe	3%	5
Total	100%	157

Other; please describe
We instructed students about print materials. Because we were remote learning, in effect, the research was exclusively electronic.
Students use electronic research services beginning in Week 4 of the fall semester, after completing a closed universe assignment.
We used to limit electronic research when we could actually limit it. They do not receive training on how to use it until later in the first semester. I start off with print materials so they know how to do it and what each source is. Then they are permitted to look things up and search freely. I guess they could search online earlier in the semester, but most don't know how yet.
Students may use electronic research services freely at any time in their 1L year, as long as the assignment allows research.
research is taught in the Spring; once that occurs students have full access to electronic resources

Q7.7 - For required research instruction for first-year students, do students receive instruction on research using the following electronic services?³⁰

	Yes		No		No, but students are briefly introduced to the service.		Total
Bloomberg Law	19%	45	65%	157	17%	40	242
Casemaker	1%	2	92%	222	7%	18	242
Fastcase	5%	11	84%	204	11%	27	242
Google Scholar	17%	40	71%	171	13%	31	242
Lexis Advance / Lexis+	98%	238	0%	1	1%	3	242
Westlaw Edge	99%	240	0%	0	1%	2	242
Other	4%	10	93%	226	2%	6	242

Other	
Casetext	Law Library Electronic Resources Not Tied to Lexis/Westlaw
Congress.gov, and California.gov	Online government websites
Cornell Legal Information Institute, and the GPO website	Pacer
Free online sources, starting with Google.	Regular google, government sites
Free resources	SSRN, Casetext
General Internet Options	State bar publications
Google (not scholar)	State-based web sites
Govinfo and Proquest	Students were required to choose either a bloomberg or lexis session in addition to what we did in class on westlaw.
Hein Online (2 respondents)	

Q7.8 - For each of the databases listed, who provides the research instruction for first-year students? Select all that apply.

	Librarians		LRW Faculty		Vendor Reps		Other		Total # of Respondents
Bloomberg Law	60%	27	36%	16	31%	14	0%	0	45
Casemaker	100%	2	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	2
Fastcase	70%	7	60%	6	0%	0	0%	0	10
Google Scholar	31%	12	79%	31	0%	0	0%	0	39
Lexis Advance / Lexis+	51%	122	70%	165	65%	154	3%	7	237
Westlaw Edge	52%	122	74%	174	61%	143	3%	8	235
Other	40%	4	90%	9	0%	0	0%	0	10

³⁰ As a matter of survey logic, this question was displayed to all respondents who did not select “Research instruction focuses exclusively on print sources” as their answer to Q7.5. As a practical matter, this made no difference because nobody selected that answer option.

Q7.9 - For required research instruction for first-year students, do students receive instruction on research using the following sources?

	Yes		No		Total
Cases	100%	242	0%	0	242
Statutes	99%	240	1%	2	242
Secondary sources	100%	241	0%	1	242
Updating sources (e.g. Shepard's or KeyCite)	100%	241	0%	1	242
Legislative History	40%	97	60%	145	242
Regulations	50%	122	50%	120	242
Court rules	51%	124	49%	118	242
Other; please describe	3%	7	97%	235	242

Other; please describe	
Agency documents and guidelines	Non-legal research included for policy-based arguments. I also set case simulations in real settings and suggest students go there to get a feel for the setting.
Agency websites	Regulations are taught if they are relevant to any major assignment.
Dockets	Some focus on legislative history, regulations, and court rules, but not major focus.
Finding tools such as Table of Cases, citators, Descriptive Word Index	They will receive research on legislative history if it is relevant to the writing assignment.
Municipal codes	

Q7.11 - For required research instruction for upper-level students, which of the following best describes the division of research instruction between print sources and electronic research services?³¹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
All research instruction focuses on print sources.	0%	0
All research instruction focuses on electronic research services.	37%	7
Initially, most research instruction focuses on print sources with limited instruction on electronic research services, but students receive additional instruction on electronic research services later in their 1L year.	0%	0
Research instruction focuses equally on print sources and electronic research services.	5%	1
Most research instruction focuses on electronic research services, but students receive some instruction on print sources.	58%	11
Other; please describe	0%	0
Total	100%	19

Q7.12 - You indicated previously (Q7.11) that the required research instruction for upper-level students includes some amount of discussion of print sources. To what extent are students permitted to use electronic research services?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Students may not use electronic research services at all.	0%	0
Students may use electronic research services only for limited purposes (e.g., updating authorities, finding/printing cases).	0%	0
Initially, students may use electronic research services only for limited purposes, but they may freely use electronic research services freely later in the year.	0%	0
Students may freely use electronic research services at any time.	92%	11
Other; please describe	8%	1
Total	100%	12

Other; please describe
Students must do electronic research.

³¹ Questions Q7.11 through Q7.15 were displayed to respondents who selected either “upper-year students” or “both” as their answer to Q7.3.
 Page | 70

Q7.13 – For required instruction for upper-level students, do students receive instruction on research using the following electronic services?³²

	Yes		No		No, but students are briefly introduced to the service.		Total
Bloomberg Law	35%	6	65%	11	0%	0	17
Casemaker	6%	1	82%	14	12%	2	17
Fastcase	6%	1	82%	14	12%	2	17
Google Scholar	24%	4	53%	9	24%	4	17
Lexis Advance / Lexis+	89%	17	11%	2	0%	0	19
Westlaw Edge	95%	18	5%	1	0%	0	19
Other	25%	1	75%	3	0%	0	4

Other	
Agency regulations and websites	
Free resources	
Internet research, Westlaw	

Q7.14 - For each of the databases listed, who provides the research instruction for upper-level students? Select all that apply.

	Librarians		LRW Faculty		Vendor Reps		Other		Total # of Respondents
Bloomberg Law	67%	4	33%	2	0%	0	17%	1	6
Casemaker	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Fastcase	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Google Scholar	75%	3	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	4
Lexis Advance / Lexis+	35%	6	59%	10	29%	5	0%	0	17
Westlaw Edge	35%	6	71%	12	18%	3	0%	0	17
Other	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1

³² This question used survey logic that was comparable to Q7.7, with the same lack of practical effect given the responses to Q7.11.

Q7.15 – For required research instruction for upper-level students, do students receive instruction on research using the following sources?

	Yes		No		Total
Cases	95%	18	5%	1	19
Statutes	95%	18	5%	1	19
Secondary Sources	95%	18	5%	1	19
Updating (e.g., Shepard's or KeyCite)	95%	18	5%	1	19
Regulations	79%	15	21%	4	19
Legislative history	79%	15	21%	4	19
Court rules	74%	14	26%	5	19
Other; please describe	5%	1	95%	18	19

Other	
Forms	

Q7.16 - The preceding block of questions has asked you to provide various details about the research instruction in required LRW Courses that you taught during 2020-2021. To the extent that you have not already done so in response to earlier questions, we invite you to use the following space to describe how the COVID-19 pandemic affected how you taught research, focusing on whatever points are of importance to you. Please feel free to use as much space as you wish.

Again, instruction was more effective via Zoom
Although LRW classes were in person, the vendor overviews for Lexis, Westlaw, and Bloomberg were videos this year that students had to watch outside of class.
Although we briefly discussed print resources, the students did not use any print resources because of COVID-19. All research was done electronically.
Because classes were exclusively on Zoom, we focused our attention on electronic resources. Normally, we would spend time on print resources as well.
Because of Covid, it was harder for me to do a class in which I have students in small groups learn about secondary sources by first examining hard/print copies of those sources. But we did a comparable exercise somehow.
COVID-19 didn't really impact the way I taught research. It worked remarkably similar to the way I taught it in class except for my inability to circulate among the groups as they worked.
Did not teach print research
Due to Covid-19, we shifted our focus to electronic research.
Due to the pandemic, all research instruction had to be done online.
Due to the pandemic, research instruction focused solely on electronic sources. However, I did lecture on the availability of print sources.
Enhanced focus on online sources.
Exclusively used on-line sources due to COVID restrictions.
Forced us to focus on electronic sources instead of starting with print.
Generally, we teach research utilizing both print and electronic sources, however, given the ongoing pandemic, we only taught the students using electronic sources (Lexis + Westlaw).
Honestly, teaching research online worked great. Having students share screens while doing research feels much more interactive and engaging than projecting only the teacher's computer in the classroom.
I began teaching research mostly asynchronous. I recorded lectures, used Lexis Learn, and West Knowledge Center, and then gave the students search and find exercises to assess their knowledge. They completed this all outside of class.
I conducted more of my own online research demos in-class, via Zoom. I did invite librarians to serve as guest lecturers for some classes, but I did not use vendors at all.
I did not have the opportunity to do exercises in the law library, nor do too much with doing in-class group exercises. That was too hard to do well. (Normally, I have a law librarian floating around the room to see how things are going.)
I don't believe this part of my teaching has been affected by COVID.
I like to show students books when I teach research. I was unable to do so because of COVID.
I provided most of my research instruction via pre-recorded videos. It worked well, so I plan to continue.
I really wanted to make sure that my students went to the library at least once. Luckily, the head librarian at my institution was wonderfully helpful and let me setup my normal scavenger hunt in the library. I was fortunate to be teaching a hybrid course with about a third of the students in-person. These students performed the research hunt in the library while the online students watched them over Zoom. Not perfect, but it at least served the goal of showing all students what the page numbers on Westlaw refer to in the real world.

I substantially revamped my research instruction, incorporating a research book for the first time in years (with accompanying Lexis/Westlaw guided exercises), and I reinforced the lessons students essentially self-taught using the book with interactive in-class research exercises. It was a lot more fun - and a lot more instructive - than my prior research teaching. This is the first time I've felt good about my research instruction in a long time. (One good thing to come out of the pandemic...)
I usually bring print sources to class but did not that during the 2020-2021 academic year.
I would have provided some information on print sources, particularly statutory codes, if we were not teaching virtually. Given that students could not access a physical library, I did not address physical, print resources.
In-class research, as a group and individually, has always been a significant course component. When students attend online, the group work is nearly impossible and the individual work is less effective because some students are not engaging as they would in the classroom.
It was a little tricky teaching research on Zoom. In the classroom, students can watch what I'm doing on the screen while also doing it themselves on their devices. On Zoom, it's unworkable for them to "do" while also "watching."
Librarians sent me pictures of the books in the library that I used to show students rather than send them to the library (which was closed to patrons). I also relied much more on the improved West Knowledge Center modules. Normally I require students to do more with fact-based research. I could not do as much this year because many students were not living locally.
Libraries were closed due to covid so research for the writing assignments was done solely using electronic databases.
More exercises completed as homework, then presented by students and discussed in class, as opposed to exercises completed during class. Covid limitations on instructors "floating" and a larger number of students in the room resulted in this change.
My course relies heavily on books and print sources. Not having access to books is problematic for many reasons. I can give each student a book. Plus, many books are not available electronically.
Not much impact, however, for students who also liked to use print research in the library, they occasionally felt frustrated.
One thing that was harder: in an in-person course, students would research electronically at their desks while I did it on the overhead. Then they'd comment or ask questions if they had different results than I did -- we were able to suss out problems sooner. When class is online, they can be looking at my screen or their own; harder to check in on both at once.
Ordinarily, we would teach in-print research before electronic research; the pandemic disallowed use of the library books in that way, so electronic research instruction was all that could be effectively taught.
Our research librarians chose to teach online during 2020-21.
Our school forbade students from gathering in the library--in order to achieve social distancing--so we completely abandoned research in the library during AY20-21, though we did provide students with all the regular class-based instruction in how to use the books for research. I worry for students' ability on this topic.
Our students did not have access to the law library. As a result, use of print resources were limited.
Research instruction focuses more on research strategy than on a particular database. Students are encouraged to seek out additional instruction from database vendors.
Research was all online last year - no in-library or paper/book research instruction
See previous comments on ZOOM. Teaching research became significantly easier and clearer to students - technology during the pandemic made everything clearer and easier. Loved it.
Since we teach primarily electronic research, I didn't notice any COVID-19-related effects.
Students were not required to do print research because of restrictions on library use during the pandemic.
The Covid-19 pandemic prevented students from having the opportunity to conduct book/print research (non-electronic research). I did, however, emphasize during class discussions the importance of developing book/print research skills, as well as electronic research and provided some demonstrations related to print research.
The legal research portion of our first-year Legal Research and Writing course (a year-long course) is taught by legal research faculty/law librarians. It was entirely online instructions during the 2020-21 year due to COVID. Most of the classes were synchronous.
The librarians teach the research portion in the spring semester.

<p>The pandemic did not affect how I taught research. I successfully used the screen-share function on Zoom when demo-ing, and students participated in virtual research tutorials with Lexis, Westlaw, and Bloomberg reps.</p>
<p>The pandemic had the same effect on our research instruction as I previously indicated.</p>
<p>The reason why I taught live was because I could not set aside book research and I could not envision teaching research (and other skills) exclusively through Zoom. I had two students in the fall who could not attend class live because they had family members at home with health conditions. For those two students, I copied and sent the materials they needed to them. For everyone else, I said they could complete the assignment within a week and come up to the school to do so at odd hours to avoid coming into contact with people. In the end, my students were really excited to have some hands-on research experiences in the library. One student said it was the highlight of the semester! I think they wanted to see that they could DO something well after they had the training. Being remote and having to keep distance between all of us made them hungry for such experiences. I did change one assignment to a group presentation and I accommodated folks who wanted to be exclusively remote and those who wanted to be in the library in person. That was for the secondary assignment. I ended up giving the remote folks assignments they could do exclusively online. It worked really well and I would consider doing it again.</p>
<p>The reps presented virtually but our Lexis rep had such difficulty with the transmission - her sound was not working that she had to send around a video instead. We had our school library staff also present virtually.</p>
<p>The Westlaw/Lexis reps. did presentations on-line, which (ironically) I did not believe went as well as an in-person lecture.</p>
<p>Those previous answers reflect how I taught research during the pandemic which was exclusively online though I talked about the books a bit to help students visualize what the databases are about. I also allowed students to use the books if they preferred doing that at their own local libraries (our law library was closed during the pandemic) insofar as they had prior experience or knowledge of how to use a law library because they worked at a law firm prior to attending law school. Pre-pandemic, I would always start research instruction with a tour of the library, and point out the differences between how print resources are organized (by topic and accessed with an index) versus electronic resources (by identifying the presence of words or phrases within the databases).</p>
<p>Unfortunately, we could not do any print research due to COVID, but hope to return to doing print research when we can do so safely. Our Lexis rep was fantastic, and she conducted the classes via Zoom. For Westlaw, we recorded one of the LRW professors doing that instruction (we have not been satisfied with our Westlaw reps the past several years), and the students were required to watch the video and answer some questions. We will continue to do this post-COVID, although we hope to have our Lexis rep back in person when it is safe to do so.</p>
<p>We all had less access to librarian help with research workshops this year due to the pandemic, so I had to give up a set of research conferences that I usually hold with research librarians. I just didn't have the capacity to do them on my own.</p>
<p>We could not use print resources to the extent that we had in the past and had to space out library instruction to keep students distanced.</p>
<p>We did not do our traditional library day at the beginning of the course using print sources.</p>
<p>We did not spend much time on print sources as I did not want to require students to touch the same books.</p>
<p>We flipped much of the research instruction; librarians could easily sent up classes and extra sessions using Zoom.</p>
<p>We relied more heavily on electronic research during the COVID-19 pandemic, as many professors and students could not gain access to print sources.</p>
<p>We used to focus more on print research, using substantial assignments that required them to use the books. I converted those assignments to be online-only assignments for Lexis and Westlaw use.</p>
<p>While in years past I have done some print research with students, because of COVID-19 we went to entirely electronic sources.</p>
<p>Zoom classes worked very well for regular (non-research) LRW. Zoom worked less well teaching research. It is very hard to replicate giving the students a research task and then walking around the room to help students.</p>

Part F. Non-LRW Courses

The questions in this part were asked of all respondents who selected either “Full-time” or “Part-time” as their employment status in Q3.2, “LRW Faculty” as their primary responsibility in Q3.4, and that they taught one or more non-LRW course(s) during the 2020-2021 Academic Year in Q3.6.

Q10.2 - Which Non-LRW Courses did you teach during the 2020-2021 Academic Year, if any? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Live-client Clinic	3%	4
Non-clinic, Non-LRW Simulation (Skills) Course	13%	19
1L Required Doctrinal	9%	13
1L Elective Doctrinal	2%	3
Upper-Level Required Doctrinal	11%	16
Upper-Level Elective Doctrinal	27%	39
Seminar	23%	33
Bar Exam Prep Course	7%	10
Academic Support Course	3%	5
Other; please describe	25%	36
None	6%	8
Total # of Respondents		144

Other	
1 credit "mini-seminar"	Law and Literature
1-credit Mindful Lawyer class	LLM course: research and analysis in American law
1L Experiential Elective; LLM required doctrinal course	Mindful Lawyer - upper-level elective
Appellate Advocacy	Moot court
Contracts Drafting Course that is not part of our LRW program	Moot Court Board
Contracts I - Summer Pre-Law Course	Moot Court Briefs and Oral Advocacy
Doctrinal for students	Online Undergraduate Paralegal Studies and Masters in Law courses
Elective undergraduate Honors course	Privacy Law had a doctrinal structure. It had a case book. But the course was writing intensive. Students grades were based on term papers or blog posts. Class time was spent discussing the writing and critiquing of the blog posts.
Externship	Street Law
Externship seminar	Supervise individual upper level research projects and practicums
I taught a year-long Writing Center tutoring course.	Trial Advocacy
I thought the scholarly course counted in this category	Undergrad course previewing law school
Import / Export Law	Undergraduate Honors College Course

Independent Study (law review)	Upper-division Legal Drafting
Indian Legal Research	Upper-level class that is one of two options to fulfill a requirement
Intro to US Legal Systems (required LL.M. orientation course)	Upper-Level Contract Drafting Course
Judicial externship (2 respondents)	Upper-level elective
Juris Masters class	

Q10.3 - Was this course part of your normal teaching load?

	Normal Teaching Load		Overload		Other		Total
Live-client Clinic	75%	3	25%	1	0%	0	4
Non-clinic, Non-LRW Simulation (Skills) Course	42%	8	47%	9	11%	2	19
1L Required Doctrinal	54%	7	38%	5	8%	1	13
1L Elective Doctrinal	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	3
Upper-level Required Doctrinal	44%	7	50%	8	6%	1	16
Upper-level Elective Doctrinal	49%	19	46%	18	5%	2	39
Seminar	42%	14	45%	15	12%	4	33
Academic Support Course	60%	3	20%	1	20%	1	5
Bar Exam Prep Course	40%	4	40%	4	20%	2	10
Other	42%	15	47%	17	11%	4	36

Part G. Work Load

The questions in this part (Q11.3 through Q11.19) were displayed only to Full-time and Part-time faculty. The Survey Committee determined that asking about topics such as “normal” teaching loads at a particular institution didn’t apply to Visitors.

Respondents were advised that “For purposes of the following questions, ‘normal teaching load’ refers to courses you were expected to teach during the Academic Year as part of your usual job responsibilities. Do not include overload courses if the overload is temporary, even if it is not compensated. Do not include summer courses if you receive additional compensation for those courses. If you teach more than one section of the same course, count each section as a separate course.

Answer the following questions thinking of your normal teaching load as of the 2020-2021 Academic Year.”

Q11.3 - Did you have a normal teaching load in connection with your employment at your school during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?³³

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	85%	271
No	15%	46
Total	100%	317

³³ Respondents who answered “No” to this question were skipped forward to Q11.18.

Q11.4 - In connection with your normal teaching load, are you expected to teach during the following academic terms (e.g., semester, trimester)?

	Yes	No	My school does not have this academic term.	Total
First Full Academic Term	268	3	0	271
Second Full Academic Term	268	3	0	271
Third Full Academic Term	11	8	252	271
Fourth Full Academic Term	1	5	265	271
Summer Academic Term (if not a Full Academic Term)	5	239	27	271

Q11.5 - How many courses are included in your normal teaching load? Reminder: If you teach more than one section of the same course, count each section as a separate course.

First Full Academic Term

	0		1		1.5		2		3		4		Total
LRW Courses	1%	4	44%	117	0%	1	51%	138	3%	7	0%	1	268
Non-LRW Courses	81%	214	17%	46	0%	0	1%	3	1%	2	0%	0	265

Second Full Academic Term

	0		0.5		1		1.5		2		3		4		Total
LRW Courses	4%	11	0%	0	47%	127	0%	1	45%	120	3%	8	0%	1	268
Non-LRW Courses	73%	193	1%	2	23%	61	0%	0	3%	9	0%	0	0%	1	266

Third Full Academic Term

	0		1		2		3		Total
LRW Courses	9%	1	73%	8	9%	1	9%	1	11
Non-LRW Courses	73%	8	27%	3	0%	0	0%	0	11

Fourth Full Academic Term

	0		1		Total
LRW Courses	0%	0	100%	1	1
Non-LRW Courses	100%	1	0%	0	1

Summer Academic Term (if not a Full Academic Term)

	0		1		Total
LRW Courses	60%	3	40%	2	5
Non-LRW Courses	40%	2	60%	3	5

Q11.6 - Has the number of courses in your normal teaching load changed since the previous Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, it has INCREASED.	3%	7
Yes, it has DECREASED.	4%	10
No, it has remained the same.	90%	244
This is my first year of teaching at this school.	4%	10
Total	100%	271

Q11.7 - How many credits do the courses in your normal teaching load comprise? Reminder: If you teach more than one section of the same course, count each section as a separate course.

First Full Academic Term

	0		1		2		2.5		3		4		5		6		7		8		Total
LRW Courses	1%	4	2%	5	24%	65	2%	6	29%	77	12%	33	4%	11	22%	59	2%	5	1%	2	267
Non-LRW Courses	81%	215	2%	4	5%	13	0%	0	10%	27	2%	5	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	266

Second Full Academic Term

	0		1		1.5		2		2.5		3		3.5		4		5		6		7		8		Total
LRW Courses	3%	9	1%	4	0%	0	33%	88	1%	4	26%	69	1%	2	16%	43	3%	7	14%	38	1%	2	1%	2	268
Non-LRW Courses	72%	192	1%	3	0%	1	7%	20	0%	0	13%	36	0%	0	4%	11	0%	0	1%	2	1%	3	0%	0	268

Third Full Academic Term

	0		2		3		6		7		Total
LRW Courses	9%	1	55%	6	18%	2	9%	1	9%	1	11
Non-LRW Courses	73%	8	18%	2	9%	1	0%	0	0%	0	11

Fourth Full Academic Term

	0		1		Total
LRW Courses	0%	0	100%	1	1
Non-LRW Courses	100%	1	0%	0	1

Summer Academic Term (if not a Full Academic Term)

	0		2		3		Total
LRW Courses	40%	2	20%	1	40%	2	5
Non-LRW Courses	80%	4	0%	0	20%	1	5

Q11.8 - Has the number of credit hours in your normal teaching load changed since the previous Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, it has INCREASED.	4%	10
Yes, it has DECREASED.	4%	10
No, it has remained the same.	89%	242
This is my first year of teaching at this school.	3%	9
Total	100%	271

Q11.9 - Why has the number of courses and/or the number of credit hours in your normal teaching load INCREASED?

Added a third unit to fall semester LRW.
Administrative glitch allowed significantly more students to enroll in a capped course.
Budgetary reasons
I had to teach an additional course because another LRW faculty member left and, due to COVID-19, there was a hiring freeze.
I have taken on more.
I received a summer stipend for research and one of the conditions of the stipend was to teach a 4th course
I was part-time (LRW only) in 2019-20; I started teaching full-time (LRW + Legislation) in 2020-21.
In Spring 2021 I taught one section of legal writing (2 credits) and one section of professional responsibility (3 credits) for a total of 5 credits. The previous semester I had taught two sections of legal writing (4 credits total). I volunteered to teach PR; it wasn't required.
My spring writing course is a seminar. I alternate 2 and 3 hour seminars.
Only because we decided that our second semester course was worth three credits instead of two. We didn't actually change what we do in the course.
The credits for LAWR II (spring semester) were increased by one credit.
We sought and received an extra unit of credit for our fall LRW/predictive class.
We were able to secure an additional credit for our upper-level seminar for TA's without additional teaching time.

Q11.10 - Why has the number of courses and/or the number of credit hours in your normal teaching load DECREASED?

As a Visiting Assistant Professor, I was expected to teach legal writing every semester and to teach a doctrinal course one of those four semesters.
For 2020-21, my two classes were combined into one. This year, I am teaching my two classes as normal.
I became the LRW director which includes course relief
I had a course relief to work on curriculum development.
I requested (and was given) the opportunity to teach a non-LRW course and take on another administrative responsibilities for one semester.
I took on an administrative role. I expect my role to grow larger this year, which means my normal load will continue to decrease.
In the previous academic year, I was required to teach an additional (non-LRW) course as part of my base contract. When my contract was renewed, I negotiated to have the extra class treated as an overload.
Lower enrollment; higher admission criteria
My previously teaching load was 3 units higher than other directors of academic programs with teaching responsibilities. The Academic Dean reduced my load by 3 units in AY20-21 so that my load was equivalent to other academic program directors with teaching loads.
Spring 2020 I taught a 4 credit non-LRW course. Since then, the school hired a person to cover that course.
Typically, I teach the academic support course on an overload. I was not required to do that in 2020-2021.

Q11.11 - In connection with your normal teaching load, what is the typical number of students for whom you have grading/feedback responsibility in each semester? If you do not have students in a particular course type in a given semester, please leave the answer for that course type/semester blank.

First Full Academic Term

# of Students	1L LRW Courses	Upper-Level LRW Courses	Live-Client Clinics	Non-LRW Skills/Simulation Courses	Academic Support Courses	Bar Prep Courses	Seminar Courses	Other Non-LRW Courses
1-5	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
6-10	0	7	2	2	0	1	1	3
11-15	7	9	1	3	1	0	1	7
16-20	30	15	1	4	1	1	4	6
21-25	30	8	0	0	0	1	0	3
26-30	47	2	0	1	0	0	0	3
31-35	31	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
36-40	64	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
41-45	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
46-49	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
50-59	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
60-69	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
70-79	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
100-115	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
140	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
170	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
220	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # of Respondents for each course	252	47	5	12	3	5	6	36

Second Full Academic Term

# of Students	1L LRW Courses	Upper-Level LRW Courses	Live-Client Clinics	Non-LRW Skills/Simulation Courses	Academic Support Courses	Bar Prep Courses	Seminar Courses	Other Non-LRW Courses
1-5	0	1	3	0	1	0	0	1
6-10	0	4	4	1	0	0	1	2
11-15	10	7	1	1	1	0	5	3
16-20	34	17	1	7	0	1	8	2
21-25	36	5	0	1	0	1	0	2
26-30	42	1	0	0	1	0	0	7
31-35	29	3	0	1	0	0	0	3
36-40	60	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
41-45	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	3
46-49	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-59	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
60	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey—2020-2021 Individual Survey
Part G. Work Load

90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
100-115	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
220	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
225	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # of Respondents for each course	251	42	9	13	3	3	14	38

Third Full Academic Term

# of Students	1L LRW Courses	Upper-Level LRW Courses	Live-Client Clinics	Non-LRW Skills/Simulation Courses	Academic Support Courses	Bar Prep Courses	Seminar Courses	Other Non-LRW Courses
3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
18	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total # of Respondents for each course	10	2	0	1	0	0	0	2

Fourth Full Academic Term

# of Students	1L LRW Courses	Upper-Level LRW Courses	Live-Client Clinics	Non-LRW Skills/Simulation Courses	Academic Support Courses	Bar Prep Courses	Seminar Courses	Other Non-LRW Courses
20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # of Respondents for each course	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Summer Academic Term (if not a Full Academic Term)

# of Students	1L LRW Courses	Upper-Level LRW Courses	Live-Client Clinics	Non-LRW Skills/Simulation Courses	Academic Support Courses	Bar Prep Courses	Seminar Courses	Other Non-LRW Courses
10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
20	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
125	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Total # of Respondents for each course	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	2

Q11.12 - In connection with your normal teaching load, has the number of students for whom you have grading/feedback responsibility in LRW Courses changed significantly (i.e., more than the typical year-to-year fluctuation) since the previous Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, it has INCREASED.	14%	39
Yes, it has DECREASED.	4%	12
No, it has remained the same.	77%	210
This is my first year of teaching at this school.	4%	10
Total	100%	271

Q11.13 - Why has the number of students for whom you have grading responsibility in LRW Courses INCREASED significantly?

Administration declines to hire additional faculty to teach increasing numbers of students
Admissions keeps over-enrolling the school but we aren't hiring new people. Even when we do hire, we end up with large classes. Example: this year we hired TWO additional full-time people and we still have sections of 20 instead of sections of 12 - 16.
Bar prep classes are more popular. My legal writing classes are at night and enrollment there has resulted in a few more students the last few years.
Because one LRW faculty member left and, due to COVID-19, we were subjected to a hiring freeze.
Because the law school seems to enroll an ever increasing number of students.
Dean increased workload over my objection.
Enrollment went up and we didn't add sections.
Fewer instructors in the department than previous year and some instructors in the department stopped teaching LRW and taught other courses this year. School also offered a fully online 1L section which had its own LRW sub-sections separate from the in-person cohort. Enrollment increased slightly from previous year but there were fewer instructors available to teach the 1L LRW courses.
First, I had more students assigned to my class than in prior years. Second, I had to grade papers for a colleague hospitalized with Covid.
Hiring freeze, increase in student enrollment
I stepped down as associate dean for academic affairs so I am now taking a larger LRW section.
I took more responsibility.
In the 2020-2021 AY, enrollment was unusually high, and we were teaching with one fewer prof than anticipated.
Increase of 10-12 students
Increased enrollment & fewer LRW professors
Increased enrollment at the law school.
Increased enrollment in the law school.
Lack of hiring and increased enrollment
Larger class size
Larger class size and a hiring freeze due to Covid has led to larger sections.
Larger class size for 2021-22
Larger class sizes with fewer people to spread the course load
Larger enrollment in the incoming class and we lost our adjunct professor. In the spring semester we were able to get an adjunct on board to teach one of the 4 sections which reduced my load in the spring.
Larger entering class
Less faculty assigned to teach the courses
More students and fewer professors.
More students being admitted.
My elective, [name of course], is attracting more students (it hasn't been capped): in the 3 years I've been teaching it, I had about 8 students, then 10, and now 17 are enrolled. I am going to ask for a cap of 15.
Our incoming 1L classes have gotten larger and with that the number of students we are required to teach.
Slight increase in student enrollment.
Some fellows/VAPs became demoralized with the coming of lockdowns in March 2020 and left the program. Then, enrollment was unexpectedly high during the lockdown year (2020-2021).
The law school has admitted more students but has not adjusted the number of faculty teaching small-section LRW courses. The load we report to the ABA is 35 students per professor. Our actual loads are between 45-50.
The school has increased admissions and has not rehired faculty that either left or that the law school did not renew.
Unexpectedly large 1L class. Supposedly unexpected.
Very large number of admitted students and not enough people to teach Legal Writing.
We have admitted more students lately.

Q11.14 - Why has the number of students for whom you have grading responsibility in LRW Courses DECREASED significantly?

Declining enrollment; higher admissions standards
Decrease was due to pandemic -- inability for international students to travel to the US & unwillingness to take virtual classes
I had a course relief, so I taught one less course.
I took on an administrative role (which means I dropped a class as part of my load).
I took on an overload course that was new in my rotation; as a condition of doing so, I bargained for fewer LRW students. Typically I have 34 - 36.
More professors
My Graduate LRW class was unusually small because of the low enrollment of foreign LLM students caused by the pandemic.
Scheduling classes to be mostly online and some in person prevented an even distribution of students in each section. Some had many more than usual, and others had fewer.
Smaller classes during covid. This will change for next year.
The Covid-19 pandemic impacted the timing of the enrollment of the international students who I taught in my 2020-2021 LRW course. The enrollment in my 2021-2022 course has returned to normal.
This year, I did not teach LW courses because of my role as Academic Dean. Normally, I teach 45ish students per semester
Though our school downsized several years ago, it did not hire people who left or retired for several years. In the last 3 years, we have replaced everyone who left and we have maintained our downsized number. So this has, for the first time last year, meant that we have a normal number of students.

Q11.15 - You previously indicated that your appointment term is 9, 10, or 11 months (Q5.3). During the month(s) in which you are not under contract, do you typically spend more than a de minimis amount of time engaged in the following activities in connection with your employment at your school?

	No		Yes, with additional compensation.		Yes, without additional compensation.		Total
Teaching Required LRW Course(s)	92%	128	2%	3	6%	8	139
Teaching Elective LRW Course(s)	89%	121	11%	15	0%	0	136
Teaching Non-LRW Course(s)	77%	108	22%	31	1%	1	140
Preparing course materials for LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	19%	27	10%	14	71%	101	142
Preparing course materials for Non-LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	61%	80	6%	8	33%	44	132
Academic Support activities involving direct student contact	72%	95	4%	5	24%	32	132
Scholarship	30%	43	42%	60	28%	40	143
Service to the law school or wider university	35%	50	6%	9	58%	83	142
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	63%	87	0%	0	37%	52	139
Service to regional or national organizations, including LRW-related organizations	47%	65	2%	3	51%	70	138
Supervising (including advising and coaching) interscholastic moot court teams or other competition teams	91%	127	0%	0	9%	12	139
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	92%	129	1%	1	7%	10	140
Performing administrative duties in connection with LRW Course(s) or LRW Program(s)	59%	84	13%	18	29%	41	143
Performing administrative duties in connection with Academic Support or Bar Success Programs	94%	130	3%	4	4%	5	139
Performing other administrative duties for the law school	79%	111	6%	9	14%	20	140
Other activities related to performing the job responsibilities associated with my contract	68%	95	3%	4	29%	40	139

Q11.16 - You previously indicated that your appointment term is 9, 10, or 11 months (Q5.3) and that you spend more than a de minimis amount of time engaged in uncompensated activities during the months in which you are not under contract (Q11.15). On average, how many hours per month do you spend engaged in uncompensated activities in connection with your employment at your school during the months in which you are not under contract?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1-5	6%	8
6-10	13%	18
11-15	13%	17
20-25	18%	25
30-35	10%	13
40	17%	23
50	6%	8
60-65	3%	4
75	1%	1
80-85	7%	9
90	1%	1
100	1%	2
120	1%	1
130	1%	1
160	2%	3
200	1%	1
250	1%	1
Total	100%	136

Q11.17 - During the semesters of the Academic Year in which you are under contract and expected to teach your normal teaching load, what percentage of your work time do you typically spend on the following activities?

	None		Less than 5%		6% to 25%		26% to 50%		51% to 75%		76% to 100%		Total
Teaching Required LRW Course(s)	3%	8	1%	3	13%	34	26%	69	39%	103	19%	50	267
Teaching Elective LRW Course(s)	72%	150	3%	6	12%	25	10%	21	2%	4	1%	3	209
Teaching Non-LRW Course(s)	49%	115	3%	6	24%	56	19%	45	3%	6	2%	5	233
Preparing course materials for LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	9%	22	24%	60	46%	113	14%	34	4%	9	3%	7	245
Preparing course materials for Non-LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	52%	118	20%	46	21%	48	5%	11	1%	2	1%	2	227
Academic Support activities involving direct student contact	36%	81	22%	49	33%	75	7%	16	2%	4	0%	1	226
Scholarship	26%	58	26%	58	38%	87	10%	22	0%	1	0%	0	226
Service to the law school or wider university	4%	9	18%	46	68%	173	9%	22	1%	3	0%	1	254
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	40%	98	43%	105	16%	40	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	245
Service to regional or national organizations, including LRW-related organizations	30%	75	42%	105	27%	68	1%	3	0%	0	0%	0	251
Supervising (including advising and coaching) interscholastic moot court teams or other competition teams	67%	166	15%	38	12%	30	4%	11	0%	1	0%	0	246
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	80%	192	14%	33	5%	11	2%	4	0%	1	0%	0	241
Performing administrative duties in connection with LRW Course(s) or LRW Program(s)	29%	76	26%	68	33%	86	6%	16	3%	9	1%	3	258
Performing administrative duties in connection with Academic Support or Bar Success Programs	84%	205	10%	24	3%	8	2%	6	0%	0	0%	0	243
Performing other administrative duties for the law school	50%	123	23%	56	22%	53	4%	10	1%	2	0%	1	245
Other activities	54%	121	32%	72	14%	31	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	225

Q11.18 - During the semesters of the Academic Year in which you are under contract and NOT expected to teach your normal teaching load, what percentage of your work time do you typically spend on the following activities?

	N/A - I am expected to teach as part of a normal teaching load during all semesters in which I am under contract.		None		Less than 5%		6% to 25%		26% to 50%		51% to 75%		76% to 100%		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Teaching Required LRW Course(s)	73%	206	16%	46	1%	2	2%	6	5%	13	2%	7	1%	3	283
Teaching Elective LRW Course(s)	65%	166	31%	79	0%	1	2%	5	1%	3	0%	1	0%	0	255
Teaching Non-LRW Course(s)	67%	176	21%	55	1%	3	6%	16	4%	11	0%	0	0%	1	262
Preparing course materials for LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	65%	174	7%	20	5%	14	14%	37	6%	16	1%	3	2%	5	269
Preparing course materials for Non-LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	68%	175	17%	44	6%	16	7%	18	2%	4	0%	1	0%	0	258
Academic Support activities involving direct student contact	68%	176	22%	56	5%	13	3%	9	1%	2	1%	2	0%	0	258
Scholarship	65%	171	13%	34	5%	12	7%	18	6%	16	2%	4	3%	8	263
Service to the law school or wider university	64%	171	6%	16	8%	22	16%	42	5%	12	1%	2	0%	1	266
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	64%	168	17%	45	13%	35	5%	13	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	263
Service to regional or national organizations, including LRW-related organizations	63%	169	14%	38	14%	39	8%	21	1%	3	0%	0	0%	0	270
Supervising (including advising and coaching) interscholastic moot court teams or other competition teams	64%	168	27%	70	6%	15	3%	8	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	263
Supervising an intramural moot	65%	168	30%	77	4%	10	1%	3	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	260

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey—2020-2021 Individual Survey
 Part G. Work Load

court competition															
Performing administrative duties in connection with LRW Course(s) or LRW Program(s)	62%	169	18%	50	7%	20	8%	21	3%	9	1%	2	1%	3	274
Performing administrative duties in connection with Academic Support or Bar Success Programs	62%	164	32%	85	2%	6	3%	8	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	264
Performing other administrative duties for the law school	63%	164	20%	52	7%	17	7%	17	1%	3	2%	4	2%	4	261
Other activities	66%	166	24%	60	5%	12	4%	11	0%	0	0%	1	0%	1	251

Q11.19 - The preceding block of questions has asked you to provide various details about your work load during 2020-2021. To the extent that you have not already done so in response to earlier questions, we invite you to use the following space to describe how the COVID-19 pandemic affected your work load, focusing on whatever points are of importance to you. Please feel free to use as much space as you wish.

All my materials needed to be prepared well in advance for uploading to Canvas. Normally, I make hard copies for students to save them the time for downloading/printing. I found it more time-consuming to review papers on-line than in meeting with students, where I can circle on a checklist areas needing improvement.

As Academic Dean, I taught LW prior to the pandemic (1 v. 2 courses). A visitor was hired to teach my 2 courses & I continued to teach one class to reduce numbers. Because of the pandemic, I step down from teaching LW in 2020-21.

As Associate Dean for Academic Affairs my load was great because I had to rearrange classes and re-do the 20-21 class schedule.

As many of us will no doubt report, I spent considerable time revamping my syllabi to account for new teaching modalities. Some of the changes I discovered and incorporated have really improved my teaching, even now that I have transitioned back into a physical classroom. I will be more mindful of updating my teaching style and materials on a regular basis as a result.

As noted previously, the pandemic caused me to have to adjust and supplement my Moodle course content. I ended up effectively writing textbook chapters at the start of each Moodle module. While not mentioned because it was for summer of 2020, I also had to co-teach a non-LRW course during the summer 2020 term. There were many additional faculty meetings to address pandemic issues.

At the beginning, the workload was much higher trying to adapt to the online universe and converting our courses over to accommodate that. Obviously, we could not have any in-person events, but we still attended many school-wide presentations and events online via Zoom.

Because of COVID, I spent more time preparing for class because I had to think further in advance as to what documentation the students would need for class. I couldn't just walk into class with a handout.

Because of slashed budgets and slashed staffing, we pretty much do all administrative work related to teaching our courses or writing. We have no secretary, nor any help with getting appropriate materials to students, nor anything related to enhancing anything the department might be doing. This is true for all faculty. Thus, if there is a problem with tech, or a student's personal issue, or an issue with disability services, we must figure out how to solve it. If we want to write and submit articles, we do it on our own and pay any fees. We don't have an intermediary to return papers. This was happening before COVID, and was just exacerbated by COVID. We are also bar prep mentors and have mandatory duties related to all students. Because our faculty is so small, we are all on multiple committees, often doing multiple major things (like trying to hire visitors, considering a merger with another law school, and dealing with the fallout from systemic racism (e.g., considering changing the name of the law school, as well as vetting a program that will be conducting a workshop on racial justice)). Although we are paid for overloads, it is an adjunct's salary, and without many of us taking overloads, we would not have proper coverage of even our core curriculum. For the 2021-22 school year, we will have more students than the previous few years and thus all sections of first year Legal Writing are overloaded.

Converting courses to an online format required a significant investment of time, with no additional compensation.

Converting my courses to an online format required more time for teaching prep, training, and sharing best practices than in normal semesters.

Covid did not affect my workload but under my contract I'm expected to teach one additional non-LRW course in additional to my LRW teaching course load. During the preceding year, my non-LRW upper level elective course was cancelled due to lack of student enrollment so last year I had to make-up for that by doing double-duty - an extra non-LRW course during the fall and winter semesters.

Covid made my non-LRW classes more popular. So my teaching load increased.

COVID-19 increased my workload due to the need more online meetings and the expectation that the work continue uninterrupted during the pandemic. In addition, I took on additional work projects, courses and responsibilities over this past year.

COVID-19 made everything administrative harder and more time-consuming.

Covid-19 seemed to increase the workload inasmuch as most of our classroom activities and materials had to be significantly revised to meet the demands of online or mask-to-mask instruction. It was grueling and the work still continues--we've unfortunately not been able to stop. Our new normal seems to be a new increased work load on top of the tremendous work load that we all had pre-Covid.

During 20-21 I was Associate Dean of Faculty Scholarship, which included duties related to supporting the Dean and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in areas of strategic planning and administration. The pandemic was a moving target and we spent significant time beyond normal administrative duties deal with pandemic related contingencies.

During 2020-21, I serve as Associate Dean. Previously, I was able to teach a section of LRW as a half-time load. The pandemic required *much* more time on school-wide administrative duties, so I did not to teach LRW in spring.

During the summer, I engage in research to understand current developments in the pedagogy of LW, research legal issues to develop new assignments, and communicate with students about their job search and provide advice and counsel regarding their 1L summer job and their 2L summer search.

Everything stranger and weirder except for student conferences. They were easier; I plan to keep conferences on zoom in the future.

Everything takes longer on line. We were required to have all classes filmed, and then we had to edit the films before posting. Providing feedback and grading papers was much more time consuming. To grade a paper I had to print it, grade it, scan it, and email it to the student. Filming class and giving students access to film of their writing class provides little value and much potential embarrassment.

Everything took longer and had a higher cognitive load. My Fitbit told me that when I went into the classroom to teach in hybrid mode (partly on Zoom), my heartrate was spiking. I thought I wasn't stressed, but at some level I was, always. More faculty meetings--glad we had them, but they required energy. By March 2021, I hit a wall on supervising Notes & Comments for journal students and didn't handle that task as well as in years past. On the plus side, less time commuting on non-teaching days, and more ability to multi-task during some Zoom meetings.

Everything took longer being fully online.

Flipping my LRW courses and moving them online was a time intensive process.

I devoted a lot more time to student advising and support during the pandemic. I also devoted a lot of time to reworking my existing course materials to work in a virtual format.

I essentially worked 3-4 jobs during COVID - I served as an Interim Associate Dean responsible for supervising 12 staff members across multiple departments (admissions, career services, marketing, student life, etc.). For half the year, I served as Director of Legal Writing (uncompensated) while the Director was on sabbatical. I had a teaching overload as both semesters and was charged with serving as the Director of a new Center (also uncompensated).

I feel like my work load was at least double over the course of the 2020-2021 school year. I coach for the bar exam and because it was moved to October, I completed 1/2 of my fall semester normal course load while still critiquing and grading the students studying for the bar exam. There was no extra compensation and very little recognition of the work that this required. Because I was local and could come into the school during the week, something I decided to try to do to try to create a little more division between work hours and home hours, I found myself also picking up the slack for the at-home workers who were too afraid to come into the office or too far away to justify the drive. Are you there today? Can you do this? I wasn't the only one who felt like a lot of work was "left" for the few people who were in-person sometimes. I also think it was unfair that the university expected its employees to use their own internet, sometimes their own computers, their own phones, their own printers, etc. to continue to try to seamlessly do the work of the school. We picked up the financial costs of this transition in ways that have not even been acknowledged.

I found myself on six committees: two of them hiring committees. I am also the faculty prosecutor for Code of Conduct violations. I spent much more time in service than before.

I found the administrative time spent to present the class virtually to be extensive - significantly more admin time than in a normal school year. Office hours and meetings also had to be precisely scheduled in blocks of time (rather than students entering my office as soon as the prior student was finished), so more time than usual had to be devoted to office hours.

I had a few more students last year than what I would say is a "typical" year, but unfortunately that higher load has become more the norm than the outlier. That has more to do with staffing issues than COVID. I also spent significantly more time preparing for class and trying to engage with my students during this past academic year. That was largely due to the fact that teaching online was new to me, and we were trying to do a combo of online (synchronous) and in-person courses for the first-year LRW Course.

I had to devote considerable time to learning how to teach online, as I had not previously done so and was provided with virtually no useful instruction or guidance.

I spent a great deal of time "after hours" on zoom calls with students.

I spent substantially more time preparing for class because it was the first time I taught online.

I spent the summer of 2020 (off contract) taking online courses to help me teach online. I also spent a considerable amount of time learning a new LMS that was compatible with the Zoom/Panopta requirements.

I taught a compensated teaching overload during the 2020-2021 academic year to have smaller sections of students consistent with safety protocols.

I was able to be more productive within business hours as the commute time was eliminated. I attended more conferences and workshops because they were online. I was also experienced Zoom fatigue.

I was asked to direct LAWR, but I also hold the role of Vice Dean of Student Affairs and teach a clinic. Thus, I was given course relief from teaching LAWR. I usually teach Advanced LAWR a/k/a LAWR III, which is our third semester of LAWR and required to be taken in the second year.

I was on a COVID-19 task force and a Remote Teaching Committee in addition to my regular committee service.

I wasn't required to do so but, because we were in-person and we had some students who were remote-only, I added a 3rd section. I co-taught that section with a colleague. I didn't have more students than usual but, as a result of adding a totally online course, my course load went up for the year. It was my idea and voluntary so wasn't a required course overload.

I'm sure everyone will write the same thing but it felt like the pandemic doubled my workload because I bent over backwards to be accessible and to provide one-on-one touches to all of my students.

In 2020-21, I taught both my classes as one class; my student load did not change.

In addition to aligning my teaching load with other directors of academic programs with teaching responsibilities, the Academic Dean wanted to reduce my teaching load in the spring to continue supporting adjuncts by creating asynchronous course content and otherwise keep the LRW program running in a remote environment.

In addition to all previously required responsibilities and activities, the Covid-19 pandemic required extensive, ongoing technical support, closer supervision, greater attention to course requirements, faculty, administrative demands, and to students. Greater attention was required in all course and program related activities and in providing academic and emotional support to faculty and students.

In Summer 2020, we were expected to attend a number of workshops designed to get everyone up to speed on online teaching. They were required pretty much regardless of our previous level of proficiency. In addition, the administration scheduled a series of scholarly colloquia during the summer. As the only contract faculty, the women who teach LRW felt particular pressure to attend. In Summer 2021, the summer colloquia were once again scheduled. Once again, the largest contingent of full-time faculty at these events was LRW faculty, all women on contracts (most short-term contracts of 3 years). As usual, the extra burdens placed on faculty fall particularly hard on contract faculty, who -- at [school] -- are all women and (with only one exception) always have been.

Increased work load to due to more students/overload, preparing asynchronous content for each class week, and delivering course in two formats (in-person/hybrid and fully online). Held more individual student meetings than previous years due to increased student need at least partly attributable to pandemic-related concerns.

Increased work load to switch to remote delivery

Ironically, COVID made some things easier. I no longer had to commute. Zoom was fairly effective for teaching everything except for research. It was very good for hosting one on one student conferences to discuss memos and briefs.

It made it more burdensome than ever.

It seemed that I worked all of the time during the COVID-19 pandemic -- weekdays, weeknights, weekends -- all hours of the day.

It's hard to decide what's "not compensated" for people on a regular tenure-track with 9-month contracts and summer research stipends. We may give talks, plan conferences, or serve on committees for national scholarly organizations, and generally keep up with developments in the law all year round, and that's definitely an expected part of the job. I think it's understood that part of the 9-month salary -- and perhaps part of the summer research stipend -- is meant to compensate for this kind of work. I don't think my colleagues would consider it "uncompensated," although some of it may occur, of necessity, in summer months and not be strictly related to the specific project for which we have the summer stipend that year.

Learning about zoom and Brightspace (a Learning Management application, like Canvas)

Much committee work is also required, as well as attendance at numerous school-related functions.

My administrative duties unrelated to LRW greatly increased as we responded to scheduling, quarantining, and other issues related to Covid-19.

My scholarship has been a struggle during Covid, as is true for so many of us. Trying to write while at home, doing Zoom school, and anxious about the pandemic was nearly impossible.

My service responsibilities--to my law school, to the larger university, and to national organizations--tripled. As did my meetings with students that dealt with so many more issues than course information.

My workload increased significantly, though the number of duties and number of students did not increase. I spent an increased amount of time working individually with students who were struggling with the circumstances of the year. Mostly, I would have done that on my own, but I was explicitly asked by the administration to take on additional outreach duties because I knew the students better than their other professors. It's the kind of work that falls on LRW professors disproportionately, that can't so easily be quantified, and that so often doesn't get recognized.

No impact. Since I was on sabbatical all year, I had planned to work from home regardless of the pandemic.

None of the professors at my school were required to do more than what is normal last year. I teach two classes as overload classes for extra pay, but I am not required to do so.

Not having to commute and working from home saved me 8 or more hours per week. It made my workload much easier to handle.

Not much effect.

Our class sizes increased by 25 percent, even though legal writing remained in-person.

Significant additional work load including transitioning to online format and larger class size and additional student support needs.

Student demand for support outside of class, including current and former students, was remarkably high. Being among the few faculty in the classroom consistently made the commitment to providing this support much more significant than in non-covid years.

Technically, over the summer, I am compensated for preparing my upcoming LRW courses. In the 2020 summer, all my summer time was spent preparing for the future year. There was an unusual amount of preparation to do, so I was doing more than normal preparation. By contrast, the 2021 summer, I had less course preparation and more scholarship and service during the summer.

The administrative responsibilities and service/meetings for the school and the university seemed to increase an incredible amount. There were more meetings during more hours of the day than when we are in person. It was exhausting.

The combination of COVID and the racial unrest during the summer of 2020 added significantly to my workload. I served on the Administrative Committee, which was responsible for drafting policy changes to grading, exams, and academic honors. These are just a few law school policies that were temporarily adjusted due to COVID. I was also placed on the Ad Hoc Racial Justice Working Group, along with most of the other faculty of color at my law school. In addition, I served as Chair of the Disciplinary Committee. Finally, I was placed on Faculty Selection for the first time, which was a major time burden. As a result, I had no time for scholarship or personal mental health maintenance during this difficult time.

The course-related work load during the 2020-2021 academic year was significantly higher than normal, especially in the fall semester, because everything had to be converted to an online format. In addition, spending time counseling students also took more time due to the stress that everyone was under during the height of the pandemic. That said, the workload will go up further this coming year, because the school has admitted substantially larger numbers of 1L students, without hiring more LRW faculty to teach them.

The delay in the 2020 bar exam meant that my full time bar support responsibilities overlapped with my full time LRW (and other) for approximately half the semester. I was not compensated for this.

The pandemic caused prep to take much longer than normal.

The pandemic increased my workload dramatically because of the need to re-vamp courses to adopt to hybrid teaching. I was also involved with an ad hoc committee devoted to academic adjustments related to the pandemic, which was very time consuming.

The pandemic increased my workload, partly because of the additional care my students required - they needed more support in office hours while navigating this challenging time as a 1L. It also required additional time and effort to prepare lesson plans and simulations to function in the virtual space. Finally, efforts to create community in a remote-setting also added somewhat to my typical workload.

The workload increased significantly during with pandemic with the various committees to address online instruction and other operational issues. Also, the students appeared to be more anxious and needed more time.

There was a lot of service work that was unique to the COVID pandemic as well as work associated with transitioning the work of the Writing Center and academic support online.

Ugh, well, I had to revamp my entire Appellate Advocacy program to move it online, and I had to -- TWICE -- move an oral argument competition from the U.S. Courthouse to Zoom. I took a course offered by [school] last summer in online teaching, which was helpful, and spent many, many hours learning various electronic teaching strategies/programs. In addition to the upheaval in my appellate advocacy course, I had to deal with a judicial externship program that went completely remote. That meant dealing with many, many judges and chambers on an individual level to determine whether externships could proceed, and under what circumstances.

We are teaching far too much and far too many students. Teaching 40 students in 1L legal writing, plus another upper level course, plus scholarship, plus practice (which is a requirement for all professors holding a clinical title regardless of what courses they teach) plus service = the load has become a flash point in the law school. The deans are aware and are worried for us but university pressures keep their hands tied a bit.

We were expected to undertake additional technical training during the summer months to prepare for teaching via Zoom.

Work was much more demoralizing and tedious under the Covid restrictions. Masks made class much more of a chore, and spending all day on a laptop is not good for anyone's health. I went out of my way to meet with students at coffee shops and outdoors in the park to regain some sense of normalcy amidst the fear and restrictions.

Part H. Part-Time Faculty

This block of questions (Q12.2 through Q12.7) was displayed to the 7 respondents who identified themselves as Part-Time Faculty in Q3.2. Users of this Report should consider whether the small number of respondents affects the representativeness of these results.

Q12.2 - On average, how many hours per week are you expected to work? Note: If you prefer not to answer this question, please leave it blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
10	25%	1
25	25%	1
28	25%	1
40	25%	1
Total	100%	4

Q12.3 - Do you have an office at the law school? Note: This question seeks information about assigned office space, including shared office space, regardless of whether you regularly use the office space.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	86%	6
No	14%	1
Other (please explain)	0%	0
Total	100%	7

Q12.4 - Is your office shared with others?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	50%	3
No	50%	3
Other (please explain)	0%	0
Total	100%	6

Q12.5 - Which of the following LRW Courses have you taught, whether at this institution or another? Note: Select all that apply, even if you did not teach the course during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	43%	3
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	29%	2
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	86%	6
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	29%	2
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0
Blended LRW Course; substantive law topic	0%	0
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	14%	1
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0
Scholarly writing	14%	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	14%	1
Contract drafting (general)	14%	1
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	14%	1
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	14%	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	14%	1
Other transactional drafting; please identify course	0%	0
Legislation	0%	0
Total # of Respondents		7

Q12.6 - How many times have you taught each of the following LRW Courses, whether at this institution or another?

	1	4	5	8	10	15	45	60	65	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Blended LRW Course	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scholarly writing	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Other transactional drafting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Q12.7 - For each course that you have taught, please indicate your level of involvement in the following activities:

Syllabus Creation³⁴

	I developed independently.	I developed with guidance and suggestions from the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I chose to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I was required to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	My involvement in this activity has varied depending on the circumstances.	Other	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	0	1	0	1	1	0	3
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	0	1	0	1	0	0	2
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	0	1	2	1	2	0	6
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0	0	2	0	0	0	2

³⁴ To improve readability for this and the subsequent tables for Q12.7, the courses for which no responses were received have been omitted. A complete list of the courses for which information was solicited (including those with no responses) can be found in the tables in Q12.5 and Q12.6.

Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Scholarly writing	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Book Selection

	I developed independently.	I developed with guidance and suggestions from the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I chose to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I was required to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	My involvement in this activity has varied depending on the circumstances.	Other	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1	0	0	1	1	0	3
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	0	1	1	3	1	0	6
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Scholarly writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Creation of Class/Lecture Content

	I developed independently.	I developed with guidance and suggestions from the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I chose to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I was required to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	My involvement in this activity has varied depending on the circumstances.	Other	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	2	3	1	0	0	0	6
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Scholarly writing	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Creation of Major Writing Assignments

	I developed independently.	I developed with guidance and suggestions from the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I chose to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	I was required to do the same thing as the director or another full-time LRW Faculty member.	My involvement in this activity has varied depending on the circumstances.	Other	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1	1	0	1	0	0	3
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	0	1	1	4	0	0	6
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Scholarly writing	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Part I. Committee Service

The questions in this part (Q14.2 through Q14.9) were displayed only to Full-time and Part-time faculty. The Survey Committee determined that asking about committee service at a particular institution didn't apply to Visitors.

Q14.2 - Were you permitted or required to serve on law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	3%	9
Yes, I was permitted to and I served on one or more law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	27%	77
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not serve on any law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	4%	12
Yes, I was required to serve on one or more law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	65%	186
I don't know	1%	3
Total	100%	287

Q14.3 - Were you permitted or required to chair law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	32%	91
Yes, I was permitted to and I chaired one or more law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	19%	55
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not chair any law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	33%	96
Yes, I was required to chair one or more law school committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	13%	36
I don't know	3%	9
Total	100%	287

Q14.4 - Were you permitted or required to serve on university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year? For purposes of this question, university committees include the faculty senate and similar entities.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	26%	73
Yes, I was permitted to and I served on one or more university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	26%	74
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not serve on any university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	33%	94
Yes, I was required to serve on one or more university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	3%	10
N/A; my law school is not affiliated with a university.	6%	18
I don't know	6%	17
Total	100%	286

Q14.5 - Were you permitted or required to chair university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year? For purposes of this question, university committees include the faculty senate and similar entities.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	45%	129
Yes, I was permitted to and I chaired one or more university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	2%	7
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not chair any university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	33%	95
Yes, I was required to chair one or more university committees during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	0%	0
N/A; my law school is not affiliated with a university.	6%	18
I don't know	13%	38
Total	100%	287

Q14.6 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, which of the following law school committees did you serve on?³⁵

	Voting Member		Non-Voting Member		My school has this committee but I did not serve on it		My school does not have this committee		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
ABA Standards Compliance (or similar)	5%	12	1%	2	74%	195	21%	54	263
ABA Self-Study or Site Visit	3%	9	1%	2	75%	197	21%	55	263
Admissions	11%	28	1%	3	85%	224	3%	8	263
Budget	1%	2	0%	1	78%	205	21%	55	263
Faculty appointments (LRW Positions)	21%	56	2%	5	65%	172	11%	30	263
Faculty appointments (Clinic Positions)	7%	18	1%	2	80%	210	13%	33	263
Faculty appointments (Doctrinal Positions)	8%	22	2%	4	86%	226	4%	11	263
Faculty appointments (Library and other teaching positions not covered by previous three categories)	8%	20	0%	0	82%	215	11%	28	263
Other appointments (e.g. dean search, other administrative positions)	7%	18	0%	1	81%	213	12%	31	263
Clerkship	7%	19	1%	2	76%	199	16%	43	263
Curriculum	20%	53	2%	4	76%	199	3%	7	263
Experiential learning	4%	10	2%	4	73%	192	22%	57	263
Moot Court	8%	22	0%	1	64%	169	27%	71	263
Library	3%	7	1%	2	77%	203	19%	51	263
LRW	13%	35	0%	1	48%	126	38%	101	263
Outcomes/Assessment	14%	36	2%	5	71%	188	13%	34	263
Strategic planning (including Steering Committee, Administrative Committee, Dean’s Advisory Committee or similar functions)	10%	27	0%	1	80%	210	10%	25	263
Teaching assignments	2%	4	0%	0	59%	156	39%	103	263
Technology	5%	13	0%	0	75%	196	21%	54	263
Promotion and tenure (LRW Faculty only)	10%	25	0%	0	72%	190	18%	48	263
Promotion and tenure (all faculty)	9%	24	2%	4	87%	228	3%	7	263
Other; please list	38%	101	1%	3	59%	154	2%	5	263

³⁵ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.2 that during the 2020-2021 Academic Year they were either 1) required to serve or 2) were permitted to and served on a law school committee.

Other; please list ³⁶	
Academic Achievement/Support/Success and/or Bar Passage (8 respondents)	Honors Program Committee (2 respondents)
Academic Affairs and Advising (3 respondents)	Intellectual Life (2 respondents)
Academic Integrity/Student Discipline/Conduct (11 respondents)	Institute for Continuing Legal Education
Academic Responsibility (2 respondents)	Internal procedures
Academic Rules Committee (2 respondents)	International Opportunities (2 respondents)
Academic Standards and Status (12 respondents)	International Programs (2 respondents)
Academic Titles Committee	1L Faculty Working Group
Ad hoc committees on grading curves and bar alternatives	Law Review committee/faculty advisor (2 respondents)
Adjunct Review and/or Hiring (4 respondents)	Law School Emergency Assistance Fund Committee
Appeals and Rules	Law School Rules/Policies Committee
Awards (8 respondents)	LL.M.
Building/Facilities (2 respondents)	Mentoring Committee
Bylaws (2 respondents)	Non-JD Program Admissions
Conduct Code Revisions (2 respondents)	Professional Development/Career Planning (3 respondents)
Covid 19 task force and remote teaching committee	Professional Responsibility
Dean's Management Committee	Public Interest/Service (7 respondents)
DEI (36 respondents) ³⁷	Student Open Houses Committee
Disability Accommodation / Exam Accommodations (3 respondents)	Recruiting
Distance Education	Safety Committee
Distinguished Faculty Awards	Scholarship (2 respondents)
Externship Committee	Student Affairs/Support/Services (7 respondents)
Faculty Development (9 respondents)	State Bar Task Force
Faculty Governance	Student Scholarship Committee
Faculty Rights Committee	Student petitions (2 respondents)
Faculty Scholarship (3 respondents)	Title IX
Family Law Program Committee	I was the faculty member in charge of a student honor society (planning events). It's a committee assignment.
Financial Aid	I also chaired the ad hoc faculty grievance committee.
Graduate writing requirement committee	We cannot serve on any committee that have to do with hiring, promoting, or evaluating tenure stream faculty.
Hall of Fame Committee	

³⁶ For the textual responses to Q14.6 through Q14.9, the Survey Committee combined categories that appeared similar, such as “Academic Achievement” and “Academic Success.”

³⁷ The Survey Committee will add DEI as an answer option to future surveys for this and similar questions below, and may consider adding other recurring responses.

Q14.7 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, which of the following law school committees did you chair? Select all that apply.³⁸

	% of Respondents	Respondents
ABA Standards Compliance (or similar)	1%	1
ABA Self-Study or Site Visit	1%	1
Admissions	5%	4
Budget	0%	0
Faculty appointments (LRW Positions)	11%	9
Faculty appointments (Clinic Positions)	2%	2
Faculty appointments (Doctrinal Positions)	2%	2
Faculty appointments (Library and other teaching positions not covered by previous three categories)	1%	1
Other appointments (e.g. dean search, other administrative positions)	1%	1
Clerkship	5%	4
Curriculum	7%	6
Experiential learning	0%	0
Moot Court	5%	4
Library	4%	3
LRW	2%	2
Outcomes/Assessment	11%	9
Strategic planning (including Steering Committee, Administrative Committee, Dean’s Advisory Committee or similar functions)	4%	3
Teaching assignments	0%	0
Technology	4%	3
Promotion and tenure (LRW Faculty only)	4%	3
Promotion and tenure (all faculty)	1%	1
Other; please list	54%	46
Total # of Respondents		85

Other; please list:	
Academic Standing/Status (2 respondents)	Honor Council
Academic Success	Honors and Awards
Ad Hoc Committee on Revising Faculty Rules	Honors Program Committee
Ad Hoc Grievance Committee	Internal procedures and policies (includes ABA compliance)
Adjunct and visiting faculty (4 respondents)	International
Administrative (academic policies)	Law Student Writing
Advising Committee	LILAC Committee
Awards	Non-JD (Global) Programs
Building Committee	Petitions and retention
Community & Inclusion	Placement Committee
DEI (8 respondents)	Pro Bono/Public Interest (2 respondents)
Disability Accommodations	Scholarship
Faculty Development	Strategic planning

³⁸ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.3 that during the 2020-2021 Academic Year they were either 1) required to serve or 2) were permitted to and chaired a law school committee.

Faculty Evaluation Redraft Sub Committee, a subcommittee of our Faculty Development Committee	Student Discipline (2 respondents)
Faculty Governance	Student Mentoring Committee
Family Law Program Committee	Student support
Honor code review (2 respondents)	Teaching & Learning

Q14.8 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, which of the following university committees did you serve on? Select all that apply.³⁹

	Voting member		Non-voting member		My school has this committee but I did not serve on it		My school does not have this committee		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Admissions	1%	1	0%	0	94%	79	5%	4	84
Appointments (dean search other than law school dean, etc.)	2%	2	0%	0	95%	80	2%	2	84
Curriculum	6%	5	2%	2	90%	76	1%	1	84
Promotion and tenure	0%	0	0%	0	98%	82	2%	2	84
Faculty Senate (or equivalent)	18%	15	1%	1	81%	68	0%	0	84
Other; please list:	61%	51	1%	1	38%	32	0%	0	84

Other; please list	
Academic Discipline & Grade Appeals	Grievance (2 respondents)
Academic Systems Steering Committee	Institutional Effectiveness
Access and Opportunity Fellow	Law School Dean Search Committee (this was a University Committee, not limited to members of the law school community)
Adjuncts	LMS committee
Administrative Policies	Non-resident review committee
Americans with Disabilities Act Committee	Paralegal advisory
Athletics Steering Committee	Presidential Working Group on Sustainability
Benefits	President's Task Force for 150th Anniversary
Building Namings Committee	Professional development awards committee
Center for Teaching and Scholarly Excellence Advisory Board	Public safety (2 respondents)
Committee on Committees Committee	Senate Committee for Student Life
Community Advisory Board	Space planning/reopening task force
Conduct Hearings	Strategic planning
Council of Academic Diversity Officers	Student Activities
Covid Response	Student Conduct Committee (2 respondents)
DEI (6 respondents)	Technology (2 respondents)
Distinguished Teaching Awards	Technology in teaching advisory committee

³⁹ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.4 that during the 2020-2021 Academic Year they were either 1) required to serve or 2) were permitted to and served on a university committee.

Faculty Advisory Committee for Center for Teaching & Learning	Title IX
Faculty Constitution Committee	Undergraduate General Education Accreditation
Faculty Executive Committee	University appeals for student conduct
Faculty Senate Executive Committee	University Assessment (4 respondents)
Faculty Welfare (2 respondents)	University Council (2 respondents)
Farmworker Program Board	University Council Personnel Committee
Full-Time Non-Tenure Track Committee	University Graduate Council
General Counsel's Advisory Committee	University Handbook Committee
General Petitions Committee	Vincentian Fellows
Graduate Council (2 respondents)	Women's Faculty Committee
Graduate programs and accreditation sub-committees	I served on two ad hoc committees on Main Campus.

Q14.9 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, which of the following university committees did you chair? Select all that apply.⁴⁰

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Admissions	0%	0
Appointments (dean search other than law school dean, etc.)	0%	0
Curriculum	0%	0
Promotion and tenure	0%	0
Faculty Senate (or equivalent)	29%	2
Other; please list	86%	6
Total # of Respondents		7

Other; please list
Committee on DEI & Sustainability
Gender and Equity
Non-resident review committee
Senate Committee for Student Life
Task Force on Misconduct Investigations
Women's Faculty Committee

⁴⁰ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.5 that during the 2020-2021 Academic Year they were either 1) required to serve or 2) were permitted to and chaired a university committee.

Part J. Directors of LRW Programs

Q15.2 - In response to a previous question (Q3.6), you indicated that you served as an LRW Director for an LRW Program during the 2020-2021 Academic Year. Which of the following programs did you serve as an LRW Director for?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
First-Year LRW Program (coordinated separately from any upper-level courses or program)	66%	55
Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated separately from the first-year courses or program)	7%	6
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated as a single, cohesive program)	22%	18
Other LRW Program; please specify:	5%	4
Total	100%	83

Other LRW Program; please specify
I was the director of both the first-year writing program and the upper-level appellate advocacy program. But the programs are not really coordinated.
I took [a rotating program administrator job mid-year]
Because I am the only one teaching in Spring and Summer trimesters, I am the de facto "Director."
LL.M. Legal Writing Program

Q15.3 - Do you hold an administrative rank and/or title in connection with your role as an LRW Director?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	75%	62
No	25%	21
Total	100%	83

Q15.4 - What is your current administrative rank and title in connection with your role as an LRW Director?

Classification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Clinical	11%	5
Visiting	2%	1
Other	34%	15
N/A	52%	23
Total	100%	44

Rank

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full	45%	25
Associate	9%	5
Assistant	7%	4
Other	14%	8
N/A	25%	14
Total	100%	56

Title

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Dean	5%	3
Director	75%	46
Co-Director	3%	2
Coordinator	7%	4
Co-Coordinator	0%	0
Chair	3%	2
Co-Chair	0%	0
Other	5%	3
N/A	2%	1
Total	100%	61

Qualification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
of Legal Writing (or equivalent)	69%	40
of the First-Year Legal Writing Program (or equivalent)	28%	16
of the Upper-Level Legal Writing Program (or equivalent)	0%	0
of the Advocacy Program	2%	1
Other	2%	1
N/A	0%	0
Total	100%	58

Q15.5 - Is your LRW Director position a permanent position or a rotating position?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Permanent	83%	66
Rotating	18%	14
Total	100%	80

Q15.6 - What is the term of the position?⁴¹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1 year	7%	1
2 years	43%	6
3 or more years	7%	1
Unlimited	43%	6
Total	100%	14

Q15.7 - How many years have you served as an LRW Director, whether at your current school or another institution, in the following position types? If one or more of your positions has been a rotating position, provide the total number of years you have served in the position at any point in time.⁴²

	Director		Co-Director		Assistant Director		Associate Director		Total
0	4%	10	33%	79	31%	73	32%	75	237
1-2	79%	19	8%	2	8%	2	4%	1	24
3-5	67%	14	0%	0	14%	3	19%	4	21
6-9	64%	9	7%	1	29%	4	0%	0	14
10-14	80%	12	7%	1	0%	0	13%	2	15
15-19	83%	5	0%	0	17%	1	0%	0	6
20-24	100%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	7
25-29	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
30+	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3

⁴¹ This question was asked of all respondents who indicated in Q15.5 that they had a rotating position.

⁴² For questions Q15.7 and Q15.8, non-integer responses were rounded down. For example, a response of 0.5 was treated as 0, 2.5 was treated as 2, and so on.

Q15.8 - How many years have you served as an LRW Director at your current institution in the following position types? If one or more of your positions has been a rotating position, provide the total number of years you have served in the position at any point in time.

	Director		Co-Director		Assistant Director		Associate Director		Total
0	5%	11	33%	80	30%	73	33%	79	243
1-2	83%	20	8%	2	8%	2	0%	0	24
3-5	73%	16	0%	0	14%	3	14%	3	22
6-9	69%	9	0%	0	31%	4	0%	0	13
10-14	87%	13	7%	1	0%	0	7%	1	15
15-19	75%	3	0%	0	25%	1	0%	0	4
20-24	100%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	7
25-29	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2
30+	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2

Q15.9 - Does your role as LRW Director affect the number of courses and/or students included in your normal teaching load?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	51%	41
Yes, as LRW Director I have the same number of courses as a normal teaching load for faculty at my school, but I have a reduced number of students.	9%	7
Yes, my role as LRW Director effectively replaces one of the courses that would otherwise be in a normal teaching load for faculty at my school.	33%	27
Other; please explain:	7%	6
Total	100%	81

Other; please explain⁴³
I have a significantly reduced student load.
I have been given full course relief due to my other duties as explained above.
I teach a 1.5 load.
In 1 of 3 years, it meant a reduced number of courses. In 1 year it meant no adjustment. In 2020-21, it meant the same number of courses and students, but an overload stipend for 9 months.
The co-director receives a stipend for directing.

⁴³ The Survey Committee has omitted textual responses that could potentially identify the respondent.

Q15.10 - Which of the following administrative responsibilities are included in your role as LRW Director? Select all that apply. Please note that this question focuses on specific administrative responsibilities; it is not intended to provide or collect an exhaustive list of the administrative responsibilities of an LRW Director.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Coordinating adjuncts	39%	32
Coordinating full-time faculty	71%	58
Coordinating part-time faculty	18%	15
Creating the Major Writing Assignment(s) used in the LRW Program	70%	57
Creating the minor assignments used in the LRW Program	56%	46
Selecting and/or hiring adjuncts	44%	36
Selecting and/or hiring full-time faculty	54%	44
Selecting and/or hiring part-time faculty	21%	17
Supervising adjuncts, including evaluation	43%	35
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	23%	19
Supervising full-time faculty, including evaluation	41%	34
Supervising part-time faculty, including evaluation	17%	14
Total # of Respondents		82

Part K. Demographics

The rest of this report (Q16.2 through Q17.24) provides demographic and compensation information about survey respondents. This information was collected separately and anonymously. Responses to these questions are not associated with respondents' names, email/IP addresses, or school names. The information collected in response to these questions is reported in the aggregate and will not be reported for individual respondents. To allow a review of the data broken out by specific categories, selected, non-identifying responses from the first part of the survey are associated with responses to this part of the survey, such as respondents' appointment type, teaching focus (e.g., LRW Faculty or Non-LRW Faculty), or whether a school is public or private. If you have any questions, please contact us at ALWD.LWI.Survey@gmail.com.

Q16.2 - What was your Age at the beginning of the 2020-2021 Academic Year? If you prefer not to answer, please leave this question blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
20-29	0.7%	2
30-39	12.1%	37
40-49	37.3%	114
50-59	34.3%	105
60-69	15.0%	46
70+	0.7%	2
Total Responses		306

Q16.3 - What is your Gender Identity?⁴⁴

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Female	76.6%	245
Male	22.5%	72
Non-binary	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	0.6%	2
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	0.3%	1
Total	100%	320

⁴⁴ The Committee has chosen to omit the text responses for this and comparable questions in Part K. If you are interested in reviewing those responses, please contact the Committee to see whether any are available.

Q16.4 - Do you identify as transgender?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	0.3%	1
No	98.7%	314
Prefer not to answer	0.9%	3
Total	100%	318

Q16.5 - What is your Sexual Orientation?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Heterosexual	89.4%	286
Gay or lesbian	3.8%	12
Bisexual	2.8%	9
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	1.3%	4
Prefer not to answer	2.8%	9
Total	100%	320

Q16.6 - What is your race?

Note: the categories and definitions (set out after the table) are taken from the ABA's annual law school questionnaire.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.3%	1
Asian	1.9%	6
Black or African-American	3.8%	12
Hispanic	0.9%	3
Multiracial	1.9%	6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	2.5%	8
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	2.2%	7
White	86.6%	277
Total	100%	320

The following definitions were provided to respondents via a pop-up:

- *American Indian or Alaska Native*. A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.

- *Asian*: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian Subcontinent, including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.
- *Black or African American*: A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
- *Hispanic*: A person of Cuban, Mexican, Puerto Rican, South or Central American or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
- *Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander*: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.
- *White*: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, the Middle East, or North Africa.

Q16.7 - In response to the previous question, you answered "multiracial." Please select all that apply.

Note: the categories and definitions are taken from the ABA's annual law school questionnaire. For the content of the definitions, see Q16.6.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	0
Asian	50.0%	3
Black or African-American	33.3%	2
Hispanic	16.7%	1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0
Other race; please identify:	16.7%	1
Prefer not to answer	0.0%	0
White	100.0%	6
Total # of Respondents		6

Part L. Compensation

Q17.2 - Did you receive a summer research stipend in connection with the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	32.4%	104
No, I am not eligible for research stipends.	23.1%	74
No, I am eligible for research stipends, but I did not apply for one.	29.9%	96
No, I am eligible for research stipends and applied for one, but I did not receive one.	0.0%	0
Other, please explain	5.9%	19
No, my school does not offer research stipends.	6.5%	21
Prefer not to answer	2.2%	7
Total	100%	321

Other, please explain"
Completing article from stipend received in prior year
I receive a stipend for my work as Director but it does not require me to research
I received compensation for attending a University-offered course on remote instruction.
My school changed the "research stipend" to be contingent on teaching an extra course the next academic year, so I did not apply for one (I am not sure if it even still counts as a research stipend for purposes of this survey).
My school offers awards for certain publication, but only after the work has been published. I worked on scholarship during the year, but have not yet been compensated because the work has not yet been published.
No (no explanation given) (2 respondents)
No, although my school offers them. If I teach during the summer, I am not eligible for it, and so because I taught summer school, my application was denied
No, but I don't know if it is a thing.
No, having started at my new institution in August 2020, I was not yet eligible for the summer research stipend.
No, I am on a 12 month contract.
No, stipends were not available for summer 2020 due to pandemic budget issues -but I am eligible to apply.
No. I don't know if I am eligible for one or not.
Only pre-tenure faculty are eligible for summer research stipends.
Received stipend for bar support
Stipends are available if scholarship of a certain length is completed/published by the end of the following spring break.

Q17.3 - Why aren't you eligible for research stipends?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
I am ineligible because I am a Visitor.	8.1%	5
I am ineligible because I am a non-faculty administrator/staff member.	0.0%	0
I am ineligible because I am part-time.	8.1%	5
I am ineligible because LRW Faculty are explicitly ineligible based on course package.	29.0%	18
I am ineligible because of my appointment type (e.g., 405(c) status).	33.9%	21
I am ineligible because of my contract length (e.g., 12 months).	11.3%	7
Other; please explain	9.7%	6
Total	100%	62

Other, please explain ⁴⁵	
We are not required to do research/scholarship	
LRW faculty are ineligible	
Not aware that I am eligible for research stipends. Don't have time to dedicate to one anyway because of teaching load during school year and prep activities during summer for next school year and other service obligations.	
Research stipends are only provided for tenure-track law faculty and LW faculty are not tenure-track	
I have no idea, but we are not eligible	
Our Dean has chosen not to make research funds available to LRW faculty.	

Q17.4 - You indicated that you are not eligible for research stipends because of your contract length. Is this reason applicable to other LRW Faculty at your school?⁴⁵

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, all/most	28.6%	2
Yes, some	28.6%	2
No	28.6%	2
I don't know	0.0%	0
N/A (no other LRW Faculty at my school)	14.3%	1
Total	100%	7

⁴⁵ This and the following question was asked of all respondents who selected the “I am ineligible because of my contract length (e.g., 12 months)” answer in Q17.3.

Q17.5 - You indicated that you are not eligible for research stipends because of your contract length. Is this reason applicable to any Non-LRW Faculty?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	71.4%	5
No	28.6%	2
I don't know	0.0%	0
Total	100%	7

Q17.6 - You indicated that you are not eligible for research stipends because of your appointment type. Is this reason applicable to other LRW Faculty at your school?⁴⁶

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, all/most	95.2%	20
Yes, some	4.8%	1
No	0.0%	0
I don't know	0.0%	0
N/A (no other LRW Faculty at my school)	0.0%	0
Total	100%	21

Q17.7 - You indicated that you are not eligible for research stipends because of your appointment type. Is this reason applicable to any Non-LRW Faculty?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	61.9%	13
No	9.5%	2
I don't know	28.6%	6
Total	100%	21

⁴⁶ This and the following question was asked of all respondents who selected the “I am ineligible because of my appointment type (e.g., 405(c) status)” answer in Q17.3.

Q17.8 - You indicated that you were not eligible for research stipends. What was the typical amount of research stipend available to those who were eligible for research stipends in the 2020-2021 Academic Year?⁴⁷

	% of Total Responses	Responses
\$0 - 2,500	1.4%	1
\$2,501 - 5,000	4.2%	3
\$5,001 - 7,500	2.8%	2
\$7,501 - 10,000	5.6%	4
\$10,001 - 12,500	6.9%	5
\$12,501 - 15,000	6.9%	5
\$15,001 - 17,500	0.0%	0
\$17,501 - 20,000	2.8%	2
More than \$20,000	4.2%	3
I don't know	62.5%	45
I prefer not to answer	0.0%	0
Other; please describe	1.4%	1
Varies too much to say	1.4%	1
Total	100%	72

Other, please describe
7.5% of the faculty member's base salary.

Q17.9 - Regardless of the amount of stipend you actually received, if any, what is the typical amount of the research stipend you were eligible for?⁴⁸

	% of Total Responses	Responses
\$0 - 2,500	4.5%	10
\$2,501 - 5,000	8.9%	20
\$5,001 - 7,500	7.1%	16
\$7,501 - 10,000	23.2%	52
\$10,001 - 12,500	11.6%	26
\$12,501 - 15,000	12.1%	27
\$15,001 - 17,500	4.5%	10
More than \$20,000	0.9%	2
I don't know	16.5%	37
I prefer not to answer	1.3%	3
Other; please describe	2.2%	5
Varies too much to say	5.8%	13
Total	100%	224

⁴⁷ This question was asked of all respondents who selected the general “No, I am not eligible for research stipends” answer in Q17.2.

⁴⁸ This and questions Q17.10-Q17.11 were asked of all respondents who did not select “No, I am not eligible for research stipends” or “No, my school does not offer research stipends” as their answer to Q17.2.

Other, please describe
All faculty stipends are based on placement of the article not on research
As previously described, my school offers publication awards after publication. The amounts vary. For example, a solo-authored, full-length article in a top-100 flagship law review is awarded \$8,000
My stipend is 15% of my base salary.
Was up to \$15K before COVID; up to \$10K because of COVID
We get 15% of our 9-month salary, which is over \$20K in my case.

Q17.10 - How does the frequency of research stipends available to you compare to the frequency of research stipends available to most/all Non-LRW Faculty at your school?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
As often as Non-LRW Faculty	62.9%	129
More often than Non-LRW Faculty	0.0%	0
Less often than Non-LRW Faculty	8.8%	18
Varies too much to say	1.5%	3
I don't know	25.9%	53
I prefer not to answer	1.0%	2
Total	100%	205

Q17.11 - How does the amount of research stipends available to you compare to the amount of research stipends available to most/all Non-LRW Faculty at your school?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Same amount as Non-LRW Faculty	50.7%	104
I don't know	30.7%	63
Lower amount than Non-LRW Faculty	15.1%	31
Varies too much to say	2.4%	5
I prefer not to answer	1.0%	2
Higher amount than Non-LRW Faculty	0.0%	0
Total	100%	205

Q17.12 - Compared to the research stipends available to Non-LRW Faculty, how much LOWER is the research stipend available to you?⁴⁹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
\$0 -2,500	3.2%	1
\$2,501 - 5,000	25.8%	8
\$5,001 - 7,500	9.7%	3
\$7,501 - 10,000	3.2%	1
\$10,001 - 12,500	6.5%	2
\$12,501 - 15,000	9.7%	3
\$15,001 - 17,500	6.5%	2
More than \$20,000	6.5%	2
I don't know	9.7%	3
I prefer not to answer	3.2%	1
Other; please describe	6.5%	2
Varies too much to say	9.7%	3
Total	100%	31

Other, please describe
15% of annual salary for all faculty, so the dollar figure varies
The school is not transparent on these numbers, but based on anecdotal evidence, LRW research stipends are roughly \$15k lower than those available to non-LRW faculty

Q17.14 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, did you receive financial compensation for holding a named chair or professorship?⁵⁰

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	2.2%	7
No, I do not hold a named chair or professorship.	95.6%	305
No, I hold a named chair or professorship, but it does not provide compensation.	1.9%	6
Prefer not to answer	0.3%	1
Total	100%	319

⁴⁹ The Survey asked a similar question about higher research stipends. There were no answers to that question.

⁵⁰ Information about the amount of compensation received for holding a named chair or professorship is provided in Q17.23.

Q17.15 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, did you teach a course overload (with or without compensation), including any course that you taught during a semester in which you would not otherwise be required to teach (e.g., a summer course)?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	40.8%	131
No	59.2%	190
Total	100%	321

Q17.16 - What compensation, if any, did you receive for the course overload?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
None	17.6%	23
Additional money	78.6%	103
Release time in a prior/subsequent Academic Year in lieu of compensation.	0.0%	0
Other, please describe	3.1%	4
Prefer not to answer	0.8%	1
Total	100%	131

Other, please describe
Reduction in student load for the year (half)
Service
I volunteer to teach the Intro to Transactional Skills course
I taught two classes at a partner institution in Hungary (virtually) -- both doctrinal. I will receive additional money for this.

Q17.17 - Would Non-LRW Faculty be compensated for a course overload?⁵¹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	27.3%	6
No	13.6%	3
Varies	31.8%	7
I don't know	27.3%	6
Total	100%	22

⁵¹ This question was asked of all respondents who selected “none” as their answer to Q17.16.

Q17.19 - What was the nature of the overload request?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
I requested the overload.	30.5%	40
The administration asked me to teach the overload.	36.6%	48
The administration asked for a volunteer to teach the class, and I volunteered.	13.7%	18
Other; please describe	19.1%	25
Total	100%	131

Other, please describe
Admin specifically asked me to teach the class. I also am a co-instructor in another non-LRW class that I do not receive compensation for.
All LRW faculty teach one overload course per semester
Difficult to describe -- none of these options really captures it.
Due to the delay in the bar exam. I asked to not have to teach LRWI in the fall (and got no response which meant no) and again to not teach LRWII in the spring (and got no response which meant no)
I am asked to teach two overload courses per semester, plus Jan. session. I also volunteer to teach pipeline course.
I asked.
I did not have an extra (third) section in 2020-2021 because we finally hired an additional LRW professor. But, because the 2nd hired LRW professor bailed at the last minute, I had the same number of students with my 2 sections that I previously taught when I had 3 sections. I was hired to teach 2 sections. But, since 2015, I have been assigned 3 sections because we lost LRW professors that had been filled by fellows. So, effectively, I've taught an overload in terms of an additional section and a higher number of students since 2015, all without any offer or payment of overload pay.
I have always taught an overload so there was no specific request this year.
I normally teach the course as an overload for additional compensation, but during 2020-21 was given only one small LRW section and taught the upper-level course without additional compensation
I proposed and co-taught a special seminar on a timely topic.
I requested the overload, because I was asked to teach a class I did not want to teach, and I did not want to "give up" a class that I wanted to teach.
I serve voluntarily as faculty for the school's intramural moot court competition. [Not sure if this is the kind of activity these questions are directed at, but there it is.]
I teach several overload courses, sometimes on a rotating basis. Some of these are courses I developed and therefore volunteer to teach. Some of them I've been offered to teach
I volunteer to teach summer school. I like it.
I volunteered to teach at the partner institution.
I volunteered to teach it.
I was required to staff all courses taught by my program and was short faculty to cover courses.

One of our LRW faculty members left and we couldn't replace her due to COVID-19 restrictions so I offered to teach an additional class.

Our admin allows, but does not require, the more senior LRW faculty to work as faculty supervisors for summer students doing externships.

Our LRW I course is offered every summer. We usually rotate who teaches it, but at least 2 professors must do it every summer. We often rotate but, if there are too many students, all of us are required to teach.

Part of a global studies program

Special circumstances arose and I volunteered.

The overload is a perpetual expectation, so there was no specific request for this class.

Q17.20 - Regardless of whether you held an associated title, did you receive financial compensation in addition to your base salary for any of the following activities during the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	Yes		No; I did not have this responsibility during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.		No, although I did have this responsibility during the 2020-2021 Academic Year.		Prefer not to answer		Total
Serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program	14.0%	45	72.6%	233	12.1%	39	1.2%	4	321
Supervising adjuncts who teach an LRW Course outside of an LRW Program	1.6%	5	86.0%	276	10.6%	34	1.9%	6	321
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	0.9%	3	87.9%	282	10.0%	32	1.2%	4	321
Supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	2.8%	9	80.7%	259	15.6%	50	0.9%	3	321
Teaching classes as part of an Orientation Program or Academic Support Program (not including course overloads; include course overloads in previous question (Q17.16))	12.5%	40	59.5%	191	27.4%	88	0.6%	2	321
One-on-one student support as part of an Academic Support Program	2.8%	9	83.2%	267	13.4%	43	0.6%	2	321
Service to the law school or the wider university	7.2%	23	28.0%	90	64.5%	207	0.3%	1	321
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	0.9%	3	70.7%	227	27.1%	87	1.2%	4	321
Service to regional or national professional organizations (including LRW-related organizations)	3.1%	10	55.8%	179	39.9%	128	1.2%	4	321

17.21 - During the 2020-2021 Academic Year, did you receive financial compensation in addition to your base salary for any other activities not already addressed in previous questions? Reminder: In addition to the activities listed in the previous question (Q17.20), earlier questions have addressed research stipends, chair/professorship compensation, and course overload compensation.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	19.2%	61
No	80.8%	256
Total	100%	317

Q17.22 - What was your unit of base pay for the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

Note: This question was asked only of part-time faculty.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Per credit hour	16.7%	1
Per course	0.0%	0
Per academic term (e.g., semester, trimester)	16.7%	1
Annual salary	50.0%	3
Other; please describe	16.7%	1
Total	100%	6

Other, please describe
Per student per semester

Q17.23 - How much compensation did you receive for the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

Note: If you prefer not to answer this question, please leave it blank. The system will read this as a non-answer so that it will not skew the results. Otherwise, please enter an answer for each category.

Full-time faculty

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Base salary/pay ⁵²	60,000	225,000	106,641	247
Research stipend	1600	25,000	11,035	79
Compensation from named chair or professorship	1200	25,000	9700	6
Compensation for extra course/overload	500	36,000	11,580	74
Compensation for serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program	1000	25,000	11,396	29
Compensation for supervising adjuncts who teach an LRW Course outside of an LRW Program	3000	6000	4500	2
Compensation for supervising an intramural moot court competition	4000	4000	4000	1
Compensation for supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	1000	6000	3250	4
Compensation for teaching classes as part of an Orientation Program or Academic Support Program (not including course overloads; include course overloads in previous question)	350	8000	2481	21
Compensation for one-on-one student support as part of an Academic Support Program	5000	5000	5000	1
Compensation for service to the law school or the wider university	10,000	30,000	21,250	4
Compensation for service to regional or national professional organizations (including LRW-related organizations)	1500	1500	1500	2
Compensation for other activities; please describe	250	50,000	10,662	42

Compensation for other activities, please describe	
3 credit summer school course	Grant for creating new course
ABA review committee chair	Grant-funded teaching in pipeline program in the summer
Admin for int'l students	I am paid for the spring non-LRW class I teach
Administrative Stipend	Lawyering Lab
Assistant Dean	Lawyering Skills Coordinator

⁵² More details about salary ranges for fulltime faculty are provided in a table below, along with similar information for research stipends and extra courses/overloads. If you would like to see comparable information (if available) for other compensation or faculty categories, or other ways of breaking out the data, please contact the Survey Committee.

Associate Dean of Learning Outcomes	On-line course development and administration
Associate Dean supplement	One-time teaching design bonus
Asst. Dean Stipend	Online course in teaching online; seminar for international attorneys
Bar Prep	Online Masters of Legal Studies program
Bar support work	Partial overload pay for large class sizes
Bonus	Stipend for supplies due to working at from home
Books, book proposal reviews and the like	Summer Class
Class preparation for LRW in the coming year	Summer School, and small bonus
Conducted a beginning of summer writing workshop to help students get ready for clerkships. The workshop was a half day workshop and I taught it with a colleague.	Summer teaching
consulting	Summer teaching
Dean of Student Affairs	Summer teaching plus running an extra program
Developing a new course	Supervising externs
Director of Professionalism	Taught a three-day summer course.
Edit an ABA Journal	Teaching a one week "Lawyering Lab" before the start of semester 2.
Experiential Learning Director	Training for teaching online
Expert witness work	

Visitor

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Base salary/pay	36,000	103,000	84,250	10
Research stipend	5000	13,000	8750	4
Compensation for extra course/overload	20,000	20,000	20,000	1
Compensation for supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	4000	4000	4000	1
Compensation for teaching classes as part of an Orientation Program or Academic Support Program (not including course overloads; include course overloads in previous question)	7000	7000	7000	1
Compensation for service to the law school or the wider university	2000	2000	2000	1

Part-time faculty

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Base salary/pay	15,000	94,500	47,083	6
Compensation for supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	1200	1200	1200	1

Salary Ranges for Fulltime LRW Faculty

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
60,000-70,000	19
70,001-80,000	26
80,001-90,000	43
90,001-100,000	38
100,001-110,000	29
110,001-120,000	30
120,001-130,000	23
130,001-140,000	8
140,001-150,000	11
150,001-160,000	5
160,001-170,000	4
170,001-180,000	5
180,001-200,000	4
200,000+	2
Total	247

Research Stipend Ranges for Fulltime LRW Faculty

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
1,600-3,000	6
4,000	2
5,000-5,500	5
7,500-8,000	3
9,000-9,200	5
10,000-10,500	22
11,000-11,500	3
12,000-12,500	7
13,500	2
15,000	17
16,000-18,000	5

20,000+	2
Total	79

Compensation for Extra Course/Overload Ranges for Fulltime LRW Faculty

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
500-800	3
2,000-3,750	6
4,000-5,800	5
6,000-8,000	10
9,000-9,999	5
10,000-11,475	15
12,000	10
14,000	1
15,000	6
17,500-18,000	2
20,000-25,000	7
30,000+	4
Total	74

Q17.24 - If you have been at this school for more than one Academic Year, did your base salary change for the 2020-2021 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, my base salary INCREASED for the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	38.3%	120
Yes, my base salary DECREASED for the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	3.2%	10
No, my base salary remained the same for the 2020-2021 Academic Year.	50.2%	157
N/A	8.3%	26
Total	100%	313

Q17.25 - What was the reason for your base salary increase? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Cost of Living Raise	37.8%	45
Promotion Raise	14.3%	17
Merit/Individual Performance Raise	33.6%	40
Other; please describe	15.1%	18
I don't know how my raise was determined.	18.5%	22
Uniform raise for LRW Faculty only that was LESS THAN raises for Non-LRW Faculty	3.4%	4
Uniform raise for LRW Faculty only that was MORE THAN raises for Non-LRW Faculty	1.7%	2
Total # of Respondents		119

Other, please describe
All employees were eligible for a non-merit based raise due to years of no raises being given at all due to budget concerns.
All tenure-track faculty received salary adjustments according to new market data.
Change in status from visitor to faculty
Equity increase to match similarly-situated faculty
Equity pay raises through [state university system], not law school or University
[I] had not received my promotion raise when I moved from year to year into my 5 year contract, and was making between \$100000 to 104000 for the 4 preceding years. I went to the dean in November to request recognition and promotion raise.
I received the professorship last year. We did not get raises last year, so aside from the professorship, all other numbers remained the same.
LRW Dept. raise. More than some Non-LRW faculty, but less than many LRW Faculty
Negotiation of new contract, which included a salary increase and a separate increase from starting to treat an additional required class as an overload rather than part of the base package
Our salaries were increased based on CUPA data
Raise through provision of union contract that attempts to reduce disparities with similar faculty at other institutions
Temporary coordinator of LW
The raise was a combination merit and cost of living. At our school, legal writing faculty are placed into 1 bucket; TTF into another bucket. Whether we merit a raise is based on comparison to other NTTF who, at our school, are extraordinary. I also believe that we have less money in our bucket. I believe the potential size of the merit increase is based on a percentage of the salaries in the bucket. Because our salaries are lower, the potential for merit raises is, I think, also smaller.
There may have been a cost of living raise or some other adjustment based on the union contract. There may have been an across-the-board merit raise, but maybe not.
Uniform raise for LRW faculty, not sure how it compared to non-LRW faculty
Uniform raise that is the same as non-LRW faculty
Uniform raise, but I don't know how it compared with non-LRW faculty.
Visitor to regular faculty

Q17.26 - What was the reason for your base salary decrease? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Change from full-time to part time	0.0%	0
I don't know how the decrease was determined.	0.0%	0
Other; please describe	100.0%	10
Uniform decrease for LRW Faculty only that was GREATER THAN decreases for Non-LRW Faculty	0.0%	0
Uniform decrease for LRW Faculty only that was LESS THAN decreases for Non-LRW Faculty	0.0%	0
Total # of Respondents		10

Other, please describe
10 percent cut in salary for all faculty at the University due to COVID
Change from senior lecturer to assistant clinical professor status.
COVID - budget related
COVID related university wide cut
Full-year sabbatical receives 60% of normal base salary
Stair-step pay cut for three months for all faculty and staff based on salary.
State cut all state employees' salaries 2%
The school decreased salaries and compensation because of COVID
Uniform decrease for all faculty and staff in the form of furlough days (my actual salary is a guesstimate, FYI).
University wide salary decrease of 5% due to pandemic

Q17.27 - The preceding block of questions has asked you to provide various details about your compensation during 2020-2021. To the extent that you have not already done so in response to earlier questions, we invite you to use the following space to describe how the COVID-19 pandemic affected your compensation, focusing on whatever points are of importance to you. Please feel free to use as much space as you wish.

Please describe
All base salaries of all faculty at the University were not increased due to the pandemic.
All raises, including cost-of-living adjustments, were canceled or postponed before the start of the 2020-2021 AY.
All state employees had their salaries cut by 2% as a result of financial concerns regarding the pandemic. We also had our travel funds eliminated.
All tenure-track faculty had their salaries adjusted to reflect new market data. Only half of the adjustment was made last year due to financial constraints as a result of the pandemic, but it still resulted in an increase.
Base salaries were frozen for the entire University for 2020-21 because of COVID.
Base salary remained the same and research stipends decreased by \$5,000 for all eligible faculty members.
Compensation was frozen for 2020-2021 except for faculty who were promoted.
COVID did not have a negative effect on my compensation. Indirectly, it had a positive effect because I was able to write an article that enabled me to apply for and receive a research stipend which I hadn't applied for in a while. I have not yet received the second half of the stipend (it's paid in halves) which I'll get when my article appears in print.
COVID did not impact my compensation.
COVID hit our state's economy very hard; all university departments had to make cuts; we had furlough days (i.e., unpaid "days off") as part of the cuts.
Despite being a visitor, my compensation was reduced because the university did not make retirement plan contributions. As a visitor, there is no assurance that it will ever be made up. I supplied my own computer, internet access, printer, paper, ink, camera, microphone, and software to work from home. No effort was made to compensate or to provide tools for use in teaching from home.
Due to the pandemic, there were no raises this year.
During the 2020-21 AY, our normal salary increase was withheld because of the COVID-19 pandemic. We also lost a number of research benefits.
Faculty did not receive a raise for the 2020-21 year. In recognition of special efforts of all (faculty and staff), the college gave each a \$150 gift card on Amazon. (This meant because our salary did not increase, employer contributions to 401 retirement accounts did not have to increase either.)
Faculty salaries were frozen
I "volunteered" to teach summer school in 2020 when employers withdrew job offers from students in response to COVID. It was a new prep and took enormous time for 8 weeks. The students were great, but I entered the school year exhausted. NOTE: I do not receive compensation for serving as director of legal writing, but I do receive three credits of course relief (equal to one course).
I did not qualify for a stipend because I was not able to write for the past two summers. The summer of 2020 was swallowed by the pandemic and my school's reaction to national racial unrest, in addition to serving on faculty selection committee for the first time. I had more time to write during the summer of 2021, but I was exhausted from not having had a break from the fall of 2019 straight through the spring of 2021.

I don't think COVID affected my salary so much as what the union was able to negotiate. COVID did give me the opportunity to take overload classes, as well as teach two summer courses. The University has reduced all summer pay, so I suppose in a different era I might have had a higher salary when teaching in summer. The decision to save in summer, however, came before COVID.
I forgot to previously include that we did receive a 500.00 stipend to attend classes through the University regarding how to transfer our courses to Blackboard and how to create an online course.
I provided much more individual support for students during the pandemic than I normally do when we are in person. I often met with students in the evening and on weekends to accommodate their schedules and needs.
I taught a compensated overload both fall and spring to ensure compliance with safety protocols.
I taught at another school during the summer to make additional compensation. Lots of side gigs to make extra money. It would be interesting to do a survey about those of us who are breadwinners for families and often need to pick up more work.
I used to be able to get a research stipend during the summer in addition to getting extra money to teach a summer course. This year, they made us choose one or the other type of compensation.
I usually receive some reimbursement for travel but no travel so no reimbursement
I was expected to take on even more duties without compensation due to budget issues.
I was significantly affected in that I typically teach overseas for five weeks of the year and earn between \$9000 and \$12000. I made up this loss by being more active in my legal practice.
I would have had more income for summer teaching before the 2021-2022 year, but students generally were not interested in more classes this summer.
I'm not totally sure, but my recollection is that my school decided not to give any raises in 2020-21 because of budgetary constraints attributed to the pandemic.
In summer 2021, I received a \$5,000 course development stipend. We could not receive a course development stipend AND a research stipend.
It apparently has stalled an equity process started some two years ago to bring the salaries of women and NTT professors in line with their male peers.
It didn't really change, and if anything, helped.
Like many schools, the larger university imposed a salary freeze for 2020-2021
My base salary covers my responsibility for the LRW program, the academic support program, and the bar prep program. I do not receive stipends for that work because it is all part of my contract.
My individual compensation was not affected. However, our law school (which is in the top tier of USNWR schools) has been hiring tenured and clinical faculty prolifically, yet administration determined that it was not necessary to hire LRW faculty, even though we knew that retirements were occurring.
My salary was frozen for the 2020-21 year. Then I received a modest (less than usual) raise starting in Fall of 21 for the 2021-22 year (which was determined by student evals - and those were negatively impacted by the pandemic).
My total compensation was actually less because my university as a whole imposed mandatory furlough payroll deductions during the pandemic, which thankfully ended earlier.
N/A
No additional compensation for vastly increased workload teaching online.
No change
No impact to compensation.
No impact.
No one got a raise in the 2020-21 academic year due to COVID.
No raises were given in 2021-21 because of COVID-related budget freezes.
No real effect on compensation.

Normally, we receive merit-based salary increases each year but those were paused last year because of the financial deficit caused by COVID
Our "summer research grants" really are a way to reward service. For some LRW professors, it's primarily to reward scholarships; for many others, it's a way to reward service. But it's all combined into one summer payment.
We did get raises this year and some of us received a bonus for our hard work over the last two years, but it was and is still frustrating. This applied to everyone though, not just those of us who teach LRW.
Our university imposed a 5% cut on base salary in 2020-21
Our university not only eliminated any merit salary increases for the 2020-21 academic year, but also forced us to take 5 furlough days, resulting in over a thousand dollars of unpaid time. The university also stopped our retirement matching for 18 months.
Pay increases paused in 20-21; made up for in 21-22.
Salaries were frozen and the university suspended contributions to our retirement accounts for the entire academic year. Faculty were also asked to give up some percentage of summer research grant.
Salaries were frozen in 2021-22
Salary freeze in 2020-21 academic year
See above. Our salary and retirement were reduced because of COVID and budget concerns.
Several of us teaching legal writing have applied for equity raises based on arguments that we are paid less than faculty at equal rank with analogous job duties.
Some of our non-base-salary compensation was decreased temporarily during the 2020-2021 academic year due to university-wide budget constraints.
The changes that my law school made to respond to State and University COVID-based requirements quadrupled the number and form of LRW classes that we offered, causing my administrative responsibilities to quadruple.
The larger university paid us a stipend (I think \$2500) during Covid-19 to offset the freeze on retirement benefits and the lack of merit increases for 2020-2021.
The law school provided \$500 to cover some additional expense due to COVID.
The pandemic did not affect my compensation in any way. Note, I was willing to answer the previous question as to compensation, but the blocks did not function.
The pandemic did not affect the base salary, but it did affect the normal annual raise (there was none in 20-21) and the school contribution to the retirement account (there was no match).
The university also stopped contributions to the retirement program during COVID. As of July 1 our compensation was returned to its pre-COVID level and retirement contributions were started again (without backfilling).
The University froze all faculty salaries and suspended retirement contributions (equal to 5-10% of faculty salaries), in 2020-2021 because of the COVID-19 pandemic.
The University froze all salaries for academic year 2020-21.
The University gave out one-time bonuses to everyone of \$1800
The university required unpaid "furloughs" of six days, spread over six months, during 2020-21 for all employees to make up for a COVID budget shortfall. The salary "cut" was necessary to avoid layoffs.
The university was on a hiring and salary freeze last year so I did not request additional compensation. I learned later that other faculty (TT) asked for and did receive additional compensation. I also talked with my administration about being compensated for the overload but got no response (which meant no).
The usual annual increases were canceled, so compensation stayed the same.
There was no effect except that all LRW faculty were required to teach the summer semesters due to increased enrollment.
Took a decrease summer of 2020 and into the fall 2020-2021 academic year.

University froze salaries, stopped matching retirement contributions, and asked for voluntary reductions in pay by faculty; I voluntarily reduced my summer research grant
University pay freeze. Lost university retirement contribution of matching 8% of salary.
University reduced salaries across the board by graduated percentages according to base salary range. Later in the year, the university back paid the difference.
We did not get base salary raises due to the pandemic.
We did not receive any raises during 2020-2021. In addition, our university stopped doing employer matches for retirement. At the end of the academic year, we received a small bonus--approximately \$1500.
We had a 10% pay cut for the entire university. This was restored in April 2021. (The cut covered faculty and staff making over 60K (who I believe had a 5% cut; administrators had a 15% cut).
We had a salary freeze due to COVID.
We had a temporary salary freeze, but annual raises are typical.
We had a university-wide pay cut for three months. Mine was 10%. It hurt.
We received a \$100 Amazon gift card.
While my base salary increased, all university employees were required to take a six month reduction in pay because of the pandemic. At my pay level, I was required to take a 5% pay reduction, which essentially made my salary the same. However our Dean was able to use other money to pay us a stipend for work done to, among other things, integrate technology into our classes. I received this stipend and so as a practical matter did not have an overall reduction in my salary.