

ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey, 2023-2024

Report of the Individual Survey

ALWD

Association of Legal
Writing Directors



2023-2024 Survey Committee

Ted Becker (Co-Chair)
Marci A. Rosenthal (Co-Chair)
Alissa Rubin Gomez
Kim Holst
Michael Santana
Danielle Tully

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

2023-2024 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 2023-2024. These results provide information collected from 317 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 2023-2024 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
Marci A. Rosenthal, Florida International University College of Law
July 2024

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.....	7
Part C. Faculty Contracts	12
Part D. LRW Course Details.....	18
Part E. Research Instruction in Required Courses	58
Part F. Non-LRW Courses	66
Part G. Work Load.....	68
Part H. Part-Time Faculty.....	89
Part I. Committee Service.....	100
Part J. Directors of LRW Programs.....	107
Part K. Demographics	112
Part L. Compensation	115
Part M. Hot Topics—Generative AI	132

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, and will next be administered later this year or early next to collect information about the 2024-2025 academic year that will soon be starting. The second phase is the Individual Phase, which seeks more detailed information from individual faculty members who teach legal writing courses. This is the second report prepared for the Individual Phase; the first covered the 2020-2021 academic year. We anticipate that this phase will also be administered every two years, alternating with the Institutional Survey.

Respondent Pool

In the spring of 2024, the Survey Committee collected the names and email addresses of faculty who taught an LRW course during the 2023-2024 Academic Year. Specifically, the Committee sent a short Qualtrics survey to either the person who submitted information about a law school for the most recent Institutional Survey, 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 2023-2024 Academic Year.²

The Committee received responses from 172 schools. Based on the information received from those schools, the Committee sent invitations to 913 individual professors in March 2024 to complete the Individual Survey. Ultimately, 317 individuals completed the Survey, a response rate of 35%, slightly better than the 33% response rate for the previous Individual Survey.³

By way of comparison, approximately 74% of the law schools eligible to complete the most recent 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 different response rates between the two surveys, which it believes to be attributable to several factors.

Specifically, we are 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 As we did with the 2020-2021 Individual Survey, 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. Several respondents chose one of these options and exited the Survey as a result; they are not included in the "317" total above. In addition, other respondents started to complete the Survey but did not finish. These partial 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 most recent 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 144 respondents were first asked to identify how many full-time professors taught LRW at their school in 2021-2022. The percentages of faculty falling within each of the five full-time categories identified in the 2021-2022 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:

	2023-2024 Individual Survey Q3.5		2021-2022 Institutional Survey Q8.16 ⁴	
	# of Professors	%	# of Professors	%
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	53	18.2%	149	21.7%
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	30	10.2%	46	6.7%
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	109	37.3%	244	35.4%
Full-time, Short-term	64	21.9%	170	24.7%
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	36	12.3%	79	11.5%
Total	292	100%	762	100%

Turning to demographic information such as age and sex, 92 respondents to the most recent 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 the most recent 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 17 of this year’s Individual Survey respondents were part-time or visitors. See Q3.2 of this year’s Survey.

comparable questions between the 2021-2022 Institutional Survey and the 2023-2024 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 very slightly younger: 68% of the respondents were between 40-59, compared to 71% of professors identified as being in that age range in the previous 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: 78.6% of the respondents were women, as compared to 73.1% of professors so identified in the last 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 the last Institutional Survey (71.1%/330 professors in the 41-60 age range).

⁷ Compare Q16.3 of this year’s Individual Survey to Q8.19 of the last 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 2023-2024 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 second Individual Phase report, and while the data presented here can be compared to the previous one, it cannot be compared directly to earlier Institutional 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 few times the Survey is administered, 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 2023-2024, 7 respondents indicated in response to Q3.2 that “Part-Time Faculty” best described their employment status. All those respondents saw the subsequent series of questions in Part H about Part-Time Faculty. But we are left to wonder how representative those respondents are of the complete cohort of part-time faculty across the country in 2023-2024 (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 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 2023-2024, 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, 301 respondents answered Q17.15, with 106 of them indicating that they taught a course overload during 2023-2024. All 106 saw and answered Q17.16, with 9 indicating that they received no compensation for teaching the overload. All 9 saw Q17.17, which asked whether non-LRW faculty would be compensated for teaching an overload, but only 8 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	95%	299
Part-time	2%	7
Visitor	3%	10
Total	100%	316

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Faculty	99%	312
Non-faculty administrator/staff member	1%	4
Total	100%	316

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
LRW Faculty	90%	285
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	1%	4
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0%	1
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are in academic support	0%	0
Other Non-LRW Faculty	2%	7
Non-faculty administrator/staff member primarily engaged in teaching or administering LRW Courses	1%	2
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%	1
Non-faculty administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are in another area; please specify:	0%	1
Other ⁸	4%	14
Total	100%	315

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	11%	34
Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	6%	19
Tenured with Programmatic Tenure	8%	24
Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	2%	6
405(c) Status	26%	81
405(c)-track	9%	28
Full-time, Short-term	21%	64
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	12%	36
Visitor	3%	10
Part-time	1%	3
Other ¹⁰	2%	6
Total	100%	311

Q3.6 - For the 2023-2024 Academic Year, did you have the following responsibilities at your school?

	Yes		No		Total
Teaching one or more LRW Course(s)	97%	307	3%	8	315
Teaching one or more Non-LRW Course(s)	48%	152	52%	163	315
Scholarship	36%	114	64%	201	315
Service	93%	293	7%	22	315
Serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program(s)	24%	77	76%	238	315
Administration in connection with the law school or university other than administration of an LRW Program(s)	20%	64	80%	251	315
Other; please describe	10%	32	90%	283	315

Other, please describe ¹¹	
Academic Success Program advisor (2 responses)	I'm not sure how to answer the Q re: whether I served as an LRW Director. Our LRW program went directorless this year, but we each shouldered LRW director responsibilities, so in a sense, we were all co-directors. But I don't supervise or direct anyone--we reach agreement as a group, so I answered "no."
Administrative coordinator for LRW Faculty (not a director)	In charge of the moot court program
Application Committee	Lawyering skills as overload
Assistant Director of LRW Program	Legal Writing Liaison in charge of mentoring and basic

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 "academic success program advisor" 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.

	administration
Chair of Faculty DEI Committee	LL.M. and Academic Excellence responsibilities
Chair of LRW-related committee	Mock trial director
Co-Advisor to Moot Court Team	Moot court coach
Committee requirement	My position will require teaching non-LW courses in the coming years; and scholarship is encouraged
Committee work, including hiring for LRW; Serving as Coordinator or Committee-led LRW Program	n/a
Coordinator of the LRW program, but not a “director” per se.	Ombuds
Curriculum committee	On sabbatical
Design curriculum, draft problem, administer moot court competition	Pro bono facilitator
Direct an intersession experiential program	Scholastic standing
Directed the externship program	Served on board of BIPOC mentoring program
Director of Academic Excellence (1L support programs)	Service included service at the university level on multiple committees
Director of Academic Excellence and Bar Support	Shared-governance tasks (moved to directorless model)
Director of appellate advocacy	Student advising
Ethics	Supervise all moot court programs too
Externship director	University Committees
I am the Director of Academic Support	Volunteered to be a small-group facilitator for a one-credit PF DEI course
I didn’t have to do scholarship, but did. And I did service/admin on the Legal Practice hiring committee.	

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No, I am fully promoted.	41%	127
No, the position I hold does not have ranks.	13%	41
No, other; please explain	4%	11
Yes	42%	132
Total	100%	311

No, other; please explain
As lecturers in residence we only have one promotion phase, after 12 semesters
I believe I can go for “full professor of the practice” but I am unaware of any LRW faculty member having ever done that.
I could apply to transfer to the tenure track
I have been “promoted” to the highest title afforded to non-tenure-track faculty. This title comes with no additional protections, salary raises or any other benefits
My position is based on one-year contracts
No, as p/t; yes, as f/t (as I was the prior 20 years)
Requires more time
Theoretically yes but there are no promotion standards for me.
Those with five year contracts are eligible for one promotion to “Senior” skills professor through the Union. I have achieved that status.
Visitor
Visitor, but fully promoted at my home institution

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 2023-2024 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	6%	19
No	94%	286
Total	100%	305

Q3.9 - What was the reason for your leave? Select all that apply.¹⁴

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Medical leave	24%	4
Parental leave	18%	3
Sabbatical/research leave	41%	7
Release time (e.g., compensation for previous semester overloads)	0%	0
Other; please explain¹⁵	18%	3
Visitor at another law school	6%	1
Total # of Responses		17

Q3.10 - How long was your leave?¹⁶

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full Academic Year	6%	1
One Full Academic Term (e.g., semester, trimester)	71%	12
Other; please explain	24%	4
Total	100%	17

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 responses” refers to the number of respondents who selected at least one answer option. This amount will frequently differ from the cumulative total 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 315, while the total number of responses for all options is 400.

¹⁵ 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.

¹⁶ 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.

Q3.11 - How long was your Visitorship at this school?¹⁷

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full Academic Year	40%	4
One Full Academic Term (e.g., semester, trimester)	0%	0
Other; please explain	60%	6
Total	100%	10

Other; please explain
10-month renewable contract
Long-term
Three academic terms
Two academic years (3 responses)

¹⁷ This question was asked of all respondents who selected “Visitor” as their answer to Q3.5.

Part B. Education and Experience

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
JD	99%	314
LL.M.	7%	22
S.JD	<1%	1
Ph.D	4%	12
Other advanced non-library degree; please specify	14%	43
MLS	<1%	1
MLIS	2%	6
Other library advanced degree; please specify	<1%	1
None of the above.	0%	0
Prefer not to answer.	0%	0
Total # of Responses		315

Other advanced non-library degree; please specify	
ABD (all but dissertation in philosophy)	M.S. Higher Education Leadership
ABD PhD	MA, Critical Theory
CA Teaching Credential (expired)	Master in Professional Accounting
Ed.S	Master of Public Administration (2 responses)
M.A. (12 responses)	Master of Science (2 responses)
M.A. Education (3 responses)	MBA
M.Div. (2 responses)	MPH
M.Ed (4 responses)	MSW (3 responses)
M.F.A. (2 responses)	M.S. School psychology
M.S. (2 responses)	M.S.S.A.

Other library advanced library; please specify
MSIS

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1974-1979	1%	3
1980-1984	4%	13
1985-1989	11%	33
1990-1994	16%	50
1995-1999	16%	49
2000-2004	20%	60
2005-2009	17%	52
2010-2014	10%	30
2015-2019	5%	14
2020+	1%	3
Total	100%	307

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. 313 out of 315 respondents elected to answer them.

Q4.5 - At the beginning of the 2023-2024 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	39	12.8	313
Years of Part-Time experience	0	27	0.4	300
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	30	1.7	312

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	22	262	194
1-2	33	24	56
3-5	43	6	38
6-9	32	6	11
10-14	47	1	5
15-19	54	0	5
20-24	46	0	2
25-29	21	1	0
30+	15	0	1
Total	313	300	312

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 2023-2024 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	39	10.3	313
Years of Part-Time experience	0	27	0.3	309
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	30	1.1	313

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	42	281	247
1-2	44	19	30
3-5	40	3	17
6-9	41	5	11
10-14	43	0	2
15-19	46	0	4
20-24	32	0	1
25-29	14	1	0
30+	11	0	1
Total	313	309	313

Q4.7 - At the beginning of the 2023-2024 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	38	3.1	313
Years of Part-Time experience	0	12	0.2	312
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	3	0.0	312

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	197	299	310
1-2	32	7	1
3-5	28	4	1
6-9	22	0	0
10-14	11	2	0
15-19	8	0	0
20-24	8	0	0
25-29	5	0	0
30+	2	0	0
Total	313	312	312

Q4.8 - At the beginning of the 2023-2024 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	38	2.6	312
Years of Part-Time experience	0	12	0.1	311
Years of experience as an Adjunct	0	0	0.0	312

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	214	300	312
1-2	29	5	0
3-5	21	4	0
6-9	18	1	0
10-14	12	1	0
15-19	8	0	0
20-24	7	0	0
25-29	1	0	0
30+	2	0	0
Total	312	311	312

Q4.9 - At the beginning of the 2023-2024 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	35	8.4	311
Years of part-time practice	0	27	1.1	311
Years of occasional or de minimis practice (e.g., occasional pro bono work)	0	39	1.7	310

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	21	251	253
1-2	26	23	17
3-5	78	15	12
6-9	84	12	8
10-14	54	5	8
15-19	21	2	4
20-24	13	1	2
25-29	8	2	1
30+	6	0	5
Total	311	311	310

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	35	6.7	310
Years of part-time practice	0	39	0.5	312
Years of occasional or de minimis practice (e.g., occasional pro bono work)	0	18	0.2	311

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	35	282	296
1-2	32	14	8
3-5	88	7	5
6-9	82	6	1
10-14	46	1	0
15-19	15	0	1
20-24	7	1	0
25-29	4	0	0
30+	1	1	0
Total	310	312	311

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 2023-2024 Academic Year?

Classification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Clinical	27%	69
Visiting	0%	0
Other	48%	122
N/A	25%	63
Total	100%	254

Rank

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full	45%	132
Associate	21%	62
Assistant	18%	53
Senior	4%	11
Master	0%	0
Other	7%	20
N/A	6%	18
Total	100%	296

Title

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Professor	86%	259
Lecturer	9%	28
Instructor	2%	6
Other	3%	8
N/A	0%	0
Total	100%	301

Qualification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
of Law	41%	119
of Legal Writing (or equivalent)	35%	103
of the Practice (or equivalent)	11%	33
Other	6%	18
N/A	6%	18
Total	100%	291

Q5.3 - How long was your appointment for the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

Respondents were advised that “The intent of this question is to determine whether faculty are appointed to a term of expected service lasting 9 months of the year (or 10, or 11, or 12), regardless of the length of their current contract, how far along professors are within that contract, or whether professors have the opportunity to take on additional optional work such as teaching summer classes. The details of such arrangements can obviously vary greatly from school to school. For example, a professor in the third year of 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) but also has the option to teach summer classes for additional compensation. In such a case, the appropriate response would be ‘10 months.’ This question is not asking the length of a respondent’s current contract or how far along in that contract a respondent is (in the preceding example, seven years and three years, respectively); that information is solicited from non-tenured faculty in later questions.”²¹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
9 months	43%	130
10 months	12%	37
11 months	2%	5
12 months	38%	113
Other	5%	16
Total	100%	301

²¹ 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.

Q5.4 - Which of the following best describes the term of your contract in effect for the 2023-2024 Academic Year?²²

Respondents were advised that “The intent of this question is to determine the length of a professor’s current contract, focusing on professors who do not have traditional or programmatic tenure and focusing only on the length of the contract regardless of how or whether it might be renewed or how far along in the contract a respondent is. For example, returning to the ‘third year of a seven-year contract with a 10-month appointment’ scenario from the explanatory note for Q5.3, the appropriate answer for that scenario would be ‘My contract is for a specific term of years.’ Similarly, select that answer if you have a presumptively renewable contract for a term of years.”²³

	% of Total Responses	Responses
My contract does not have a set length.	8%	19
My contract is for a specific number of years.	83%	199
Other; please explain	9%	22
Total	100%	240

²² This question was displayed to all respondents who did not select either “tenured with traditional tenure” or “tenured with programmatic tenure” as a response to Q3.5.

²³ 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.

Q5.5 - In response to Q5.4, you indicated that your contract in effect for the 2023-2024 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	23%	45
2	6%	12
3	30%	59
4	1%	1
5	34%	68
6	1%	1
7	6%	12
8	1%	1
Total	100%	199

Q5.6 - In response to Q5.4, you indicated that your contract in effect for the 2023-2024 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.	3%	5
I am not/was not eligible for continued employment after my contract term is/was complete.	1%	1
I will be/was eligible for renewal at the end of my contract term, but there is no presumption in favor of renewal.	29%	58
The contract is/was presumptively renewable.	60%	120
Other; please explain:	8%	15
Total	100%	199

Other; please explain
3 yr k ends this year and with promotion to associate will be on presumptively renewable 3 year until promotion to full and 5 yr pres. renew.
After four years teaching LRW at the law school on a presumptively renewable contract at [school] (from [year] to [year]), I left for a different position in the law school, which I held for only a year. I returned to LRW in fall [year] to fill in for a colleague who went on leave. That is why my current contract is only for the year.
An expedited-review process is available for reappointment of senior faculty in the [LRW Program].
At the end of my current contract, I will be considered for full professorship, and if approved, I will have an indefinite contract at that time.
Eligible for renewal and the presumption is implied but not explicit- if dean chooses not to renew there is a process where a committee to determine if that is a reasonable decision.
Eligible for renewal. Must complete application but expect to be renewed
I am in my third one-year contract, and the renewal of the first two contracts was more or less presumed. After completing my third year, I am eligible for a 3-year contract, but it is not a presumptive-renewal process (there is a full committee review of performance).
My current position and standard contract will change beginning with the 2024-25 academic year. I may be eligible for a new contract under different terms and will have no presumption or expectation of renewal.

Our standards do not explicitly provide that our contracts are presumptively renewable but they have been treated as such.

Rolling & presumptively renewable

The 1 year contract is presumptively renewable for a term of 5 years.

The contract automatically rolls over

The contract is for a fixed-term of three years and is renewable.

The informal presumption is that I'll be renewed, but I still need to go through a process to re-apply and "justify" the renewal. Also, the Dean can decline renewal.

This was my second year of one-year contracts that precede three-year rolling, presumptively renewable contracts

Q5.7 - Was your contract for the 2023-2024 Academic Year subject to a limit on the number of years you may teach at the school?²⁴

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	1%	1
No	94%	100
I don't know	5%	5
Total	100%	106

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
3	100%	1
Total	100%	1

²⁴ 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 2023-2024 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.²⁵

	Respondents
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	173
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	161
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	116
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	48
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	10
Blended LRW Course; substantive law topic:	5
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	5
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	3
Judicial opinion writing	10
Scholarly writing	11
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	6
Contract drafting (general)	14
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0
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	4
Legislation	0
Other (aggregated); please identify Course	41
Total # of Respondents	307

Other transactional drafting; please identify course	
Course included contract drafting, litigation, and pretrial drafting	
Direct an adjunct-staffed experiential course on transactional practice	
Overview of transactional drafting as a component of an appellate advocacy course	
State Judicial Externships (three different courts)	

²⁵ 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:	
1. Veterans Law; 2. Race and the Law	
Agricultural Law Seminar	
Social Justice Lawyering	
Survey of Federal District Court Writing and Practice	

Other	
A course for international LLMS that combines research, writing and an introduction to the US Legal System (Lawyering Skills for LLMS)	Judicial clerkship mini-seminar
A course that combines research and persuasive writing (Lawyering Skills II)	Labor Law
Academic Success	Law & Literature
Academic success course (non-LRW)	Law Seminar
Advanced Legal Writing and Editing - covers both predictive and persuasive writing but also editing (upper-level)	Legal Reasoning (ASP Course with a focus on IRAC practice)
Advanced Legal Writing: Writing Center	Legal Skills in Social Context (social justice project)
Advanced Torts	Legal Sources for LLM students
All within context of [upper-level LRW] course	Legal writing class for undergraduates offered through university's political science department
Amicus Advocacy	Modern LPS innovation & tech
Bar Exam Prep Course	Moot Court (two responses)
Bar Prep Fundamentals	Moot Court Board
Bar Writing (teaching skills for the MEE and MPT)	Negotiation
Client interviewing and counseling with ancillary writing projects throughout the semester.	Negotiation Skills as an optional overload
Critical Perspectives	Pretrial Practice & Procedure
Evidence	Principles of Legal Analysis (ASP course with a focus on extra IRAC practice)
Faculty Advisor for Moot Court (which involves 1 credit for students)	Research portion of LARW - writing is taught by another faculty member
Focused on analysis and writing for upper-level students who benefit from an additional course in fundamentals of legal analysis & writing	Seminar for my teaching assistants
I taught Advanced Legal Writing, which includes both objective and persuasive writing at an advanced level.	Texas Criminal Procedure as an optional overload
International scholarly writing course	Trial Practice
Interviewing, counseling, and negotiation	Upper Level Writing Requirement Advisor; Moot Court Team Advisor

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
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1%	1	0%	0	99%	169	0%	0	170
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1%	1	0%	0	99%	158	0%	0	159
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1%	1	3%	3	96%	110	0%	0	114
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	29%	6	38%	8	33%	7	0%	0	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	9%	4	20%	9	70%	32	2%	1	46
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	50%	5	30%	3	20%	2	0%	0	10
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	5	0%	0	5
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	0%	0	3
Contract drafting (general)	36%	5	36%	5	29%	4	0%	0	14
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	33%	2	50%	3	17%	1	0%	0	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	25%	4	44%	7	25%	4	6%	1	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	50%	2	0%	0	50%	2	0%	0	4
Blended LRW Course	40%	2	60%	3	0%	0	0%	0	5

Judicial opinion writing	56%	5	44%	4	0%	0	0%	0	9
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	36%	4	55%	6	9%	1	0%	0	11
Other (aggregated)	53%	21	13%	5	33%	13	3%	1	40

Q6.4 - How many sections of each course did you teach during the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	1	1.25	1.5	2	3	4	5	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	100	0	0	69	4	0	0	173
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	95	0	1	62	1	2	0	161
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	52	1	0	60	2	1	0	116
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	16	0	0	3	1	1	0	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	27	0	1	17	3	0	0	48
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	8	0	0	2	0	0	0	10
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Contract drafting (general)	12	0	0	2	0	0	0	14
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	11	0	0	4	1	0	0	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other transactional drafting	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Blended LRW Course	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Judicial opinion writing	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	10
Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scholarly writing	9	0	0	0	2	0	0	11
Other (aggregated)	32	0	0	6	2	0	1	41

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%	169	2%	4	0%	0	173
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	94%	150	4%	6	2%	3	159
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	96%	111	4%	5	0%	0	116
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	5%	1	95%	20	0%	0	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	52%	25	48%	23	0%	0	48
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	100%	10	0%	0	10
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	80%	4	20%	1	0%	0	5
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	100%	3	0%	0	3
Contract drafting (general)	21%	3	79%	11	0%	0	14
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)	17%	1	83%	5	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.)	13%	2	88%	14	0%	0	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	4
Blended LRW Course	0%	0	100%	5	0%	0	5
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	100%	10	0%	0	10
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	100%	11	0%	0	11
Other (aggregated)	23%	9	75%	30	3%	1	40

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	10	90	28.3	170
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	10	69	27.6	158
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	8	58	30.0	112
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	4	79	20.1	20
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	10	96	33.8	42
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	20	13.9	7
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	18	30	23.7	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	5	40	18.7	3
Contract drafting (general)	12	49	20.2	13
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0.0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	16	24	20.0	5
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	12	12	12.0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	12	32	19.1	15
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0.0	0
Other transactional drafting	7	56	30.8	4
Blended LRW Course	5	16	10.6	5
Judicial opinion writing	11	30	15.7	9
Legislation	0	0	0.0	0
Scholarly writing	1	22	12.1	10
Other (aggregated)	6	90	24.7	40

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	10	90	28.4	170
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	10	69	27.8	158
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	58	29.8	114
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	4	79	20.1	20
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	10	96	33.1	40
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	20	13.9	7
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	18	30	23.7	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	5	40	18.7	3
Contract drafting (general)	12	49	20.2	13
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0.0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	16	24	19	4
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	12	12	12.0	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	12	32	19.1	15
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	0	0.0	0
Other transactional drafting	7	56	30.8	4
Blended LRW Course	5	16	10.6	5
Judicial opinion writing	11	30	15.7	9
Legislation	0	0	0.0	0
Scholarly writing	1	22	12.1	10
Other (aggregated)	2	90	22.3	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	9	164	173
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	5	155	160
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	4	112	116
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0	21	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	1	45	46
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0	10	10
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	4	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0	3	3
Contract drafting (general)	0	14	14
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	1	5	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	2	2	4
Blended LRW Course	0	5	5
Judicial opinion writing	0	10	10
Legislation	0	0	0
Scholarly writing	1	10	11
Other (aggregated)	12	29	41

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	32%	58	44%	80	23%	42	1%	1	181
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	39%	66	46%	78	14%	24	1%	2	170
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	44%	56	38%	48	16%	20	3%	4	128
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	18%	4	9%	2	14%	3	59%	13	22
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	52%	24	17%	8	15%	7	15%	7	46
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	10%	1	10%	1	20%	2	60%	6	10
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	25%	1	0%	0	50%	2	25%	1	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	3
Contract drafting (general)	20%	3	13%	2	47%	7	20%	3	15
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	17%	1	0%	0	50%	3	33%	2	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.)	29%	5	6%	1	24%	4	41%	7	17
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	50%	2	25%	1	25%	1	0%	0	4
Blended LRW Course	0%	0	0%	0	60%	3	40%	2	5
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	40%	4	60%	6	10
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	9%	1	45%	5	45%	5	11
Other (aggregated)	16%	7	21%	9	30%	13	33%	14	43

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%	34	39%	22	2%	1	57
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	51%	33	43%	28	6%	4	65
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	59%	33	36%	20	5%	3	56
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	3
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	78%	18	22%	5	0%	0	23
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)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	3
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)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
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%	5	0%	0	0%	0	5
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Other transactional drafting	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
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	0%	0	0
Other (aggregated)	71%	5	29%	2	0%	0	7

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	33%	26	42%	33	25%	20	79
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	34%	26	49%	38	17%	13	77
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	42%	20	33%	16	25%	12	48
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	0%	0	100%	2	2
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	50%	4	25%	2	25%	2	8
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	2
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	100%	1	0%	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	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)	44%	4	33%	3	22%	2	9

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	21%	36	77%	129	2%	3	168
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	23%	34	75%	113	2%	3	150
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	33%	37	62%	69	5%	5	111
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	27%	6	73%	16	0%	0	22
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)	33%	1	67%	2	0%	0	3
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	67%	2	33%	1	0%	0	3
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)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
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%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
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	0%	0	0
Other (aggregated)	22%	2	78%	7	0%	0	9

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
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	33%	12	47%	17	19%	7	36
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	26%	9	53%	18	21%	7	34
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	43%	16	38%	14	19%	7	37
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0%	0	83%	5	17%	1	6
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)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	2
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	100%	1	1
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	50%	1	50%	1	2
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

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	0%	0	0
Other (aggregated)	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	2

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
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	2%	4	98%	165	0%	0	169
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1%	1	99%	160	0%	0	161
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	3%	3	95%	109	3%	3	115
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	5%	1	95%	20	0%	0	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	4%	2	96%	44	0%	0	46
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	10%	1	90%	9	0%	0	10
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	100%	3	0%	0	3
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	100%	13	0%	0	13
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	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	0%	0	100%	4	0%	0	4
Blended LRW Course	0%	0	100%	5	0%	0	5
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	100%	10	0%	0	10
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	100%	11	0%	0	11
Other (aggregated)	5%	2	95%	39	0%	0	41

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	47%	81	35%	61	17%	30	172
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	50%	81	30%	49	19%	31	161
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	50%	58	34%	40	16%	18	116
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	67%	14	19%	4	14%	3	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	59%	27	22%	10	20%	9	46
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	40%	4	10%	1	50%	5	10
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	25%	1	25%	1	50%	2	4
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	33%	1	67%	2	3
Contract drafting (general)	21%	3	29%	4	50%	7	14
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	50%	3	50%	3	6
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	31%	5	38%	6	31%	5	16
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	25%	1	0%	0	75%	3	4
Blended LRW Course	80%	4	20%	1	0%	0	5

Judicial opinion writing	40%	4	40%	4	20%	2	10
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	55%	6	18%	2	27%	3	11
Other (aggregated)	14%	6	29%	12	57%	24	42

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
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	1%	2	34%	48	46%	66	12%	17	6%	9	142
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	2%	2	32%	41	52%	67	13%	17	2%	3	130
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	2%	2	32%	31	37%	36	20%	19	9%	9	97
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0%	0	44%	8	44%	8	11%	2	0%	0	18
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	3%	1	25%	9	53%	19	11%	4	8%	3	36
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0%	0	60%	3	20%	1	20%	1	0%	0	5
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	2
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	0%	0	0%	0	71%	5	29%	2	0%	0	7

Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0%	0	0%	0	33%	1	33%	1	33%	1	3
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0%	0	18%	2	55%	6	18%	2	9%	1	11
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Blended LRW Course	20%	1	60%	3	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0	5
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	0%	0	63%	5	38%	3	0%	0	8
Legislation	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Scholarly writing	0%	0	25%	2	63%	5	13%	1	0%	0	8
Other (aggregated)	0%	0	22%	4	28%	5	17%	3	33%	6	18

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
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	78%	135	4%	7	12%	20	6%	10	172
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	75%	121	19%	31	2%	4	3%	5	161
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	76%	88	14%	16	4%	5	6%	7	116
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	33%	7	48%	10	19%	4	0%	0	21
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	47%	21	38%	17	13%	6	2%	1	45

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	21%	33	79%	126	159
Office Memo - Closed Universe	94%	161	6%	11	172
Office Memo - Open Universe	80%	135	20%	34	169
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	59%	97	41%	67	164
Transactional Document	4%	6	96%	147	153
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	26%	28	74%	80	108

Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	
(1) Text to supervising attorney; (2) Comparison of Client Letter and AI generated Client Letter	MPT type assignment
A short CREAC--not in memo or email format	Negotiation Exercise Written Submission (included pre-negotiation preparation, summary of negotiation, reflection on outcome/process)
Analytical essay was graded as a first graded assignment	One TRAC using rule-based reasoning to evaluate one element of a claim. One TREAC using rule-based and analogical reasoning to evaluate one factor of a claim. One outline of the Discussion section of a closed-universe office memo.
Appellate brief Motion	Outlines, case charts, research reports
At our school, students have three writing assignments the first semester: closed U memo, open memo, and final memo. They also have a final exam.	Reflective writing assignments
Bench memo judicial opinion	Research assignment - taught by research librarian
Best summer movie	Research assignment; AI editing assignment, etc.
Case brief	Research summary
Client Interview summaries; Reflection essays	Rule Explanation paragraphs; Research Log; Timed Research Assignment
CREAC assignments/analysis without some sections of memo	Rules statements, explanation paragraphs
CREAC component (2 assignments), Annotated outline	Shorter sections of memos
Demand letter	Slide deck
Essay writing practice	This year, we had students critique an AI-written E-Mail memo.
Exercises	Trial court pleading (motion) and appellate brief
Introductory legal analysis exercise	Two short CREAC style analyses (not a full memo)
Job application cover letters and writing samples	

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	26%	44	74%	123	167
In-class Presentation - Group	23%	38	77%	129	167
In-class Presentation - Individual	11%	18	89%	146	164
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	25%	40	75%	122	162
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	32%	52	68%	111	163
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	11%	13	89%	101	114

Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	
Appellate oral arguments	Oral arguments on appellate brief assignment.
Client counseling	Oral presentation on selected topic
In-class presentations periodic as cold call; Oral reports required in meeting with Teaching Assistants who served as Senior Partners	Oral Report to Client
Negotiation Exercise	Participation in class discussion and exercises
One-on-one conferences with me simulating partner-associate discussions of the developing memo	Practice rounds for Mandatory Moot Court component of the class.
Oral Argument (2 responses)	Presentation on professionalism
Oral argument on trial motion	Two individual meetings with the professor to discuss the student's progress in the course and questions regarding previous and upcoming writing assignments.
Oral Argument; In-class speaking exercises; optional additional presentations	

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	94%	127	6%	8	135
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	69%	92	31%	41	133
Research Journal	31%	40	69%	87	127
Research Memo	38%	50	62%	80	130
Research Quiz	42%	54	58%	74	128
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	19%	15	81%	65	80

Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	
Detailed prompts and directions provided for three research assignments to guide students through the process.	Research chart- prelim and updated reference desk support questions research status update
Exercises	Research charts, in-class discussion, report to supervisor about research results
Group research report	Research email
In my class, I teach book & online research. The librarians do not teach research, the LRW profs do. So about 50% or more of class instruction is research.	Research exercises tied to writing assignment
Lexis Learn videos	Research Path
Librarians teach research, so not clear on what they do	Research Worksheet Tied to a Writing Assignment
Note: I didn't teach the research component of the class--a law librarian did.	Students invented a legal problem with specific facts for a hypothetical client, researched it, and then presented their findings to the class.
Research assignments required students to explain how they found the answers, like a "journal."	Westlaw and LexisNexis Research Assignments

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	67%	114	33%	57	171
Individualized comments written on the paper itself and in the margins	98%	168	2%	3	171
Individualized comments written at the beginning or end of the paper	88%	151	12%	21	172
Individualized feedback memos	21%	34	79%	129	163
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	71%	120	29%	48	168
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	91%	155	9%	16	171
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	23%	37	77%	127	164
Individualized comments given in person during conference	91%	156	9%	16	172
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	13%	21	87%	141	162
Other; please describe	9%	9	91%	95	104

Other; please describe	
Additional in person writing feedback in 1:1 setting for struggling students	Recorded oral comments on the final submissions were in two parts: individualized for each student, and group feedback that went to everyone
Live critiques	Recorded zoom meeting with live feedback while drafting written comments; both written comments and zoom recording provided to student from that meeting
Live feedback	Rubrics containing individualized comments.
Live grading	Use of PP slides that are posted on Canvas and explained in class; recorded feedback lectures posted
Peer feedback	

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	22%	34	78%	122	156
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	45%	70	55%	86	156
Pre-trial/Trial Brief	86%	136	14%	23	159
Appellate Brief	40%	61	60%	92	153
Other Writing Assignment(s)	34%	40	66%	77	117

Other writing assignment(s)	
APA, Letter of Intent, Motion	Mediation Summary
Bench Brief	Motion and memo in support
Clarify - the short form assignment was a list of cases for both sides and a paragraph summarizing each side's argument	Motion for Summary Judgment
Complaint (2 responses)	Other pre-litigation drafting assignments
Complaint & Demand Letter	Other shorter writing assignments
Contract, judicial opinion, scholarly article	Outline
Court Observation Report	Parts of the brief
Critique of oral argument	Reflection on oral argument viewing
Demand letter (6 responses)	Research memo/chart
Demand Letter; Contract	Research report (3 responses)
Discovery plan, letter to opposing counsel	Revise objective memo to persuasive brief
Draft headings; draft of Argument section	Rules drafting exercise
Infographic	Short practice assignments; review assignment from first semester
Joint Statement of Facts for MSJ	Slide deck
Letter assignment - response to citizen "letter to the editor" in a newspaper	Students wrote two trial briefs for the course.
Letter to the editor	

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

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	9%	14	91%	144	158
In-class Presentation - Group	26%	42	74%	118	160
In-class Presentation - Individual	28%	44	72%	115	159
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	18%	27	82%	127	154
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	22%	35	78%	122	157
Pre-trial Argument	52%	82	48%	76	158
Trial Argument	19%	29	81%	127	156
Appellate Argument	36%	56	64%	98	154
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	13%	15	87%	100	115

Other speaking assignment(s)	
(1) various oral-argument exercises during class sessions; (2) practice arguments during class preparing for graded oral argument.	Negotiations in small groups
Group Oral Arg assignment arguing the other side	Non-legal persuasive argument
Mediation exercise where students negotiate on behalf of client.	Our oral argument is a hybrid. It is a trial brief but argued more like an appellate argument.
Negotiation (2 responses)	Research results, case descriptions, summary of arguments, practice oral arguments, attorney meeting
Negotiation - Group	Students did three rounds of oral arguments (two practice, one graded), but all fell within one category above
Negotiation -- two students v. two students	Think-pair-share exercises in class.
Negotiation simulation	We actually do a mediation brief in this class and a simulated mediation. I am including that as a “pre-trial brief” for the survey.
Negotiation with opposing counsel	

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	100%	121	0%	0	121
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	42%	50	58%	68	118
Research Journal	26%	31	74%	86	117
Research Memo	24%	28	76%	89	117
Research Quiz	22%	25	78%	91	116
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	13%	12	87%	78	90

Other research assignment(s)	
Annotated outline as a means of demonstrating how their research was tied to their analysis.	Practice quizzes
Development in class of research plan with ideas provided afterward.	Research charts- preliminary and updated research support questions research status update
Discussion thread for sharing cases	Research charts, in-class research discussions, in-class research exercises
Group research presentation and research guide	Research emails and Research reports
In-class research competition	Research report (2)
Independent research was coordinated with exercises. Also had an in-class exercise introducing Lexis AI.	Westlaw and LexisNexis Research Assignments
Librarians conducted open research class in which students had to find cases on a topic unrelated to the brief and argue them	

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	61%	97	39%	63	160
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	96%	154	4%	7	161
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	85%	137	15%	24	161
Individualized feedback memos	19%	30	81%	127	157
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	71%	114	29%	46	160
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	87%	139	13%	21	160
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	23%	36	77%	122	158
Individualized comments given in person during conference	86%	138	14%	22	160
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	11%	17	89%	140	157
Other; please describe	6%	7	94%	101	108

Other, please describe	
Live critique	Peer review
Live feedback.	Recorded oral comments on the final submission were in two parts: individualized for each student, and group feedback that went to everyone
Live-critiquing conference for one assignment	Students finished the course by doing an oral argument and receiving feedback on that.
Peer feedback	Team-based learning quiz based on common errors

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.²⁶

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	43%	49	57%	64	113
Office Memo - Closed Universe	91%	103	9%	10	113
Office Memo - Open Universe	85%	95	15%	17	112
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	80%	85	20%	21	106
Pre-trial/Trial Brief	79%	89	21%	24	113
Appellate Brief	45%	46	55%	57	103
Transactional Document	29%	29	71%	71	100
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	46%	25	54%	29	54

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	34%	38	66%	73	111
In-class Presentation - Group	36%	40	64%	70	110
In-class Presentation - Individual	25%	27	75%	79	106
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	25%	27	75%	80	107
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	37%	40	63%	69	109
Pre-trial Argument	30%	33	70%	76	109
Trial Argument	22%	24	78%	87	111
Appellate Argument	42%	45	58%	62	107
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	20%	12	80%	49	61

²⁶ 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	99%	86	1%	1	87
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	73%	61	27%	23	84
Research Journal	31%	24	69%	54	78
Research Memo	46%	37	54%	43	80
Research Quiz	48%	37	52%	40	77
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	16%	8	84%	41	49

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	70%	78	30%	33	111
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	97%	112	3%	4	116
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	81%	89	19%	21	110
Individualized feedback memos	28%	29	72%	73	102
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	72%	79	28%	30	109
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	93%	106	7%	8	114
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	31%	33	69%	72	105
Individualized comments given in person during conference	93%	108	7%	8	116
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	16%	16	84%	86	102
Other; please describe	7%	4	93%	52	56

Questions 6.34 through 6.37 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing.²⁷

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

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	43%	9	57%	12	21
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	38%	8	62%	13	21
Pre-trial/Trial Brief	75%	15	25%	5	20
Appellate Brief	32%	6	68%	13	19
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	71%	10	29%	4	14

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

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	20%	4	80%	16	20
In-class Presentation - Group	35%	7	65%	13	20
In-class Presentation - Individual	55%	11	45%	9	20
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	20%	4	80%	16	20
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	26%	5	74%	14	19
Pre-trial Argument	20%	4	80%	16	20
Trial Argument	24%	5	76%	16	21
Appellate Argument	21%	4	79%	15	19
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	15%	2	85%	11	13

²⁷ 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	86%	6	14%	1	7
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	33%	2	67%	4	6
Research Journal	17%	1	83%	5	6
Research Memo	33%	2	67%	4	6
Research Quiz	33%	2	67%	4	6
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	20%	1	80%	4	5

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	71%	15	29%	6	21
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	100%	21	0%	0	21
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	90%	18	10%	2	20
Individualized feedback memos	20%	4	80%	16	20
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	65%	13	35%	7	20
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	76%	16	24%	5	21
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	42%	8	58%	11	19
Individualized comments given in person during conference	76%	16	24%	5	21
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	5%	1	95%	19	20
Other; please describe	8%	1	92%	12	13

Questions 6.39 through 6.42 seek additional information from respondents who taught a course on appellate advocacy.²⁸

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

	Yes		No		Total
Client Letter	9%	4	91%	40	44
Short-Form or E-Mail Memo/Assignment	9%	4	91%	39	43
Appellate Brief	91%	41	9%	4	45
Other Writing Assignment(s); please describe	39%	13	61%	20	33

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

	Yes		No		Total
Client Interview	7%	3	93%	40	43
In-class Presentation - Group	26%	11	74%	32	43
In-class Presentation - Individual	42%	18	58%	25	43
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Group	17%	7	83%	35	42
Oral Report to Senior Partner - Individual	19%	8	81%	34	42
Appellate Argument	96%	44	4%	2	46
Other Speaking Assignment(s); please describe	8%	2	92%	24	26

²⁸ 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%	21	0%	0	21
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	30%	6	70%	14	20
Research Journal	20%	4	80%	16	20
Research Memo	35%	7	65%	13	20
Research Quiz	10%	2	90%	18	20
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	7%	1	93%	13	14

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	58%	25	42%	18	43
Individualized comments written on paper itself and in the margins	85%	39	15%	7	46
Individualized, short comments written at the end of the paper	74%	34	26%	12	46
Individualized feedback memos	21%	9	79%	33	42
Individualized grading grids or score sheets	73%	32	27%	12	44
General oral feedback addressed to all students in class	78%	35	22%	10	45
Group discussion or “firm meetings”	29%	12	71%	30	42
Individualized comments given in person during conference	82%	37	18%	8	45
Individualized oral comments recorded and provided to student electronically (other than recordings of in person conferences)	3%	1	98%	39	40
Other; please describe	8%	2	92%	22	24

Q6.43 - In a previous question (Q6.2), you indicated that you taught introduction to legal research during the 2023-2024 Academic Year. Did this course include the following types of assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	80%	4	20%	1	5
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	50%	2	50%	2	4
Research Journal	25%	1	75%	3	4
Research Memo	80%	4	20%	1	5
Research Quiz	75%	3	25%	1	4
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	100%	2	0%	0	2

Q6.44 - In a previous question (Q6.2), you indicated that you taught advanced legal research during the 2023-2024 Academic Year. Did this course include the following types of assignments?

	Yes		No		Total
Open Research Tied to a Writing Assignment	100%	3	0%	0	3
Research Exercise Independent of Writing Assignments	67%	2	33%	1	3
Research Journal	100%	3	0%	0	3
Research Memo	100%	2	0%	0	2
Research Quiz	50%	1	50%	1	2
Other Research Assignment(s); please describe	0%	0	100%	2	2

Q6.45 - To what extent did you provide instruction on citation in the LRW Course(s) that you taught in the 2023-2024 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%	271
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.	76%	232
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%	21
Other; please explain	8%	26
Total # of Respondents		306

Other; please explain	
A capstone citation exercise	My Honors Fellows (teaching assistants) taught and provided feedback on citations, although I oversaw their work.
Assigned the Interactive Citation Workbook and expected correctly formatted citations in submitted work.	My T.A. did the lion's share of teaching about citations and providing feedback
Citation component handled by teaching fellow.	My TA taught and critiqued citation.
Citation was taught by TAs and TAs provided feedback	My Teaching Assistants provided explicit instruction on citation.
I assigned citation exercises from a book called "Bluebook Uncovered."	My teaching assistants provided feedback on draft citations, graded citations for final assignments and met with students individually about citations. I separately assign the Mastering the Bluebook Interactive Exercises in both Fall & Spring.
I do not use class time to teach citation in the second-semester. I do require students to complete citation exercises and to use correct citation form in written assignments.	Students are required to complete online citation modules
I gave a citation quiz assignment in my objective writing course for first year students	Students received feedback on citations from TAs.
I give citation quizzes, including specifically: state case and statutes, and federal case and statutes, and secondary sources.	TAs
I provided explicit instruction on citation and I expected students to use correctly formatted citations in their submitted work. I provided feedback on those citations.	TAs assist heavily in teaching citation and they exclusively grade citation, with my oversight
I provided feedback on citation where appropriate.	TAs teach 5 citation modules for 15 minutes during 5 classes. TAs grade citations under my supervision.
I used the Interactive Citation Workstation for self-paced citation instruction except for more complex concepts or those directly related to writing like History, Signals, and Parentheticals.	Teaching assistants provided written feedback and led a citation workshop
ICW - to complete independently	The class TA conducted a class on proper citations and meet with students individually to review their citations.
My Dean's Fellow taught a citation lab course once a week alongside my weekly class	Weekly citation exercises were part of 1L curriculum, but they were taught on-line.

Q6.46 - Did you assign the following citation texts as either required or recommended texts in the LRW Course(s) that you taught in the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	Yes		No		Total
ALWD Guide to Legal Citation	11%	33	89%	273	306
Bluebook	89%	271	11%	35	306
State Citation Manual	14%	42	86%	264	306
Other citation text; please describe	8%	26	92%	280	306

Other citation text; please describe
Citation Handbook on Wisconsin Rules of Citation, written by Desmond Wu and Mary Ann Polewski
Dianne Anthon, Bluebook Uncovered (2 responses)
For state citation form, I provided the proper form (not BB) that lawyers use in this state.
Gave the option of either ALWD or Bluebook
I allow students to use whatever citation manual they used in the first-semester course, so the Indigo Book needs to be added to this list
I also included the Indigo Book as an option. The students were given the option of selecting any citation guide they wanted. I required one, but not any specific one.
I was on sabbatical in the fall; if I teach 1Ls in the fall, I require ALWD guide. In the spring, I tell students to use what they used in the fall.
Indigo Book (3 responses)
Interactive Citation Workbook for the Bluebook by Lexis+ (4 responses)
Linda Barris, Understanding and Mastering The Bluebook
Louisiana permits at least 3 different styles of citation in litigation documents; students received links to all of these, as well as to an unpublished work collecting them
Mastering the Bluebook exercises and supplement (2 responses)
MBIE
Open source materials such as LLI or Bluebook Uncovered.
Students used Louisiana Legal Research text, which has a chapter on citation.
Teaching Law
The persuasive memo was to be filed in immigration court, so students used the citation forms for agency decisions appropriate for that venue.
Understanding and Mastering the Bluebook
Understanding and Mastering the Bluebook (text) and online exercises
Understanding and Mastering the Bluebook; Mastering the Bluebook Interactive Citation exercises
Various handouts, videos, etc. about 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	73%	24	15%	5	12%	4	33
Bluebook	96%	259	3%	8	1%	4	271

Q6.50 - How often did you employ the following teaching activities throughout the semester in the LRW Courses that you taught during the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	Never		Rarely		Occasionally		Frequently		Total
Demonstrations	7%	21	15%	44	44%	132	34%	103	300
Lecture	0%	0	6%	18	22%	67	72%	219	304
In-class exercises, individual	4%	13	11%	32	33%	100	52%	155	300
In-class exercises in pairs	8%	24	11%	31	33%	96	49%	144	295
In-class exercises in groups of three or more	4%	12	5%	14	28%	85	63%	193	304
In-class writing and critiquing	7%	21	20%	60	43%	131	30%	91	303
Q & A and class discussion	0%	1	1%	2	12%	37	87%	265	305

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 2023-2024 Academic Year. The following tables provide information about the research instruction in such courses.

Respondents were also advised that “for purposes of this block of questions, the term ‘electronic research services’ includes generative AI tools such as ChatGPT and Lexis+ AI. Further, we’ve added a set of ‘hot topics’ questions near the end of the Survey that asks additional specific questions about generative AI.”

Q7.3 - During the 2023-2024 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	86%	208
Upper-Level Students	4%	10
Both	10%	23
Total	100%	241

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.	41%	94
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.	1%	3
Research instruction focuses equally on print sources and electronic research services.	3%	6
Most research instruction focuses on electronic research services, but students receive some instruction on print sources.	53%	122
Other; please describe	3%	6
Total	100%	231

Other; please describe
Almost exclusively focused on electronic research services; only print instruction was having them look up a case in a case reporter, to demonstrate what a case reporter is.
Component handled by different professor
I don't know
I teach students how to do everything in the books first. As soon as I've covered codes, print materials for cases, and print materials for secondary sources, we open up online training for all of it. I would say maybe 3-4 classes into research, they get access online. I believe they need to see the differences in the books and understand how to research that way before they can understand it online.
Our legal research faculty provides the modules for legal research, and utilizes my class time to do so. When I have supplemental discussions, I focus primarily on electronic research services.
Unsure - research part of class taught by research librarian.

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.	9%	12
Students may use electronic research services freely at any time in their 1L year.	88%	115
Other; please describe	2%	3
Total	100%	131

Other; please describe
Not sure of institutional policy; students could freely use electronic sources (including AI, if disclosed) in my course
Students may use electronic research services freely at any time during the second semester of their 1L year.
Students start out learning research in print sources only. In the second semester, as we move into open-universe writing assignments, students may choose between using print and electronic sources.

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

Note: In the 2020-2021 Individual Survey, this and comparable questions later in this Part E included Casemaker as an answer option. Casemaker was not included as an answer option for the 2023-2024 Survey due to its merger into Fastcase.

	Yes		No		No, but students are briefly introduced to the service.		Total
Bloomberg Law	16%	36	65%	150	19%	45	231
Fastcase	5%	12	81%	188	13%	31	231
Google Scholar	11%	26	73%	168	16%	37	231
Lexis	99%	229	0%	1	0%	1	231
Westlaw	99%	229	0%	1	0%	1	231
Other	5%	12	92%	212	3%	7	231

Other	
AI including ChatGPT and Claude	Google
Books Unbound - Wisconsin	Google, government websites
CEB (3 responses)	HeinOnline (other online databases)
ChatGPT	I do not teach our legal research course, but to the best of my knowledge the above is accurate.
Cornell Legal Information Institute	I teach students how to use regular google to find free databases such as the Caselaw Access Project, state online statutes and legislative history, etc.
Court websites and other free websites	Michigan Institute for Continuing Legal Education website treatises; Michigan Supreme Court (Michigan courts) website, which includes Michigan’s court rules and rules of evidence
Don’t know	My first year students did an AI assignment to see how AI platforms performed
Free legal resources	State resources
Free online resources such as state-created statutory sites	State Services

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.

Q7.8 - 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 per database
Bloomberg Law	83%	30	19%	7	25%	9	0%	0	36
Fastcase	92%	11	8%	1	0%	0	0%	0	12
Google Scholar	54%	14	58%	15	0%	0	0%	0	26
Lexis	61%	139	71%	163	61%	140	2%	4	229
Westlaw	63%	142	74%	166	55%	123	1%	3	225
Other	36%	4	82%	9	0%	0	9%	1	11

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%	231	0%	0	231
Statutes	100%	231	0%	0	231
Secondary sources	100%	231	0%	0	231
Updating sources (e.g. Shepard's or KeyCite)	100%	231	0%	0	231
Legislative History	37%	85	63%	146	231
Regulations	45%	104	55%	127	231
Court rules	55%	126	45%	105	231
Other; please describe	2%	5	98%	226	231

Other; please describe	
Depends on the professor; we don't all do the same thing	Local rules
Don't know	Native American and Tribal Law.
ECF dockets and court documents	Students take a research course in addition to and independent from LRW during one semester of their first year.
Everything in BOTH the proprietary and 'free world' is fair game	

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.	64%	21
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.	6%	2
Most research instruction focuses on electronic research services, but students receive some instruction on print sources.	30%	10
Other; please describe	0%	0
Total	100%	33

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.	100%	12
Other; please describe	0%	0
Total	100%	12

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 | 63

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%	11	45%	14	19%	6	31
Fastcase	13%	4	80%	24	7%	2	30
Google Scholar	32%	10	65%	20	3%	1	31
Lexis	97%	32	0%	0	3%	1	33
Westlaw	97%	32	0%	0	3%	1	33
Other	53%	9	47%	8	0%	0	17

Other	
AI including ChatGPT and Claude	
CEB, ChatGPT	
Chat GPT	
Michigan Institute for Continuing Legal Education; Michigan Supreme Court (Michigan courts) website, which includes Michigan’s court rules and rules of evidence	
Social Science sources, news stories, etc. (varies by assignment)	
Supreme Court website with filings	
Various	
Various sites that provide templates for contracts, as well as AI	

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 per database
Bloomberg Law	82%	9	45%	5	9%	1	0%	0	11
Fastcase	75%	3	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	4
Google Scholar	44%	4	67%	6	0%	0	11%	1	9
Lexis	55%	17	71%	22	32%	10	3%	1	31
Westlaw	63%	19	70%	21	20%	6	3%	1	30
Other	71%	5	57%	4	14%	1	0%	0	7

³² This question used survey logic that was comparable to Q7.7, with the same lack of practical impact 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	88%	29	12%	4	33
Statutes	85%	28	15%	5	33
Secondary Sources	94%	31	6%	2	33
Updating (e.g., Shepard’s or KeyCite)	88%	29	12%	4	33
Regulations	52%	17	48%	16	33
Legislative history	48%	16	52%	17	33
Court rules	73%	24	27%	9	33
Other; please describe	18%	6	82%	27	33

Other	
Contract drafting, other forms, dockets, jury verdicts	
Contract template sites, as well as AI usage	
Dockets, GenAI, Practical Law	
Firm and model contracts	
Information and sources specific to the problem on which they are working.	
Policy reports, amicus briefs, court documents	
Practice manuals, forms, industry background research	

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 2023-2024 Academic Year in Q3.6.

Q10.2 - Which Non-LRW Courses did you teach during the 2023-2024 Academic Year, if any? Select all that apply.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Live-client Clinic	2%	2
Non-clinic, Non-LRW Simulation (Skills) Course	16%	20
1L Required Doctrinal	6%	8
1L Elective Doctrinal	1%	1
Upper-Level Required Doctrinal	9%	11
Upper-Level Elective Doctrinal	30%	37
Seminar	15%	19
Bar Exam Prep Course	10%	12
Academic Support Course	6%	8
Other; please describe	24%	30
None	6%	8
Total # of Respondents	100%	125

Other	
1L Elective Seminar	Negotiation - 1L required simulation; Pretrial Director - Upper-level elective simulation
1L required 1-credit course on critical perspectives in the law	Prelaw scholars to undergrads
2 international practicums of supervised fieldwork by students in Vanuatu & Tanzania	Professional Responsibility
A hybrid online doctrinal and skills course for masters of jurisprudence students	Professional-Identity Development
Judicial Externship Course	Scholarly writing; international scholarly; contract drafting
Judicial externship seminar	Skills courses
Law & Humanities	TA training and an intersession (one week course before the beginning of the Spring semester)
Legal Sources for LLMs	U.S. Legal Skills to Foreign Trained Lawyers
LLM Research and Analysis in American Law	Undergraduate and Masters Courses
LLM writing course	Undergraduate course
Mindfulness in Law Practice	Undergraduate elective
Moot court	Upper level contract drafting and negotiation class
Moot Court Advisor	Upper level oral communication skills class

Moot Court Board	Upper level pretrial skills courses
Moot Court I	Upper-Level Experiential Course

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

	Normal Teaching Load		Overload		Other		Total
Live-client Clinic	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
Non-clinic, Non-LRW Simulation (Skills) Course	55%	11	45%	9	0%	0	20
1L Required Doctrinal	75%	6	25%	2	0%	0	8
1L Elective Doctrinal	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Upper-level Required Doctrinal	55%	6	45%	5	0%	0	11
Upper-level Elective Doctrinal	59%	22	41%	15	0%	0	37
Seminar	42%	8	47%	9	11%	2	19
Academic Support Course	50%	4	50%	4	0%	0	8
Bar Exam Prep Course	50%	6	42%	5	8%	1	12
Other	27%	8	70%	21	3%	1	30

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 “The intent of the following block of questions is to obtain information about what a LRW faculty member’s typical work load is, recognizing that what’s ‘typical’ might vary from school to school or professor to professor. For purposes of the following questions, ‘normal teaching load’ refers to courses you are typically expected to teach during the Academic Year as part of your usual job responsibilities. This includes teaching overload courses or summer courses (with or without additional compensation) if teaching those courses is part of your usual responsibilities. This also includes typical annual variation in courses taught (e.g., if a professor’s teaching load typically alternates between teaching two sections of the same course for both semesters one year, and teaching one section of that course plus an upper-level course in the following year). 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 2023-2024 Academic Year.”

Q11.3 - Did you have a normal teaching load in connection with your employment at your school during the 2023-2024 Academic Year? Respondents who answer “no” will have the opportunity to provide further explanation in later questions.³³

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	70%	214
No	30%	91
Total	100%	305

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	303	2	0	305
Second Full Academic Term	302	3	0	305
Third Full Academic Term	6	4	295	305
Fourth Full Academic Term	1	3	301	305
Summer Academic Term (if not a Full Academic Term)	12	275	18	305

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		2		3		4		Total
LRW Courses	3%	8	47%	141	49%	147	2%	6	0%	1	303
Non-LRW Courses	78%	235	20%	61	2%	6	0%	1	0%	0	303

Second Full Academic Term

	0		0.5		1		2		3		Total
LRW Courses	4%	13	0%	0	46%	138	48%	145	2%	6	302
Non-LRW Courses	76%	228	0%	1	20%	60	4%	11	0%	1	301

Third Full Academic Term

	0		2		Total
LRW Courses	0%	0	100%	6	6
Non-LRW Courses	100%	6	0%	0	6

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	50%	6	50%	6	12
Non-LRW Courses	58%	7	42%	5	12

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.	6%	17
Yes, it has DECREASED.	4%	12
No, it has remained the same.	82%	250
This is my first year of teaching at this school.	9%	26
Total	100%	305

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		3.5	
LRW Courses	3%	8	3%	10	15%	44	0%	1	36%	109	0%	1
Non-LRW Courses	77%	233	2%	5	7%	21	0%	0	10%	31	0%	0

(table continued)

	4		5		6		7		7.5		8		Total
LRW Courses	15%	46	1%	3	25%	76	1%	3	0%	1	0%	1	303
Non-LRW Courses	4%	11	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	303

Second Full Academic Term

	0		1		2		3		3.5	
LRW Courses	4%	13	4%	13	28%	86	23%	68	0%	1
Non-LRW Courses	73%	221	3%	10	4%	13	14%	43	0%	0

(table continued)

	4		5		6		7		7.5		Total
LRW Courses	20%	61	3%	8	16%	48	1%	3	0%	1	302
Non-LRW Courses	4%	11	0%	0	1%	4	0%	0	0%	0	302

Third Full Academic Term

	0		3		4		Total
LRW Courses	0%	0	17%	1	83%	5	6
Non-LRW Courses	100%	6	0%	0	0%	0	6

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		2		3		Total
LRW Courses	45%	5	9%	1	9%	1	36%	4	11
Non-LRW Courses	67%	8	8%	1	25%	3	0%	0	12

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.	8%	23
Yes, it has DECREASED.	5%	14
No, it has remained the same.	78%	239
This is my first year of teaching at this school.	10%	29
Total	100%	305

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

Because I was teaching a course during a part of the previous academic year that was 2 credit hours.
Faculty voted to increase LRW I from 3 credit hours to 4 credit hours.
First year teachers get a reduced course load
I added an upper level course.
I agreed to teach an extra class this year (Employment Law) when the original instructor became unavailable.
I am moving away from full-time LRW teaching and spending more time teaching appellate advocacy to upper-level students, which is consistent with my career goals.
I created a new course and am teaching that as well.
I have been director of moot court this year in addition to teaching load as an interim measure
I led a team in teaching a new professional-identity course for 1Ls.
I taught a new course in addition to my regular teaching load.
I took on the position of Faculty Advisor for Moot Court.
I was given teaching relief the previous year.
I went from teaching 1Ls to teaching 2Ls and 3Ls.
LAWR I and II used to carry 2.5 credits each. As of this year, they carry 3.
Lower credit load for the first year. We reduced the number of students in ALR, which led to additional sections.
Need for coverage of required 1L classes
New compensation package - we teach 4 credits of LRW in Fall and 4 in spring. We teach two (2) credits of another course either F or Sp. Total of 12 credits. Any course over that is paid as an overload course - paid by the # of credits.
New course
This is my second year at the Law School, and in the first year I taught a decreased load for the first semester pursuant to School practice for new professors
This was negotiated as an additional class in place of bar prep grading.
To reflect student work
We incorporated a transactional component that increased the workload, and the faculty voted to increase the credits from 2.5 per semester to 3.
Went from teaching one section of each course to two sections.

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

Course release as part of my administrative role
Director requested smaller class sizes, and additional LRW faculty were hired
Doctrinal class is 2 credits, as opposed to 3-credit LRW course
I am 50% teaching and 50% administrative. For the last few years, I have had to take on a 100% teaching load due to Covid and staff shortages. This year I returned to my 50% load.
I became Associate Dean of Admissions. I only taught one class. Previously, I taught full time, 4 or 5 classes a year.
I became the Director of the program and now only teach one section. Past two years, I taught 2 sections as an Adjunct.
I became the program co-director and therefore have only one section instead of two.
I normally teach two sections of LRW in the Fall -- 6 hours. Scholarly Writing is only 2 hours.
I retired....went to part-time in Fall 2024, teaching one course.
I was able to teach a seminar at my request in 2022-2023
I was granted tenure, which moved me from a 13-credit load to a 10-credit load. At the same time, the number of credits for legal writing was increased. And one of the courses I teach was granted clinic status, which increased the course credits. This netted me a 3-course load per year instead of a 5-course load.
I was teaching an overload for several years, but I stopped last year
Last year and the year before I also co-taught a seminar with [another LRW faculty member]. This year, we offered the seminar again but cancelled the class when an insufficient number of students enrolled.
Our class size decreased. Thus, I am teaching a 2-hour bar prep class in lieu of one 3-hour section of LRW.
The school modified its writing curriculum by adding more required writing courses but reducing the credits from 3 to 2 for some of those courses. First term = R&W 1 (2 credits); Second term = R&W 2 (2 credits); Third term = Advocacy (3 credits); upper level = Writing for Practice (2 credits)
They decreased because I was appointed to the position of Director of Lawyering Skills. Thus, I received one course release to account for the administrative duties involved in the Director of Lawyering Skills position.
This semester I taught a bar prep course that was the first course of its kind at our school. I also taught an appellate advocacy class that was also new. These courses replaced the traditional Spring LRW courses I usually teach and were only 4 credits total, rather than 6 (for Spring). I am not sure I'll be teaching the bar prep course again or not. We will likely be hiring someone to teach that.
We are under contract to teach four courses per academic year. Usually for me this includes one LRW each semester (two) and one doctrinal. I then get credit for one course for my job as director. That totals four. I usually then teach one overload doctrinal class. However this academic year I received credit for one course for preparing a large portion of the ABA questionnaire.

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	0	1	1	0	0	2
6-10	2	5	1	2	1	1	0	2
11-15	8	15	1	4	1	0	1	2
16-20	46	17	0	8	1	2	2	6
21-25	35	5	0	2	1	2	1	2
26-30	46	3	0	1	1	1	1	3
31-35	50	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
36-40	60	3	0	1	0	0	0	1
41-45	15	3	0	0	0	1	0	1
46-49	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
50-59	9	1	0	2	0	0	0	4
60-69	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
70-79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
90-99	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
225	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total # of Respondents for each course	276	54	2	25	6	7	5	33

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	2	1	0	1	0	0	1
6-10	2	6	3	2	2	0	2	2
11-15	9	17	1	7	2	1	4	2
16-20	51	15	0	6	0	0	4	1
21-25	40	2	0	0	1	2	0	4
26-30	43	1	0	1	1	1	3	8
31-35	42	2	0	1	0	2	0	4
36-40	60	3	0	1	0	0	0	1
41-45	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
46-49	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
50-59	8	1	0	2	0	1	0	3
60-69	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
70-79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
80-89	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
90	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

170	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total # of Respondents for each course	271	51	5	22	7	10	13	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
17	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
38	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # of Respondents for each course	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0

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
17	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total # of Respondents for each course	0	1	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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
12	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
17	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total # of Respondents for each course	3	2	0	1	1	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.	11%	32
Yes, it has DECREASED.	9%	28
No, it has remained the same.	71%	217
This is my first year of teaching at this school.	9%	27
Total	100%	304

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

Apparently, students tell other students that they need to take me for the upper-level appellate writing and advocacy class, so the number of students in my section has increased significantly.
Because the size of the 1L class has increased.
Because we do not have enough teachers to teach Legal Writing, and because I am teaching online and was expected to take the entire group. Also, because of reduced staffing, we are all teaching overloads not part of our "normal" assignment, as well as taking on additional upper level writing projects.
Because we were short one professor this year.
Class size increase (two responses)
First year teachers have reduced course load
Gradual increase in size of entering 1L class.
I was teaching a different course
Increased enrollment (two responses)
Increased student enrollment, increased pressure from main university campus for law school to admit more students.
Less faculty to teach LRW, smaller entering class size, less sections of LRW, some LRW sections include LLM students (fall) and some include LLM transfers to JD (spring). This year there have also been 2L JD students who did not take/pass LRWII. In the past, this was a rare occurrence so it could be that this year is just an outlier but we'll see if that is the case or if it's a new trend.
LRW Faculty on leave/sabbatical - 10-15% increase in number of students per section.
LRW professors have left and the law school has not hired LRW professors to replace them.
New course
Our class size has generally increased; the 2022-23 year was artificially small because the prior two years had been extra large and we couldn't actually fit more students in!
Over enrollment.
Same as previous answer--I taught fewer students the previous year because that was my first year teaching, and our school gives first year teachers a reduced course load first semester
Same reason: I led a team teaching a new course in professional-identity development.
Teaching relief the previous year
The 2023-24 1L class was larger than expected, increasing our number of students from ~32 (2022-23) to ~38. Next year (2024-25), we will add three new faculty to our group, so that our number of students should drop back to ~31.
The law school is bringing in more students to each class, this has been an upward trend for the past several years.
The number of students in our LRW course had trended down (to 24-28 students per section) but now are going back up due to enrollment needs
The school needed me to teach over the typical 40 students due to enrollment this year.
The student numbers have gone up, and the school has not rehired LWR faculty to replace faculty members who have left over the years.
Very near the beginning of the academic year, one of our 1L writing professors moved into another role at the law school. We were not able to hire in time for the academic year to begin and accordingly had to split that professor's class among the remaining 1L professors.
We are admitting more students into our full-time (day) program, which is where I teach. That's because our part-time (evening) program has shrunk.
We enrolled a big class and we don't have enough professors.
We had a larger 1L class this year.
We lost an adjunct late in the summer and I decided to absorb those students in my LRW section.
Went from one section of LRW to two sections. Non-LRW course enrollment increased per administration's decision to increase the class size.

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

1L enrollment decreased somewhat.
Additional sections added
Because in addition to teaching a course, I'm responsible for curriculum development, all assignments, and materials used in the course for all the sections each semester. I oversee all other sections of the course, which are taught by adjuncts. In the fall semester, I oversaw 6 sections in the spring semester I oversaw 8 sections.
Combination of enrollment numbers and emergency/unexpected leave of a colleague resulted in an increased load last year and then enrollment numbers were slightly less than average this year (and no emergency leave to cover of a colleague's students required)
From 54 students to 46 students because our dean added an additional section of Legal Practice (from 10-11 sections)
Hired additional faculty members in legal writing.
Hiring
I advocated for the hire of two more legal writing professors, and I was successful! Now, we have nine full-time professors in our program.
I am teaching only in the evening hybrid program
I became Associate Dean of Admissions.
I became the Director of the program this year. Prior 2 years, I taught 2 sections as an Adjunct.
I became the program co-director and therefore am teaching one section instead of two.
I direct the legal writing program at my school. For most of the years that I was teaching and directing, I taught the same number of students as other legal writing professors who did not have the directing responsibilities that I have. During the Fall 2022 semester, I applied for positions at other schools that paid roughly the same salary that I am paid but required professors to teach fewer students per semester than I was teaching. In response, my school decreased the size of my class sections to account for the additional work that I was putting in as the director.
I retired, taught part-time in Fall 2023
More LRW faculty led to smaller 1L class sizes.
New hires by the Dean with funding from the provost
New vice dean made effort to cap each section at 25 students because of shameful prior teaching load that led to inability to attract candidates for fellows positions
Our academic dean has read the ABA Sourcebook on Legal Writing Programs and also looked at national averages at schools that are tenure-track. Our numbers were among the highest in the nation when counting in the extra courses we were required to teach.
Smaller 1L class (3 responses)
Smaller class sizes, more LRW profs
The administration hired two additional lecturers this year to decrease our class sizes from the 2022-2023 academic year.
The school has made an effort to limit LRW classes to no more than 22 students
Varies by year. Usually 25-27. Had 22 this past year.
We added two lecturers this year to cover increased enrollment.
We hired additional Full time LRW professor.

Q11.15 - You previously indicated in your response to Q5.3 that your appointment term is 9, 10, or 11 months. 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)	91%	147	5%	8	4%	6	161
Teaching Elective LRW Course(s)	92%	148	7%	12	1%	1	161
Teaching Non-LRW Course(s)	84%	132	15%	24	1%	2	158
Preparing course materials for LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	20%	33	11%	18	70%	117	168
Preparing course materials for Non-LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	60%	95	1%	2	39%	62	159
Academic Support activities involving direct student contact	71%	110	7%	11	22%	35	156
Scholarship	39%	63	45%	73	16%	26	162
Service to the law school or wider university	43%	72	5%	9	51%	86	167
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	70%	114	1%	2	29%	48	164
Service to regional or national organizations, including LRW-related organizations	49%	80	2%	3	49%	81	164
Supervising (including advising and coaching) interscholastic moot court teams or other competition teams	86%	140	2%	3	12%	19	162
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	94%	152	2%	3	4%	7	162
Performing administrative duties in connection with LRW Course(s) or LRW Program(s)	56%	94	12%	20	32%	53	167
Performing administrative duties in connection with Academic Support or Bar Success Programs	90%	146	3%	5	7%	12	163
Performing other administrative duties for the law school	74%	122	8%	14	18%	29	165
Other activities related to performing the job responsibilities associated with my contract	60%	99	4%	7	36%	59	165

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	8%	12
6-10	17%	26
11-15	14%	21
16-20	16%	25
25	1%	1
30-35	5%	7
40	16%	25
50-55	5%	7
60	6%	9
70-75	3%	4
80	4%	6
90	1%	1
100	1%	2
110	1%	1
120	4%	6
150	1%	1
160	1%	1
Total	100%	155

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)	4%	11	0%	1	13%	39	31%	93	36%	107	15%	46	297
Teaching Elective LRW Course(s)	73%	183	2%	4	12%	29	11%	28	2%	4	1%	3	251
Teaching Non-LRW Course(s)	52%	140	2%	5	24%	65	18%	49	3%	9	1%	2	270
Preparing course materials for LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	16%	44	23%	64	43%	122	13%	37	3%	8	2%	6	281
Preparing course materials for Non-LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	57%	152	20%	54	18%	48	4%	11	1%	2	1%	2	269
Academic Support activities involving direct student contact	43%	120	24%	66	27%	75	5%	15	1%	2	0%	1	279
Scholarship	35%	94	26%	71	33%	90	6%	17	0%	0	0%	0	272
Service to the law school or wider university	2%	7	20%	58	68%	194	8%	23	1%	3	0%	0	285
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	45%	128	41%	117	14%	39	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	285
Service to regional or national organizations, including LRW-related organizations	33%	97	42%	123	23%	67	2%	5	0%	0	0%	0	292
Supervising (including advising and coaching) interscholastic moot court teams or other competition teams	67%	191	17%	49	14%	41	2%	5	0%	0	0%	0	286
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	84%	240	9%	27	6%	16	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	285
Performing administrative duties in connection with LRW Course(s) or LRW Program(s)	31%	92	27%	79	31%	91	9%	27	1%	4	0%	1	294
Performing administrative duties in connection with Academic Support or Bar Success Programs	86%	245	9%	26	5%	13	1%	2	0%	0	0%	0	286
Performing other administrative duties for the law school	51%	147	27%	78	16%	46	4%	13	2%	6	0%	1	291
Other activities	56%	147	32%	83	11%	30	1%	3	0%	0	0%	0	263

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)	72%	205	21%	60	0%	1	1%	2	4%	12	0%	1	1%	2	283
Teaching Elective LRW Course(s)	66%	174	30%	78	0%	1	1%	3	3%	7	0%	0	0%	0	263
Teaching Non-LRW Course(s)	66%	171	25%	64	0%	0	3%	9	6%	16	0%	1	0%	0	261
Preparing course materials for LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	64%	168	6%	16	5%	12	15%	39	7%	18	3%	7	2%	4	264
Preparing course materials for Non-LRW Course(s) to be taught in a future semester	69%	178	14%	36	6%	16	8%	20	3%	9	0%	0	0%	0	259
Academic Support activities involving direct student contact	71%	184	15%	39	8%	20	5%	13	1%	3	0%	1	0%	0	260
Scholarship	68%	178	9%	23	4%	11	10%	25	5%	14	3%	7	2%	5	263
Service to the law school or wider university	64%	169	4%	11	11%	30	15%	40	3%	9	2%	4	0%	0	263
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	66%	175	16%	43	12%	31	6%	16	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	265
Service to regional or national organizations, including LRW-related organizations	64%	170	12%	33	16%	43	7%	18	1%	3	0%	0	0%	0	267
Supervising (including advising and coaching) interscholastic moot court teams or other competition teams	72%	192	21%	55	5%	13	2%	4	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	265
Supervising an intramural moot	73%	193	23%	61	2%	6	1%	2	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	263

court competition															
Performing administrative duties in connection with LRW Course(s) or LRW Program(s)	67%	185	14%	38	7%	20	8%	23	2%	6	1%	3	0%	1	276
Performing administrative duties in connection with Academic Support or Bar Success Programs	70%	186	23%	61	4%	11	2%	5	0%	1	0%	1	0%	0	265
Performing other administrative duties for the law school	68%	179	15%	40	8%	21	5%	14	2%	5	2%	5	0%	1	265
Other activities	70%	179	17%	43	7%	19	4%	11	1%	2	1%	2	0%	0	256

Q11.19 - You indicated earlier that you didn't have a normal teaching load during the current Academic Year. 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 your normal teaching load has changed this year, focusing on whatever points are of importance to you. Please feel free to use as much space as you wish.

(1) I taught an upper-level LRW course in place of one of my two regular 1L LRW sections in the spring semester. (2) I taught (and was paid extra for) a short elective (non-LRW) seminar for 1Ls in the spring semester.

A "normal" work load for legal writing faculty would be two sections of first-year writing during the first and second semesters. I am teaching those sections, as well as a one-credit (non-LW) seminar and one three-credit upper level writing course (that is combined with other topics).

A somewhat lower student enrollment allowed me to focus more time on scholarship and committee work.

Although not required by my contract, I have chosen to teach an additional upper-level LWR course. I now regularly teach this class, so it is part of my "normal" load in the ordinary meaning of that term, but it is not a defined expectation of my job or contract.

Assigned double the sections of LRW this year. Also increased enrollment of non-LRW course requiring individual feedback throughout the semester.

Currently serving in administrative role so eligible for reduced course load (not teaching 1L required course).

During the current Academic Year, I am not teaching the first-year Lawyering course. Instead, I am teaching upper-level skills courses (including an elective LRW course) that amount to the same number of credits in total. Every seven years, a Lawyering Program faculty member has the option to rotate out of teaching Lawyering; that faculty member can take a writing leave for one semester or teach upper-level classes/clinics both semesters.

Fall of 2023 I taught 1 section instead of 2 and was paid at 50% of full-time employee rate. I did this to attend to personal obligations.

For the academic year 23-24 only, I was relieved of teaching obligations in order to make it logistically possible for me to take over the administrative duties of the directorship while still maintaining my private law practice. Effective June 1, 2024, I am full time at [the law school] and my historical teaching load will resume beginning with the Fall 2024 semester.

For the first time, I taught an Academic Success course during the one-week winter intersession that took place before the first week of the spring semester. There were 12 students in the course, and they were taking it Pass/Fail for one credit hour. It was required for students who were ranked in the bottom third of the first-year class after the first semester of law school. I was compensated for the course, and it was treated as an overload.

Given that I had taught an overload for 10 years prior and was asked to co-chair the Professional Responsibility Committee responsible for enforcing the student disciplinary code, I was given relief from teaching the 1L course. Instead, I taught 4 upper level courses. Although I taught fewer students than if I taught the 1L course, I did teach two intensive writing paper requirement seminars, designed a new course, taught an experiential course, and directed the school's Writing Center.
Given the number of adjuncts in our program and the materials and support we provide those adjuncts, our only required course is a legal writing tutor course (we also oversee all of the legal writing tutors).
Had health issues in the Fall of 2023. Expect to resume normal schedule this fall.
I agreed to develop and teach a one-credit, seminar-style Advanced Legal Writing course in the spring semester. I applied for and obtained a small grant from the university to develop the course.
I am in my first year at this school. They allowed me to "ease into" the job by only teaching one class the first semester. For all other semesters, I will have a full load of four courses per year just as all the other professors do.
I am now the director of LWR and the Coordinator of our Adjunct program for Lawyering Skills (pretrial simulation). In addition, I teach courses in both programs regularly.
I am secretary of the university faculty and so I have a one course teaching relief.
I am serving as an associate dean so am teaching only 2 courses during the academic year.
I am serving as Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, so I teach one course a semester. This year, I am teaching Property rather than LRW.
I didn't teach at all this year. This was also my first post-tenure year. If I had taught a "normal" year post-tenure then my load would have been: 1 section of legal writing in the fall and spring semesters, plus the 4-credit clinic in the spring semester. In future years I will likely also teach an advanced clinic (carryover students) in the fall semester. That won't be credited towards my credit count. The section sizes in legal writing are shrinking in acknowledgement of our new status as tenure-track. **For people already in the building that was an election, so you are going to see answers from other professors [at this school] who are still on the clinical title series and whose teaching loads may not have changed quite as drastically. However, the section sizes have gone down for everyone, not just those of us on tenure track. I think that the academic dean is also trying to bring the NTT legal writing folks to a 10-credit maximum just like the TT folks.
I didn't teach LRW in the Spring semester because I was asked to teach and create two new courses for the law school. I am unsure whether I will be continuing those courses in the Spring next year, but I do expect to teach at least one section of LRW in the Spring next year regardless.
I don't think I understood your earlier questions, and, frankly, I'm too tired to go back. A normal teaching load at my school is two classes per semester. For approximately the last 8 years or so, MY normal teaching load has been 3 classes a semester, with an average of 20 students in each class. The third class each semester is an overload class, for which I receive approximately the same compensation as an adjunct professor receives for teaching at our school (it's not much). However, the additional compensation is necessary because we are not paid the same as the case book faculty. This past spring, I took on a 4th class.
I got credit for one course for writing a portion of the 10-year ABA accreditation questionnaire, including the entire self assessment. Otherwise I would have taught four courses plus the directorship. This year is three courses plus the directorship plus the ABA.
I have an administrative component to my role this year. Half of my time is devoted to associate dean duties. Thus, I have only one section of legal writing in fall and spring, and no additional non-legal writing course.
I have course relief for Lawyering (I only teach half a class: 16 students) so that I can also teach a federal appellate immigration clinic. I've received this course relief every year for the past 3 years or so, but this will be the final year since our LRW program will no longer allow routine course relief to teach other courses.
I have taken on an additional administrator role in exchange for a course release.
I just moved back to full-time LRW faculty in spring 2024. In fall, I taught a seminar course and an upper-level skills course.
I may have messed up this survey because in addition to teaching in the fall and spring in the 1L LRW program, I also teach a required LL.M. class in the fall, and then an elective Law & Humanities course in the spring. I am paid an overload for the fall LLM LRW class.
I picked up 2 new overload courses, one a bar-prep course for students identified to be at-risk for failing the bar exam based on their first semester 1L grades and the other a course for our foreign-trained LL.Ms introducing them to U.S. Legal vocabulary and foundational constitutional principles. I also supervised two lecturers who were new to teaching legal research and writing this year.
I receive one course release per year to compensate for directing the program.

I serve as the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and Academic Affairs for which I receive a course reduction each semester.
I taught an overload in the Fall and Spring semesters. In Fall, I taught an Advanced Appellate Advocacy course, an upper-level elective to 16 students. In the Spring, I taught the required Professional Responsibility course to 70 students.
I taught an overload of a legal writing course during both semesters of this academic year.
I taught an overload Trusts and Wills Test
I teach a half load of LRW to accommodate my administrative load as the Asst Dean for Students.
I teach an added doctrinal course as an overload every semester (typically Contracts first semester and Legal Profession second semester). The current semester in addition to my writing course I am teaching a double overload (Legal Profession and Remedies).
I teach three courses in the fall and five courses in the spring. My normal teaching load would be one LRW course in the fall and one LRW course in the spring. But as an overload that I usually carry and have done so for years, and extra pay, I teach a second section of LWR for the January admit students that would be in the spring and then the same students in the fall; two substantive courses (ADR and Mediation Representation); a Basic Mediation course; and in the summer Child Welfare. Sometimes I also teach VIS International Arbitration Course in the spring which would be six classes in the spring. My total enrollment of students in the fall for all courses is 65. My total enrollment of students in the spring is 100 students. I usually only have 10 students in the summer.
I took on our Academic Success Program as an overload.
I took on teaching an additional half class in the spring semester because a colleague was on leave.
I typically teach a 2-2. This year, I taught a 1-2 and had more time to administer the Academic Excellence Programming that I develop and oversee for 1L students.
I usually teach Client Interviewing and Counseling, as well and teach and direct the Externship Program. This academic year, I also taught LRW to 1Ls as an overload.
I usually teach one section of 1L LRW fall and spring and one upper-level LRW course in the fall and spring. This year we lost an LRW professor so I taught two 1L sections of LRW in the fall and spring.
I volunteered to teach Workers' Compensation and Capital Punishment to supplement my low salary.
I was on sabbatical and research leave for the entire year. I did not have any teaching responsibilities.
I was on sabbatical during the fall semester so only taught Lawyering Skills (1L LRW) and an upper division skills based course in the spring (rather than teaching Lawyering Skills both semesters, spring and fall).
I was on sabbatical in the fall. We have a 3 course load -- one course in one semester, and two courses in the other. Typically, two of the courses are one-L writing courses, with the third negotiated. My third is always an upper level writing course -- we have a required third semester, which can be fulfilled by a variety of courses taken after the first year.
I'm not sure if I understood the question correctly. My understanding of the normal teaching load for LRW faculty at the school is teaching two sections of LRW and one other non-LRW course. My teaching load is two sections of LRW and being one of the two Academic Success Program advisors/administrators.
In 2023-2024, I was the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. I was not supposed to teach at all, but I ended up co-teaching an LRW class in the fall and spring and Professional Responsibility in the summer. In 2024-2025, I will be returning to the faculty after 5 years as Associate Dean. I will teach a combo of doctrinal and LRW classes and I will be on a short track to traditional tenure, a change from my existing programmatic tenure.
In addition to my LRW classes, I taught Commercial Law (a 4 credit required course in the fall semester). This is a course that I have taught from time-to-time as the need arose.
In addition to my normal teaching load of 1 LWR course per term, I taught an upperlevel LWR course as a voluntary overload (for pay, not part of my normal teaching load)
In my first year of teaching, I was given a reduced load of students for both semesters. Usually legal writing faculty have about 35 students. I had about 25.
In the Fall I was on a pretenure research sabbatical. I was expected to devote almost all of my time to scholarship.
Increased class size compared to previous years due to increased enrollment
My normal teaching load has not changed but I teach several overloads.
My normal teaching load has not changed in the past 8 years. I teach 9 credits in the fall and 7 in the spring. The union-negotiated requirement is 10 credits per year, so I am significantly overloaded.
My normal teaching load is one LRW section each semester (it's the same section, but each semester is a separate class). Last year, I taught an overload both semesters, teaching Advanced Legal Writing and Editing in

the fall as an overload and Employment Law in the spring as an overload.
My school gave me a medical leave of absence under FMLA. I coordinated with the person who taught for me in the fall and was in regular contact with her. I also opted to co-teach the 1-credit [...] course at [the school] that I had helped found, even though I was on leave. I was not compensated for this service.
Not teaching LRW. Taught Contracts, Torts, and Sales instead.
Number of 1L LRW students decreased - now we have 27 - 30 students per LW prof. Our package is - teach LW I in fall for 4 credits (meets 2x a week) and one additional course for 2 credits. Same for LW II in Spring. Additional courses are optional to be taught and paid as overloads. Overload Courses can be taught in pre-sessions and during the semester. LW package now is closer to the doctrinal faculty package. The hiring salary has increased substantially. We are advocating for increased status and tenure. Will know by next year whether the faculty approves the proposal.
On teaching overload each semester
Only because I took medical leave.
Part of my contract provides me the option to take an overload (3-credit) course each semester. For example, next AY, in addition to my sections of LRW (two each semester), I will also teach a constitutional law course in summer 2024 and a legal profession class (our required 2L legal ethics course) in spring 2025.
Phased retirement. 1/2 time.
Sabbatical
Serving as an associate dean
Several things: 1) I taught Torts which is a five-hour class and received additional compensation. 2) I taught several online programs for international students. The classes had about 70 students each and took place over a weekend. I think I did this 3 times. I received additional compensation for these classes.
Taught an overload course
This year I had a reduced teaching load. That meant I taught two courses during the academic year instead of three. Because one of my courses was still a LRW course, it meant that I spent almost as much time teaching as I would have had I not had a reduced load.
To supplement our salaries, full-time LRW faculty take on additional teaching and administrative duties for additional compensation. I direct an intersession experiential program and teach a course in our online MJD program, as well as teach sessions in our orientation program for international students, all of which require significant effort and balancing with a "regular" teaching load and service requirements.
Took on teaching a Professional Responsibility course.
Volunteered to take on intersession course on GenAI volunteered to teach PR plus PIF in spring semester
We are required to teach two sections of LRW per semester. There are some variations. For instance, next year, a tenured prof. asked to teach Torts. Another tenured prof. teaches Con Law once a year. Those profs only teach one LRW class/semester. I will be in the Administration, along with two other LRW profs. We all will teach one section of LRW/semester. But barring those exceptions, we teach two sections of LRW/semester. I have been teaching an intersession course that meets the week before class that is a drafting skills class. I created a new intersession class this past year that is another kind of skills class (negotiation). I co-teach both skills courses. We have to offer one of the classes in the middle of the semester to avoid conflicts. This has caused me to have to teach an extra class mid-semester. All of the non-LRW classes I teach are taught as overloads. And they are all optional. They help me earn more money and are in my practice area, which I find rewarding. However, I taught five classes between January and April (two skills classes, two LRW classes, and one upper-level elective). It was a stressful semester and I think I reached the upper level of what I can do in a semester.
We didn't have any faculty who could teach Advanced Legal Research this year. The class is well-liked among students, so I volunteered to take it on as an overload.
We had an unexpected absence of a Moot Court adjunct, and I was asked to fill in for the Spring and Summer terms until the former adjunct could be replaced.
We typically teach both the first and second semesters of a year-long legal writing course, but we had a unique situation this year. Because I was hired after the first semester started and another writing professor was going on maternity leave for the second semester, she taught the first semester course and I taught the second semester course. So, I had a few months here before I started teaching.

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
20	33%	1
25	33%	1
40	33%	1
Total	100%	3

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	83%	5
No	17%	1
Other (please explain)	0%	0
Total	100%	6

Q12.4 - Is your office shared with others?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	0%	0
No	100%	5
Other (please explain)	0%	0
Total	100%	5

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 2023-2024 Academic Year.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	83%	5
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	83%	5
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	50%	3
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	17%	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	50%	3
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	17%	1
Advanced legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0
Blended LRW Course; substantive law topic	0%	0
Contract drafting (general)	17%	1
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0%	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	17%	1
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0%	0
Introduction to legal research (if taught as an independent course)	0%	0
Judicial opinion writing	17%	1
Legislation	0%	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	17%	1
Other transactional drafting; please identify course	0%	0
Scholarly writing	17%	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	17%	1
Total # of Respondents		6

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

	2	4	5	15	16	17	25	30	31	38	64	Total
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	5
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	5
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	0	0	0	1	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	0
Blended LRW Course	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Contract drafting (general)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	0	0	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	0	0
Judicial opinion writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Legislation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Other transactional drafting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Scholarly writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wills/estate planning drafting	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	2	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1	2	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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.

Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1	2	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	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	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	1	0	4
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1	2	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Contract drafting (general)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	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	2	1	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	2	1	0	0	1	0	4
Course focusing on both objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing AND basic persuasive writing	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
Course focusing principally on advanced persuasive writing	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both)	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Advanced advocacy (defined as focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

Contract drafting (general)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Judicial opinion writing	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	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 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	4%	11
Yes, I was permitted to and I served on one or more law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	20%	55
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not serve on any law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	3%	9
Yes, I was required to serve on one or more law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	72%	199
I don't know	1%	2
Total	100%	276

Q14.3 - Were you permitted or required to chair law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	28%	77
Yes, I was permitted to and I chaired one or more law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	18%	49
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not chair any law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	34%	95
Yes, I was required to chair one or more law school committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	14%	39
I don't know	6%	16
Total	100%	276

Q14.4 - Were you permitted or required to serve on university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year? For purposes of this question, university committees include the faculty senate and similar entities.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	24%	67
Yes, I was permitted to and I served on one or more university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	20%	55
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not serve on any university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	40%	110
Yes, I was required to serve on one or more university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	5%	15
N/A; my law school is not affiliated with a university.	5%	15
I don't know	5%	14
Total	100%	276

Q14.5 - Were you permitted or required to chair university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year? For purposes of this question, university committees include the faculty senate and similar entities.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
No	38%	106
Yes, I was permitted to and I chaired one or more university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	3%	9
Yes, I was permitted to but I did not chair any university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	36%	99
Yes, I was required to chair one or more university committees during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	0%	0
N/A; my law school is not affiliated with a university.	5%	15
I don't know	17%	47
Total	100%	276

Q14.6 - During the 2023-2024 Academic Year, which of the following law school committees did you serve on?³⁵ Note: options marked with an asterisk were new this year.

	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)	6%	16	2%	4	70%	177	22%	57	254
ABA Self-Study or Site Visit	3%	7	2%	4	75%	191	20%	52	254
Academic Integrity / Student Discipline*	10%	25	1%	2	83%	212	6%	15	254
Academic Support / Bar Practice*	7%	18	1%	3	71%	181	20%	52	254
Admissions	15%	39	2%	5	80%	203	3%	7	254
Awards*	7%	17	1%	2	76%	193	17%	42	254
Budget	2%	5	0%	1	70%	177	28%	71	254
DEI*	11%	27	1%	3	79%	201	9%	23	254
Faculty appointments (LRW Positions)	28%	71	2%	5	65%	165	5%	13	254
Faculty appointments (Clinic Positions)	12%	31	2%	4	80%	204	6%	15	254
Faculty appointments (Doctrinal Positions)	9%	23	4%	9	87%	220	1%	2	254
Faculty appointments (Library and other teaching positions not covered by previous three categories)	10%	25	1%	3	82%	208	7%	18	254
Faculty Development*	7%	18	0%	1	76%	194	16%	41	254
Other appointments (e.g. dean search, other administrative positions)	11%	29	1%	2	76%	194	11%	29	254
Clerkship	6%	16	1%	2	71%	181	22%	55	254
Curriculum	20%	50	1%	3	78%	198	1%	3	254
Experiential learning	5%	12	1%	2	69%	174	26%	66	254
Moot Court	6%	14	0%	0	63%	160	31%	80	254
Library	2%	6	0%	0	74%	187	24%	61	254
LRW	14%	36	2%	4	46%	116	39%	98	254
Outcomes/Assessment	14%	35	1%	2	68%	172	18%	45	254
Promotion and tenure (LRW Faculty only)	11%	29	1%	2	67%	169	21%	54	254
Promotion and tenure (all faculty)	9%	23	2%	4	87%	222	2%	5	254
Strategic planning (including Steering Committee, Administrative Committee, Dean's Advisory Committee or similar functions)	10%	26	1%	3	80%	203	9%	22	254
Teaching assignments	1%	2	0%	0	60%	152	39%	100	254
Technology	3%	7	0%	1	74%	188	23%	58	254
Other; please list	25%	64	1%	2	68%	172	6%	16	254

³⁵ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.2 that during the 2023-2024 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 Affairs; Career Development	LLM programming
Accessibility	LRW Curriculum Committee
Ad hoc committee on 21st century lawyering	Not sure what committees we have and don't have!
Ad hoc committee on bylaws and status	Note: I was non-voting on some committees because of administrative role, not because of LRW status.
Adjunct Review Committee (4 responses)	Online learning
Adjunct Review Committee; Academic Standards Committee	Outreach
AI	Petitions and Retention; Law Review
Bench and Bar (external relationships and programs)	Policy Committee; Part-Time Program Committee
Benefits	Post-tenure Review Committee
Building Committee (covering renovations and office moves, etc.)	Probation & Readmission
Chair Evening JD Committee	Professional Identity Formation (co-chair); Global Committee (Governs international LLM program);
Chair, Research & Writing Department, which includes working with Dean to recruit, evaluate, train, and supervise adjuncts for writing courses.	Professional Identity Formation Planning Committee
Community & Inclusion	Professionalism Standards
DEI course development	Public interest; career services; ad hoc grade policy
Employee Wellness	Public Service (3 responses)
Externship committee & Honor Council	Re-admissions
Faculty Bylaws	Retentions
Faculty Catholic Identity Committee	Rules committee
Faculty Colloquium (Scholarship) Committee	Safety
Faculty Executive Committee	SAMP student advising
Faculty status	Scholastic Standing Committee (2 responses)
Faulty Rep to Board of Trustees	Space
Gen AI Task Force	Speakers committee, ad hoc committee on pro bono
Graduate LLM Admissions	Student and Alumni Affairs, First Gen Task Force, Professional Identity Development
Grievance Committee	Student Services (2 responses)
I am not sure my school has all the committees listed, but I didn't change the default responses for this question, except for the one committee of which I am a member.	Student writing, student affairs
I do not know all the committees that my school has.	Teaching (2 responses)
Internal procedures	The law school has other committees, but I do not serve on any of them.
International students	Visiting Assistant Professor Committee
Law Review	Wellness (3 responses)
LLM committee and committee creating provisions for NNT faculty promotion	

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.”

Q14.7 - During the 2023-2024 Academic Year, which of the following law school committees did you chair? Select all that apply.³⁷ Note: options marked with an asterisk were new this year.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
ABA Standards Compliance (or similar)	7%	6
ABA Self-Study or Site Visit	3%	3
Academic Integrity/Student Discipline*	5%	4
Academic Support / Bar Practice*	7%	6
Admissions	6%	5
Awards*	2%	2
Budget	1%	1
DEI*	6%	5
Faculty appointments (LRW Positions)	13%	11
Faculty appointments (Clinic Positions)	2%	2
Faculty appointments (Doctrinal Positions)	1%	1
Faculty appointments (Library and other teaching positions not covered by previous three categories)	0%	0
Faculty Development*	2%	2
Other appointments (e.g. dean search, other administrative positions)	1%	1
Clerkship	7%	6
Curriculum	8%	7
Experiential learning	0%	0
Moot Court	3%	3
Library	0%	0
LRW	7%	6
Outcomes/Assessment	11%	10
Promotion and tenure (LRW Faculty only)	5%	4
Promotion and tenure (all faculty)	0%	0
Strategic planning (including Steering Committee, Administrative Committee, Dean's Advisory Committee or similar functions)	1%	1
Teaching assignments	0%	0
Technology	3%	3
Other; please list	30%	26
Total # of Respondents		87

Other; please list:	
A faculty member's mentor committee	LRW Curriculum Committee
Adjunct Faculty (2 responses)	One Read (housed within DEI committee)
Adjunct support	Online Learning
Artificial Intelligence Workgroup (not an official committee)	Outreach
Career Development	Part-Time Program
Committee creating provisions for promotion of NNT faculty	Petitions and Retention
Employee Wellness	Professional Identity Formation

³⁷ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.3 that during the 2023-2024 Academic Year they were either 1) required to serve or 2) were permitted to and chaired a law school committee.

Evening JD	Retentions
Experiential education committee (includes promotion, tenure, and hiring for LRW and clinical faculty)	Scholastic Standing
Faculty Catholic Identity Committee	Student Mentor
Faculty Executive Committee	Student Services
First Gen Task Force	Teaching
I chaired the Curriculum Committee, which is also in charge of Outcomes/Assessment	Wellness

Q14.8 - During the 2023-2024 Academic Year, which of the following university committees did you serve on? Select all that apply.³⁸ Note: options marked with an asterisk were new this year.

	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	4%	3	0%	0	80%	56	16%	11	70
Appointments (dean search other than law school dean, etc.)	3%	2	0%	0	84%	59	13%	9	70
Curriculum	4%	3	0%	0	87%	61	9%	6	70
DEI*	6%	4	0%	0	89%	62	6%	4	70
Promotion and tenure	3%	2	0%	0	89%	62	9%	6	70
Faculty Senate (or equivalent)	24%	17	0%	0	74%	52	1%	1	70
Other; please list:	63%	44	3%	2	33%	23	1%	1	70

Other; please list	
21st Century Skills Award Committee	Intercollegiate Athletics Advisory Committee
Advisory Board to Faculty Engagement and Development	Interdisciplinary Artificial Intelligence Committee
AI Advisory Committee	IRB
Asian studies institute advisory board	Issues related to teaching and promoting better teaching
Assessments	Library
Athletic Board	LMS subcommittee (non-voting); University Appeals Administrator
Awards	Ombuds
Awards Committee--SEC Grant	Policy Committee
Committee that appoints nominees to all Standing Committees of the University	President's Working Group on Sustainability. University Committee on Athletics. University faculty discipline Committee.
Cultural Affairs	Provost's Research and Scholarship Award Council
Cura [school name]	Research
Educational Technology Committee	RTE Task Force / Committee (devoted to issues faced by non-tenure-track, full-time faculty at the

³⁸ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.4 that during the 2023-2024 Academic Year they were either 1) required to serve or 2) were permitted to and served on a university committee.

	university)
Emeriti	Rules and Jurisdiction
Faculty council, awards committee, presidential review committee	Senior Associate Deans
Faculty Senate Finance Committee and Outcomes Assessment Committee	Strategic Planning
Fees	Union Contract Implementation Committee and Executive Committee
Generative AI	University Assessment
Generative AI; Finance	University Conduct Board
Grievance	University Faculty Council
Hearing Board	University Hearing Board
Honors and Awards	University manual
I served on a university-wide committee considering issues regarding Generative AI	University Senate Committee on Committees
I served on both the Academic Integrity Review Board and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel's Peer Review Committee (advice on complaints of faculty violating anti-harassment policies).	University Teaching Council
Institutional Equity	

Q14.9 - During the 2023-2024 Academic Year, which of the following university committees did you chair? Select all that apply.³⁹ Note: options marked with an asterisk were new this year.

	% of Respondents	Respondents
Admissions	0%	0
Appointments (dean search other than law school dean, etc.)	0%	0
Curriculum	0%	0
DEI*	0%	0
Promotion and tenure	0%	0
Faculty Senate (or equivalent)	13%	1
Other; please list	88%	7
Total # of Respondents		8

Other; please list
Committee that appoints nominees to all Standing Committees of the University
Constitution and bylaws and faculty membership
Educational Technology Committee
Faculty Senate Committee on Women Faculty
Grievance
Library
Policy Committee

³⁹ This question was displayed to all respondents who indicated in Q14.5 that during the 2023-2024 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 2023-2024 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)	53%	40
Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated separately from the first-year courses or program)	5%	4
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated as a single, cohesive program)	36%	27
Other LRW Program; please specify:	7%	5
Total	100%	76

Other LRW Program; please specify
Associate Director, responsible for the upper level LRW course, in coordination with the LRW Program Director.
Both first-year and LLM programs, which are coordinated separately.
LLM legal writing program
LRW and Moot Court, including the Moot Court Competition 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	66%	50
No	34%	26
Total	100%	76

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%	4
Visiting	3%	1
Other	26%	10
N/A	61%	23
Total	100%	38

Rank

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Full	30%	13
Associate	18%	8
Assistant	11%	5
Other	2%	1
N/A	39%	17
Total	100%	44

Title

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Dean	6%	3
Director	78%	38
Co-Director	6%	3
Coordinator	2%	1
Co-Coordinator	0%	0
Chair	2%	1
Co-Chair	0%	0
Other	6%	3
N/A	0%	0
Total	100%	49

Qualification

	% of Total Responses	Responses
of Legal Writing (or equivalent)	79%	37
of the First-Year Legal Writing Program (or equivalent)	11%	5
of the Upper-Level Legal Writing Program (or equivalent)	2%	1
of the Advocacy Program	2%	1
Other	6%	3
N/A	0%	0
Total	100%	47

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Permanent	83%	63
Rotating	17%	13
Total	100%	76

Q15.6 - What is the term of the position?⁴⁰

	% of Total Responses	Responses
1 year	8%	1
2 years	8%	1
3 or more years	15%	2
Unlimited	69%	9
Total	100%	13

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.⁴¹

	Director		Co-Director		Assistant Director		Associate Director		Total
0	7%	16	30%	66	32%	70	31%	69	221
1-2	65%	22	12%	4	12%	4	12%	4	34
3-5	64%	9	21%	3	7%	1	7%	1	14
6-9	67%	8	17%	2	8%	1	8%	1	12
10-14	67%	6	11%	1	11%	1	11%	1	9
15-19	71%	5	14%	1	0%	0	14%	1	7
20-24	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
25-29	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
30+	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2

⁴⁰ This question was asked of all respondents who indicated in Q15.5 that they had a rotating position.

⁴¹ 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	8%	17	29%	65	33%	74	31%	70	226
1-2	69%	22	16%	5	6%	2	9%	3	32
3-5	64%	9	21%	3	7%	1	7%	1	14
6-9	70%	7	20%	2	0%	0	10%	1	10
10-14	75%	6	13%	1	0%	0	13%	1	8
15-19	71%	5	14%	1	0%	0	14%	1	7
20-24	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
25-29	100%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3
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	58%	44
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.	8%	6
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.	26%	20
Other; please explain:	8%	6
Total	100%	76

Other; please explain⁴²
All professors teaching the upper level LRW course I teach and oversee, teach, approximately, the same number of students.
As full-time faculty, you are required to teach one course and have an administrative role or teach 2 courses. My Director position qualifies as an administrative role.
Because we are an adjunct-only program across 3 semesters, I do not have a regular teaching load.
For the first of my appointment only, I was not required to teach at all.
My role as director is my primary role--other LRW instructors besides the two of us categorized as “directors” are adjunct faculty (first-year program) or fellows (LLM program).
The number of students in my classes varies based on the needs of the school. For example, in 2021-22, I had a full class of 20 JD students and 20 LLM students while in 2020-21 I taught 16 JD students and 15 LLM students

⁴² 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%	30
Coordinating full-time faculty	79%	60
Coordinating part-time faculty	20%	15
Creating the Major Writing Assignment(s) used in the LRW Program	51%	39
Creating the minor assignments used in the LRW Program	49%	37
Selecting and/or hiring adjuncts	45%	34
Selecting and/or hiring full-time faculty	58%	44
Selecting and/or hiring part-time faculty	18%	14
Supervising adjuncts, including evaluation	42%	32
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	18%	14
Supervising full-time faculty, including evaluation	50%	38
Supervising part-time faculty, including evaluation	17%	13
Total # of Respondents	100%	76

Part K. Demographics

The next two sections of this report (Q16.2 through Q17.24) provide 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 2023-2024 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	0.4%	1
30-39	11.6%	33
40-49	35.4%	101
50-59	32.2%	92
60-69	18.9%	54
70+	1.4%	4
Total Responses		285

Q16.3 - What is your Gender Identity?⁴³

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Female	78.6%	232
Male	17.6%	52
Non-binary	0.7%	2
Prefer not to answer	2.0%	6
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	1.0%	3
Total	100%	295

⁴³ 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	0.7%	2
No	97.3%	285
Prefer not to answer	2.0%	6
Total	100%	293

Q16.5 - What is your Sexual Orientation?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Heterosexual	84.7%	249
Gay or lesbian	4.8%	14
Bisexual	2.4%	7
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	2.0%	6
Prefer not to answer	6.1%	18
Total	100%	294

Q16.6 - What is your race/ethnicity?

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	0.7%	2
Asian American	3.4%	10
Black or African-American	4.7%	14
Hispanic	2.0%	6
Multiracial	2.0%	6
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	3.7%	11
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	1.7%	5
White	81.8%	242
Total	100%	296

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 American*: 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 American	50.0%	3
Black or African-American	50.0%	3
Hispanic	16.7%	1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0
Other race; please identify:	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	0.0%	0
White	83.3%	5
Total # of Respondents		6

Part L. Compensation

Q17.2 - Did you receive a summer research stipend in connection with the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	31.6%	95
No, I am not eligible for research stipends.	18.9%	57
No, I am eligible for research stipends, but I did not apply for one.	32.9%	99
No, I am eligible for research stipends and applied for one, but I did not receive one.	0.3%	1
Other, please explain	6.6%	20
No, my school does not offer research stipends.	7.0%	21
Prefer not to answer	2.7%	8
Total	100%	301

Other, please explain
Currently serving in an administrative role so temporarily ineligible to apply for summer research stipend, which would be additional to the stipend I receive for administrative role
I didn't receive a summer research stipend but didn't know to ask or apply for one.
I do not know my school's policy.
I do not think I am eligible for research stipends, but I'm not sure.
I don't know if I'm eligible; I do have research funds available over the course of the academic year; this past year those funds were used to pay TAs, using my research funds to support the LRW program has been necessary every year
I don't know if research stipends are available but I do not have one; I am also transitioning out of this role in a few weeks
I expect to receive one.
I received a course development stipend instead.
I received a stipend for project development
I taught two summer classes, and one was an overload. I am eligible for scholarship grants, but did not apply this past year.
I was new last summer but would be eligible to receive a stipend in the coming summer
I will apply for one in May, but they are not approved yet.
I'm not sure but I don't think we are eligible
No
No and I am not sure I am eligible to receive a research stipend.
No- I would normally be eligible but because I taught a summer program, was not eligible last year
No, but I do not know whether I am eligible or not.
Not sure if I'm eligible. It seems unlikely, as I'm on a 12 month contract, but perhaps under special circumstances.
Only new professors get summer stipends.
We get stipends based on a combination of past work and future work. I am not working on a project right now, so I won't be getting one this year. I have gotten them in the past for previously published articles, after they are out.
Currently serving in an administrative role so temporarily ineligible to apply for summer research stipend, which would be additional to the stipend I receive for administrative role

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
I am ineligible because I am a Visitor.	4.0%	2
I am ineligible because I am a non-faculty administrator/staff member.	0.0%	0
I am ineligible because I am part-time.	2.0%	1
I am ineligible because LRW Faculty are explicitly ineligible.	38.0%	19
I am ineligible because of my appointment type (e.g., 405(c) status).	24.0%	12
I am ineligible because of my contract length (e.g., 12 months).	14.0%	7
Other; please explain	18.0%	9
Total	100%	50

Other, please explain
Generally, LRW faculty are excluded from stipends. I'm hesitant to state that we are "explicitly ineligible"
I am ineligible because I hold a summer administrative appointment.
I'm ineligible because I'm not required to produce scholarship.
I'm not sure why I am ineligible.
No logical reason provided.
Not tenure track
Only pre-tenure and pre-promotion faculty are entitled.
Promoted/tenured faculty are no longer eligible for summer stipends
Summer research grants are regularly provided to research faculty but not offered to non-research 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?⁴⁴

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, all/most	42.9%	3
Yes, some	0.0%	0
No	28.6%	2
I don't know	28.6%	2
N/A (no other LRW Faculty at my school)	0.0%	0
Total	100%	7

⁴⁴ 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	42.9%	3
No	14.3%	1
I don't know	42.9%	3
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?⁴⁵

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, all/most	100.0%	12
Yes, some	0.0%	0
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%	12

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	25.0%	3
No	0.0%	0
I don't know	75.0%	9
Total	100%	12

⁴⁵ 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 2023-2024 Academic Year?⁴⁶

	% of Total Responses	Responses
\$0 - 2,500	0.0%	0
\$2,501 - 5,000	0.0%	0
\$5,001 - 7,500	1.8%	1
\$7,501 - 10,000	5.3%	3
\$10,001 - 12,500	7.0%	4
\$12,501 - 15,000	5.3%	3
\$15,001 - 17,500	1.8%	1
\$17,501 - 20,000	1.8%	1
More than \$20,000	7.0%	4
I don't know	64.9%	37
I prefer not to answer	0.0%	0
Other; please describe	5.3%	3
Varies too much to say	0.0%	0
Total	100%	57

Other, please describe
15% of salary
More than \$20k (this is for my home institution; I am not eligible as a visitor at [school omitted])
Tenure-side faculty and clinicians are eligible for (and almost all receive) a stipend of 15% of their 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?⁴⁷

	% of Total Responses	Responses
\$0 - 2,500	1.8%	4
\$2,501 - 5,000	6.8%	15
\$5,001 - 7,500	6.8%	15
\$7,501 - 10,000	16.3%	36
\$10,001 - 12,500	13.1%	29
\$12,501 - 15,000	16.3%	36
\$15,001 - 17,500	5.0%	11
\$17,501 - 20,000	5.4%	12
More than \$20,000	1.4%	3
I don't know	19.9%	44
I prefer not to answer	1.8%	4
Other; please describe	0.0%	0
Varies too much to say	5.4%	12
Total	100%	221

⁴⁶ This question was asked of all respondents who selected the general “No, I am not eligible for research stipends” answer in Q17.2.

⁴⁷ 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.

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	59.6%	121
More often than Non-LRW Faculty	0.0%	0
Less often than Non-LRW Faculty	8.4%	17
Varies too much to say	0.5%	1
I don't know	30.5%	62
I prefer not to answer	1.0%	2
Total	100%	203

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	48.8%	99
Lower amount than Non-LRW Faculty	10.8%	22
Higher amount than Non-LRW Faculty	0.0%	0
Varies too much to say	2.0%	4
I don't know.	37.4%	76
I prefer not to answer.	1.0%	2
Total	100%	203

Q17.12 - Compared to the research stipends available to Non-LRW Faculty, how much LOWER is the research stipend available to you?⁴⁸

	% of Total Responses	Responses
\$0 -2,500	4.5%	1
\$2,501 - 5,000	18.2%	4
\$5,001 - 7,500	0.0%	0
\$7,501 - 10,000	13.6%	3
\$10,001 - 12,500	4.5%	1
\$12,501 - 15,000	4.5%	1
\$15,001 - 17,500	0.0%	0
\$17,501 - 20,000	0.0%	0
More than \$20,000	0.0%	0
Other; please describe:	9.1%	2
Varies too much to say	22.7%	5
I don't know.	22.7%	5
I prefer not to answer.	0.0%	0
Total	100%	22

Other, please describe
I received an amount \$500 less than my TT doctrinal colleague.
Stipends are 15% of faculty salary. Tenured faculty have higher salaries than LW faculty.

Q17.14 - During the 2023-2024 Academic Year, did you receive financial compensation for holding a named chair or professorship?⁴⁹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	5.0%	15
No, I do not hold a named chair or professorship.	92.6%	277
No, I hold a named chair or professorship, but it does not provide compensation.	1.3%	4
Prefer not to answer	1.0%	3
Total	100%	299

⁴⁸ The Survey asked a similar question about higher research stipends. There were no answers to that question.

⁴⁹ Information about the amount of compensation received for holding a named chair or professorship is provided in Q17.23.

Q17.15 - During the 2023-2024 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	35.2%	106
No	64.8%	195
Total	100%	301

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
None	8.5%	9
Additional money	88.7%	94
Release time in a prior/subsequent Academic Year in lieu of compensation.	0.0%	0
Other, please describe	2.8%	3
Prefer not to answer	0.0%	0
Total	100%	106

Other, please describe	
Enjoyment of the subject matter and teaching non-J.D. students	
Paid extra for summer course, but not for academic year overload	
Teaching relief in the spring semester (one fewer course)	

Q17.17 - Would Non-LRW Faculty be compensated for a course overload?⁵⁰

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	62.5%	5
No	0.0%	0
Varies	25.0%	2
I don't know	12.5%	1
Total	100%	8

⁵⁰ This question was asked of all respondents who selected “none” as their answer to Q17.16.

Q17.18 - What compensation, if any, did you receive for the course overload?⁵¹

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Same type and amount as Non-LRW Faculty would receive	61.2%	52
Same type but lower amount than Non-LRW Faculty would receive	3.5%	3
Same type but higher amount than Non-LRW Faculty would receive	1.2%	1
Varies	1.2%	1
Other; please describe	1.2%	1
I don't know.	31.8%	27
Prefer not to answer.	0.0%	0
Total	100%	85

Other, please describe
Same as other non-tenured faculty, lower than tenured faculty

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
I requested the overload.	32.7%	34
The administration asked me to teach the overload.	44.2%	46
The administration asked for a volunteer to teach the class, and I volunteered.	10.6%	11
Other; please describe	12.5%	13
Total	100%	104

Other, please describe
A continuing education program
Accommodation for a student. Independent study
Developing online course for 2024-2025 - considered overload
Faculty can apply to teach short seminars on a topic of their choice, and roughly 12 are selected each year.
I am required by my appointment letter to teach an overload, something I did not realize was the case when I was hired.
I co-taught a one week summer course introducing incoming students to law school. I was invited by a faculty colleague to co-teach the course.
I have taught an overload for approximately 8 years. It is now built into the curriculum--we wouldn't have enough coverage for classes without my teaching the overload.
I once volunteered to teach lawyering skills. Subsequently, I was asked to develop materials and coordinate the required course among adjuncts. I now teach a permanent overload of 6 credit hours (only required to

⁵¹ This question was asked of all respondents who selected “additional money,” “release time,” or “other” as their answer to Q17.16.

teach 4 credit hours of LRW and 1 credit Methods)

I taught a one-credit reading seminar that I have offered to teach before as a non-compensated overload. Doing so may have affected the amount of my summer stipend, but it's not clear.

I volunteer to teach and do not request an overload

It is a summer pre-law program for admitted international LLM students.

The director of a related center asked for me to take on the overload based on earlier assistance provided to the center.

The LRW faculty rotate who teaches in the summer.

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 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	Yes		No; I did not have this responsibility during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.		No, although I did have this responsibility during the 2023-2024 Academic Year.		Prefer not to answer		Total
Serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program	14.6%	44	72.8%	219	10.6%	32	2.0%	6	301
Supervising adjuncts who teach an LRW Course outside of an LRW Program	2.3%	7	86.7%	261	9.3%	28	1.7%	5	301
Supervising an intramural moot court competition	3.3%	10	87.0%	262	8.0%	24	1.7%	5	301
Supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	6.0%	18	79.1%	238	13.3%	40	1.7%	5	301
Teaching classes as part of an Orientation Program or Academic Support Program (not including course overloads; include course overloads in a previous question (Q17.16))	10.3%	31	64.1%	193	23.6%	71	2.0%	6	301
One-on-one student support as part of an Academic Support Program	1.7%	5	80.4%	242	15.9%	48	2.0%	6	301
Service to the law school or the wider university	6.3%	19	23.9%	72	68.1%	205	1.7%	5	301
Service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	1.0%	3	69.8%	210	27.2%	82	2.0%	6	301
Service to regional or national professional organizations (including LRW-related organizations)	1.3%	4	53.8%	162	42.2%	127	2.7%	8	301

Q17.21 - During the 2023-2024 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, so please do not take those items into account when answering this question.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes	18.2%	54
No	81.8%	243
Total	100%	297

Q17.22 - What was your unit of base pay for the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

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

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Per credit hour	0.0%	0
Per course	20.0%	1
Per academic term (e.g., semester, trimester)	0.0%	0
Annual salary	80.0%	4
Other; please describe	0.0%	0
Total	100%	5

Q17.23 - How much compensation did you receive for the 2023-2024 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	62,500	268,000	118,828	239
Research stipend	2000	30,000	12,166	78
Compensation from named chair or professorship	2000	25,000	11,389	9
Compensation for extra course/overload	2000	50,000	13,197	72
Compensation for serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program	2500	36,000	12,264	36
Compensation for supervising adjuncts who teach an LRW Course outside of an LRW Program	2500	7000	4750	2
Compensation for supervising an intramural moot court competition	1500	10,000	4000	6
Compensation for supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	1500	15,000	5890	10
Compensation for teaching classes as part of an Orientation Program or Academic Support Program (not including course overloads; include course overloads in the answer option above)	300	8000	3189	14
Compensation for one-on-one student support as part of an Academic Support Program	600	6000	4033	3
Compensation for service to the law school or the wider university	5000	40,000	20,722	9
Compensation for service to the local/state community (including to practicing bar)	5000	5000	5000	1
Compensation for service to regional or national professional organizations (including LRW-related organizations)	0	0	0	0
Compensation for other activities; please describe	250	50,000	10,464	39

Compensation for other activities, please describe	
AD	Develop 1L program to increase belonging
Administrative (non-LRW)	Director of PT Program
Administrative role (Assoc Dean)	Director of study abroad program
Administrative Stipend	Drafting problems for a LRW course
Associate Dean	Faculty fellow
Associate Dean of Experiential Learning	Keynote speaker fee
Bar prep grading	LRW adjunct teaching
Bar support for Multistate Performance Tests (MPTS)	Membership in LRW Committee

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.

Bonus	Merit-based raise
Bonus for publication of scholarship	Prep work
Books, honoraria, reviews	Salary Supplement
Chair of Ombuds committee	Student Overload
Consultant for pre-law program not affiliated with school	Symposium paper
Coordinating Lawyering Skills adjunct program	Taught in the pipeline program
Course development	Teaching award
Creation of on-line course (refresher)	Teaching summer class
Department liaison	Working on site visit
Design curriculum for new course; work in Clinic over summer,	Writing LRW assignments

Visitor

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Base salary/pay	24,000	115,000	77,500	8
Research stipend	5000	5000	5000	1
Compensation for extra course/overload	6000	6000	6000	1
Compensation for serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program	7500	7500	7500	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)	2000	2000	2000	1

Part-time faculty

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
Base salary/pay	9000	75,000	53,000	3
Compensation for serving as an LRW Director in connection with an LRW Program	20,000	20,000	20,000	1
Compensation for supervising adjuncts who teach an LRW Course outside of an LRW Program	10,000	10,000	10,000	1
Compensation for supervising, advising, or coaching moot court or other interscholastic competition teams	750	750	750	1

Salary Ranges for Fulltime LRW Faculty

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
60,000-70,000	5
70,001-80,000	23
80,001-90,000	21
90,001-100,000	31
100,001-110,000	36
110,001-120,000	29
120,001-130,000	26
130,001-140,000	19
140,001-150,000	12
150,001-160,000	12
160,001-170,000	9
170,001-180,000	7
180,001-200,000	4
200,000+	5
Total	239

Research Stipend Ranges for Fulltime LRW Faculty

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
2,000-3,000	3
5,000	6
6,000	2
7,000-8,000	6
10,000-11,500	20
12,000-12,500	7
13,000-14,000	5
15,000	11
16,000-18,000	11

20,000+	7
Total	78

Compensation for Extra Course/Overload Ranges for Fulltime LRW Faculty

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
2,000-3,500	7
4,000-4,530	3
5,000-5,600	10
6,000-8,000	9
9,000	1
10,000-11,000	9
12,000-12,500	4
14,000-14,300	5
15,000	4
16,000-17,000	3
18,000-19,000	2
20,000-26,000	8
30,000+	7
Total	72

Q17.24 - If you have been at this school for more than one Academic Year, did your base salary change for the 2023-2024 Academic Year?

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, my base salary INCREASED for the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	74.2%	213
Yes, my base salary DECREASED for the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	0.3%	1
No, my base salary remained the same for the 2023-2024 Academic Year.	13.9%	40
N/A	11.5%	33
Total	100%	287

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

	% of Responses	Responses
Cost of Living Raise	45.3%	96
Promotion Raise	9.4%	20
Merit/Individual Performance Raise	47.6%	101
Other; please describe	13.2%	28
I don't know how my raise was determined.	11.8%	25
Uniform raise for LRW Faculty only that was LESS THAN raises for Non-LRW Faculty	2.4%	5
Uniform raise for LRW Faculty only that was MORE THAN raises for Non-LRW Faculty	1.4%	3
Total # of Respondents		212

Other, please describe
1% raise for equity concerns.
3% raise voted by the university's board of trustees
All clinical faculty (including LRW) received raises, although the amount varied. Doctrinal faculty did not receive raises beyond the normal cost-of-living raise, which we get every year.
Award & longevity pay
Dean's initiative to "enhance the base salaries of [the] non-tenure-track faculty.
Equity raise
General raise for all law faculty
Hired a new person and my salary went up for parity.
Hired into an associate teaching professor position from a visiting lecturer position.
I went from a non-permanent position to a permanent, professor of practice position
One time raise at university
Parity raise
Promotion from assistant to associate professor
Retention increase
Retention offer
Salary equalization raises
Salary study
Standard university-wide raise
Uniform raise
Uniform raise for all faculty, LRW and non-LRW, by legislature
Uniform raise that was the same percentage for LRW and other faculty.
Uniform raises for LRW faculty that made the teaching package similar to non-LRW - base course (LRW) plus two upper level courses per year.
Union contract raise
Union contract was negotiated resulting in back pay that was added to base pay; LRW salaries were also adjusted to achieve "equity" based on years of service to the law school
Union negotiated increases
Union raise and non-uniform LRW raises
University-wide salary increase for certain underpaid employees
University's new contract with the state of [omitted]

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	100.0%	1
I don't know how the decrease was determined.	0.0%	0
Other; please describe	0.0%	0
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	100%	1

Part M. Hot Topics—Generative AI

Respondents were advised that “The following set of ‘hot topics’ questions is intended to explore whether and how legal writing professors are incorporating generative AI tools in their courses. For the purposes of these questions, ‘generative AI’ is defined as a category of artificial intelligence focused on creating original content, such as text, images, or audio, based on patterns learned from existing data. At the time this survey was conducted, prominent generative AI tools include but of course are not limited to ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Claude, Llama, Microsoft Copilot, and Lexis+ AI. The Survey Committee is well aware that the availability and technical capabilities of such tools are expanding rapidly, and we are not asking respondents to forecast how generative AI will continue to develop. Unless otherwise indicated, please answer the following questions based on your current use of generative AI tools in your courses in the 2023-2024 Academic Year.”

Question HT1 - Do you, your law school or affiliated university, or your LRW Program have a policy that explicitly addresses student use of generative AI, as opposed to general policies about academic integrity and plagiarism that do not explicitly address that topic? Select all that apply.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Yes, the affiliated university has a policy	16%	50
Yes, the LRW Program has a policy	34%	107
Yes, my law school has a policy	35%	111
Yes, I have a policy	52%	162
No, there is no policy from any source	10%	30
I don't know	3%	10
Total		313

Question HT2 - Do you allow students to use generative AI tools for the following purposes in your first-year courses?⁵³

	Yes for all assignments in the course		Yes for at least one assignment in the course		Never		Total
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Preparing written assignments	7%	19	27%	75	66%	186	280
Conducting legal research	18%	48	34%	92	49%	133	273
Any other class purposes (please explain)	12%	21	26%	45	63%	110	176

⁵³ This question was displayed to all respondents who selected “first-year” for one or more of the courses listed in Q6.5.

Other, please explain ⁵⁴	
AI ethics instruction assignment	Introduce it and how it works
Any and all; but must be DISCLOSED	Learning course material in LRW and other courses
Brainstorming, outlining ideas, etc.	Learning how to use AI
Case briefing/summaries	Lexis rep showed students how to search but also gave cautions.
Citation	Non-graded exercises
Class exercises	Not for drafting written work
Comparison	One assignment required students to use AI and critique it.
Contract drafting (2 responses)	Only with express permission
Editing (2 responses)	Our policy will be changing.
Editing and revising	Planning a work project and editing/revising
Editing exercises, “blank page” exercises	Playing around!
Editing grammar and sentence structure in assignments.	Preparing for oral argument
Exercises to teach about how to use AI	Professors are allowed to use AI for an in class summary of the argument assignment
Exploring its capabilities and limitations	Research exercise
For in-class exercises we allow the use of generative AI	Students can use Lexis AI and Chat GPT during in class exercises; but not for graded assignments
For in-class use and demonstration	Students critiqued an Email memo that they generated using AI
For revising writing; for oral presentation skills coaching	Students must fill out a certificate of how the AI was used
For ungraded in-class assignments	They can use it for editing but not content generation.
Generating letters	They can use it to check grammar.
Grammar Checker	This past year I did not permit their use for assignments for me at all but did permit/use them in-class for exercises.
Grammarly	To critique an AI generated statement of facts
I allow students to use genAI for anything so long as they disclose that to me.	Transactional skills contract drafting/revising exercise
I allow the use of GAI to explore search terms intended for use in computer research, but that is all.	Using it to help revise and edit assignments in the second half of the class
I allow them to use it during in-class exercises like theme development, etc.	We completed an inclass demonstration and they were allowed to use AI on only one specific section of a written assignment.
I assume that normal use of traditional Lexis and Westlaw tools is not “AI”	We did an in-class exercise using ChatGPT related to the closed memo to show the limits of AI
I did not allow generative AI for marked assignments. I had one week where students used generative AI to redo a previous	We do incorporate some in-class work with Gen AI so students get experience with it.

⁵⁴ As noted earlier, for many text response tables in this report, the Committee has consolidated identical responses, and, when needed, lightly edited certain responses for obvious typos. Otherwise, for this and other Hot Topics questions that ask for open-ended responses, we have with very limited exceptions included every response in its entirety because each response represents that respondent’s individual experience. The exceptions: We have on occasion edited or omitted responses if we thought they might personally identify a respondent or were non-responsive to the question.

assignment. This was so students could compare generative AI to their own work and get practice using those tools.	
I required students to disclose use of AI	We have used generative AI intermittently throughout the year to complete in-class exercises.
Idea generation	We incorporate GAI results into our teaching materials
Idea generator in second semester	We used demos for both research and writing this year, but the students did not use these tools in their assignments.
If explicitly allowed for an in-class exercise	We used for in-class exercise
In class assignments (2 responses)	Using it to help revise and edit assignments in the second half of the class
In class exercises (2 responses)	We completed an in class demonstration and they were allowed to use AI on only one specific section of a written assignment.
In-class exercise on AI	

Question HT3 - Do you allow students to use generative AI tools for the following purposes in your upper-level courses?⁵⁵

	Yes for all assignments in the course		Yes for at least one assignment in the course		Never		Total
	16%	19	20%	23	64%	74	
Preparing written assignments	16%	19	20%	23	64%	74	116
Conducting legal research	28%	33	19%	22	53%	61	116
Any other class purposes (please explain)	14%	10	15%	11	72%	53	74

Other, please explain	
An in-class activity	In-class discussion of tools
Any and all; must be DISCLOSED	Lexis rep showed students how to use it but gave them cautions
Brainstorming, outlining, etc.	N/a because it was a bar prep course
Brainstorming, outlining, oral argument prep	Need to consider how to incorporate
Doesn't really apply because of the class format	Not sure where to put this - but students may use generative AI for brainstorming purposes, but not for drafting actual language or performing actual research
During the contract drafting part of the course, students must research contract "samples" that they could use as a starting point for their own contract. During this exercise, students are not prohibited from using AI tools to find these samples.	Preparing for oral argument
Editing grammar and sentence structure in assignments.	There is no research on this class
For learning how to use AI	We did an in-class exercise that demonstrated using AI for a client letter
Idea generation	We do incorporate some in-class work with Gen AI so students get experience with it.
In class exercises (3 responses)	

⁵⁵ This question was displayed to all respondents who selected "upper-level" for one or more of the courses listed in Q6.5. Page | 135

Question HT4 - For what purposes do you allow students to use generative AI tools in preparing written assignments? Select all that apply.⁵⁶

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Brainstorming	77%	84
Drafting	53%	58
Editing	69%	75
Identifying templates for particular types of documents	44%	48
Other (please explain)	14%	15
Outlining	58%	63
Researching (whether legal or otherwise)	72%	78
Summarizing	44%	48
Total Responses		109

Other, please explain	
AI is only allowed in the spring semester, after we teach students how to use it.	Proofreading
Any and all purposes; must be DISCLOSED	Refining language (e.g., tone, style)
Drafting a legal standard.	Revising language
Editing and proofreading for tone and mechanics	Seeing how AI does NOT work!
Grammar help	There are specific assignments that must incorporate using AI, otherwise it is not allowed. It is not allowed unless specifically stated in the assignment.
I permitted use of AI if the student independently verified the results with traditional legal sources	With a big caveat that AI will not, at this point, generate a passing brief in my class
Only for the contract drafting assignment last year	

⁵⁶ This question was displayed to all respondents who selected “Yes for all assignments” or “Yes for at least one assignment” for the “preparing written assignments” option in either HT2 or HT3.

Question HT5 - For what purposes do you allow students to use generative AI tools in conducting legal research? Select all that apply.⁵⁷

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Identifying general legal principles	82%	124
Identifying sample documents such as memos or briefs	36%	54
Identifying specific legal authorities	69%	104
Other (please explain)	13%	20
Summarizing specific materials	48%	72
Total Responses		151

Other, please explain	
Answering a series of questions	It is used to analyze prompts, re-draft clauses, and for demonstration of the tools.
Any	Legal research training
Anything and everything; so long as the use is DISCLOSED	Librarians teach research within the LW program. They do teach use or AI
But always with warnings about inaccuracies in AI and that they were responsible for their work product.	No restrictions
For any purpose with the caveats above	They are allowed to use it to identify specific legal authorities, but they are required to check those authorities in a legal database to ensure they are real and accurately represented
I don't	To evaluate the results and learn that Gen AI tools are not reliable research tools.
I would do all of the above, but only if the type of GenAI was Lexis + AI; I would only allow the last use with a general GenAI such as ChatGPT	Unknown
It is introduced as a tool with the appropriate caveats	With a big caveat that AI often generates lies or extremely unhelpful sources and will likely waste your time rather than help you.

⁵⁷ This question was displayed to all respondents who selected “Yes for all assignments” or “Yes for at least one assignment” for the “conducting legal research” option in either HT2 or HT3.

Question HT6 - Have you used generative AI tools for your own purposes in teaching your courses?

	Yes, frequently		Yes, sometimes		Yes, once or twice		Never		Total
Preparing teaching materials for class such as syllabi, course policies, class notes, or slides	3%	9	9%	29	18%	56	69%	213	307
Creating or revising class exercises and assignments	4%	12	10%	30	23%	71	63%	194	307
Grading or evaluating student work	<1%	1	1%	3	2%	6	97%	296	306
Other (please explain)	4%	6	12%	18	8%	12	76%	115	151

Other, please explain	
Checking research	I run exam questions through it; seek sample answers from it; generate course images using Dall-E
Classroom demonstrations, such as drafting a memo, brief, or contract -- or a section/piece, to show the potential and limitations of AI and to familiarize students with AI	I use Westlaw AI filters in research for assignments
Created images for slides (2 responses)	Investigating how it works
Creating examples or alternative explanations	Letters of recommendation (3 responses)
Creating in class exercises	Only to create images for exercises
Creating rubrics	Only used these tools for creating the demos for students about these tools.
Creating samples for students to evaluate; experimenting with prompts related to our assignment or other hypotheticals	Preparing problems and the background materials for problems.
Creating the course problem	Preparing random admin memos
Demonstrating how well it summarizes the law	Research
Determining how it might be used by students on an assignment	Responding to reflections -- ungraded
Drafting emails	Running experiments to see what AI comes up with and analyzing how I can incorporate it in the future; Starter doc for Moot Court student's appellate brief checklists
Editing grammar and sentence structure in assignments.	To evaluate AI responses to previously created assignments
For the in-class exercises described above (to prepare for them)	To prepare for the class discussions of the exercises that I permitted them to use AI on
Generating a graphic for an assignment	Used to generate materials for an escape room
Generating lists for advice, sample documents	Warning students about the dangers posed by AI to human dignity and the threat AI poses in an age of late capitalism
Helping me code google sheets/excel for rubric creation	We discuss and use examples in our teaching materials, but don't use GAI to create those materials
I did not teach this year.	

Question HT7 - What concerns do you have about using generative AI tools in your courses? Select all that apply.

	% of Total Responses	Responses
Academic integrity / Plagiarism	80%	249
Accuracy of results / Hallucinations	86%	268
Bias	61%	190
Concerns external to the academic setting such as energy usage or environmental impact of AI	11%	34
Confidentiality	42%	132
Cost and accessibility	35%	108
Lack of time or space in the curriculum to incorporate another topic in the course	55%	173
Negative impact on students' development of legal writing and related skills	86%	270
None	1%	3
Other (please explain)	5%	16
Personal concerns about your ability to develop the technical skills needed to teach AI effectively	39%	123
Rapid development makes it difficult to ensure teaching about AI isn't outdated	58%	180
Steep learning curve for you and/or your students	31%	96
Whether employers will allow students to use these tools in practice	37%	115
Total Responses		313

Other, please explain	
AI is incredibly dangerous; it represents a crushing of human dignity and a domination of our society by big tech	Mainly concerned about students learning foundational skills to be able to later assess usefulness/accuracy of AI generated work
By far the largest concern is the negative impact on skill development. Chicken and egg problem: How to develop their ability to critically assess and revise AI generated work without them having experience writing and revising work themselves in the first place.	Privacy for students who are required to open accounts to use tools for their assignments.
Ensuring students can successfully tackle bar exam	Some students do not want to put the program on their computer/tablet
General interest and concern: for the assignments I give generative AI cannot even create passing responses. I'm	Students crave certainty and AI is constantly changing, balancing that can be tough

exceedingly not concerned about student over-use.	
I am concerned that employers and clients will REQUIRE/EXPECT it, and so students must learn to do it	Students do not have enough time to learn how to use the tool effectively. Most do not use it well even if allowed.
I don't want poor students to see it as a cheat or a lift. It is not. It can be helpful, but only if you first know what you are doing.	Takes longer to edit AI responses than to create them myself.
I worry about law becoming stale, since AI = recycled knowledge. Sometimes a case is useful to a client due to one vital sentence. Will AI catch that vital sentence?	Whether AI is improperly accessing copyrighted materials
In general, I don't think we know anything about how the use of AI will affect student development. As a former copy editor, I know that editing can be a powerful way to learn to write - but we're not yet doing anything to use AI to harness that.	

Question HT8 - What benefits or perceived opportunities, if any, have you identified for you and/or your students from using generative AI in your courses? Please use as much space as you wish to explain.

-An easy way to get started -practice for evaluating accuracy and reliability of sources
1. Students are more prepared for the practice of law because more legal employers are using AI. 2. AI can help students write better. 3. AI can help students research with AI being another tool in the research toolkit.
A potential benefit I see, but have not experimented with it in class, primarily relates to Lexis AI. I've noticed students over the past several years lack basic research skills. The conversational style of Lexis AI may be beneficial to students who struggle with research. However, I am not sold on its ability to generate acceptable documents.
AI's best use, in my opinion, is as a conversation partner. Perhaps that is the same as saying brainstorming. It's a way to get started; a way to examine where you are; a way to generate ideas. It's also way better at grammar and punctuation than almost any law student, and man am I sick of fixing commas. Let GAI do it. That's how it will work in practice.
Awareness
Being able to use AI if their employers expect them to know how to use it.
Being ready to use the tools effectively if their future employers want them to use it.
Benefits - it is an enhanced research tool - much like putting in key word phrases as a search term.
Benefits: efficiencies gained for lawyers and money saved for clients.
Better grammar.
Brainstorming ideas, starting the writing process, organizing research, examples of themes for your prompt.
Brainstorming partner; grammar checker; project management
Creating materials for LRW problems is much more efficient with the help of Generative AI. It also provides many ideas for in-class exercises, which helps prevent my lesson plans from feeling stale.
Development of a new skill
Editing and formatting; possibly assignment or model answer or revision exercise generation
Editing is one of the most powerful methods I know for learning how to write. If the editor is held to a very high standard (higher than would be imposed for the original writing, which is only logical), the editor must know MORE about how to write than the original writer. Using AI could offer the opportunity to prod students into learning more than they do simply writing. I am unsure how my colleagues will respond if I start permitting it in our 1L writing course, but I'm sure some are already using it whether they admit it or not.
Efficiency
Efficiency in preparing work product long term (though short term as 1L students I am not sure it saves time because of their lack of expertise and time required to develop an effective set of prompts and to effectively revise the work). More opportunities for critique and revision exercises and easier to generate them as a faculty member which I view as critical skills both for student learning and for lawyers in practice.
Efficiency on basic assignments

Efficiency, helps with combatting writer's block
Efficiency, if used well. Leveling playing field for students for whom English is a second language. Preparing them for practice in a legal world that will increasingly rely on Gen AI tools.
Efficiency, modeling effective writing mechanics, research
Employers expect them to use it, so students feel more ready to enter practice. They can get a sense of forms of common documents faster than using formbooks.
For myself, the main benefit has been to use AI as a way to get started on a project. I frequently speak to audiences outside the US on topics in US law. I use the AI to brainstorm a general structure for a talk. Although I usually go off in a different direction, having the AI available for brainstorming is really helpful.
For the tasks that it accomplishes accurately, AI is incredibly efficient and creates time and cost savings in practice. My sense is that law firms and employers would grasp the cost savings and encourage attorneys to incorporate some GAI to reduce costs to clients so attorneys can spend more time on more complex tasks.
For the upcoming academic year, I plan to incorporate editing activities based on AI responses to legal questions. My sense is that the future of LRW will in part be to teach students editing that involve the same critical thinking and analysis skills that are taught as part of the writing process.
GAI has saved me a lot of time in drafting materials for my course. My students have seen how it can save time doing tasks like drafting motions for extension of time, summarizing a case, finding specific references in a deposition transcript, drafting an email response, drafting a settlement agreement, etc.
Generating new ideas/getting outside your own tunnel vision/learning to phrase a question or prompt accurately and precisely
Generative AI can help make students (future attorneys) more efficient and focused.
Generative AI is a great tool for learning, for assisting with academic support. It is passable right now for getting partial drafts of actual writing projects, although it is much better at generating smaller, more contained works, e.g., sections, or a few paragraphs, or a limited number of contract clauses, than full drafts of memos or briefs. I can't say I have observed that much interest in students about learning generative AI techniques. Most are either not interested, don't want to stretch to learn something new and complicated, or think it is not worth their time or effort. Some students probably are gun shy because there are professors who hate AI and ban it, so students use that as an excuse not to practice with it let alone master it.
Generative AI is here to stay, and legal academia does its students a disservice by not teaching core competencies, pitfalls, and benefits for these tools. I see multiple opportunities for my 1L LRW courses, both now and in the future: (1) using GAI as a "personal tutor" to learn editing and proofreading concepts and rules (not just to make these changes), allowing now; (2) expediting finding basic transactional precedents in appropriate circumstances (understanding every form---whether GAI generated or otherwise---must be tailored), allowing next year; (3) helping understand the underlying concepts we teach, e.g., CR[e]AC structure, persuasive value, and more (although with the caveat that they must check GAI recommendations and explanations against course content), allowing next year. Because I teach 1Ls, I restrict use beyond these (please see below).
Generative AI isn't going away, and the learning curve becomes exponentially steeper as time passes. Lawyers are embracing these tools, and students have to have a baseline of AI literacy so they understand how they can and CAN'T use them ethically. By using them from the very beginning of their legal education, we can incorporate them into the teaching and learning of legal analysis so that students don't learn legal analysis one year, generative AI the next, and think mistakenly that one is a substitute for the other.
Generative AI tools can be effective, additional, research tools. Greater access to data with a process that's more user friendly.
Good for short in class exercises to find research answers to a limited question.
Good place to begin and end.

Grammar has improved
Having these skills may give our students employment advantages.
Help with grammar and punctuation. Brainstorming. Summarizing information.
Helping students develop technological competency.
Honestly, none so far.
I am planning to do more training this summer and adopt some exercises for use next year. I am behind on this.
I assume we will incorporate Lexis AI+ and Westlaw's generative AI into assignments. But for now they aren't that useful. We have mostly decided to prioritize teaching the skills that students would need to evaluate generative AI output.
I believe at the current stage of development, AI can be efficient in doing very targeted short research and drafting assignments. Students should be familiar with how to use AI, with what AI can do well, with the limits on AI, and with the ethical and practical problems that can result from the wrong use of AI.
I believe students entering practice will need to know about generative AI in the next one to two years; accordingly, it is my responsibility to learn HOW to teach generative AI in the classroom, and what specific skills employers will expect my students to know. For this reason, cooperation between the academy and bench and bar is more important now than ever.
I believe that lawyers (and their clients) will be using AI heavily in the future, so students should gain experience with using AI in the legal classroom.
I believe this a tool that students will be expected to use in practice and should be proficient in. Many students were afraid of the risk of plagiarism, and so had not previously experimented with it.
I do perceive a benefit to using GAI in upper-level courses. These benefits are simply directly at allowing them to explore the different potential uses for GAI while in school so they can take these skills into the practice of law. Some courses are more suited to these benefits than others.
I don't have a firm grasp of this yet after just using AI for one semester.
I encourage the use of generative AI tools for research and teach students to regard them as secondary sources which must be validated. Students will be using these tools in practice and it will only be of benefit to use these tools efficiently and ethically. For me, generative AI tools have been very helpful in helping me create problems and fact patterns.
I have been told by students that generative AI was helpful for them in three contexts: (1) in getting something on the page to prevent blank-page paralysis, (2) in putting complex legal rules into "plain language" for a lay-person audience, and (3) identifying and explaining grammar and punctuation errors in student drafts.
I have found it helpful when I know something about a legal topic. I have not found it to be that much more helpful when I do not have prior knowledge about a topic.
I have not evaluated the assignment yet.
I have not used generative AI in my courses, but I have used it to create a new website for the Lawyering Program, and I use it to generate first drafts of recommendation letters. I can see AI fixing language problems that L2 students have, although there are already tools out there that can do this with fewer of the confidentiality problems of AI.
I have used AI to demonstrate to my students that all though it can be a great tool, you must learn the foundational skills on your own to ensure the accuracy of the information you are receiving.
I have used generative AI to create opportunities for students to critique bad drafts. The exercise was explicitly designed to show them the limitations of generative AI, and also to spark a wider discussion of what makes for good, clear, organized analysis and writing.
I have yet to allow students to use AI in my course. I plan to do so next year. My biggest concern is overreliance and misuse of generative AI.
I haven't identified any. I don't think AI has reached a point where it is beneficial to legal writers.

I haven't used it, but plan to in the new year.
I haven't found any major benefits yet, other than that students are becoming more aware of the potential problems with using AI.
I just started introducing generative AI resources to my students. I do not have sufficient information related to this question yet.
I love AI's potential for contract drafting. It drafts in clearer language, generally, than most lawyers do. And with rudimentary prompts, it organizes better than lawyers do. Alas, it's been rubbish (so far) for memos and briefs -- less helpful than I'd hoped it would be.
I require my students to report their GenAI use, identifying the prompts they used, so that I can tailor my feedback on their work by taking into account the effectiveness of their use of this tool. Thus far, none of my students have reported using it (and I trust their honesty in reporting).
I think AI can be very useful for students: in helping them get started on a project, as a sounding board, to help students who English is not their first language or problems processing information, such as dyslexia, and training them for what will become the new norm.
I think it can be useful once you have the knowledge to judge whether the results are accurate. You also need to know HOW to use it to secure accurate results.
I think it could be a helpful editing tool, but I worry students will rely on it too much.
I think it is a great study aid for students just learning basic legal concepts. It is very helpful in outlining and organizing ideas. It can help students make connections among concepts. It is a great one-on-one instructor, with endless patience, for some things (e.g., coding, word processor troubleshooting). It helps students brainstorm potential arguments, adjust tone and style of language, and correct specific writing errors.
I think it is important to respond to what students are going to be expected to do in practice and in their summer jobs.
I think it will be especially helpful to my ESL students -- no need to waste time on when to use a determiner etc. Also may be good as an "Am I in the right neighborhood on this issue?" for all students.
I think it will be important for students to use this and adapt in the workplace if their employer wants them to use it. It can save time and money. I have already heard students say their employers want them to use it.
I think lawyers have an obligation to stay abreast of current technology, and that GenAI is likely to reshape the profession in many ways, so I am glad to have introduced the technology to my students. I do not think that in its current form GenAI has improved my students' abilities to produce quality work. My objective at the moment is simply to have exposed my students to the technology and given them some sense of its possibilities and weaknesses.
I think that AI skills are going to become increasingly important and that we need to make sure our students get exposed to AI tools and gain at least a little familiarity with what they can (and *cannot*--yet) do.
I think that generative AI can be useful for editing or suggestions to get them past the blank page, and I think it's something that they'll use in practice. In advanced classes like contract drafting, it can be very useful.
I think that some writers can benefit from using generative AI to fix errors in grammar, usage, and style or to quickly generate textual demonstrations of various grammar/usage/style phenomena that they don't understand or can't easily recognize. (E.g., a student who cannot easily recognize passive voice constructions can use generative AI to quickly generate sentences written in either active voice or passive voice.) I think that tools like Lexis+ AI often help EXPERIENCED researchers quickly locate some of the key sources relevant to a legal question. However, I have not seen (either in a demonstration or in my own experimentation with generative AI) a generative AI tool that can produce research results that are equal in quality to the results that an experienced researcher can produce by doing their own work. And I have not seen a generative AI tool whose drafting function can generate comprehensive or accurate implicit or synthesized rules as part of its content. After my students completed a major writing assignment, I showed them a version of the same assignment completed by ChatGPT. It was valuable in the sense that the students could see that Chat GPT constructed sentences with many of the right words, but the substance was not always accurate or

comprehensive.
I use AI to write letters of recommendation.
I use generative AI tools to create art to illustrate my class slides. I am able to have the computer draw colorful cartoon images about our class problem, for example.
I use it all the time for PPT images and they are a big hit. It is also helpful to run the problem through AI.
I want to convey to the students the benefits of AI but also the limitations. The benefit is in getting started on an assignment, such as a client letter, when you don't know how to start, for example. We have discussed firms starting to use this as a cost-saver for certain limited uses.
I would think it's generally better to be prepared to use the newest technology.
If a CREDIBLE source, it allows speed to comb through countless sources to provide raw (but relevant) data for students' skeptical assessment and insight.
If I could limit them to using it just as a research tool, I think it would be valuable to expose them to it. But I don't want to open a Pandora's box that would lead to plagiarism issues.
If the user knows what to look for and how to critically assess results, AI will save a ton of time in getting started on legal research and writing project. The thing is, I don't think 1Ls know what to look for or how to critically assess results. The upper-level students may be only slightly better at it.
If, as seems likely, legal professionals will be using some form of generative AI in practice, we should be aware of the available tools and able to use them responsibly.
Increased speed of work completion; discovering perspectives or sources that would otherwise be overlooked.
Increases speed of legal research; results in more polished legal writing; assists with crafting rule statements from multiple sources.
Introducing it instead of avoiding it- students don't know much more than we do so when we use it a little bit in class, it gives them more agency in how to use it as support and to supplement, not as a substitute. They are learning how it is not always right, the limitations, imperfections. This helps them become better decision-makers. I would also rather they make mistakes in a class/learning environment so they can learn from it.
Is and will continue to be incorporated into the legal profession, and we are currently discussing if, when, and how we might include this, but to date, especially considering the rapidity of change, it has been difficult to find a consensus.
It can be a great time-saver. However, for first year students specifically, I strongly believe they need to develop their analytical abilities and successfully convey their full thought process on the page before learning how to use the shortcuts generative AI can provide. My experience is that students lack the attention to detail necessary to successfully employ generative AI.
It can generate ideas and writing really quickly.
It can help students who lack certain grammar skills with editing their work.
It can help with research.
It can jump start the writing process and help with writer's block.
It fills a gap for students who do not have a legal background in providing templates. It is another tool in thinking about how to approach any problem
It is a good place to start. It must be checked but can begin your research, not end it. Does not replace legal analysis.
It is always a positive to teach students about emerging technology that will affect their practice in the future.
It seems to be useful in contract drafting, at least to get a start at some terms. It can also provide a very very high-level discussion of a topic, like "What is an adverse employment action under discrimination law?" But when you get more detailed, it is not helpful. It has also been helpful for some sentence-level clarity and flow improvements. Students who struggle with basic writing flow or grammar, some of their sentences can benefit from AI.

It seems to be useful in helping students develop a writing plan or generating ideas for working through writer's block. It also seems to be useful in editing or revising discrete sections of a memo or brief.
It will likely speed up finding a good starting point for research.
It's a competence that they will need to learn to perform their legal jobs. It can help students be mindful of the possible pitfalls, including ethical issues.
It's already here, so students and faculty should at least be familiar with it. I'll likely add some type of coverage next semester.
Lexis' AI seems to be a helpful starting place for research. Employers will expect that students will be able to utilize such tools in practice. If done correctly, AI can lead to more efficient, timely-completed projects.
Many firms and other employers now require attorneys to use some AI tools in preliminary drafting. I have used it to check my own work. For example, I'll generate an assignment or policy and then see what AI gives me to see if there's anything I want to add or tweak.
May be helpful for summer internships
N/A (3 responses)
None (3 responses)
None - it hasn't entered into the conversation.
None really. I have found Gen AI to be pretty unhelpful for the basic research and writing skills I'm trying to impart on my 1Ls.
None so far. I do not think most generative AI platforms are helpful tools to introduce to 1Ls. They don't know enough to be able to accurately assess the value of the results.
None, really. I think that is to come in the (perhaps near) future, but at this point my focus is on teaching the students the fundamental legal research and writing skills so that, as AI technologies in the legal arena develop, students are able to evaluate them.
None. I don't want to incorporate these tools at all. They seem not helpful to the legal field or society as a whole.
Not enough experience yet to see benefits.
Overcoming writer's block, evaluating a generated text, comparing AI-generated format to lawyer-generated format (e.g CREAC paradigm), employers will expect new generation of graduates to be adept at using it, research tool (e.g. Lexis AI, not chat GPT), crafting good questions.
Potential for increased efficiency at the initial steps of research.
Practice with prompts; Exposure to the risks; Learning what the tool can and cannot do (well)
Presently useful as a brainstorming tool and a summarizing tool. Lexis+ AI is minimally helpful as a research tool.
Research tools work much like secondary sources and may initially be easier for students to navigate. Memo drafting tools do a nice job with the organization of legal analysis.
Research, source-checking
Spotting and correcting specific writing deficiencies (such as passive voice); summarizing materials; generating sample oral argument questions.
Still figuring it out. For me, I used AI to help generate exam questions (essay prompts) for a summer seminar that I taught. I hate writing exam questions, and the AI tool was a useful tool for coming up with ideas. I ended up discarding most of the suggested questions. But using the tool to further refine a few of the questions, I was able to come up with 5 or 6 good questions, which was all I needed. My students were given an overview of Lexis's AI tools during online research training, which was led by one of my librarian colleagues. The training was mostly about the limits of AI in generating accurate research results. I did not find the results that were generated for my assignments to be useful, so the research training (which also covered other topics) was to inform

my students that AI-assisted research is not yet a reliable shortcut.
Students have seen the limitations of AI and the cautionary use of trusting its results
Students like the conversational nature of the research tools but, thus far, most students agree AI research is worse than the regular search algorithms.
Students must learn to complete tasks accurately; quickly; and cheaply - in that order. Becoming competent and professionally responsible in the use of these tools is essential.
Students ought to know what Chat GPT and AI are, and the dangers they pose regarding hallucinations and bias. They also need to think about a day when AI is used for judging and the inherent class based bias in the development of AI as well as the risks to our society posed by rapid, uncritical adoption of AI.
Students recognize and appreciate, I think, us being transparent and aiming to engage with the very new technology and integrate it into the curriculum. The problem is time/space - to really do Gen AI well, we'd want several classes, exercises, assignments, etc. - and at that stage one wonders if it might detract from other fundamentals.
The availability of Lexis+AI forces students to think about their writing in a different way because they realize that their judgment and experience--rather than text-generation-- is the value they can add. They will need to develop judgment regarding what to ask AI to do and how to verify and edit AI results.
The biggest benefit right now is to provide a general overview of law, including the elements of the cause of action. It writes the umbrella paragraph decently. It also helps students to edit their work. We are now using it to help brainstorm new memo and brief problems.
The large language models are quite good at writing--often better than my students. I really have no problem with students using genAI for writing.
The product of AI is often good for generating ideas. The product is also good to show the flaws of AI in relation to either the prompt given, or the accuracy/comprehensiveness of the results. Most of my students are hesitant to use AI and do not use it effectively.
The students who use it appropriately have turned in "cleaner" work (less grammatical errors, etc.). The students who used it to start their research were able to quickly find on-point secondary sources, which aided greatly in their understanding of the problem.
There are a lot of practice areas post-law school where these tools will be valuable. Conducting extensive discovery, for example, will be sped up incredibly by tools that can skim and summarize a full email inbox in minutes. But my LRW colleagues and I have struggled mightily to find ways to use Generative AI in the classroom that live up to the hype, and at every turn we were disappointed. A year ago we thought these were fascinating tools that could help with legal drafting. A year later they are still producing garbage that takes more time to rewrite than they're worth for anything longer than a page.
There is a benefit from a legal research standpoint. It can make legal research easier because it gives students a solid starting point. It is also nice for them to get templates of client letters or emails.
They will be using it in the future. They should get familiar with it - both its benefits and its detriments. They should learn not to trust it - especially because the problems of hallucinations are not going away. They should understand where it can be helpful. AI is wonderful, right now, at summarizing a document and eliminating wordiness. They should understand where it could get them in trouble - hallucinations, poor legal reasoning, and inability, at this point, to make cogent legal arguments based on the facts of precedent cases.
This is a new tool that students will need to learn to use.
This is something we have no choice but to teach, recognizing that our students will go to vastly different places - some law firms have embraced everything that text generators can do, and others haven't touched it and don't plan to.
This is the direction the legal field is headed, so we need to begin to integrate AI strategically into our instruction; I just do not personally have any experience with AI and would need to be trained myself before I could help train students to use it accurately, while still ensuring that they are learning the necessary legal analytical skills.

To prepare for what they may encounter in practice
Too busy with teaching skills overload to devote time to contemplate this.
Using AI has allowed students to see that the reasons they understand when the results are bad is because they've developed "lawyer intelligence."
Very useful for filling out fact patterns with additional materials, such as documents and deposition transcript excerpts
We had students critique numerous examples of GenAI-generated work. Review of various types of samples helped students master fundamental lawyering skills, identify tasks for which tools are better (or worse) suited, and practice critique/editing skills.
We need to prepare them for what the practice will be when they graduate and AI is here to stay.
We work to teach students how to use AI effectively and to be aware of the downsides of AI especially with regard to the law. Students can use AI to help them become better writers if it is used effectively. But before students can use AI effectively, they need to know what good legal writing is, and how to do it.
What benefits or perceived opportunities, if any, have you identified for you and/or your students from using generative AI in your courses? Please use as much space as you wish to explain.
Writing a first draft of anything is daunting. If AI can get nervous writers over that hump, then great. I tell my students to dictate, diagram, free write their first drafts just to get something on the page. All first drafts are junk anyway. So I see AI as just another tool for that. There's utility to rewriting a junky AI draft because it will engage the critical thinking processes. At least I hope so. That's how I plan to teach it (and use it for my own writing, tbh).
Z-E-R-O

Question HT9 - To the extent not already covered above, please feel free to provide any further comments about the use of generative AI in your courses, such as your observations about any notable successes or failures in incorporating these tools, or different approaches you follow based on whether your students are 1Ls or upper-level. If you would like to describe any policies in place in your courses or school about student use of generative AI, please do so here. Please use as much space as you wish to explain.

1. A survey of my students indicated most found AI either somewhat helpful or very helpful when editing their legal writing assignment.

As concerning as AI is to the legal writing community, I don't think a ban is a good idea. Students need to understand the limitations and possible uses so they need to work with it and learn how to use it early

Because I teach 1L LRW courses, I restrict its use (either this academic year or next) to the above areas. This year, only a small percentage of students used GAI tools, which I'd restricted to use only a tutor of editing and proofreading in their drafts. To use a GAI tool, students had to complete prerequisites and certify their completion. First, they had to view a flipped lecture that explained how GAI tool work; what they are and aren't good at; what ethical, professional, and practical considerations or concerns exist with their use; and how to generate effective prompts (basic prompt-engineering). Second, they had to view a recording of my demonstrating how to use a GAI tool for the limited purposes I allowed: editing and proofreading. In this regard, I required more than simply running their draft text through the tool: instead, they were limited to a single paragraph max, and they had to iterate with the tool to follow up on any concepts that they didn't understand, e.g., passive voice, thesis sentences, etc. That is, they were required to use the tool as a kind of personalized tutor for editing. After using a GAI tool, students had to include a brief reflection at the assignment's end, on which tool they used, how they used it, and whether it was effective. I restricted the use of these tools to editing and proofreading this year because I wanted to ensure students embedded core legal-writing concepts in long-term memory, creating neural pathways through struggling through the skills without the aid of a GAI tool. I believe this is needed for 1Ls, for whom legal writing is completely new. The few students who used a GAI tool recounted that it was helpful in litigation writing for editing and proofreading. The one who used it for editing/proofreading in our transactional drafting found it not to be useful because, given how these tools work, it kept suggesting overly formal language (we use plain-English drafting).

Class experiments with AI indicate its results are not accurate or reliable but students may lack the knowledge and experience to realize that.

During the 2023-2024 school year, my program prohibited students from using generative AI to assist with the drafting of their legal writing assignments. I continue to have strong concerns about incorporating generative AI in the first-year legal writing courses at my school. I am not "anti-AI," but I think that AI is a tool best wielded by people who are already skilled at evaluating the accuracy and quality of the product the AI generates. And even after a year of researching AI, experimenting with it myself, and seeing demonstrations from vendors, I remain convinced that the best way to build those evaluative skills (i.e., fundamental reading, analysis, and writing skills) is in an environment that is mostly free of generative-AI crutches. Sometimes, the conversations around generative AI seem to treat time spent conducting legal research as "wasted" time that could be spent doing something else. But in my experience as a student and professor, key advancement in research, reading, and analysis skills often occurs in the long hours spent outside of class, reading through and selecting sources for open-research assignments. I also find the demonstrations from Westlaw and Lexis vendors frustrating, because they are often quick and superficial, and they seem to focus more on highlighting bells and whistles than on providing concrete evidence/examples of how these tools can actually help students learn or build skills. Additionally, I worry that students at my school will become overly dependent on AI tools, the way that they are already overly dependent

on products that will generate case briefs for them. Many of the students who graduate from my school pursue careers in public interest law. And as long as Lexis and Westlaw plan to charge additional fees for legal organizations' use of their AI tools, many of the local public-interest employers might choose not to pay for their employees to have access to those tools. I expect that in a few years, law professors (including many LRW professors) will have developed effective strategies for incorporating generative AI tools into courses designed to help new law students build fundamental skills, and they will also conduct studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of these strategies. But it doesn't seem like legal education is there yet, and I am reluctant to incorporate generative AI use into the already-jam-packed syllabus of my course before effective (and data-backed) strategies are in place. Lastly, although no one designed it to be this way, I find it unfortunate that generative AI tools have come on the scene before most of us had a chance to recover from the burnout we experienced while teaching through the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. We were called upon to adapt and innovate at a moment's notice, for a period of over a year, and many (maybe most!) of us did! But we did it while suffering a lot of stress, fatigue, and loss, and we are still tired and healing. Those of us who thrive when tackling the challenges of the unknown are likely thriving in the first year of the generative AI era. But we should also recognize generative AI as a significant work-related stressor.

First, our faculty has not yet even begun to discuss a policy re: AI. Second, even if we did, our faculty has a peculiar attitude toward policies, which for some reason most faculty see as suggestions or options. Our faculty culture toward policies is mostly "If I don't want to, you can't make me." I don't foresee policy discussions about AI turning out any differently.

For both my 1L and upper-level writing classes, I showed how AI can be used in client communications. I used the 1L closed memo problem and asked ChatGPT to write a demand letter (the memo was on the firm offer rule). We then used ChatGPT to change the tone of the letter in two different ways. We then used it to show that, when it added cases, it hallucinated them (it included fake cases/that don't exist).

For this year, we strictly forbade using AI except for one assignment at the end because Lexis and Westlaw (hopefully reliable sources without hallucinations) had not released their products until well into the spring semester. I am sure next year students will be taught to use AI. My concern with how much it will short circuit learning.

Generative AI may be useful to teach in the future, but my sense is that at this point it's developing so quickly that I am concerned that anything I teach may be outdated by the time I teach it.

Honestly, I think the Shapo book's new exercise on picking apart an AI generated brief sounds promising. But I also think law students, and LWI, should be taking a more critical view of the broader impact AI will pose to a society (and legal profession) that is already too big-law focused and overcentralized.

I allow students to use generative AI to edit their work, particularly for grammar and sentence structure. I think that training our students in generative AI will be necessary because they will increasingly be expected to use it in law practice.

I am concerned about our ability to teach our students legal analysis, research and writing skills sufficiently to help them develop of the critical judgment necessary to use AI platforms, tools, and resources effectively and ethically. I am concerned that the availability of AI resources for law students generally is truncating their law school learning experience.

I am just getting started on this with my students. I'll have more info on this topic next year.

I am very concerned about the unauthorized use of AI.

I am very glad that I taught my students about AI this year because there are several workplaces that are expecting them to know and understand the technology. Whether we agree with it or not, it's here, and we are responsible for instilling best practices for usage in our students. I'm also glad we were able to work with it in a way that showed the students both the benefits and shortcomings of the tech(I had one student diagnose and correct an odd grammar error she kept repeating, but I also had a student submit a hallucinated case on an assignment). Our law school and university forbid AI usage except where authorized by the individual professor. My personal policy is that students are free to use AI on any assignment, however they see fit, but they will be held responsible for all output as if they created it themselves. I introduced them to the tech by having them present the

<p>same prompts across various platforms and assess the output. We had AI research, draft, outline, and brainstorm, and we used ChatGPT, Claude, Lexis+AI, Westlaw Ask Practical Law, and any others of their choosing.</p>
<p>I believe students need to develop skills before they will have the knowledge to assess the results generative AI provides.</p>
<p>I discuss the drawbacks of AI use in depth with my students and why they should not over rely on it. Students seemed receptive to the warnings and hopefully see it as a beginning, and not an ending, place</p>
<p>I don't know enough about it.</p>
<p>I examined ChatGPT early on and discovered that it was wildly inaccurate for legal research. It does seem ok at writing boilerplate, though.</p>
<p>I expect the use of AI to be allowed for research purposes in 2024-25.</p>
<p>I have been trying to get everyone at the law school to play with AI to see what it can do and what it does not do well. It is here. We need to learn how to use it just as we learned how to use Westlaw, Lexis, Google Scholar, and other tools.</p>
<p>I have had many students refuse to use AI out of principle, or because of privacy concerns. it is difficult to teach students how to use it if we can't spend any time on it. I have found that many students cannot effectively search Lexis or Westlaw either, so we need much more training in computer literacy across-the-board. This just does not fit in Legal Writing any more.</p>
<p>I have had the most success, in both my 1L and my upper-level course, using and teaching GenAI as an editing tool. For my 1Ls, I have also taught it was an initial research tool (rather like Google) to help orient to the overarching legal framework, but with the need to exercise lots of caution. I have stressed to all of my students the need to first understand the format/audience/structure of a type of writing, so you can effectively scrutinize what GenAI produces. The only thing I have explicitly not allowed in my classes is using GenAI to write an assignment in the first instance. I also require disclosures of AI use (although I have no real way to enforce that), so I can learn from students' use of the tools.</p>
<p>I have largely adopted a "wait and see" approach. I can see some benefit to it, but don't view it as either a panacea or threat.</p>
<p>I have tried to use AI like ChatGPT to write memo assignments. It has not been good. Similarly, I used Lexis AI+ to try to give me some answers about distinguishing cases, explaining a rule, etc., in a manner that might be useful on my written assignments. It was not helpful. It seems to me that if we are testing on the students' ability to make sophisticated arguments based on analogies to fact-intensive precedents, the A.I. is not up to that task just yet.</p>
<p>I indicated that we have no policy on AI but we are voting on a school-wide policy soon.</p>
<p>I no longer have the plagiarism concerns about using "generative AI" that I did a year ago. My students' responsibility is to produce quality written work. If it comes out of ChatGPT, it is still my students' responsibility to qualitatively evaluate that written work before affixing their name to it. I consider that exercise of professional legal judgment to be what I'm ultimately teaching them to do. As a practical matter, these tools (including Lexis AI, for which I had high hopes) are simply not prepared to draft anything longer than 3-4 paragraphs. I allowed my students free rein to use these tools. At first they were excited, but quickly they grew bored and by the end of the year no one was bothering. Perhaps there will be another great technological leap forward later, but for now the massive investment by all these tech companies seems squandered.</p>
<p>I required my second-term students to use generative AI to prepare a draft of one graded paper -- an office memo. The results were fascinating. I was hoping that the exercise would help students get a jump on their final, graded version. But what AI produced, including Lexis AI, was inaccurate and wholly unhelpful. I tell students that they may not use AI unless I allow it. But I allow it for a variety of things.</p>
<p>I set aside a class day for us to work through several GenAI exercises and they were mostly underwhelmed with its ability to do anything other than rewrite their own work in a different format (i.e., "take my memo and turn it into a client email" produced decent results, "write a memo on X legal issue with Y set of facts" produced terrible results, even with additional prompting and a</p>

defined set of cases).

I still believe that there is value in students learning how to research and write before they use any generative AI.

I think we have to adapt and teach students how to become better editors and fact checkers because, in a short time, AI will be doing most of the drafting.

I took a “straw poll” to see how comfortable my students were with use of AI. I was shocked to see how many were fearful that AI would lead them astray and therefore “refused” to use it.

I treat it like other research tools- introduce and show a few strategies for how it can support research (identify key terms, give ideas for where to go with research, etc.) while also making clear that it is a TOOL that has to be used by a person. It cannot make judgment calls, is based on an algorithm, etc. We cannot outsource thinking and, just like with anything else in legal practice, we don't do something just because we see it. We have to know why something is a certain way. I hate that I'm quoting Ronald Reagan but similar to “trust, but verify.”

I use a comparative approach where we employ a GenAI tool designed specifically for law (e.g., Lexis+ AI) and a generic GenAI tool (e.g., Gemini). We examine the differences in the output (e.g., lack of citations; non-legal language; etc.).

I will likely incorporate a short lesson in the fall and a longer one during the spring semester for my 1Ls next year. I don't think the technology is a good teaching tool for 1Ls though, so I don't plan to spend a ton of time on it. I realize this will all change as the tech improves.

I wish I had more time to explore and be part of the collective discussion about the proper role of GenAI in law school. Law schools need to come to a consensus about the proper parameters of its use, as differing standards will negatively reflect upon our institutions,.

I wish to bring the word and train every student in the law school in the use and misuse of generative AI. I have a strong feeling AI is going to become an essential part of most attorney's work and practice, and those who become excellent at using it will replace the need for firms and offices to hire as many junior level associates and attorneys as they used to. One super user of AI will be able to do the jobs of 10 or more junior level associates or staff attorneys. When the current AI reaches Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) level, people who know how AI works and can work directly with a massively powerful super AI will be useful to firms and organizations, but people with little or no experience in working with an AI will be marginalized and maybe even expendable (workwise). My university has an open ended policy leaving it to the considered discretion of professors to choose how they want AI to work in their courses: (1) Ban it all the time; (2) Allow it only on specifically identified types of assignments; (3) Allow it whenever the professor directs that it can be used on various types of assignments; (4) allow it to be used generally on all assignments (but the university still encourages guidelines on the use, i.e., don't allow yourself to plagiarize by using gen AI). My law school has not adopted its own set of rules or regulations but presumably we all are following the university policy.

I would love it if AI could help with grading!

I've had some success using AI the same way I've used samples, to help students develop and exercise professional judgment about the quality and reliability of a sample.

I've taken the approach of letting my students try it for various purposes after the first part of the semester, where we create the foundation they need to evaluate the results that they get from AI. If they use it, they need to submit a reflection. So far, most students are reporting that they are using it for editing suggestions. A few students in my advanced persuasion class used it for drafting ideas for some assignments, but they generally found that it wasn't particularly helpful, as it didn't get the tone or vocabulary right for the different documents. The best use of GenAI seems to have been to create document titles for op-eds and policy advocacy projects. Right now, it seems like it's just another tool that they can consider, rather than a complete game-changer, for many tasks that they do in my classes.

In my experience AI has not been effective in legal writing. Students have to learn these skills before trusting AI in order to discern good writing from bad writing and to edit results. There also isn't enough time to teach this skill in an introductory course and it would require Professors to learn this skill while it is evolving and we are removed from using it in practice settings. That's not to say it's not a useful skill to teach in an upper-level course, it just doesn't fit well in 1L legal writing at the is

point.

In spring 2023, ChatGPT provided much more substantive legal responses than in spring 2024. Students need to understand these tools as they are evolving, including both free and proprietary tools.

In teaching a coordinated curriculum, I think it's important that all of the Legal Methods (first-year) professors get on the same page about policies and intended uses of GAI in the classroom. This is proving difficult, but perhaps we will get a jump on it this year. GAI is here to stay, and we should figure out all of the "when, to whom, which class, how, etc." as a group. It's time to take our heads out of the sand.

In the 2022-23 and 2023-24 academic years, students were far less interested in GAI than I am. I found that very strange. Last year I even received criticism in my final evaluations for devoting an entire class to GAI. Weird! I'm hoping that in 2024-25 we'll turn the corner and students will realize that this is part of the practice of law and people who are good at it will have an edge.

It would be helpful to have a tool kit or "best practices" guide for how to incorporate AI into our writing curriculum. It's overwhelming to determine what to teach and how.

It's always been true that an attorney can pay someone else to produce work product for them. I see my role as teaching them how to do it themselves, not how to delegate it to a machine.

Last week I did an exercise where I ran the memo problem they had just turned in through LexisAI, ChatGPT and Claude, and then I brought printed versions to the class and had them divide up into groups and critique the answers. I did not tell the students these were AI papers, I told them they were from students they did not know so they could be honest in the critiques. The comments were fascinating! Then they turned in their worksheets (I had made one to guide the convos) and I told them about the experiment. They were amazed, and it had the unexpected benefit of boosting their battered self-esteem as well.

Lexis AI is not good. And ChatGPT has gotten worse at knowing the law. But I look forward to all of the technology to get better.

Many professors have presented on some helpful exercises that they use AI for, including the above listed beneficial opportunities.

Most students are not as eager to rely on GenAI as I thought; they are also not as fazed by the innovation. It was helpful to emphasize the ethical obligations surrounding technology (including the duty to be knowledgeable about it as a legal tool), as well as examples of attorneys misusing AI.

Our experience was that AI-detection software is completely unreliable and useless. It consistently and incorrectly flagged materials drafted by attorneys years before Chat GPT existed as having been largely generated by AI.

Our program is concerned about students not developing writing and research skills by using this as a shortcut. One of my colleagues showed me an appellate brief that was created with AI in violation of LRW policies and ALL of the cases were hallucinations. This student was warned not to use it, was told about a policy that would consider it academic misconduct, yet used it and is now looking at failing the course and student discipline. The school is developing policies, but for now, the LRW program has one that unless the professor allows it, it is forbidden. The extent of use, for now, is that students may receive some instruction from the prof during the semester.

Our school is not permitting the use of generative AI in the 1L Legal Writing courses, though the upper-division Appellate Advocacy course does receive a lecture on the subject.

Our school prohibits students from using large language models to prepare graded work. I tell students they may use it for research but not drafting purposes. But I fear that line easily becomes muddled. I also worry about whether I am effectively assessing students on short-form research assignments like emails because they can so easily be created using ChatBots like the AI bot newly available in Lexis. I am considering whether I need to go to an in-class research exam.

Prompting is an emerging skill, and law students should practice it. It reinforces issue-spotting and research question generating skills as well.

Students are surprisingly reluctant to use them because they don't fully understand how they work. Once students are shown how they work, students tend to use them pretty responsibly. And the students who do use them in ways they aren't intended generally turn in poor work product, so the feedback is ultimately its own penalty. It's not like using the tools as a substitute for lawyering skills results in students without lawyering skills getting ahead.

Students feel that using generative AI takes more effort than it is worth. However, some students (especially first gen) feel more confident with tone when assisted by AI.

The assignment to have students critique an AI-generated Email worked great for some sections, who allowed Chat GPT or GPT-4 to write the email. I did not, since it has confidentiality problems and my understanding is that firms don't allow it. I did allow them to use LEXIS AI, which did a terrible job—so terrible that it became hard for students to critique. So that was a fail. Our LRW program, though, bars AI in the fall, but leaves it up to each instructor in the spring. I think only one person banned it, and she ended up with honor code violations because of students who used it anyway. But thus far, it isn't developed enough to do a good job. My understanding is that it will be soon, however. One concern I have is that we may be required to teach prompt engineering. I don't know how necessary that is (GPT-4 already improves my prompts, and I'm not sure if firms' internal AI platforms would use the same techniques for prompting or not). I also don't know how to teach it apart from the general advice available online.

The students have access to Lexis and Westlaw AI so we need to confront them. We discussed their poor results -- and how, without doing your own research, they are difficult to assess. I am terrified for their ability to get jobs and learn how to write. It is a mess!

The use of AI in contract drafting is a game changer and very valuable.

To a certain extent, I've found the focus on generative AI for 1Ls to be a distraction from concerns that I find more pressing (e.g., 1Ls' ability to read actively, think critically and creatively, analyze rigorously, write clearly and concisely, and act professionally). I think generative AI is interesting and exciting, but I don't think we should let it dictate teaching priorities for a first-year legal writing course.

Tough to keep up with changes; decisions about which AI to use.

Using generative text to grade papers if it could do so well would be such a gift.

Very few students were using it in 2023-24, although we allowed it on many assignments, requiring they acknowledge its use.

We created a policy this year regarding the use of AI. In addition, I have tested it myself and it is inaccurate and not even better than a good Google search. Very concerned about students relying on it for their research and their writing and not checking its accuracy.

We have a committee currently tasked with developing an AI policy for the law school.

We have a new policy -- in essence, as I recall, it allows faculty members to decide how to use it in course work and exams, and to ban it if they wish. Of course, other than proctored close-book exams with examsoft or similar software, it will be very hard to prevent students using it. Thus, I think we need to teach students how to use it effectively. Calculators didn't destroy the teaching of math. so I don't think AI will destroy the teaching of LW!

We have required students to read the Mata Sanction Order and the Florida Bar Advisory Opinion on AI for the purpose of holding a class discussion on the ethical implications of Gen AI. I was surprised that most students were not engaged in the discussion. We also required the students to write a client letter using Gen AI. Again, I was surprised that the students were not engaged in the discussion. I thought they would be more interested in the topic and we would have a robust discussion, but the students seemed to lack interest.

We introduce the students to its use but do not allow its use on generating graded assignments. We use it to develop classroom exercises to give the students practice in its use.

We set aside a week in the research portion of our Spring semester for AI, using primarily Lexis AI+. The students almost universally reported that they would NOT look to use the product at this point -- that they felt they could do a better, more intentional and informed job of research on their own using good boolean searches and more broadly available secondary sources. That was great, though, as the students showed themselves that they had acquired the basic research skills and knowledge to be able to make that evaluation, that they would be able to speak to AI in legal research to a summer employer, and that they didn't feel they were "missing out" on it yet by not covering it in class.

We taught a class on gen AI to introduce the students, but we really need to find ways to

incorporate it more because there is not enough time to do it real justic ein teaching it during one class period.

When we have seen students utilizing these tools it has so far been with negative rather than positive impacts on the quality of their work.