

# ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey, 2021-2022

## Report of the Institutional Survey

# ALWD

Association of Legal  
Writing Directors



### 2021-2022 Survey Committee

Ted Becker (Co-Chair)  
Marci A. Rosenthal (Co-Chair)  
Kimberly Holst  
Jan Levine  
Michael Santana  
Danielle Tully

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

---

## **2021-2022 Survey Results**

**Association of Legal Writing Directors & Legal Writing Institute**

This report presents the results of the Institutional Survey component of the ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey for 2021-2022. These results provide information about the legal research and writing faculty, programs, and courses at 144 North American law schools, representing approximately 74% of the 195 law schools solicited to complete the survey.

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. Of course, no survey instrument can perfectly capture the varied, complex, and unique circumstances at every law school. 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 designated responders from each school who took the time to respond to the 2021-2022 Survey. The valuable information this report provides would not be possible if it were not for the time and effort of those designated responders.

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

---

# ALWD/LWI Legal Writing Survey

## Report of the 2021-2022 Survey

### Contents

History of the Survey.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Survey Structure.....	iii
Respondent Pool.....	iii
Definitions.....	iv
Navigating this Report & Asking Questions .....	viii
The Inevitable Caveats .....	viii
Part A. School Profiles .....	1
Part B. School Academic Term Structure .....	3
Part C. LRW Program(s) Structure .....	7
Part D. LRW Program Policies in Programs with Full-time Faculty.....	13
Part E. LRW Required Curriculum .....	18
Part F. LRW Elective Curriculum .....	36
Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes.....	55
Part H. Directors .....	64
Part I. Faculty Governance & Professional Development for Full-time Faculty.....	83
Part J. Hiring, Promotion, Retention & Tenure Policies for Full-time Faculty.....	96
Part K. Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty) .....	141
Part L. Faculty Salary Comparisons (Full-time Faculty) .....	146
Part M. Teaching Fellows .....	159
Part N. Part-time Faculty .....	169
Part O. Adjunct Faculty .....	181
Part P. Teaching Assistants.....	198
Part Q. Writing Specialists .....	205
Part R. Recent Changes.....	214
Part S. Writing Across the Curriculum .....	217
Appendix .....	219

---

## 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. Recently, growing out of the changes described above, many leaders in the legal writing community came to believe that the pendulum had shifted enough that it had become more important for the Survey to correspond to the reality of the legal writing field in the 21st century than to retain consistent questions.

In 2011, the presidents of ALWD and LWI created a joint Survey Task Force. 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 and improved 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.<sup>1</sup>

## 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, administrative assistant at the University of Michigan Law School, for her assistance in preparing this year's report.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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; before the Report you're currently reading, the Institutional Phase most recently had been administered for the 2019-2020 academic year. The second phase is the Individual Phase, which seeks more detailed information from individual faculty members who teach legal writing courses. The first report prepared for the Individual Phase covered the 2020-2021 academic year

## Respondent Pool

The respondent pool for the Survey is primarily based on ABA accreditation and provisional accreditation. For the 2021-2022 Survey, the Survey Committee solicited Institutional Phase responses from 195 American law schools, including 194 ABA-accredited and provisionally accredited law schools and 1 additional law school that is not ABA-accredited but has historical connections to the Annual Survey.<sup>2</sup> The Survey Committee did not solicit responses from those schools that have historically not responded to the survey.<sup>3</sup> For the 2021-2022 Survey, 144 law schools responded, representing approximately 74% of the law schools eligible to complete the survey. This response rate represents a drop of approximately 11% from the previous Institutional Survey administration in 2019-2020 (85%), which was itself a drop of 5% from the prior administration in 2017-2018 (90%), not to mention the comparably high completion rates of earlier surveys. The Committee considers this to be a worrisome trend and will be considering how to improve the overall response rate in future iterations of the Institutional Survey.

---

<sup>2</sup> The non-ABA-accredited school is the Massachusetts School of Law at Andover.

<sup>3</sup> At the time the 2021-2022 Survey was administered, the ABA list of accredited and provisionally accredited law schools included three law schools located in Puerto Rico: Inter American University of Puerto Rico School of Law; Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico School of Law; and University of Puerto Rico School of Law. The list also included the Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School as an ABA-approved institution, although it is not eligible for formal accreditation. The Survey Committee stopped soliciting responses from these four schools with the 2013-2014 Survey after determining that the schools had not responded to the survey in the last decade or more. Consistent with this history, the Survey Committee for the 2021-2022 Survey did not solicit responses from these schools.

## 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 2021-2022 Survey is provided in this section.

<b>405(c)-track</b>	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).
<b>Academic Year</b>	Includes all semesters, shortened semesters, or intersession during any 12-month period defined by your school.
<b>Adjunct</b>	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).
<b>Blended LRW Course</b>	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.
<b>Current Academic Year</b>	The Academic Year in which you are responding to this survey.
<b>Elective LRW Course</b>	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.

<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	A faculty member hired to perform full-time duties on a contract of five years or more in length but not presumptively renewable.
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	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.
<b>Legal Writing Assignment</b>	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.
<b>LRW Program</b>	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.
<b>LRW Course</b>	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.
<b>LRW Director</b>	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.
<b>LRW Faculty</b>	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.

<b>Major Writing Assignment</b>	A writing assignment which accounts for at least 20% of a student's final grade for the course.
<b>Non-LRW Course</b>	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.
<b>Non-LRW Faculty</b>	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.
<b>Part-time</b>	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.
<b>Programmatic Tenure</b>	Tenure that is achieved through a separate track/using different standards than traditional tenure awarded to doctrinal faculty.
<b>Required LRW Course</b>	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.
<b>Teaching Assistant</b>	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.

<b>Teaching Fellow</b>	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.
<b>Tenure-Track</b>	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.
<b>Visitor</b>	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](mailto:tbecker@umich.edu)) or Marci Rosenthal ([marciros@fiu.edu](mailto:marciros@fiu.edu)).

Finally, please note that direct comparisons to Annual Surveys before 2016-2017 are difficult because the questions have changed in the revamped version. Annual 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 x.

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, and it's inevitable that some responders will not cross reference the definitions when responding.

Some questions may offer response options that do not exactly capture the answer the respondent would like to give (“Well, it’s a little (b), but also maybe (d), and I can choose only one.” or “I don’t really know the answer.”). The revised 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 responders will decline to provide an answer. Given the length and complexity of the revised Survey, responders were allowed to skip most questions without providing an answer. Additionally, for certain questions, the revised Survey allowed responders to indicate that they preferred not to provide a response (e.g., salary). As a result, to the extent that there is a real answer to the question, but it is not provided, the response data provide an incomplete picture. Whether or not the information supplied by those who did respond is reflective and descriptive of those who did not respond is unknown and largely unknowable. Thus, the response rate to a question offers an indication of how confident one should feel about the response data for that question.

These inevitable input problems mean any statistics drawn from the data (averages, medians, etc., or trends in those statistics) have errors—errors we cannot estimate with numerical specificity. Don’t get us wrong, the responses to and corresponding raw data in this survey are useful, worthwhile, even good, but they do not necessarily provide a perfect or complete picture.

For example, in 2021-2022, 43 responders (out of 144) indicated that their school employs LRW Faculty with the status of Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure in response to Q8.2. All 43 of those responders saw and answered Q12.2, which asked whether the responder knew the annual, entry-level base salary for LRW Faculty with that status. Of those 43, 13 responded “Yes” and provided the information in response to Q12.3, and 7 responded that there was no typical entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty with that status. But 21 responders indicated that they did not know the answer, and 2 responders indicated that they preferred not to provide the information. So, we are left to wonder how the 23 schools who could not or would not provide the information would have affected the numbers reported in Q12.3. And what about the schools that didn’t respond to the survey at all? Are higher-paying schools under-represented in the responses? Lower-paying schools?

We don't know. Certainly, the data from 13 schools is useful, and it is unlikely that every non-responding school is at one or the other end of the spectrum, but could a full report of schools change the numbers meaningfully? Yes. So, in reviewing the numbers, you should be mindful of the number of schools who *could* have responded to a given question and the number of schools that actually did respond to the question.<sup>4</sup>

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

Thus, for some questions, you may find it helpful to look at a series of questions to better understand the response rate to the final question. For example, in Part P, 144 responders answered Q17.2, with 109 of them indicating that their school appoints Teaching Assistants for LRW Faculty. All 109 saw and answered Q17.3, with 67 indicating that the number of hours each Teaching Assistant is expected to spend on Teaching Assistant duties during the academic term is consistent. All 67 saw Q17.4#1, which asked how many hours each Teaching Assistant is expected to spend on Teaching Assistant duties each academic term, but only 66 answered the question for the first academic term of 2021-2022. And so on.

### The Take-Aways

- Pay attention to the number of schools responding to a given question. One can have more confidence that the responses to a question accurately reflect reality when the response rate is very high. If the question is directed at a subset of schools, pay attention to how many schools responded out of the total number of schools to whom the question is directed. The information about the number of schools in the subset may be provided in a previous question or series of questions.
- Realize that even with a perfect response rate, input errors can mean the resulting data only approximates reality (though maybe very closely) rather than being a perfect description of it.
- Pay attention to the definitions for the defined terms.
- One can draw valid inferences from the data in the tables; one just needs to qualify one's statements.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Individual Phase of the Survey is intended to provide more granular detail about individual faculty member circumstances, such as current salary.

## Part A. School Profiles

### Q2.3 - Region of Country

Answer	Responses per Answer
Region I: Far West –AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA	24
Region II: Northwest & Great Plains –ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY	5
Region III: Southwest & South Central –AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX	20
Region IV: Great Lakes/Upper Midwest –IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI	29
Region V: Southeast –AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV	16
Region VI: Mid-Atlantic –DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA	28
Region VII: Northeastern –CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (excluding New York City and Long Island), RI, VT	14
Region VIII: New York City and Long Island	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>

### Q2.4 - Entering 1L Class Size for the First Academic Term (e.g., semester, trimester, quarter) of the Current Academic Year

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
66	590	203	144

Class Size Range	Total Responses per Class Size Range
Less Than 100	11
100 to 150	41
151 to 200	37
201 to 250	26
251 to 300	8
301 to 350	7
More than 350	14
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>144</b>

## Q2.5 - School Location

Answer	Count
Urban center (6 miles or less from the center of a city with a population of 100,000 or more)	106
Suburban area (between 6 and 25 miles from the center of a city with a population of 100,000 or more)	18
Small town (6 miles or less from the center of a town with a population between 10,000 and 100,000)	19
Rural area (more than 6miles from the center of a city with a population under 100,000, or 25 miles or more from the center of a city with a population of 100,000 or more)	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>144</b>

## Q2.6 – Public or Private?

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Public	43%	62
Private	57%	82
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>144</b>

## Part B. School Academic Term Structure

**Q3.2 - How many full-length academic terms (e.g., semester, trimester, quarter) did or will your school have during the Current Academic Year?**

Note: "Full-length academic term" and "full-length term" mean the longest academic term (e.g., semester, trimester, quarter) offered (in terms of weeks).

Answer	Responses per Answer
2	139
3	4
4	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>144</b>

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

Note: This question focuses on the length of the law school's academic terms. Thus, "weeks of classroom instruction" means weeks during which classes were regularly scheduled in the law school, within the meaning of ABA Standard 304. This question is not limited to weeks during which LRW Courses were scheduled. So, if the law school has two full-length academic terms (i.e., semesters), and each full-length academic term includes 14 weeks during which classes are regularly scheduled, but LRW Courses only meet for 10 of those weeks, the answer would be 14.

### Schools with 2 Full-Length Academic Terms

Answer	Responses per Answer
12	4
13	35
13.5	0
14	78
14.5	1
15	18
16	2
17	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>139</b>

Q3.3 – Continued

Schools with 3 Full-Length Academic Terms

Answer	Responses per Answer
9	1
10	0
11	1
13	1
14	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>4</b>

Schools with 4 Full-Length Academic Terms

Answer	Responses per Answer
9	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>1</b>

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

Schools with 2 Full-Length Academic Terms

	Yes		No		No formal course offerings but for-credit experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics or externships) are available.		Unknown		Total Responses per Term Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Summer Term</b>	78%	109	13%	18	6%	9	2%	3	139
<b>Intersession, Maymester, or other short term or session</b>	51%	71	44%	61	1%	1	4%	6	139

Schools with 3 Full-Length Academic Terms

	Yes		No		No formal course offerings but for-credit experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics or externships) are available.		Unknown		Total Responses per Term Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Summer Term</b>	75%	3	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	4
<b>Intersession, Maymester, or other short term or session</b>	50%	2	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	4

## Q3.4 – Continued

## Schools with 4 Full-Length Academic Terms

	Yes		No		No formal course offerings but for-credit experiential learning opportunities (e.g., clinics or externships) are available.	Unknown		Total Responses per Term Type	
	%	0	100%	1		%	0		
Summer Term	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Intersession, Maymester, or other short term or session	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1

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

## Schools with 2 Full-Length Academic Terms

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Summer term is shorter than full-length terms, but class sessions are longer or occur more often each week so that students have the same number of contact hours with professors as they would in a full-length term.	91%	99
Summer term does not have a set length; the length of summer term courses varies depending upon the professor, subject matter, or other considerations.	6%	6
Other	4%	4
Total Responses	100%	109

## Schools with 3 Full-Length Academic Terms

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Summer term is shorter than full-length terms, but class sessions are longer or occur more often each week so that students have the same number of contact hours with professors as they would in a full-length term.	33%	1
Summer term does not have a set length; the length of summer term courses varies depending upon the professor, subject matter, or other considerations.	0%	0
Other	67%	2
Total Responses	100%	3

## Schools with 4 Full-Length Academic Terms – N/A per response to Q3.4

**Q3.5 - “Other” Explanation:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing those textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

	Yes	No	Unknown	Total Responses per Term Type
Full-length term 1	143	1	0	144
Full-length term 2	143	1	0	144
Full-length term 3	4	1	0	5
Full-length term 4	1	0	0	1
Summer term	49	61	2	112
Intersession/Maymester/Other short term or session	17	52	4	73

## Part C. LRW Program(s) Structure

### Q4.2 - Which of the following components are included in the structure of the LRW Program(s) at your school?<sup>5</sup>

Select all that apply

Answer	% of Total Respondents	Responses per Answer
First-Year LRW Program (coordinated separately from any upper-level courses or program)	84%	121
Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated separately from the first-year courses or program)	22%	32
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program (coordinated as a single, cohesive program)	16%	23
Other (aggregated) <sup>6</sup>	9%	13
None; all of the LRW Courses at my school are offered outside of an LRW Program	1%	1
<b>Total # of Respondents</b>		144

**Q4.2 - “Other” Explanation:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

	Yes		No		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	#	%	#	
First-Year LRW Program <sup>7</sup>	69%	83	31%	38	121
Upper-Level LRW Program	50%	16	50%	16	32
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	91%	21	9%	2	23
Other (aggregated)	38%	5	62%	8	13

<sup>5</sup> For purposes of the 2021-2022 Survey, “LRW Program” was defined as follows: “Any grouping of LRW Courses, whether required or elective, that are part of a coordinated legal writing curriculum. This term includes programs that are coordinated through an LRW Director (as defined) as well as programs that are coordinated through collaboration among faculty teaching in the LRW Program, including collaboration among faculty in an autonomous program, whether such coordination involves the curriculum as a whole, details of a specific course, or both. This term does not include LRW Courses that are offered outside of a coordinated curriculum.”

<sup>6</sup> The Survey instrument provided two “other” answer options, allowing responders to enter up to two other LRW Programs. Those entries have been aggregated in the report for this and other questions in this Part.

<sup>7</sup> The LRW Program descriptions shown for this question and subsequent questions omit the parenthetical explanations included in the Survey instrument. The parenthetical explanations are provided in full in Q4.2.

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

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

	Full-Time Faculty (regardless of status or teaching/administration focus)		Teaching Fellows		Part-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty		Graduate Students		Students (only if these are upper-level students who provide a substantial portion of individualized feedback on papers or have substantial responsibility for classroom teaching)		Complex hybrid involving more than one of these staffing models		Other		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	73%	88	2%	2	3%	4	4%	5	0%	0	0%	0	17%	21	1%	1	121
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	31%	10	0%	0	0%	0	38%	12	0%	0	0%	0	31%	10	0%	0	32
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	70%	16	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	30%	7	0%	0	23
<b>Other Programs</b>	54%	7	0%	0	0%	0	23%	3	0%	0	0%	0	15%	2	8%	1	13

**Q4.4 - “Other” Explanation:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part C. LRW Program(s) Structure

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

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

Question	Full-Time Faculty (regardless of status or teaching/ administration focus)	Teaching Fellows	Part- time Faculty	Adjunct Faculty	Graduate Students	Students (only if these are upper-level students who provide a substantial portion of individualized feedback on papers or have substantial responsibility for classroom teaching)	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	21	1	3	19	0	3	1	21
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	10	0	1	8	0	0	0	10
<b>Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program</b>	7	1	1	7	0	0	1	7
<b>Other Programs</b>	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	2

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

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

Question	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-Term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	26	7	52	33	18	109
Upper-Level LRW Program	4	2	7	6	3	20
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	7	3	8	8	4	23
Other Programs	2	0	3	3	3	9

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

Select all that apply; if an individual has been designated as LRW Director for the program, do not consider that person's status in responding to this question.<sup>8</sup>

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

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	8	21	7	1	27
Upper-Level LRW Program	1	2	3	0	4
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	3	6	1	0	7
Other Programs	0	1	2	1	3

<sup>8</sup> This question provides information about the teaching and administrative load for full-time faculty teaching in a specific LRW Program. Each table provides the information for faculty with a specific contract status. Each contract status was a defined term for purposes of the Survey. The definitions are provided at the beginning of this report.

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

<b>Question</b>	<b>LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses</b>	<b>LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses</b>	<b>Non-LRW Faculty</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	4	7	0	0	9
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	1	1	0	0	2
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	2	2	0	0	3
<b>Other Programs</b>	0	0	1	0	1

## Q4.12 - Continued

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

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	37	38	1	0	57
Upper-Level LRW Program	4	5	1	0	6
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	7	4	0	1	9
Other Programs	3	1	1	0	3

**Contract Status: Full-time, Short-term**

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	30	24	0	1	45
Upper-Level LRW Program	4	5	1	0	8
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	8	5	0	0	10
Other Programs	2	0	0	1	3

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

Question	LRW Faculty who only teach LRW Courses	LRW Faculty who also teach Non-LRW Courses	Non-LRW Faculty	Other	Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	21	10	1	2	26
Upper-Level LRW Program	2	1	1	0	4
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	7	9	0	1	10
Other Programs	2	0	0	1	3

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

**Q5.2 - For Required LRW Courses<sup>9</sup> that are offered as part of an LRW Program, if the same Required LRW Course is offered in more than one section and different full-time faculty teach some or all of those sections, please select the answer that best describes the extent to which each aspect of that course must be consistent across all sections taught by full-time, non-visiting, non-Teaching Fellow faculty.**

### Syllabus

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program<sup>10</sup></b>	13%	14	18%	20	38%	41	30%	33	0%	0	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	109
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	75%	15	10%	2	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	26%	6	9%	2	43%	10	13%	3	9%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

<sup>9</sup> “LRW Course” and “Required LRW Course” were defined terms for purposes of the 2021-2022 Survey. The definitions are provided at the beginning of this report.

<sup>10</sup> The Survey instrument used extended descriptions for the listed LRW Programs. Those extended descriptions were as follows:

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

Q5.2 - Continued

Content of Class/Lectures

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	5%	5	13%	14	18%	19	63%	68	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	108
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	85%	17	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	4%	1	17%	4	22%	5	52%	12	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	11%	1	22%	2	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

Textbooks

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	24%	26	5%	5	6%	6	62%	68	3%	3	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	109
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	10%	2	0%	0	0%	0	80%	16	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	35%	8	9%	2	0%	0	52%	12	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

Q5.2 - Continued

Citation Text

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	46%	50	3%	3	9%	10	41%	44	0%	0	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	108
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	20%	4	0%	0	10%	2	55%	11	0%	0	0%	0	10%	2	5%	1	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	57%	13	0%	0	9%	2	30%	7	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

Number of Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	48%	52	6%	7	27%	29	17%	19	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	109
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	10%	2	0%	0	15%	3	65%	13	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	61%	14	0%	0	22%	5	13%	3	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

Q5.2 - Continued

Substance of Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	24%	26	8%	9	19%	20	47%	51	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	108
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	0%	0	0%	0	10%	2	80%	16	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	17%	4	13%	3	35%	8	17%	4	17%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

Deadlines for Major Assignments

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	34%	37	7%	8	32%	35	25%	27	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	109
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	10%	2	0%	0	5%	1	75%	15	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	43%	10	4%	1	35%	8	9%	2	9%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	11%	1	22%	2	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	11%	1	11%	1	9

Q5.2 - Continued

**Length of Major Assignments**

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	28%	30	10%	11	32%	35	28%	30	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	108
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	10%	2	0%	0	5%	1	75%	15	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	26%	6	13%	3	30%	7	22%	5	9%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	11%	1	11%	1	9

**Number of Minor Assignments**

	Uniform for all sections		Faculty have some freedom within range set by LRW Director, if any		Faculty have some freedom within range agreed to by faculty teaching in the program		Faculty have full freedom (but may choose to collaborate with others)		Varies by course		Other		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	12%	13	9%	10	22%	24	54%	58	2%	2	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	108
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	0%	0	0%	0	15%	3	75%	15	5%	1	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	13%	3	4%	1	13%	3	65%	15	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	23
<b>Other LRW Program(s)</b>	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9

## Part E. LRW Required Curriculum<sup>11</sup>

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

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

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
1.0	5.0	2.3	144

Number of Required LRW Courses	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
1	13%	19
2	57%	82
3	21%	30
4	8%	11
5	1%	2
<b>Total Responses</b>	100%	144

<sup>11</sup> “LRW Course,” “Required LRW Course,” “Elective LRW Course,” and “Blended LRW Course” were defined terms for purposes of the 2021-2022 Survey. The definitions for the 2021-2022 Survey are provided at the beginning of this report.

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

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
2.0	11.0	5.8	144

Number of Credits for Required LRW Courses	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
2	1%	2
3	3%	4
4	16%	23
5	20%	29
6	35%	50
7	10%	15
7.5	1%	1
8	8%	12
9	4%	6
10	1%	1
11	1%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	100%	144

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

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

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

Note 2: If a course spans more than one term, please use one of the “other” answer options to identify the additional term(s) of the course (e.g., “Course focusing on principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing - second term”).<sup>12</sup>

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.

Course	% of Total Responses	Total Responses per Course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	96%	138
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the first required course in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when the students take the course.)	93%	134
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the second required course (if any) in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when students take the course.)	14%	20
Blended LRW Course (substantive law topic)	3%	4
Introduction to legal research (if taught independently of any of the above)	17%	24
Advanced legal research (if taught independently of any of the above)	3%	5
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.) (if required as a separate course)	3%	5
Contract drafting (if required as a separate course)	5%	7
Other (identify course name)	22%	32
<b>Total Responses</b>		144

**Q6.4- “Other” Explanation:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “Blended LRW Course” or “Other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

<sup>12</sup> The Survey instrument provided four “other” answer options, allowing responders to enter up to four other courses.

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

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

Select all that apply. E.g., if three professors taught this course, and two professors were adjuncts and one professor was a tenured or tenure-track professor with traditional tenure, select “adjunct” and “tenured or tenure-track with traditional tenure.”<sup>13</sup>

	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	39	35	3	4
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	14	13	3	1
405(c) or 405(c)-track	63	58	9	1
Full-time, Short-term	39	39	5	0
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	22	26	0	0
Teaching Fellow	4	2	0	0
Part-time	8	7	1	0
Adjunct	35	39	12	2
Visitor	26	22	1	2
Unknown	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	138	134	20	4

<sup>13</sup> The course names/descriptions shown for this question and subsequent questions omit the parenthetical explanations included in the Survey instrument. The parenthetical explanations are provided in full in Q6.4. As reflected in Q6.4, in addition to specifically listed courses, the Survey instrument collected information about “other” elective courses. Given the wide variety of courses reported in that category, the details for such courses have been omitted for some of the following questions. If you are interested in information about a particular category of “other” course, contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available for that category.

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure</b>	8	1	2	3	8
<b>Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure</b>	3	0	1	0	2
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track</b>	3	0	5	2	13
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	5	2	0	1	9
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	10	1	0	0	8
<b>Teaching Fellow</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Part-time</b>	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Adjunct</b>	0	2	3	5	21
<b>Visitor</b>	0	0	0	0	1
<b>Unknown</b>	1	0	0	0	1
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	24	4	5	6	32

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

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

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

	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
<b>LRW Faculty</b>	137	130	18	0
<b>Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses</b>	1	1	0	2
<b>Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian</b>	8	6	1	0
<b>Other Non-LRW Faculty</b>	7	8	6	1
<b>Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian</b>	6	5	0	0
<b>Other administrator/staff member</b>	2	2	0	0
<b>Unknown</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	138	131	19	3

	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
<b>LRW Faculty</b>	0	0	5	6	27
<b>Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses</b>	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian</b>	16	5	0	0	2
<b>Other Non-LRW Faculty</b>	1	0	1	1	6
<b>Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian</b>	8	1	0	1	1
<b>Other administrator/staff member</b>	0	0	0	0	2
<b>Unknown</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	24	5	5	7	31

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

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

Term	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
1L First Full Term	129	5	0	2
1L Second Full Term	6	122	1	0
1L Third Full Term	0	2	2	0
1L Fourth Full Term	0	0	0	0
1L Summer Term	0	0	0	0
2L First Full Term	0	3	11	0
2L Second Full Term	0	0	1	0
2L Third Full Term	0	0	0	0
2L Fourth Full Term	0	0	0	0
2L Summer Term	0	0	0	0
3L First Full Term	0	0	1	0
3L Second Full Term	0	0	0	0
3L Third Full Term	0	0	0	0
3L Fourth Full Term	0	0	0	0
Varies	0	0	4	2
Other	2	1	0	0
Unknown	1	1	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	138	134	20	4

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

Term	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
1L First Full Term	17	0	0	0	8
1L Second Full Term	5	1	0	0	7
1L Third Full Term	0	0	2	2	1
1L Fourth Full Term	0	0	0	0	1
1L Summer Term	0	0	0	0	0
2L First Full Term	1	3	0	0	5
2L Second Full Term	0	0	1	2	3
2L Third Full Term	0	0	0	0	0
2L Fourth Full Term	0	0	0	0	0
2L Summer Term	0	0	0	0	0
3L First Full Term	0	0	0	1	1
3L Second Full Term	0	0	0	0	0
3L Third Full Term	0	0	0	0	0
3L Fourth Full Term	0	0	0	0	0
Varies	0	1	2	2	3
Other	1	0	0	0	3
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	24	5	5	7	32

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

Course	First-Year LRW Program		Upper-Level LRW Program		Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program		Other		None: offered outside of a coordinated curriculum		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	92%	127	0%	0	7%	10	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	138
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	92%	123	1%	1	7%	9	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	134
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	10%	2	60%	12	25%	5	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	20
Blended LRW Course	25%	1	50%	2	0%	0	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	4
Introduction to legal research	58%	14	0%	0	4%	1	25%	6	8%	2	4%	1	24
Advanced legal research	20%	1	0%	0	20%	1	0%	0	40%	2	20%	1	5
Litigation or pretrial drafting	0%	0	60%	3	20%	1	0%	0	20%	1	0%	0	5
Contract drafting	0%	0	57%	4	29%	2	0%	0	14%	1	0%	0	7
Other (aggregated)	53%	17	34%	11	9%	3	3%	1	3%	1	0%	0	32

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

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

Question	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	2%	3	96%	132	2%	3	138
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	1%	2	96%	128	3%	4	134
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	70%	14	30%	6	0%	0	20
Blended LRW Course	50%	2	50%	2	0%	0	4
Introduction to legal research	0%	0	100%	24	0%	0	24
Advanced legal research	0%	0	100%	5	0%	0	5
Litigation or pretrial drafting	40%	2	60%	3	0%	0	5
Contract drafting	57%	4	43%	3	0%	0	7
Other (aggregated)	34%	11	63%	20	3%	1	32

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

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

*As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to these questions. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. For those questions, the parenthetical number indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, in the first table below, if 0s are included, the minimum typical number of credits is 0.0, the mean typical number of credits is 2.6, and there were 138 responses to that question for the course. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of typical number of credits is 1.0, the mean typical number of credits remains 2.6, and there were 136 responses to that question for the course.*

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.6 (2.6)	138 (136)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	6.0	2.6 (2.7)	138 (136)
Average number of students in each section of the course	10.0	50.0	22.7	138

**Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.4 (2.5)	134 (133)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.4 (2.5)	134 (132)
Average number of students in each section of the course	10.0	50.0	22.1	134

**Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	3.0	2.1	20
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	3.0	2.2	20
Average number of students in each section of the course	10.0	40.0	20.5	20

**Blended LRW Course**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	2.0	4.0	3.0	4
Average number of in-class hours per week	2.0	4.0	3.0	4
Average number of students in each section of the course	12.0	21.0	17.0	4

**Introduction to legal research**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	2.0	1.2 (1.2)	24 (23)
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	2.0	1.3	24
Average number of students in each section of the course	10.0	50.0	26.2	22

**Advanced legal research**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	2.0	1.0	5
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	2.0	1.0	5
Average number of students in each section of the course	12.0	30.0	21.8	5

**Litigation or pretrial drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	3.0	2.0	5
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	3.0	2.0	5
Average number of students in each section of the course	15.0	38.0	20.8	5

**Contract drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	3.0	1.9	7
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	3.0	2.1	7
Average number of students in each section of the course	10.0	38.0	18.4	7

**Other (aggregated)**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	1.0	4.0	2.5	32
Average number of in-class hours per week	1.0	6.0	2.5	32
Average number of students in each section of the course	8.0	60.0	20.9	32

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

Course	Graded, counts toward GPA	Graded, not counted toward GPA	Pass/Fail	Enhanced Pass/Fail (e.g., "high pass/pass/ fail" and similar options)	Varies	Other	Unknown	Total Responses per Course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	129	2	2	4	0	1	0	138
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	128	1	1	3	0	0	0	133
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	19	1	0	0	0	0	0	20
Blended LRW Course	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Introduction to legal research	22	0	2	0	0	0	0	24
Advanced legal research	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Litigation or pretrial drafting	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Contract drafting	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Other (aggregated)	22	0	5	4	0	1	0	32

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

Question	Yes, all assignments	Yes, most assignments	Only the final Major Assignment	Varies	No	Other	Unknown	N/A	Total Responses per Course
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	14	40	16	35	30	0	0	3	138
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	10	43	14	36	28	0	0	2	133
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	1	4	2	7	4	0	0	1	19
Blended LRW Course	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	4
Introduction to legal research	2	3	3	5	6	0	5	0	24
Advanced legal research	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	5
Litigation or pretrial drafting	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	5
Contract drafting	1	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	7
Other (aggregate)	0	5	4	6	13	1	1	2	32

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

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

Select all that apply.

Grade Normalization Policy	Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing	Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing	Blended LRW Course
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	14	14	5	1
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	43	41	1	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses)	26	25	8	1
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	8	7	1	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	19	19	1	1
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	10	10	0	0
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	15	15	3	0
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	14	14	0	0
Other	4	4	0	0
None	12	10	2	1
Unknown	0	0	0	1
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	165	159	21	5

## ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

## Q6.12 - Continued

Grade Normalization Policy	Introduction to legal research	Advanced legal research	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Contract drafting	Other (aggregated)
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	3	0	2	1	5
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	4	0	0	0	3
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses	6	2	2	3	4
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	3	0	1	0	3
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	5	1	0	0	3
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	0	0	0	0	3
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	1	0	1	2	1
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	1	0	0	0	1
Other	3	1	0	0	3
None	2	0	0	0	6
Unknown	1	1	0	1	2
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	29	5	6	7	34

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part E. LRW Required Curriculum

Q6.12A - In Q6.4, you indicated that the Required LRW Courses at your school include a separate introduction to legal research course. In Q6.7, you answered "other," "varies," or "unknown" for the academic term in which the introduction to legal research course is taught. In which year are students required to take the introduction to legal research course? Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
1L Year	1
2L Year	0
3L Year	0
Unknown	0
Total	1

Q6.13 – In response to earlier questions, you indicated that the Required LRW Courses for first-year students do not include a separate introduction to legal research course. Which of the following Required LRW courses provide legal research instruction during the first-year?

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Respondents	Responses per Answer
Course focusing principally on objective (including predictive) legal analysis and writing	87%	105
Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the first required course in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when the students take the course.)	81%	98
Advanced course focusing principally on persuasive writing (Please choose this option for the second required course (if any) in which students focus on persuasive writing, regardless of when students take the course.)	6%	7
Blended LRW Course	2%	2
Other	12%	14
None	0%	0
Total # of Respondents		121

**Q6.13 – Textual Responses:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “Blended LRW Course” or “Other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Respondents	Responses per Answer
LRW Faculty	69%	99
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	56%	81
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	22%	32
Teaching Assistant	8%	12
Other	6%	8
Vendor Representatives	28%	40
<b>Total # of Respondents</b>		144

**Q6.14 - Explanatory text for “Other”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “Other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available

## Part F. LRW Elective Curriculum<sup>14</sup>

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

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

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
<b>Yes</b>	81%	117
<b>No</b>	17%	25
<b>Unknown</b>	1%	2
<b>Total Responses</b>		144

---

<sup>14</sup> “LRW Course” and “Elective LRW Course” were defined terms for purposes of the 2021-2022 Survey. The definitions for the 2021-2022 Survey are provided at the beginning of this report.

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

Note: If your school offers more than one course that falls within a specific category below (e.g., two elective appellate advocacy courses), select “other” for each additional course in that category.<sup>15</sup> The answer options below are not intended to be course names; rather, the answer options are intended to describe the subject matter that is the focus of the course.

Answer	% of Total Respondents	Responses per Answer
Advanced advocacy (focusing on the theory of persuasion rather than the production of a brief)	32%	37
Advanced legal research (including subject-specific legal research and jurisdiction-specific legal research)	71%	83
Appellate advocacy (written or oral or both), other than any required course in persuasive writing	79%	92
Contract drafting (general)	65%	76
Corporate document drafting (bylaws, offering statements, SEC compliance documents, etc.)	32%	38
Drafting survey course (writing a variety of practice-oriented documents)	56%	66
Family law drafting (prenups, divorce and property settlement agreements, custody agreements, etc.)	18%	21
Judicial opinion writing	30%	35
Legislation	22%	26
Litigation or pretrial drafting (complaints, motions, discovery, etc.)	74%	87
Other (identify course name)	47%	55
Other transactional drafting (please explain)	18%	21
Scholarly writing	40%	47
Unknown	0%	0
Wills/estate planning drafting	29%	34
<b>Total # of Respondents</b>		<b>117</b>

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

The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

<sup>15</sup> The Survey instrument provided four “other” answer options, allowing responders to enter up to four other courses. Those entries have been aggregated in the report.

Q7.4 - Are any of the courses listed below online courses?<sup>16</sup>

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	5%	2	95%	35	0%	0	37
Advanced legal research	18%	15	78%	65	4%	3	83
Appellate advocacy	2%	2	97%	89	1%	1	92
Contract drafting	9%	7	88%	67	3%	2	76
Corporate document drafting	3%	1	92%	35	5%	2	38
Drafting survey course	9%	6	88%	58	3%	2	66
Family law drafting	0%	0	100%	21	0%	0	21
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	97%	34	3%	1	35
Legislation	4%	1	96%	25	0%	0	26
Litigation or pretrial drafting	1%	1	95%	83	3%	3	87
Other (aggregated)	5%	3	95%	52	0%	0	55
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	100%	21	0%	0	21
Scholarly writing	4%	2	89%	42	6%	3	47
Wills/estate planning drafting	3%	1	94%	32	3%	1	34

<sup>16</sup> The course names shown for this question and subsequent questions omit the parenthetical explanations included in the Survey instrument. The parenthetical explanations are provided in full in Q7.3. As reflected in Q7.4, in addition to specifically listed courses, the Survey instrument collected information about “other” elective courses. Given the wide variety of courses reported in that category, the details are not reported here. If you are interested in information about a particular type of course, contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available for that type of course.

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report . . . Part F. LRW Program(s) Structure

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

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

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

*As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to these questions. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. For those questions, the parenthetical number indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, in the first table below (Advanced advocacy), if 0s are included, the minimum typical number of credits is 0.0, the mean typical number of credits is 2.1, and there were 35 responses to that question for the course. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of typical number of credits is 1.0, the mean typical number of credits increases to 2.3, and there were 32 responses to that question for the course.*

**Advanced advocacy**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	2.1 (2.3)	35 (32)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.9 (2.1)	35 (31)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	25.0	12.4 (13.5)	34 (31)

**Advanced legal research**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.8 (2.1)	78 (68)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.7 (2.0)	78 (66)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	100.0	13.8 (17.7)	76 (59)

**Appellate advocacy**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.2 (2.4)	89 (80)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.9 (2.2)	88 (74)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	87.0	16.0 (19.1)	87 (73)

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

**Contract drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.8 (2.3)	75 (60)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.8 (2.3)	74 (59)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (10.0)	58.0	12.4 (17.1)	73 (53)

**Corporate document drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.8 (2.3)	36 (28)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	6.0	1.8 (2.3)	36 (26)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (6.0)	25.0	10.3 (15.7)	35 (23)

**Drafting survey course**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	3.0	2.1 (2.3)	63 (57)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.7)	3.0	2.0 (2.3)	62 (54)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (5.0)	25.0	12.9 (15.1)	62 (53)

**Family law drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	3.0	1.8 (2.4)	19 (14)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.5)	3.0	1.7 (2.3)	19 (14)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (10.0)	24.0	9.9 (15.8)	19 (12)

**Judicial opinion writing**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.9 (2.2)	35 (30)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	5.0	1.9 (2.3)	35 (29)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (6.0)	22.0	9.6 (12.9)	35 (26)

**Legislation**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	2.4 (2.6)	25 (23)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.9 (2.4)	25 (20)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (8.0)	30.0	9.3 (15.5)	25 (15)

**Litigation or Pretrial Drafting Courses**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	6.0	2.3 (2.5)	84 (76)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	6.0	2.1 (2.4)	84 (73)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (10.0)	25.0	13.1 (15.5)	84 (71)

**Other transactional drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	6.0	2.3 (2.6)	20 (17)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	4.0	1.9 (2.3)	20 (17)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (7.0)	25.0	12.1 (15.1)	20 (16)

**Scholarly writing**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.9 (2.3)	46 (39)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	3.0	1.6 (2.2)	46 (34)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (8.0)	30.0	11.7 (16.6)	44 (31)

**Wills/estate planning drafting**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (2.0)	3.0	2.2 (2.4)	33 (29)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.0)	9.0	2.1 (2.5)	33 (27)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (8.0)	35.0	12.0 (17.2)	33 (23)

**Other (aggregated)**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
Typical number of credits	0.0 (1.0)	6.0	2.2 (2.4)	54 (50)
Average number of in-class hours per week	0.0 (1.5)	3.0	1.9 (2.1)	54 (47)
Average number of students in each section of the course	0.0 (1.0)	25.0	12.2 (13.8)	54 (48)

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

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

Status	Advanced advocacy	Advanced legal research	Appellate advocacy	Contract drafting	Corporate document drafting	Drafting survey course	Family law drafting
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	9	19	27	13	13	15	3
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	3	12	8	6	7	7	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track	7	7	18	14	4	16	4
Full-time, Short-term	2	10	6	6	2	10	0
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	6	14	10	3	1	4	0
Visitor	2	0	5	3	4	7	1
Teaching Fellow	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	16	10	51	47	17	38	12
Others of Unknown Status	1	16	5	1	1	0	0
Unknown	2	4	4	6	5	5	4
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	48	92	136	99	54	102	26

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

Q7.6 - Continued

Status	Judicial opinion writing	Legislation	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Scholarly writing	Wills/estate planning drafting	Other transactional drafting	Other (aggregated)
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure	6	9	22	31	9	4	8
Tenured or tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure	5	0	8	7	1	1	4
405(c) or 405(c)-track	7	3	15	8	1	5	14
Full-time, Short-term	6	3	7	4	1	1	2
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	3	1	4	5	1	1	2
Visitor	0	1	3	1	1	0	2
Teaching Fellow	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-time	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Adjunct	15	9	58	13	19	11	26
Others of Unknown Status	2	0	2	2	3	0	2
Unknown	1	3	4	2	4	0	1
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	45	29	123	76	40	23	62

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

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

Status	Advanced advocacy	Advanced legal research	Appellate advocacy	Contract drafting	Corporate document drafting	Drafting survey course	Family law drafting
LRW Faculty	19	2	36	26	4	32	2
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	1	2	6	6	5	3	3
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	46	2	1	2	1	0
Other Non-LRW Faculty	11	8	36	26	14	22	8
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
Other administrator/staff member	1	0	0	0	0	2	0
Others of Unknown Status	3	5	17	14	7	9	4
Unknown	4	0	9	8	8	9	3
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>20</b>

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

Q7.7 - Continued

Status	Judicial opinion writing	Legislation	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Scholarly writing	Wills/estate planning drafting	Other transactional drafting	Other (aggregated)
LRW Faculty	19	4	30	16	4	4	25
Non-LRW Faculty primarily engaged in teaching or administering clinical courses	1	5	10	9	3	3	4
Non-LRW Faculty whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Other Non-LRW Faculty	8	10	31	24	15	9	17
Administrator/staff member whose primary responsibilities are as a librarian	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Other administrator/staff member	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Others of Unknown Status	4	3	17	5	5	3	9
Unknown	4	4	9	4	7	3	1
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	36	26	97	59	35	22	61

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

Type of Course	Yes		No		Varies		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
Advanced advocacy	24%	9	27%	10	14%	5	35%	13	37
Advanced legal research	13%	10	35%	28	19%	15	34%	27	80
Appellate advocacy	25%	23	26%	24	27%	25	21%	19	91
Contract drafting	42%	30	15%	11	14%	10	28%	20	71
Corporate document drafting	14%	5	8%	3	19%	7	58%	21	36
Drafting survey course	32%	21	9%	6	38%	25	20%	13	65
Family law drafting	11%	2	26%	5	11%	2	53%	10	19
Judicial opinion writing	13%	4	25%	8	25%	8	38%	12	32
Legislation	0%	0	48%	11	13%	3	39%	9	23
Litigation or pretrial drafting	35%	29	16%	13	25%	21	24%	20	83
Other (aggregated)	20%	11	46%	25	20%	11	13%	7	54
Other transactional drafting	25%	5	15%	3	15%	3	45%	9	20
Scholarly writing	11%	5	38%	18	26%	12	26%	12	47
Wills/estate planning drafting	15%	5	30%	10	9%	3	45%	15	33

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

Type of Course	Every other academic year		Once per academic year		More than once per academic year		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	20%	7	46%	16	6%	2	6%	2	23%	8	35
Advanced legal research	3%	2	53%	41	35%	27	1%	1	9%	7	78
Appellate advocacy	7%	6	54%	47	28%	24	1%	1	10%	9	87
Contract drafting	7%	5	37%	25	39%	26	1%	1	15%	10	67
Corporate document drafting	6%	2	45%	15	15%	5	0%	0	33%	11	33
Drafting survey course	3%	2	52%	33	25%	16	0%	0	20%	13	64
Family law drafting	0%	0	63%	12	11%	2	0%	0	26%	5	19
Judicial opinion writing	7%	2	67%	20	3%	1	3%	1	20%	6	30
Legislation	14%	3	59%	13	9%	2	0%	0	18%	4	22
Litigation or pretrial drafting	6%	5	44%	37	35%	29	4%	3	12%	10	84
Other (aggregated)	9%	5	63%	33	22%	12	2%	1	4%	2	53
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	68%	13	21%	4	0%	0	11%	2	19
Scholarly writing	5%	2	30%	13	41%	18	2%	1	23%	10	44
Wills/estate planning drafting	7%	2	60%	18	10%	3	3%	1	20%	6	30

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

Type of Course	First-Year LRW Program		Upper-Level LRW Program		Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program		Other		None offered outside of a coordinated curriculum		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	3%	1	25%	9	3%	1	3%	1	67%	24	0%	0	36
Advanced legal research	0%	0	5%	4	3%	2	6%	5	84%	67	3%	2	80
Appellate advocacy	1%	1	21%	19	2%	2	5%	5	70%	64	0%	0	91
Contract drafting	0%	0	16%	12	7%	5	4%	3	71%	52	1%	1	73
Corporate document drafting	0%	0	11%	4	3%	1	3%	1	84%	32	0%	0	38
Drafting survey course	2%	1	15%	10	3%	2	5%	3	74%	48	2%	1	65
Family law drafting	0%	0	21%	4	5%	1	16%	3	58%	11	0%	0	19
Judicial opinion writing	0%	0	26%	9	3%	1	0%	0	69%	24	3%	1	35
Legislation	0%	0	13%	3	4%	1	8%	2	75%	18	0%	0	24
Litigation or pretrial drafting	2%	2	15%	13	5%	4	3%	3	72%	62	2%	2	86
Other (aggregated)	0%	0	25%	14	16%	9	2%	1	56%	30	2%	1	55
Other transactional drafting	0%	0	30%	6	5%	1	0%	0	65%	13	0%	0	20
Scholarly writing	0%	0	11%	5	4%	2	11%	5	72%	33	2%	1	46
Wills/estate planning drafting	0%	0	16%	5	3%	1	9%	3	69%	22	3%	1	32

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

Type of Course	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
Advanced advocacy	38%	12	34%	11	28%	9	32
Advanced legal research	9%	7	57%	45	34%	27	79
Appellate advocacy	53%	45	26%	22	21%	18	85
Contract drafting	37%	25	29%	20	34%	23	68
Corporate document drafting	31%	11	20%	7	49%	17	35
Drafting survey course	40%	25	29%	18	31%	19	62
Family law drafting	39%	7	28%	5	33%	6	18
Judicial opinion writing	48%	15	26%	8	26%	8	31
Legislation	25%	6	29%	7	46%	11	24
Litigation or pretrial drafting	45%	38	29%	24	26%	22	84
Other (aggregated)	51%	26	29%	15	20%	10	51
Other transactional drafting	42%	8	32%	6	26%	5	19
Scholarly writing	74%	31	7%	3	19%	8	42
Wills/estate planning drafting	36%	12	21%	7	42%	14	33

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

Q7.10 - Is the course graded?

Type of Course	Graded, counts toward GPA		Graded, not counted toward GPA		Pass/Fail		Enhanced Pass/Fail (e.g., "high pass/pass/fail")		Varies		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	94%	33	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	6%	2	35
Advanced legal research	79%	64	1%	1	9%	7	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	9%	7	81
Appellate advocacy	85%	77	1%	1	8%	7	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	4%	4	91
Contract drafting	92%	67	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	7%	5	73
Corporate document drafting	86%	32	0%	0	0%	0	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	11%	4	37
Drafting survey course	89%	58	0%	0	2%	1	0%	0	2%	1	0%	0	8%	5	65
Family law drafting	100%	19	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	19
Judicial opinion writing	91%	31	0%	0	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	6%	2	34
Legislation	96%	24	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	4%	1	25
Litigation or pretrial drafting	88%	76	0%	0	1%	1	1%	1	0%	0	1%	1	8%	7	86
Other (aggregated)	84%	46	2%	1	9%	5	0%	0	0%	0	2%	1	4%	2	55
Other transactional drafting	90%	19	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5%	1	21
Scholarly writing	78%	36	0%	0	9%	4	2%	1	2%	1	0%	0	9%	4	46
Wills/estate planning drafting	85%	28	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	15%	5	33

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

	Yes, all assignments		Yes, most assignments		Only the final major Assignment		Varies		No		Other		Unknown		N/A		Total Responses per Course
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Advanced advocacy	6%	2	3%	1	6%	2	14%	5	34%	12	0%	0	37%	13	0%	0	35
Advanced legal research	5%	4	6%	5	2%	2	7%	6	25%	20	0%	0	53%	43	1%	1	81
Appellate advocacy	2%	2	8%	7	4%	4	15%	14	34%	31	0%	0	35%	32	1%	1	91
Contract drafting	4%	3	8%	6	4%	3	14%	10	25%	18	0%	0	45%	33	0%	0	73
Corporate document drafting	3%	1	5%	2	3%	1	14%	5	22%	8	0%	0	54%	20	0%	0	37
Drafting survey course	3%	2	6%	4	3%	2	17%	11	25%	16	0%	0	45%	29	2%	1	65
Family law drafting	5%	1	5%	1	5%	1	16%	3	11%	2	0%	0	58%	11	0%	0	19
Judicial opinion writing	3%	1	6%	2	0%	0	21%	7	27%	9	0%	0	42%	14	0%	0	33
Legislation	4%	1	8%	2	4%	1	20%	5	20%	5	0%	0	44%	11	0%	0	25
Litigation or pretrial drafting	5%	4	6%	5	3%	3	19%	16	24%	21	0%	0	42%	36	1%	1	86
Other (aggregated)	9%	5	9%	5	4%	2	9%	5	35%	19	0%	0	29%	16	5	3	55
Other transactional drafting	5%	1	19%	4	0%	0	10%	2	14%	3	0%	0	52%	11	0%	0	21
Scholarly writing	2%	1	2%	1	0%	0	13%	6	40%	18	0%	0	40%	18	2%	1	45
Wills/estate planning drafting	9%	3	6%	2	3%	1	9%	3	18%	6	0%	0	55%	18	0%	0	33

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

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

Select all that apply.

	Advanced advocacy	Advanced legal research	Appellate advocacy	Contract drafting	Corporate document drafting	Drafting survey course	Family law drafting
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	13	25	31	29	12	20	8
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses)	2	0	5	2	1	2	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	5	11	10	12	5	12	2
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	3	5	7	6	6	9	3
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	4	7	14	7	6	9	2
Other	2	8	7	3	1	5	3
None	7	14	17	13	7	13	4
Unknown	5	22	13	10	7	7	2
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	41	93	105	82	45	77	24

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part F . LRW Program(s) Structure

Q 7.12 - Continued

	Judicial opinion writing	Legislation	Litigation or pretrial drafting	Scholarly writing	Wills/estate planning drafting	Other (identify course name)	Other transactional drafting
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all other law school courses	13	13	30	15	12	16	10
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range), same as all 1L courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Required Mean GPA (incl. a range, specific to LRW Courses	1	0	3	0	0	4	1
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all other law school courses	6	2	9	6	2	3	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), same as all 1L courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Required Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs), specific to LRW Courses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Suggested/Non-Mandatory Mean GPA (incl. a range)	5	2	9	6	7	7	2
Suggested Distribution (e.g., 10% As, 20% Bs)	3	2	11	5	4	4	3
Other	3	1	7	4	3	7	2
None	4	6	18	13	5	15	2
Unknown	2	3	10	5	5	2	3
<b>Total Responses per Course</b>	37	29	97	54	38	58	23

## Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

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

Status	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	30%	43	70%	101	0%	0	144
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	8%	12	90%	130	1%	2	144
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	48%	69	52%	75	0%	0	144
Full-time, Short-term	39%	56	60%	86	1%	2	144
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	19%	28	80%	115	1%	1	144

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

Status	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Teaching Fellow	5%	7	94%	136	1%	1	144
Part-time	12%	17	88%	126	1%	1	144
Adjunct	55%	79	44%	64	1%	1	144

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

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Yes	33%	48
No	66%	95
Unknown	1%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>144</b>

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

Question	None of the LRW Faculty with this status are LRW Director(s).		All of the LRW Faculty with this status are LRW Director(s).		One or more (but not all) of the LRW Faculty with this status are LRW Director(s).		Total Responses per Status
	20%	6	30%	9	50%	15	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	20%	6	30%	9	50%	15	30
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	20%	2	30%	3	50%	5	10
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	24%	11	11%	5	65%	30	46
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	62%	29	4%	2	34%	16	47
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	40%	10	16%	4	44%	11	25

## ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

The following questions (Q8.10 through Q8.22) provide demographic information about survey responders and the individuals teaching legal research and writing at responding schools. Responses to these questions were not associated with responder names or schools. The information collected in response to these questions is reported in the aggregate and will not be reported for individual schools. If you have any questions, please contact us at [ALWD.LWI.Survey@gmail.com](mailto:ALWD.LWI.Survey@gmail.com).

This information was collected in most prior versions of the Institutional Survey, including the 2019-2020 Survey. Comparable demographic information is collected from a larger universe of respondents in the Individual Survey. In future years, we anticipate continuing to alternate between the Institutional and Individual Surveys as the means to collect this important information about the overall demographic characteristics of our legal writing community.

The first set of questions, Q8.10 through Q8.15, provides information about the demographics of the survey responders.

**Q8.10 - What was your age at the beginning of the 2021-2022 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.**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
30-39	2.7%	3
40-49	30.1%	34
50-59	44.2%	50
60-69	21.2%	24
70+	1.8%	2
<b>Total Responses</b>		113

**Q8.11 - What is your Gender Identity?**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Female	74.3%	104
Male	21.4%	30
Non-binary	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	3.6%	5
Prefer to self-describe	0.7%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>		140

**Q8.12 – Do you identify as transgender?**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
No	95.0%	133
Yes	0.7%	1
Prefer not to answer	4.3%	6
<b>Total Responses</b>		140

## ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

## Q8.13 - What is your sexual orientation?

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Bisexual	0.7%	1
Gay or lesbian	5.7%	8
Heterosexual	86.4%	121
Prefer not to answer	5.7%	8
Prefer to self-describe	1.4%	2
Total Responses		140

## Q8.14 - What is your race?

Note for the 2021-2022 Survey: the categories are taken from the ABA's annual law school questionnaire, and are different in some respects from the last time the survey was administered.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.5%	9
Asian	2.9%	4
Black or African-American	1.4%	2
Hispanic	1.4%	2
Multiracial	0.7%	1
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	5.0%	7
Prefer to self-describe; please describe	2.9%	4
White	79.1%	110
Total Responses		139

## Q8.15 - What was your status during the 2021-2022 Academic Year?

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	24.1%	34
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	7.8%	11
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	39.0%	55
Full-time, Short-term	10.6%	15
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	14.9%	21
Other (please describe)	3.5%	5
Total Responses		141

We have not included the text responses for the “other” category to avoid inadvertently identifying any individual responders.

## ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

The next set of questions, 8.16 through 8.22, provides information about the demographics of other faculty at the survey responders' schools. These questions did not ask for any identifying information about any individuals. We gave responders the option to opt out of providing any demographic information.

**Q8.16.** For each status of LRW Faculty listed below, excluding yourself, please indicate how many people with that status taught one or more LRW Courses at your school during the 2021-2022 Academic Year, to the best of your knowledge.

### Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	71.3%	102
1	9.8%	14
2	5.6%	8
3	1.4%	2
4	3.5%	5
5	2.1%	3
6	0.7%	1
8	2.8%	4
10-15	2.8%	4
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		143

### Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	93.8%	135
2	0.7%	1
3	2.1%	3
4	0.7%	1
6	1.4%	2
9	0.7%	1
10-15	0.6%	1
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		144

### 405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	55.6%	80
1	4.9%	7
2	7.6%	11
3	9.7%	14
4	7.6%	11
5	8.3%	12
6	0.7%	1
7	2.1%	3
8	2.8%	4
10-15	0.7%	1
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		144

## ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

**Full-time, Short-term**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	65.5%	93
1	8.5%	12
2	8.5%	12
3	1.4%	2
4	6.3%	9
5	3.5%	5
6	2.8%	4
7	1.4%	2
9	0.7%	1
10-15	1.4%	2
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		142

**Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	83.0%	117
1	3.5%	5
2	5.7%	8
3	2.1%	3
4	2.1%	3
5	0.7%	1
6	1.4%	2
10-15	1.4%	2
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		141

**Teaching Fellow**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	96.5%	138
1	0.7%	1
3	0.7%	1
6	1.4%	2
10-15	0.7%	1
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		143

**Part-Time**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	91.6%	131
1	4.9%	7
2	0.7%	1
3	1.4%	2
4	0.7%	1
7	0.7%	1
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		143

**Adjunct**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	56.9%	82
1	7.6%	11
2	4.9%	7
3	3.5%	5
4	2.1%	3
5	4.9%	7
6	3.5%	5
7	1.4%	2
8	0.7%	1
9	0.7%	1
10-15	6.9%	10
16+	6.9%	10
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		144

**Visitor**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	71.4%	100
1	17.9%	25
2	5.7%	8
3	0.7%	1
4	1.4%	2
5	0.7%	1
6	0.7%	1
7	0.7%	1
10-15	0.7%	1
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		140

**Other or Unknown Status**

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
0	97.2%	138
1	1.4%	2
3	0.7%	1
4	1.2%	1
<b>Total of Schools Responding</b>		142

## ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part G. Faculty Teaching LRW Classes

The remaining questions in this Part asked only about full-time LRW Faculty who taught one or more LRW Courses at the responder's school in the 2021-2022 Academic Year, excluding the responder. Some responders were not asked these questions if their answers to Q8.16 indicated that their school did not have any full-time LRW Faculty that year. The remaining responders were given the opportunity to opt out of providing the requested demographic information. As a result, these questions were asked of only the **92** responders who affirmatively replied that they were willing to provide such demographic information for their school.

Note - The survey included the following explanation: For each question below, to the best of your knowledge please provide the number of full-time LRW Faculty at your school who fit into each category, excluding yourself.

For purposes of these questions, full-time LRW Faculty include the following status types, as defined in this Survey:

- Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure;
- Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure;
- 405(c) or 405(c)-track;
- Full-time, Short-term; and
- Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status.

Do not include information about Adjunct and Part-time faculty, Teaching Fellows, or Visitors.

### Q8.18 AGE at the start of the 2021-2022 Academic Year

Answer	% of Total Number of Professors	Number of Professors
30 or younger	3.4%	16
31-40	19.2%	89
41-50	34.1%	158
51-60	27.4%	127
61-70	9.7%	45
71 or older	1.1%	5
Unknown	5.0%	23
Prefer not to answer	0.2%	1
<b>Total Number of Professors</b>		<b>464</b>

### Q8.19 GENDER IDENTITY

Answer	% of Total Number of Professors	Number of Professors
Female	73.1%	365
Male	26.9%	134
Non-binary	0.0%	0
Unknown	0.0%	0
Other	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	0.0%	0
<b>Total Number of Professors</b>		<b>499</b>

**Q8.20 IDENTIFICATION AS TRANSGENDER**

Answer	% of Total Number of Professors	Number of Professors
Yes	0.3%	1
No	89.1%	311
Unknown	8.6%	30
Prefer not to answer	2.0%	7
<b>Total Number of Professors</b>		<b>349</b>

**Q8.21 SEXUAL ORIENTATION**

Answer	% of Total Number of Professors	Number of Professors
Heterosexual	77.3%	338
Gay or Lesbian	4.8%	21
Bisexual	0.5%	2
Other	0.2%	1
Unknown	12.4%	54
Prefer not to answer	4.8%	21
<b>Total Number of Professors</b>		<b>437</b>

**Q8.22 RACE**

Note for the 2021-2022 Survey: the categories are taken from the ABA's annual law school questionnaire, and are different in some respects from the last time the survey was administered. Also, the order of the answer options has been changed from previous surveys. If your responses are pre-populated from that previous survey, please check to confirm that they remain correct for this year.

Answer	% of Total Number of Professors	Number of Professors
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.2%	30
Asian	4.8%	23
Black or African-American	8.9%	43
Hispanic	3.1%	15
Multiracial	0.4%	2
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.0%	0
Prefer not to answer	0.2%	1
Unknown	3.7%	18
White	72.7%	352
<b>Total Number of Professors</b>		<b>484</b>

## Part H. Directors

Q4.2 asked responders to identify which LRW Programs are included in the responding school's LRW curriculum. Q4.3 asked responders to indicate whether the LRW Programs identified in Q4.2 had one or more LRW Director(s). As reflected in Part C, the responses to Q4.2 and Q4.3 indicate that 83 of 121 First-Year LRW Programs (69%) have one or more LRW Directors, 16 of 32 Upper-Level LRW Programs (50%) have one or more LRW Directors, and 21 of 23 Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Programs (91%) have one or more LRW Directors.

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

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

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

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

	%	Responses per Answer
1 LRW Director	88%	73
2 LRW Directors	11%	9
3 LRW Directors	1%	1
Total Responses		83

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

	%	Responses per Answer
1 LRW Director	94%	15
2 LRW Directors	6%	1
Total Responses		16

Q9.2 - Continued

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

	%	Responses per Answer
1 LRW Director	81%	17
2 LRW Directors	14%	3
3 LRW Directors	5%	1
Total Responses		21

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

	Director, coordinator, or administrator	Co-director, co-coordinator, co-administrator	Associate/assistant director, associate/assistant coordinator, associate/assistant administrator
First-Year LRW Program	82	8	4
Upper-Level LRW Program	15	2	0
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	21	2	3

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

Question	1 year	2 years	3 or more years	Unlimited
First-Year LRW Program	5	7	10	72
Upper-Level LRW Program	0	2	3	12
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level Program	3	0	4	19

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

Question	Permanent	Rotating
First-Year LRW Program	85	9
Upper-Level LRW Program	14	3
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	22	4

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

	Same as other full-time teachers in the program	Less than other full-time teacher in the program	No teaching responsibilities	Other	N/A (e.g., no other full-time teachers in the program)	Unknown	More than other full-time teachers in the program	Different in a way that makes comparison difficult
<b>First-Year LRW Program</b>	43	27	2	3	6	1	3	9
<b>Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	4	3	3	1	4	1	0	1
<b>Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program</b>	20	5	0	0	0	0	1	0

**Q9.5#1 - Explanatory Text for “Other” Teaching Responsibility Comparisons:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” to describe the teaching responsibilities for an LRW Director relative to other full-time teachers in the program. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

**9.5#2 - What is the status of the LRW Director(s) for the specified LRW Program(s)?**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	25	5	5
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	7	1	3
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	29	5	10
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	11	4	6
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	21	1	2
<b>Visitor</b>	0	0	0
<b>Other</b>	1	1	0
<b>Unknown</b>	0	0	0

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
LRW Faculty	87	13	26
Non-LRW Faculty	5	2	0
Administrator/Staff Member	1	2	0
Unknown	1	0	0

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Program Type <sup>17</sup>
First-Year LRW Program	1.0	35.0	9.4	94
Upper-Level LRW Program	2.0	34.0	10.4	17
Combined LRW Program	1.0	20.0	5.5	26
Other	1.0	34.0	21.3	6

---

<sup>17</sup> The Total Responses per Program Type for Q9.6 also reflects the total number of LRW Directors for whom information was provided. Recall that some programs have more than one Director. Further, in preparing this Report, it came to the Committee’s attention that the information reported in the 2019-2020 Report for the Combined LRW Program answer option was incorrect due to a copying error. The correct results for that answer option were a minimum of 1.0, a maximum of 17.0, a mean of 5.5, and 36 total responses.

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

## First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		No		No, but the LRW Director(s) have a different status than other LRW Faculty and receive a higher salary based on that status.		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	26%	21	46%	37	20%	16	8%	6	80
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	20%	1	40%	2	40%	2	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	75%	3	25%	1	0%	0	4

## Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		No, but the LRW Director(s) have a different status than other LRW Faculty and receive a higher salary based on that status.		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	7%	1	40%	6	20%	3	33%	5	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

## Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		No, but the LRW Director(s) have a different status than other LRW Faculty and receive a higher salary based on that status.		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	20%	4	60%	12	10%	2	10%	2	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant /associate administrator	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2

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

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	42%	34	56%	45	2%	2	81
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	20%	1	80%	4	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	25%	1	75%	3	0%	0	4

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	40%	6	47%	7	13%	2	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	35%	7	60%	12	5%	1	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2

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

#### First-Year LRW Program

	Fixed Amount		Percentage of Existing Salary		Varies		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	67%	14	10%	2	5%	1	19%	4	21
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

#### Upper-Level LRW Program

	Fixed Amount		Percentage of Existing Salary		Varies		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

#### Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Fixed Amount		Percentage of Existing Salary		Varies		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	25%	1	0%	0	50%	2	25%	1	4
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	42%	8	11%	2	47%	9	19
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	0%	0	33%	1	67%	2	3
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	26%	5	16%	3	26%	5	32%	6	19
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	0%	0	0%	0	25%	1	75%	3	4
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Position Description
<b>Director, Coordinator, or Administrator</b>	5,000	28,000	12,400	5
<b>Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator</b>	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

#### First-Year LRW Program

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	55%	18	0%	0	45%	15	33
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1

#### Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	40%	2	0%	0	60%	3	5
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

#### Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	86%	6	0%	0	14%	1	7
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	47%	16	26%	9	6%	2	21%	7	34
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	1

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	50%	3	0%	0	0%	0	50%	3	6
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Yes		Yes, but prefer not to provide		No		N/A		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, Coordinator, or Administrator	43%	3	29%	2	14%	1	14%	1	7
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	50%	1	50%	1	0%	0	2

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Position Description
<b>Director, Coordinator, or Administrator</b>	1,000	30,000	13,900	16
<b>Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator</b>	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	16%	13	43%	34	1%	1	19%	15	21%	17	80
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	60%	3	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	25%	1	25%	1	0%	0	50%	2	0%	0	4

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	7%	1	40%	6	0%	0	20%	3	33%	5	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	35%	7	30%	6	5%	1	15%	3	15%	3	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	2

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

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	31%	25	3%	2	29%	23	3%	2	35%	28	80
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	60%	3	0%	0	0%	0	20%	1	20%	1	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	75%	3	4

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	27%	4	13%	2	20%	3	0%	0	40%	6	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	35%	7	10%	2	20%	4	0%	0	35%	7	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	2

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

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	8%	6	0%	0	44%	35	15%	12	34%	27	80
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	80%	4	20%	1	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	25%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	75%	3	4

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	20%	3	0%	0	27%	4	20%	3	33%	5	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	10%	2	5%	1	55%	11	5%	1	25%	5	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	2

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

#### First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	79%	64	1%	1	0%	0	15%	12	5%	4	81
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	60%	3	0%	0	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	50%	2	0%	0	0%	0	50%	2	0%	0	4

#### Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	60%	9	0%	0	0%	0	20%	3	20%	3	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

#### Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	85%	17	0%	0	5%	1	5%	1	5%	1	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2

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

**First-Year LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	84%	68	1%	1	2%	2	1%	1	11%	9	81
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	75%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	25%	1	4

**Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	67%	10	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	33%	5	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program**

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
Director, coordinator, or administrator	85%	17	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	10%	2	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2

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

#### First-Year LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	70%	57	0%	0	4%	3	10%	8	16%	13	81
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	80%	4	0%	0	0%	0	20%	1	0%	0	5
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	75%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	25%	1	4

#### Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	47%	7	0%	0	0%	0	20%	3	33%	5	15
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	50%	1	2
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

#### Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program

	Equivalent to most/all		Higher than most/all		Lower than most/all		N/A		Unknown		Total Responses per Position Description
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Director, coordinator, or administrator	80%	16	0%	0	10%	2	5%	1	5%	1	20
Co-director, co-coordinator, or co-administrator	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Assistant/associate director, assistant/associate co-coordinator, assistant/associate administrator	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	2

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

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

Status	Full voting rights		No voting rights		Vote on everything except matters related to tenure or promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions		Vote on everything except matters related to tenure or promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions AND matters related to tenure or promotion of any Non-LRW Faculty, regardless of status		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	91%	39	0%	0	2%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	1	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	50%	6	0%	0	50%	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	4%	3	6%	4	72%	50	10%	7	7%	5	0%	0	69
Full-time, Short-term	0%	0	45%	25	21%	12	18%	10	11%	6	4%	3	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	43%	12	29%	8	18%	5	7%	2	3%	1	28

Q10.3 - You selected "Other" as the best description of the voting rights for LRW Faculty who are Tenured or Tenure-Track with Traditional Tenure. Please describe the voting rights for LRW Faculty with that status.

### Other Voting Rights Descriptions – Tenured or Tenure-Track with Traditional Tenure

LRW faculty have full voting rights with the exception of status or promotion. Meaning: if the LRW faculty has tenure, he/she can vote on tenure for other faculty members, whereas [program] professors cannot. The same is true for status votes. If the [program] employee or tenure employee is a full professor, he/she can vote on all promotions, whereas an associate professor cannot vote for full professor promotions. This is the same as the rule for case-book faculty.

**Q10.4 – You selected “Other” as the best description of the voting rights for LRW Faculty who are Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure. Please describe the voting rights for LRW Faculty with that status.**

No responses were received for this status

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

Other Voting Rights Descriptions – 405(c) or 405(c)-track
LRW faculty as always enjoyed voting rights on all matters except tenure related matters. This year the Faculty has refused these rights to our newly hired LRW full-time professors. It is currently a contentious issue that we are trying to resolve.
Full voting rights except for the actual tenure vote
Vote on everything except matters related to hiring or tenure/promotion of faculty with traditional tenure/tenure-track positions.
Vote on all except traditional promotion rights. So, if only an associate, cannot vote on promotions to full professor.
Vote on everything except 1) tenure/promotion of traditional tenure matters; 2) promotion decisions for some clinical professors (this depends on the length of contract that the clinical prof is up for AND the length of contract that the LRW prof currently has), and 3) an internal budget item that by its terms applies only to traditional tenure profs.

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

Other Voting Rights Descriptions – Full-time, Short-term
Only the Director can vote except on matters related to tenure/promotion. Other LRW faculty members cannot vote.
Visitors do not have voting rights except by invitation of the permanent faculty.
On initial hire, FT, Short term faculty do not have voting rights, but after promotion to a three-year contract, they do have voting rights on matters other than Tenure/Tenure Track promotion. In the 2021-22 year, there were no LRW faculty in the latter category.
No right to vote on appointments, R&T, dean selection, election of faculty committees, votes of “no-confidence,” and matters affecting the legal research and writing curriculum.
Vote on everything except hiring + T&P matters.
Voting rights on everything except tenure and promotion for all faculty and academic catalog changes

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

Other Voting Rights Descriptions – Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Vote on everything except matters relating to hiring, tenure, and promotion of regular-title series (tenure track) and library-title series (programmatic tenure of sorts).
Can vote on all except for hiring, tenure, and promotion of tenure-track faculty, hiring of clinical, legal writing, and legal research faculty, and voting on the regulations for the law school.

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

Status	Permitted		Required		Expected		Not allowed		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	88%	38	9%	4	0%	0	2%	1	43
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	92%	11	8%	1	0%	0	0%	0	12
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	91%	63	7%	5	0%	0	1%	1	69
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	18%	10	48%	27	13%	7	5%	3	16%	9	56
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	18%	5	54%	15	11%	3	11%	3	7%	2	28

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

Status	None		Any committee except those related to tenure/promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions		Any committee except those related to tenure/promotion of faculty with Traditional Tenure/Tenure-track positions AND matters related to tenure/promotion of any Non-LRW Faculty, regardless of status		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	95%	37	3%	1	0%	0	3%	1	0%	0	39
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	67%	8	33%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	18%	12	62%	42	15%	10	6%	4	0%	0	68
Full-time, Short-term	9%	4	41%	18	25%	11	9%	4	16%	7	44
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	9%	2	48%	11	30%	7	9%	2	4%	1	23

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

Status	Yes		Yes, but the vote is only advisory		No		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	100%	39	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	39
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100%	12	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	96%	65	3%	2	0%	0	1%	1	0%	0	68
Full-time, Short-term	68%	30	11%	5	9%	4	2%	1	9%	4	44
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	65%	15	22%	5	4%	1	4%	1	4%	1	23

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

Professional Development Benefits	Yes		No		Unknown		Total Responses per Benefit
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Paid Sabbatical	62%	87	30%	42	8%	11	140
Unpaid Sabbatical	39%	54	28%	39	34%	47	140
Travel/Professional Development Funds	96%	135	1%	2	2%	3	140
Scholarship/Research Stipends	82%	115	15%	21	3%	4	140
Research Assistants	94%	131	4%	6	2%	3	140

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

**Paid Sabbatical**

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	97%	32	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3%	1	33
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	73%	8	9%	1	18%	2	0%	0	0%	0	11
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	40%	17	12%	5	42%	18	0%	0	7%	3	43
Full-time, Short-term	6%	2	3%	1	74%	23	0%	0	16%	5	31
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	13%	2	0%	0	60%	9	0%	0	27%	4	15

## Unpaid Sabbatical

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	89%	16	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	11%	2	18
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	78%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	42%	10	8%	2	21%	5	4%	1	25%	6	24
Full-time, Short-term	5%	1	11%	2	42%	8	0%	0	42%	8	19
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	11%	1	11%	1	22%	2	0%	0	56%	5	9

## Scholarship/Research Stipends

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	95%	38	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5%	2	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	90%	9	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	10%	1	10
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	56%	35	21%	13	6%	4	0%	0	16%	10	62
Full-time, Short-term	32%	15	28%	13	15%	7	2%	1	23%	11	47
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	43%	9	19%	4	19%	4	0%	0	19%	4	21

**Travel/Professional Development Funds**

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	95%	40	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5%	2	42
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	83%	10	8%	1	0%	0	0%	0	8%	1	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	74%	50	19%	13	0%	0	0%	0	7%	5	68
Full-time, Short-term	34%	18	38%	20	4%	2	0%	0	25%	13	53
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	40%	10	32%	8	0%	0	0%	0	28%	7	25

**Research Assistants**

Status	Same		Available, but to a more limited degree (e.g., less frequently or in smaller amounts)		Not available		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	95%	38	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5%	2	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	83%	10	8%	1	0%	0	0%	0	8%	1	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	78%	52	6%	4	3%	2	1%	1	12%	8	67
Full-time, Short-term	48%	25	21%	11	12%	6	2%	1	17%	9	52
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	62%	16	19%	5	4%	1	0%	0	15%	4	26

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

Select all that apply.

Status	Lower amounts for LRW Faculty		Less frequently for LRW Faculty		Only available with approval of administration (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Only available if funds remain after all Non-LRW Faculty requests are fulfilled		Other limitations		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	77%	10	31%	4	0%	0	0%	0	15%	2	13
Full-time, Short-term	69%	9	31%	4	8%	1	15%	2	15%	2	13
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	75%	3	25%	1	25%	1	50%	2	25%	1	4

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

Select all that apply.

Status	Lower amounts for LRW Faculty		Less frequently for LRW Faculty		Only available with approval of administration (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Only available if giving a presentation (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Other limitations		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	77%	10	31%	4	0%	0	0%	0	8%	1	13
Full-time, Short-term	85%	17	30%	6	20%	4	10%	2	0%	0	20
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	75%	6	25%	2	13%	1	0%	0	0%	0	8

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

Select all that apply.

Status	Only available with approval of administration (which isn't required for Non-LRW Faculty)		Only available if funds remain after all Non-LRW Faculty requests are fulfilled		Other limitations		Total Responses per Status
	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	50%	2	0%	0	50%	2	4
Full-time, Short-term	36%	4	0%	0	64%	7	11
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	40%	2	0%	0	60%	3	5

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

Status	Not allowed		Allowed, but only as an overload/summer course		Periodically allowed as part of normal course load		Regularly allowed as part of normal course load		Other		Varies by professor		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	7%	3	14%	6	60%	26	2%	1	14%	6	2%	1	43
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	8%	1	8%	1	17%	2	33%	4	0%	0	33%	4	0%	0	12
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	4%	3	28%	19	20%	14	25%	17	3%	2	20%	14	0%	0	69
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	13%	7	23%	13	13%	7	20%	11	0%	0	21%	12	11%	6	56
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	7%	2	21%	6	18%	5	25%	7	4%	1	7%	2	18%	5	28

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

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

*As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to this question. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. The parenthetical number in the table below indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, if 0s are included, the minimum number of students in LRW Courses for Tenured or Tenure-track LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure is 0.0, the mean number of students is 28.0, and there were 39 responses for this status category. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of students in LRW Courses for Tenured or Tenure-track LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure is 15, the mean number of students is 33.1, and there were 33 responses for this status category.*

Status	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Status
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0.0 (15.0)	75.0	28.0 (33.1)	39 (33)
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	20.0	44.0	35.7	10
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0.0 (20.0)	55.0	32.6 (34.2)	67 (64)
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0.0 (16.0)	55.0	32.4 (33.7)	52 (50)
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0.0 (15.0)	100.0	30.3 (33.9)	28 (25)

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part I. Faculty Governance & Professional Development for Full-time Faculty

Student Load Range	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	Combined – All Status Categories
0 Students	6	0	3	2	3	14
1-10 Students	0	0	0	0	0	0
11-20 Students	7	1	7	7	5	27
21-30 Students	8	3	16	14	6	47
31-40 Students	9	3	30	19	11	72
41-50 Students	8	3	9	9	2	31
51-60 Students	0	0	2	1	0	3
61-70 Students	0	0	0	0	0	0
71-80 Students	1	0	0	0	0	1
81-90 Students	0	0	0	0	0	0
91-100 Students	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	39	10	67	52	28	196

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

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

Status	Yes		No		Unknown		Responses per Status
Full-time, Short-term	13%	7	79%	44	9%	5	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	89%	25	11%	3	28

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

Status	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Status
Full-time, Short-term	1.0	4.0	2.6	7
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part J . Hiring, Promotion, Retention

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

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

Status	9 mos		10 mos		11 mos		12 mos		Varies too much to say		Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenure or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure</b>	53%	23	9%	4	0%	0	28%	12	5%	2	5%	2	43
<b>Tenure or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure</b>	58%	7	8%	1	0%	0	25%	3	0%	0	8%	1	12
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track</b>	39%	27	13%	9	1%	1	42%	29	1%	1	3%	2	69
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	36%	20	13%	7	4%	2	38%	21	11%	6	0%	0	56
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	29%	8	7%	2	0%	0	39%	11	18%	5	7%	2	28

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)		Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)		405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)		Full-time, Short-term		Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
One or more individual(s) have the power to unilaterally hire without approval from the faculty.	0%	0	0%	0	7%	5	32%	18	29%	8
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty as a whole.	84%	36	50%	6	51%	35	18%	10	21%	6
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have higher status.	0%	0	0%	0	4%	3	9%	5	7%	2
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have the same or higher status.	7%	3	33%	4	17%	12	5%	3	4%	1
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of Non-LRW Faculty.	2%	1	0%	0	3%	2	0%	0	0%	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of Non-LRW Faculty.	0%	0	0%	0	4%	3	13%	7	11%	3
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of LRW Faculty.	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of LRW Faculty.	0%	0	8%	1	3%	2	5%	3	7%	2
Other	0%	0	0%	0	4%	3	7%	4	11%	3
Unknown	7%	3	0%	0	3%	2	9%	5	7%	2
Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors	0%	0	8%	1	3%	2	2%	1	4%	1
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>		43		12		69		56		28

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

Select all that apply.

Status	Dean		Associate Dean		LRW Director(s)		Other		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
Full-time, Short-term	67%	16	25%	6	4%	1	4%	1	24
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	80%	8	20%	2	0%	0	0%	0	10

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

Select all that apply.

Status	Dean or associate dean		LRW Director(s)		Faculty Committee		Other		Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors	Unknown		Responses per Status	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count		%	Count		
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	58%	25	7%	3	72%	31	2%	1	2%	1	5%	2	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	42%	5	25%	3	58%	7	0%	0	17%	2	0%	0	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	61%	42	28%	19	81%	56	3%	2	3%	2	1%	1	69
Full-time, Short-term	71%	40	39%	22	41%	23	4%	2	2%	1	7%	4	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	68%	19	32%	9	43%	12	7%	2	4%	1	11%	3	28

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

Status	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought		Other		Unknown		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	48%	15	0%	0	29%	9	19%	6	3%	1	31
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	86%	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	14%	1	7
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	73%	41	0%	0	18%	10	9%	5	0%	0	56
Full-time, Short-term	43%	10	4%	1	30%	7	22%	5	0%	0	23
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	58%	7	0%	0	17%	2	25%	3	0%	0	12

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

Status	Dean or associate dean		LRW Director(s)		Faculty Committee		Other		Varies depending on purpose		Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are procedures applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Unknown		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	35%	23	5%	3	52%	34	3%	2	2%	1	2%	1	3%	2	66
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	21%	3	7%	1	50%	7	0%	0	0%	0	14%	2	7%	1	14
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	33%	39	14%	16	46%	54	3%	3	2%	2	2%	2	2%	2	118
Full-time, Short-term	42%	40	22%	21	24%	23	2%	2	1%	1	1%	1	8%	8	96
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	43%	19	20%	9	25%	11	2%	1	2%	1	2%	1	5%	2	44

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

Status	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought		Other		Unknown		Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	59%	20	0%	0	26%	9	15%	5	0%	0	34
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	86%	6	14%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	7
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	70%	38	0%	0	24%	13	6%	3	0%	0	54
Full-time, Short-term	43%	10	0%	0	30%	7	22%	5	4%	1	23
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	45%	5	0%	0	27%	3	27%	3	0%	0	11

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)		Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)		405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)		Full-time, Short-term		Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
<b>No, the standards are the same for all faculty with similar status.</b>	86%	37	33%	4	29%	20	23%	13	18%	5
<b>No, there are no standards applicable to LRW Faculty, although standards are being developed.</b>	0%	0	0%	0	1%	1	5%	3	4%	1
<b>No, there are no standards applicable to LRW Faculty, and none are being developed.</b>	2%	1	0%	0	4%	3	14%	8	25%	7
<b>Yes, there are specific standards for LRW Faculty.</b>	2%	1	42%	5	54%	37	25%	14	29%	8
<b>Yes, by default; LRW Faculty are the only faculty with this status.</b>	0%	0	0%	0	3%	2	7%	4	4%	1
<b>Other</b>	2%	1	0%	0	1%	1	5%	3	0%	0
<b>Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors</b>	2%	1	17%	2	4%	3	2%	1	7%	2
<b>Unknown</b>	5%	2	8%	1	3%	2	18%	10	14%	4
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>		43		12		69		56		28

ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part J . Hiring, Promotion, Retention

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

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

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	3%	1	90%	35	8%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	44%	4	44%	4	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	40%	24	33%	20	17%	10	3%	2	7%	4	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	18%	6	38%	13	15%	5	15%	5	15%	5	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	36%	5	29%	4	14%	2	0%	0	21%	3	14

Q11.14-11.16 - Continued

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standard related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	3%	1	92%	36	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	78%	7	11%	1	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	40%	24	48%	29	3%	2	2%	1	5%	3	2%	1	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	18%	6	47%	16	6%	2	0%	0	9%	3	21%	7	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	21%	3	43%	6	7%	1	0%	0	14%	2	14%	2	14

Q11.14-11.16 - Continued

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standard related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status.		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	3%	1	85%	33	10%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	3%	1	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	11%	1	44%	4	33%	3	0%	0	0%	0	11%	1	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	8%	5	10%	6	37%	22	3%	2	2%	1	40%	24	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	3%	1	6%	2	30%	10	0%	0	6%	2	55%	18	33
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	21%	3	0%	0	7%	1	71%	10	14

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

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	3%	1	69%	27	8%	3	0%	0	0%	0	8%	3	13%	5	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	67%	6	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	23%	14	35%	21	8%	5	0%	0	10%	6	23%	14	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	15%	5	29%	10	9%	3	6%	2	24%	8	18%	6	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	21%	3	29%	4	0%	0	0%	0	29%	4	21%	3	14

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standards related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	3%	1	74%	29	8%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	15%	6	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	78%	7	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	22%	2	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	30%	18	40%	24	3%	2	0%	0	3%	2	2%	1	22%	13	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	15%	5	36%	12	6%	2	3%	1	9%	3	12%	4	18%	6	33
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	7%	1	29%	4	14%	2	0%	0	21%	3	0%	0	29%	4	14

Q11.17-11.19 - Continued

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standards related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	3%	1	64%	25	10%	4	0%	0	3%	1	3%	1	3%	1	15%	6	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	33%	3	33%	3	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	11%	1	22%	2	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	10%	6	15%	9	20%	12	0%	0	7%	4	22%	13	27%	16	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	6%	2	9%	3	21%	7	3%	1	12%	4	30%	10	18%	6	33
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	0%	0	7%	1	7%	1	0%	0	21%	3	36%	5	29%	4	14

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

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		N/A		Total Responses per Status
			%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	49%	19	5%	2	0%	0	0%	0	13%	5	33%	13	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	89%	8	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	15%	9	20%	12	5%	3	0%	0	12%	7	48%	29	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	3%	1	24%	8	3%	1	3%	1	29%	10	38%	13	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	14%	2	21%	3	0%	0	0%	0	21%	3	43%	6	14

Q11.20-11.22 - Continued

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standards related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0%	0	51%	20	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	13%	5	0%	0	33%	13	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	51%	20	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	13%	5	0%	0	33%	13	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	100%	9	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	13%	8	27%	16	2%	1	0%	0	10%	6	0%	0	48%	29	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	3%	1	26%	9	3%	1	3%	1	18%	6	9%	3	38%	13	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	7%	1	21%	3	7%	1	0%	0	21%	3	0%	0	43%	6	14

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standards related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	44%	17	5%	2	0%	0	3%	1	15%	6	0%	0	33%	13	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	56%	5	22%	2	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	11%	1	0%	0	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	7%	4	8%	5	12%	7	0%	0	8%	5	12%	7	53%	32	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	3%	1	6%	2	6%	2	3%	1	15%	5	24%	8	44%	15	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	7%	1	0%	0	14%	2	29%	4	50%	7	14

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

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	31%	12	13%	5	5%	2	0%	0	10%	4	41%	16	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	22%	2	22%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	56%	5	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	35%	21	35%	21	7%	4	0%	0	8%	5	15%	9	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	12%	4	21%	7	6%	2	6%	2	18%	6	38%	13	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	7%	1	29%	4	0%	0	0%	0	36%	5	29%	4	14

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standards related to service applicable to LRW Faculty with this status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	33%	13	13%	5	3%	1	0%	0	10%	4	0%	0	41%	16	39
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	33%	3	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	56%	5	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	43%	26	33%	20	3%	2	0%	0	7%	4	2%	1	12%	7	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	9%	3	21%	7	6%	2	3%	1	9%	3	12%	4	41%	14	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	7%	1	29%	4	0%	0	0%	0	29%	4	7%	1	29%	4	14

Q11.23-11.25 - Continued

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Same standards		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		No written standards related to scholarship applicable to LRW Faculty with this status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	30%	11	5%	2	11%	4	3%	1	11%	4	0%	0	41%	15	37
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	11%	1	11%	1	11%	1	0%	0	0%	0	11%	1	56%	5	9
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	28%	17	17%	10	5%	3	0%	0	8%	5	23%	14	18%	11	60
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	3%	1	12%	4	6%	2	3%	1	9%	3	21%	7	47%	16	34
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	0%	0	14%	2	7%	1	0%	0	14%	2	36%	5	29%	4	14

ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part J . Hiring, Promotion, Retention

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

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

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		There are no written standards related to teaching that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	35%	13	5%	2	3%	1	16%	6	3%	1	38%	14	37
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	21%	3	7%	1	0%	0	43%	6	0%	0	29%	4	14
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status</b>	0%	0	38%	3	0%	0	0%	0	50%	4	0%	0	13%	1	8

Q11.27-11.29 - Continued

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		There are no written standards related to service that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	46%	17	0%	0	0%	0	11%	4	5%	2	38%	14	37
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	21%	3	0%	0	0%	0	43%	6	7%	1	29%	4	14
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status</b>	0%	0	38%	3	0%	0	0%	0	50%	4	0%	0	13%	1	8

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		There are no written standards related to scholarship that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	1
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	80%	4	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	11%	4	22%	8	0%	0	11%	4	19%	7	38%	14	37
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	8%	1	8%	1	0%	0	23%	3	31%	4	31%	4	13
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	0%	0	13%	1	0%	0	25%	2	25%	2	38%	3	8

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

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		There are no written standards related to teaching that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	80%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	20%	1	5
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	68%	25	8%	3	0%	0	11%	4	3%	1	11%	4	37
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	36%	5	14%	2	0%	0	43%	6	0%	0	7%	1	14
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	50%	4	0%	0	0%	0	50%	4	0%	0	0%	0	8

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		There are no written standards related to service that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	80%	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	20%	1	5
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	76%	28	0%	0	0%	0	8%	3	5%	2	11%	4	37
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	36%	5	7%	1	0%	0	43%	6	7%	1	7%	1	14
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	50%	4	0%	0	0%	0	50%	4	0%	0	0%	0	8

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

	Only LRW Directors have this status, and there are on-point standards applicable specifically to LRW Directors		Substantially similar standards		Substantially different standards		Other		Unknown		There are no written standards related to scholarship that are applicable based on a faculty member's role as LRW Faculty rather than status		N/A		Total Responses per Status
	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	60%	3	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	20%	1	5
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	0%	0	43%	16	3%	1	3%	1	14%	5	24%	9	14%	5	37
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	0%	0	15%	2	8%	1	0%	0	38%	5	31%	4	8%	1	13
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	13%	1	13%	1	0%	0	13%	1	38%	3	25%	2	8

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

Select all that apply.

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Required for promotion	119	32	13	5	0
Expected for promotion	5	3	7	0	0
Required for retention	16	5	4	0	0
Expected for retention	15	6	7	4	0
Required for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	7	1	1	0	0
Expected for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	2	0	0	0	0
Not required or expected	0	1	16	30	19
Not required or expected, but encouraged or rewarded	1	3	29	14	11
Other	0	0	0	1	1
Unknown	14	24	27	37	36
My school does not have Non-LRW Faculty with this status	2	77	47	51	72
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	140	139	138	140	139

ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part J . Hiring, Promotion, Retention

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

Select all that apply.

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Required for promotion	39	7	15	3	0
Expected for promotion	3	1	6	1	0
Required for retention	6	3	2	1	0
Expected for retention	3	2	6	3	0
Required for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	1	1	1	0	0
Expected for retention but only before tenure/long-term contract is received	2	0	0	0	0
Not required or expected	0	1	13	25	15
Not required or expected, but encouraged or rewarded	1	2	33	21	8
Other	0	0	1	0	2
Unknown	2	1	2	4	3
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	43	12	69	55	28

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

Articles about doctrinal subjects

Status	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	100%	40	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100%	8	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	95%	20	0%	0	5%	1	0%	0	21
Full-time, Short-term	100%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Articles about pedagogy (LRW)

Status	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	93%	37	0%	0	3%	1	5%	2	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	88%	7	0%	0	13%	1	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	90%	19	0%	0	10%	2	0%	0	21
Full-time, Short-term	40%	2	0%	0	60%	3	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Articles about pedagogy (non-LRW)

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	90%	36	0%	0	5%	2	5%	2	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	88%	7	0%	0	0%	0	13%	1	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	86%	18	0%	0	10%	2	5%	1	21
Full-time, Short-term	20%	1	0%	0	60%	3	20%	1	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Articles about legal writing theory or practice

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	98%	39	0%	0	0%	0	3%	1	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	100%	8	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	90%	19	0%	0	10%	2	0%	0	21
Full-time, Short-term	40%	2	0%	0	60%	3	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Articles about other skills

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	85%	34	0%	0	5%	2	10%	4	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	88%	7	0%	0	13%	1	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	81%	17	0%	0	10%	2	10%	2	21
Full-time, Short-term	60%	3	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Textbooks

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	65%	26	10%	4	23%	9	3%	1	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	88%	7	0%	0	0%	0	13%	1	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	76%	16	5%	1	14%	3	5%	1	21
Full-time, Short-term	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	40%	2	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Articles in practice-oriented publications

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	40%	16	28%	11	20%	8	13%	5	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	63%	5	13%	1	25%	2	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	76%	16	10%	2	14%	3	0%	0	21
Full-time, Short-term	40%	2	20%	1	20%	1	20%	1	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Briefs, court documents, or other writings for practice

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	15%	6	40%	16	33%	13	13%	5	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	13%	1	50%	4	38%	3	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	38%	8	33%	7	19%	4	10%	2	21
Full-time, Short-term	0%	0	60%	3	20%	1	20%	1	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Q11.35-11.36 - Continued

Teaching materials (simulations, writing problems, etc.)

	Yes		No		Unclear		Unknown		Responses per status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	13%	5	63%	25	15%	6	10%	4	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	13%	1	38%	3	50%	4	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	24%	5	33%	7	33%	7	10%	2	21
Full-time, Short-term	20%	1	40%	2	40%	2	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

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

**Number of Works Required in a Given Time Period**

	Same		More for LRW Faculty		Fewer for LRW Faculty		Varies too much to compare		Unclear		Unknown		Responses Per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	78%	31	0%	0	10%	4	3%	1	5%	2	5%	2	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	38%	3	0%	0	63%	5	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	24%	5	0%	0	43%	9	0%	0	29%	6	5%	1	21
Full-time, Short-term	40%	2	0%	0	20%	1	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

**Type of Works that Qualify**

	Same		Broader for LRW Faculty		Narrower for LRW Faculty		Varies too much to compare		Unclear		Unknown		Responses Per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	85%	34	3%	1	0%	0	5%	2	3%	1	5%	2	40
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	25%	2	75%	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	8
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	19%	4	67%	14	0%	0	0%	0	10%	2	5%	1	21
Full-time, Short-term	40%	2	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	5
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

Q11.37 - Continued

**Length of Works that Qualify**

	Same		Shorter for LRW Faculty		Longer for LRW Faculty		Varies too much to compare		Unclear		Unknown		Responses Per Status
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	83%	33	3%	1	0%	0	8%	3	3%	1	5%	2	40
<b>Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	25%	2	75%	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	8
<b>405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	19%	4	38%	8	0%	0	10%	2	24%	5	10%	2	21
<b>Full-time, Short-term</b>	40%	2	20%	1	0%	0	0%	0	40%	2	0%	0	5
<b>Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0

The following questions focus on standards or procedures that are applicable to LRW Director(s) based on the LRW Director designation. Q11.39 was shown only to responders who indicated that their school had one or more non-visiting LRW Faculty serving as an LRW Director. If the responder answered “no” or “Unknown” the survey platform skipped Q11.40 through Q11.53 for that responder.

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
<b>Yes</b>	16%	15
<b>No</b>	77%	74
<b>Unknown</b>	7%	7
<b>Total</b>		96

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

Status	Same as for non- Director LRW Faculty with this status	9 mos	10 mos	11 mos	12 mos	Varies too much to say	Responses per Answer
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	3	0	0	0	4	0	7
Full-time, Short-term	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0	0	0	0	1	0	1

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
There are no specific procedures based on LRW Director designation; the answer is the same as for other LRW Faculty with this status.	0	0	0	1	0
One or more individual(s) have the power to unilaterally hire without approval from the faculty.	1	0	2	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty as a whole.	2	0	2	0	1
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have higher status.	0	1	0	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from the faculty who have the same or higher status.	0	1	1	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of Non-LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of Non-LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed entirely of LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
The candidate cannot be hired without approval from a committee, composed primarily of LRW Faculty.	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	2	1	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	3	2	7	2	1

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

Select all that apply.

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

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

Select all that apply.

	Same as for non-Director LRW Faculty with this status	Dean or Associate Dean	Faculty Committee	Varies depending on the specific position	Other	Unknown	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0	3	1	0	0	0	3
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2	4	2	0	0	1	7
Full-time, Short-term	0	2	1	0	0	0	2
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought		All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought		Other		Unknown		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	1
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	0%	0	100%	2	0%	0	0%	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	50%	1	0%	0	50%	1	0%	0	0%	0	2
Full-time, Short-term	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	100%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	1

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

Select all that apply.

	Same as for non-Director LRW Faculty with this status	Dean or Associate Dean	Faculty Committee	Varies depending on the specific position	Other	Unknown	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	2	2	1	0	0	0	3
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	2	5	2	0	0	1	7
Full-time, Short-term	0	2	1	0	0	0	2
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

	All faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought	Only LRW Faculty with same status and same/higher rank than that which is sought	All faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track status with same/higher rank than that which is sought	Other	Unknown	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	1	0	0	1
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1	0	1	0	0	2
Full-time, Short-term	1	0	0	0	0	1
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	1	0	0	0	0	1

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

	No	No, but standards are currently being developed	Yes	Unknown	Other	Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	1	0	2	0	0	3
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	0	0	2	0	0	2
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	4	0	3	0	0	7
Full-time, Short-term	1	0	0	1	0	2
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	0	0	1	0	0	1

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

Question	Tenured or Tenure track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Substantially similar standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators with the same status regardless of type of program	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators regardless of status or type of program	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards based on type of program	0	1	1	0	0
Same standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators with the same status regardless of type of program	1	0	0	0	0
Same standards for all directors, coordinators, and administrators regardless of status or type of program	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
N/A because there are no specific written standards for directors, coordinators, or administrators of other programs	0	0	0	0	0
N/A because there are no directors, coordinators, or administrators for other programs	0	0	0	0	0
N/A Other	0	0	1	0	1
Unknown	0	1	1	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	2	2	3	0	1

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
Substantially similar standards	1	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	0	2	0	1
Substantially different standards	0	1	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
N/A because the only LRW Faculty with this status is/are LRW Director(s)	0	1	0	0	0
N/A Other	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	2	2	3	0	1

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

Select all that apply.

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	0	1	1	0	0

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	0	1	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	0	1	1	0	0

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	1	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	0	1	1	0	0

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

	Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	Full-time, Short-term	Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status
N/A	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially similar standards	0	0	1	0	0
Substantially similar EXCEPT for an added administrative component	0	1	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to teaching	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to service	0	0	0	0	0
Substantially different standards with respect to scholarship	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Status</b>	0	1	1	0	0

## Part K. Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty)

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

Question	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Varies; there is no typical entry-level annual base salary for an LRW Faculty with this status	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	13	2	21	7	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	5	3	2	2	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	27	5	26	11	69
Full-time, Short-term	26	5	17	8	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	10	6	7	5	28

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

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

Status	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Status
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	85,000	125,000	104,331	13
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	85,000	110,000	97,400	5
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	60,000	140,000	83,111	27
Full-time, Short-term	50,000	120,000	80,769	26
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status	50,000	110,000	83,450	10

Q12.3 - Continued

**Tenured or Tenure-Track with Traditional  
Tenure**

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
65,000-80,000	0
80,001-95,000	4
95,001-110,000	6
110,001-120,000	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>

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

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
65,000-80,000	0
80,001-95,000	2
95,001-110,000	3
110,001-125,000	0
125,001-140,000	0
140,001-155,000	0
155,001+	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>

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

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
58,000-70,000	6
70,001-80,000	11
80,001-90,000	4
90,001-100,000	3
100,001+	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>27</b>

Q12.3 - Continued

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

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
50,000-60,000	3
60,001-70,000	7
70,001-80,000	4
80,001-90,000	6
90,001-100,000	2
100,001+	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>

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

Salary Range	Total Responses in this Range
50,000-65,000	2
65,001-80,000	1
80,001-95,000	5
95,001-110,000	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part K Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty)

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

	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Varies; there is no typical entry-level annual base salary for faculty members of this type.	My school does not hire entry-level faculty members of this type.	Total Responses per Faculty Type
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach doctrinal courses	34	6	10	90	0	140
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	9	5	9	89	28	140
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	2	2	4	79	53	140
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	7	2	7	88	36	140
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions who primarily teach clinical courses	3	2	8	86	41	140
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions who primarily teach clinical courses	3	2	4	77	54	140

**ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part K Faculty Salary (Full-time Faculty)**

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

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Faculty Category
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach doctrinal courses	85,000	180,000	111,752	33
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Traditional Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	100,000	120,000	108,250	8
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with Programmatic Tenure or Tenure-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	100,000	110,000	105,000	2
Full-time Non-LRW Faculty with 405(c) Status or 405(c)-track positions who primarily teach clinical courses	70,000	150,000	98,043	7
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions who primarily teach clinical courses	70,000	112,000	89,000	3
Non-LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions who primarily teach clinical courses	80,000	85,000	83,167	3

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

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

The first question in this Part begins on the following page.

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

**Is there a difference?**

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

	No		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say		Unknown		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	49%	21	2%	1	0%	0	2%	1	35%	15	12%	5	43
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	8%	1	58%	7	0%	0	0%	0	25%	3	8%	1	12
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	6%	4	58%	40	0%	0	1%	1	29%	20	6%	4	69
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	2%	1	68%	38	0%	0	0%	0	30%	17	0%	0	56
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0%	0	57%	16	0%	0	11%	3	29%	8	4%	1	28

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

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

	No		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say		Unknown		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	35%	13	3%	1	0%	0	0%	0	54%	20	8%	3	37
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0%	0	33%	3	0%	0	11%	1	44%	4	11%	1	9
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	6%	3	32%	17	0%	0	2%	1	51%	27	9%	5	53
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	2%	1	43%	21	0%	0	2%	1	51%	25	2%	1	49
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0%	0	32%	8	0%	0	12%	3	48%	12	8%	2	25

Q13.2 - Continued: Is there a difference?

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

	No		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say		Unknown		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	4%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	83%	19	13%	3	23
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	33%	4	17%	2	0%	0	8%	1	42%	5	0%	0	12
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	2%	1	10%	4	0%	0	2%	1	74%	31	12%	5	42
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	0%	0	38%	15	0%	0	3%	1	55%	22	5%	2	40
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	5%	1	27%	6	0%	0	18%	4	45%	10	5%	1	22

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

	No		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say		Unknown		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions</b>	19%	5	0%	0	4%	1	0%	0	63%	17	15%	4	27
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions</b>	14%	1	14%	1	0%	0	14%	1	57%	4	0%	0	7
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions</b>	10%	6	21%	13	2%	1	3%	2	61%	38	3%	2	62
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions</b>	2%	1	20%	8	0%	0	2%	1	71%	29	5%	2	41
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions</b>	0%	0	13%	3	0%	0	13%	3	65%	15	9%	2	23

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

	No		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say		Unknown		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions</b>	4%	1	0%	0	4%	1	0%	0	68%	19	25%	7	28
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	14%	1	71%	5	14%	1	7
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions</b>	4%	2	8%	4	2%	1	4%	2	72%	38	11%	6	53
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions</b>	2%	1	19%	9	2%	1	2%	1	73%	35	2%	1	48
<b>Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions</b>	0%	0	21%	5	0%	0	13%	3	63%	15	4%	1	24

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

	No		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is lower		Yes, the entry-level annual base salary for LRW Faculty is higher		There is too much variation in faculty salaries to say		Unknown		My school does not hire entry-level LRW Faculty with this status		Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	12%	3	0%	0	0%	0	4%	1	65%	17	19%	5	26
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	14%	1	71%	5	14%	1	7
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	7%	3	9%	4	2%	1	4%	2	73%	33	4%	2	45
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	5%	2	14%	6	0%	0	0%	0	79%	33	2%	1	42
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	5%	1	18%	4	0%	0	14%	3	64%	14	0%	0	22

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

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

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

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	34	0	0	9	43
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	4	1	0	7	12
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	21	10	1	37	69
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	11	8	2	35	56
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	9	2	1	16	28

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

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	25	1	0	11	37
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	5	0	0	4	9
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	26	3	0	24	53
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	17	3	3	26	49
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	12	1	1	11	25

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

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

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	15	0	0	8	23
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	8	0	0	4	12
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	27	0	0	15	42
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	15	1	1	23	40
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	10	0	0	12	22

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

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	19	1	0	7	27
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	6	0	0	1	7
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	32	1	1	28	62
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	17	0	0	24	41
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	11	0	0	12	23

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

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

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	20	0	0	8	28
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	4	0	0	3	7
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	29	0	1	23	53
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	22	2	0	24	48
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	14	0	0	10	24

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

	N/A	Yes	Yes, but prefer not to provide	No	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	19	0	0	7	26
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	5	0	0	2	7
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	28	0	0	17	45
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	23	0	0	19	42
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	12	0	0	10	22

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

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	20,000	20,000	20,000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	6,000	95,000	42,300	10
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	20,000	65,000	43,750	8
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	40,000	90,000	65,000	2

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	30,000	40,000	33,333	3
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	35,000	60,000	45,000	3
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	90,000	90,000	90,000	1

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	60,000	60,000	60,000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0	0	0	0

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	30,000	30,000	30,000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0	0	0	0

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per LRW Faculty Status
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Traditional Tenure-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time Programmatic Tenure-Track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time 405(c)-track positions	0	0	0	0
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Short-term positions	30,000	30,000	30,000	1
Entry-level LRW Faculty with Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) Status positions	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

## Part M. Teaching Fellows

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

	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	29%	2
Yes, but prefer not to provide	29%	2
No	43%	3
Varies	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>7</b>

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

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
70,000	70,000	70,000	2

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

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

Course Type	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Course Type
<b>LRW Courses</b>	1.0	2.0	1.7	7
<b>Non-LRW Courses</b>	0.0	2.0	0.5	5

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part M. Teaching Fellows

**Q14.5 - What is the total number of students the Teaching Fellow will typically teach in LRW Courses each academic term (e.g., semester, trimester, quarter)?**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Term
Full-length term 1	15.0	40.0	28.6	7
Full-length term 2	15.0	40.0	28.6	7
Full-length term 3	33.0	33.0	33.0	1
Full-length term 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Summer term	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Intersession/Maymester/Other short term or session	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper- Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
The Teaching Fellow and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching; the Teaching Fellow is solely responsible for grading and critiquing.	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is solely responsible for all classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	1	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	2	0	0

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part M. Teaching Fellows

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

Select all that apply.

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	1	0	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0	0	0
Surprise class observation	0	0	0
Announced class observation	0	0	0
Review of end-of-term evaluations	2	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper- Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
The Teaching Fellow is expected to create the course syllabus.	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is permitted to create the course syllabus but has the option to use a syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	1	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is not permitted to create the course syllabus; the Teaching Fellow must use the course syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper- Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
The Teaching Fellow is expected to create the assignments.	0	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is permitted to create the assignments but has the option to use assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	1	0	0
The Teaching Fellow is not permitted to create the assignments; the Teaching Fellow must use the assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

**Deadlines for Major Assignments**

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	1	0	0

**Number of Major Assignments**

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0
No or limited autonomy	1	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	2	0	0

**Length of Major Assignments**

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0
No or limited autonomy	1	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
Total Responses per Program Type	2	0	0

## Q14.10-14.12 - Continued

## Number of Minor Assignments

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	1	0	0

## Citation Text

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	2	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	2	0	0

## Textbooks

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	2	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	2	0	0

Q14.10-14.12 - Continued

Content of Class/Lectures

Question	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	0	0
Some autonomy within established range	2	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	2	0	0

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

Answer	Responses per Answer
Yes	2
No	5
Unknown	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	7

Q14.14 – When a Teaching Fellow teaches an LRW Course outside of an LRW Program, who is responsible for supervising, mentoring, and/or training the Teaching Fellow?

Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
Dean	0
Associate Dean	1
LRW Director(s)	0
Non-Director LRW Faculty	0
Other	0
Unknown	1
<b>Total</b>	2

**Q14.15 – When a Teaching Fellow teaches an LRW Course offered outside of an LRW Program, which of the following supervisory actions does the person responsible for supervising the Teaching Fellow regularly undertake with regard to the Teaching Fellow?**

Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0
Surprise class observation	0
Announced class observation	0
Review of end-of-term evaluations	0
Other	0
Unknown	1
Varies significantly by course or supervisor	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>

**Q14.16 - In response to a previous question (Q6.5), you indicated that the following courses were taught in whole or in part by Teaching Fellows. For these courses, please provide the following information:**

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

*As the tables below reflect, some responders entered 0 in response to these questions. In light of the instructions, these answers were included in the analysis. For those questions, the parenthetical number indicates the result if 0s are excluded. For example, in the first table below, if 0s are included, the minimum number of years of legal practice is 0.0, the mean number of years is 2.5, and there were 2 responses to that question for the course. If 0s are excluded, the minimum number of years of legal practice is 5.0, the mean number of years is 5.0, and there was 1 response to that question for the course.*

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
How many students, on average, did each Teaching Fellow teach in this course?	25.0	40.0	32.7	3
What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Teaching Fellow must have to teach this course?	0.0 (5.0)	5.0	2.5 (5.0)	2 (1)

**Course focusing principally on basic persuasive writing**

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Question for this Course
How many students, on average, did each Teaching Fellow teach in this course?	33.0	40.0	36.5	2
What is the minimum number of years of legal practice that a Teaching Fellow must have to teach this course?	0.0 (0.0)	0.0	0.0 (0.0)	1 (0)

## Part N. Part-time Faculty

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Equivalent to Most/All	24%	4
Higher than Most/All	18%	3
Lower than Most/All	12%	2
Varies too much to say	12%	2
My school does not hire Part-time faculty to teach Non-LRW Courses.	12%	2
Unknown	24%	4
<b>Total Responses</b>		17

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Per credit hour	12%	2
Per course	29%	5
Per academic term (e.g., semester)	35%	6
Annual salary	24%	4
Other	12%	2
Unknown	6%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>		17

**Q15.3 - Explanatory text for “Other” unit of pay:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

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

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

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

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Personal Interview	88%	15
Writing Sample	59%	10
J.D. Transcript	65%	11
Reference Letter(s)	59%	10
Sample Critiqued Memo/Brief	24%	4
Other	6%	1
Unknown	6%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>		17

**Q15.6 - Explanatory text for “Other” requirements:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Never	65%	11
Sometimes	24%	4
About half the time	0%	0
Most of the time	0%	0
Always	6%	1
Unknown	6%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>		17

**15.8 - To what extent is the following information consistent across Part-time faculty who teach LRW Courses?**

	Generally consistent	Generally consistent, but I don't know the number	Varies	Unknown	Responses per Answer
<b>Number of hours the Part-time faculty member is expected to spend each week</b>	10	0	5	2	17
<b>Total number of students the Part-time faculty member will typically teach in LRW Courses each academic term</b>	12	0	3	2	17
<b>Whether the Part-time faculty member is permitted to have another job</b>	10	0	5	2	17

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

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
10.0	25.0	21.2	10

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Academic Term
Full-length term 1	17.0	36.0	23.0	12
Full-length term 2	17.0	36.0	22.9	12
Full-length term 3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Full-length term 4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Summer term	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
Intersession/Maymester/Other short term or session	0.0	0.0	0.0	2

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	90%	9
Yes, but only another part-time job.	10%	1
Yes, but it is discouraged.	0%	0
No	0%	0
Other	0%	0
Unknown	0%	0
Total Responses		10

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Yes	1	0	0
Yes, but I don't know the number	0	0	0
No	3	1	1
Varies	1	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	5	1	1

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
First-Year LRW Program	3.0	3.0	3.0	1
Upper-Level LRW Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
LRW Director(s) for the program	5	0	1
Non-Director LRW Faculty	0	0	0
Dean	0	0	0
Associate dean	0	1	0
Other	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	5	1	1

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

Select all that apply.

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	2	0	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	2	0	1
Surprise class observation	2	0	0
Announced class observation	2	0	1
Review of end-of-term evaluations	5	0	1
Other	2	0	0
Unknown	0	1	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	5	1	1

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
The Part-time faculty member is expected to create the course syllabus.	0	1	0
The Part-time faculty member is permitted to create the course syllabus but has the option to use a syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	1	0	1
The Part-time faculty member is not permitted to create the course syllabus; the Part-time faculty member must use the course syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	4	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	5	1	1

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
The Part-time faculty member is expected to create the assignments.	0	1	1
The Part-time faculty member is permitted to create the assignments but has the option to use assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	0	0	0
The Part-time faculty member is not permitted to create the assignments; the Part-time LRW Faculty must use the assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	4	0	0
Varies by course	1	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

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

**Number of Major Assignments**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	1	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	1
No or limited autonomy	4	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

## Q15.18-15.20 - Continued

## Deadlines for Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	1	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	1
No or limited autonomy	3	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

## Length of Major Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	1	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	1
No or limited autonomy	4	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

## Number of Minor Assignments

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	1	1
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0
No or limited autonomy	3	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>

## Citation Text

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	0	1	1
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	0
No or limited autonomy	4	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	5	1	1

## Textbooks

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	1	1	1
Some autonomy within established range	0	0	0
No or limited autonomy	4	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	5	1	1

## Content of Lectures/In-Class Exercises

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	2	1	1
Some autonomy within established range	2	0	0
No or limited autonomy	0	0	0
Varies by course	0	0	0
Unknown	0	0	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	4	1	1

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

	Responses per Answer
Yes	0
Yes, but I don't know the number	2
No	6
Varies	2
No Part-time LRW Faculty teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program.	6
Unknown	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>17</b>

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

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
0	0	0	0

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
Dean	2
Associate Dean	2
LRW Director(s)	2
Non-Director LRW Faculty	1
Varies by course	4
Other	0
Unknown	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>11</b>

**Q15.23 - Explanatory text for “Other”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	Responses per Answer
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	2
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0
Surprise class observation	0
Announced class observation	2
Review of end-of-term evaluations	5
Other	0
Varies significantly by course and/or supervisor	4
Unknown	2
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>11</b>

## Part O. Adjunct Faculty

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Equivalent to most/all	42%	33
Higher than most/all	25%	20
Lower than most/all	4%	3
Too much variation to say.	5%	4
Unknown	24%	19
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>79</b>

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

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Per credit hour	39%	31
Per course	48%	38
Other	6%	5
Unknown	10%	8
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>79</b>

**Q16.3 - Explanatory text for “Other” units of pay:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Question	Yes	Yes, but I don't know the amount	Yes, but I prefer not to provide the amount	No	Unknown	Total
Per credit hour	20	6	3	1	1	31
Per course	18	8	3	3	6	38
Other	3	0	1	0	1	5
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

*As the tables below reflect, one responder entered 1 in response for the “other units of pay” option. This answer is likely an error. Accordingly, the parenthetical numbers indicate the results if that answer is excluded from the analysis.*

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Count
<b>Per credit hour</b>	1,000	5,000	2,233	20
<b>Per course</b>	1,200	15,000	5,831	18
<b>Other Units of Pay</b>	1 (40)	1,000	347 (520)	3 (2)

**Adjunct Pay  
Range Per  
Credit Hour**

Pay Range	Total Responses per Range
<b>1-500</b>	0
<b>501-1000</b>	1
<b>1001-2000</b>	10
<b>2001-3000</b>	7
<b>3001-5000</b>	2
<b>Total Responses</b>	30

Q16.5 - Continued

**Adjunct Pay  
Range Per  
Course**

Pay Range	Total Responses per Range
1,000-2,000	2
2,001-5,000	7
5,001-10,000	7
10,001-15,000	2
15,000-20,000	0
20,001-22,000	0
22,001+	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>18</b>

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

	First-Year LRW Program		Upper-Level LRW Program		Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program	
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
<b>LRW Director(s) for the program</b>	71%	17	50%	10	71%	5
<b>Non-Director LRW Faculty</b>	17%	4	15%	3	0%	0
<b>Dean</b>	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0
<b>Associate dean</b>	8%	2	20%	4	14%	1
<b>Other</b>	4%	1	5%	1	14%	1
<b>Unknown</b>	0%	0	10%	2	0%	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>		24		20		7

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part O. Adjunct Faculty

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

	Yes		Yes, but I don't know the number		No		Varies		Unknown		Total Responses per Program Type
First-Year LRW Program	33%	8	4%	1	42%	10	17%	4	4%	1	24
Upper-Level LRW Program	10%	2	5%	1	40%	8	15%	3	30%	6	20
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	43%	3	0%	0	29%	2	29%	2	0%	0	7

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Program
First-Year LRW Program	2.0	5.0	4.0	8
Upper-Level LRW Program	3.0	5.0	4.0	2
Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	2.0	5.0	3.0	3

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

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First-Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Personal Interview	21	14	7
Writing Sample	16	8	3
J.D. Transcript	7	7	5
Reference Letter(s)	8	7	3
Sample Critiqued Memo/Brief	4	2	2
Co-Teaching with a full-time LRW Faculty	0	0	1
Co-Teaching with a more experienced Adjunct	0	0	0
Other	12	2	2
Unknown	1	6	0
Total Responses per Program Type	24	20	7

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part O. Adjunct Faculty

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	3	0	1
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	5	1	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0	0	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	5	4	3
Surprise class observation	5	1	3
Announced class observation	15	5	5
Review of end-of-term evaluations	19	11	7
Other	10	2	2
Unknown	2	8	0
Discuss and resolve issues with difficult or academically struggling students	16	3	3
Discuss and resolve issues with course or law school administration	15	2	3
Discuss and resolve student complaints with adjunct faculty	17	3	3
None	0	1	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	24	20	7

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part O. Adjunct Faculty

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
The Adjunct and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co-teach the course, with shared classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	0	0	0
The Adjunct and the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty co- teach the course, with shared classroom teaching; the Adjunct is solely responsible for grading and critiquing.	0	0	0
The Adjunct is solely responsible for all classroom teaching, grading, and critiquing.	18	17	4
Varies by Course	0	1	1
Other	5	1	2
Unknown	0	1	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
The Adjunct is expected to create the course syllabus.	2	4	0
The Adjunct is permitted to create the course syllabus but has the option to use a syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	6	4	3
The Adjunct is not permitted to create the course syllabus; the Adjunct must use the course syllabus provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	15	8	2
Varies by Course	0	1	1
Other	0	0	1
Unknown	0	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
The Adjunct is expected to create the assignments.	1	5	0
The Adjunct is permitted to create the assignments but has the option to use assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	8	4	3
The Adjunct is not permitted to create the assignments; the Adjunct must use the assignments provided by the LRW Director or another full-time LRW Faculty.	11	7	2
Varies by Course	1	1	1
Other	2	0	1
Unknown	0	3	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>

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

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	2	3	0
Some autonomy within established range	4	3	1
No or limited autonomy	17	9	4
Varies by course	0	2	2
Unknown	0	3	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>

**Deadlines for Major Assignments**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	2	4	0
Some autonomy within established range	5	3	2
No or limited autonomy	14	6	3
Varies by course	0	1	2
Unknown	1	2	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	22	16	7

**Length of Major Assignments**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper-Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	2	3	0
Some autonomy within established range	7	5	2
No or limited autonomy	15	8	3
Varies by course	0	1	2
Unknown	0	3	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	24	20	7

**Number of Minor Assignments**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	3	6	1
Some autonomy within established range	7	1	2
No or limited autonomy	11	7	2
Varies by course	0	0	2
Unknown	1	2	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	22	16	7

**Citation Text**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	4	6	0
Some autonomy within established range	1	0	2
No or limited autonomy	19	10	4
Varies by course	0	0	1
Unknown	0	2	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	24	18	7

**Textbooks**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	4	7	1
Some autonomy within established range	3	1	2
No or limited autonomy	17	8	2
Varies by course	0	1	2
Unknown	0	3	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	24	20	7

**Content of Class/Lectures**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program
Complete autonomy	6	6	1
Some autonomy within established range	11	6	4
No or limited autonomy	5	2	0
Varies by course	0	0	2
Unknown	0	2	0
<b>Total Responses per Program Type</b>	22	16	7

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	6%	5
Yes, but I don't know the number	10%	8
No	24%	19
Varies	14%	11
No Adjuncts teach LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program.	29%	23
Unknown	16%	13
<b>Total Responses</b>		79

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

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses
2.0	5.0	3.8	5

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

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

Answer	% of Total Responses	Count
Personal Interview	18%	34
Writing Sample	11%	21
J.D. Transcript	11%	21
Reference Letter(s)	13%	25
Sample Critiqued Memo/Brief	3%	5
Co-Teaching with full-time LRW Faculty	1%	2
Co-Teaching with a more experienced Adjunct	1%	1
Other	4%	7
Unknown	8%	16
Resume/CV	18%	34
Recommendation from a faculty member	4%	7
Varies	9%	17
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>56</b>

**Q16.19 - Explanatory text for “Other” items required before the Adjunct will be hired to teach an LRW Course:**  
 The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Dean	2%	1
Associate Dean	66%	37
LRW Director(s)	9%	5
Non-Director LRW Faculty	2%	1
No one	0%	0
Other	5%	3
Varies by course	11%	6
Unknown	5%	3
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>56</b>

**Q16.20 - Explanatory text for “Other”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part O. Adjunct Faculty

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

Answer	% of Total Responses	Count
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0%	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments before return to students	0%	0
Review of all graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	0%	0
Review of a sample of graded/critiqued Major Assignments after return to students	7%	4
Surprise class observation	5%	3
Announced class observation	29%	16
Review of end-of-term evaluations	50%	28
Other	7%	4
Varies significantly by course and/or supervisor	14%	8
Unknown	30%	17
None	0%	0
Discuss and resolve issues with difficult or academically struggling students	9%	5
Discuss and resolve issues with course or law school administration	13%	7
Discuss and resolve student complaints with adjunct faculty	20%	11
<b>Total Responses</b>		56

**Q16.21 - Explanatory text for “Other”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

Q16.22 - For each of the listed programs, or for Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, how many training sessions per semester does the person responsible for supervising, training, and/or mentoring Adjuncts regularly undertake?

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
None	1	0	0	9
One training session before the semester	2	2	1	12
One training session during the semester	1	0	0	0
Two or three training sessions before and/or during the semester	6	2	1	2
Four training sessions before and/or during the semester	2	0	1	0
Unknown	4	6	1	30
Varies significantly by course and/or supervisor	1	0	0	3
<b>Total Responses</b>	17	10	4	56

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part O. Adjunct Faculty

**Q16.23 - For each of the listed programs, or for Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, what is the focus of the training session(s) identified in your answer to the preceding question? Select all that apply.**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
In-class teaching	11	4	1	9
Commenting on student writing	10	3	2	7
Dealing with difficult students	7	1	1	4
Dealing with administrative issues	8	2	2	7
Other	1	0	1	3
Unknown	5	5	1	32
N/A; No training sessions offered	1	1	0	10
<b>Total Responses</b>	17	10	4	56

**Q16.23 - Explanatory text for “Other”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

**Q16.24 - For each of the listed programs, or for Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, how many adjuncts were supervised during the Current Academic Year by the person responsible for supervising, mentoring, and/or training adjuncts?**

Note -- This question is asking for the collective amount of adjuncts supervised over the entire year, not per semester. For example, if a single adjunct was supervised in two separate semesters, that person should be counted once, not twice.

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper- Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
1-4	6	2	1	15
5-9	2	2	1	5
10-14	2	1	0	1
15-20	1	0	1	1
21 or more	4	1	1	1
Unknown	2	3	0	31
None	0	1	0	2
<b>Total Responses</b>	17	10	4	56

ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part O. Adjunct Faculty

**Q16.25 - For each of the listed programs, or for Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, how many adjuncts teaching during the Current Academic Year have the following years of experience teaching in the program or at the school?**

Note -- Please do not count years of experience teaching at other schools. Please calculate the amount of teaching experience at the start of the Current Academic Year. If there are no adjuncts for a particular category, please enter "0". If you don't know the answer for a particular category, please leave the answer box blank.

**0-2 Years**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
0	2	2	1	13
1	0	0	1	4
2	3	3	0	3
3	1	1	0	2
4	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	1	1
6-10	2	2	1	0
11+	0	0	0	0
Unknown	1	1	0	3
<b>Total Responses</b>	9	9	4	26

**3-7 Years**

	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
0	0	1	1	9
1	1	1	1	6
2	5	1	0	3
3	0	0	0	2
4	0	1	1	3
5	1	0	0	2
6-10	4	2	0	2
11+	1	0	1	0
Unknown	0	1	0	3
<b>Total Responses</b>	12	7	4	30

## 8+ Years

Answer	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
0	0	0	2	8
1	2	0	0	6
2	2	1	0	6
3	0	2	0	1
4	1	0	1	2
5	0	0	0	2
6-10	3	1	0	1
11+	2	0	1	0
Unknown	0	1	0	3
<b>Total Responses</b>	10	5	4	29

**Q16.26 - For each of the listed programs, or for Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses that are offered outside of an LRW Program, how does your school typically recruit adjuncts? Select all that apply.**

Answer	First-Year LRW Program	Upper-Level LRW Program	Combined First- Year and Upper-Level LRW Program	Adjuncts teaching LRW Courses outside of an LRW Program
<b>Word of Mouth</b>	15	7	3	31
<b>Actively recruiting candidates</b>	10	6	3	24
<b>Public job posting</b>	6	5	1	14
<b>Alumni networking</b>	11	7	2	25
<b>Other</b>	2	1	0	5
<b>Unknown</b>	2	3	0	18
<b>Total Responses</b>	17	10	4	56

**Q16.26 - Explanatory text for “Other”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

## Part P. Teaching Assistants

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

	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	76%	109
No	24%	35
Unknown	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		144

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

	%	Responses per Answer
Generally consistent	61%	67
Varies by professor or course	39%	42
Unknown	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		109

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

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Term
First full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	300.0	77.5	66
Second full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	300.0	77.3	66
Third full-length term of the Current Academic Year	60.0	60.0	60.0	1
Fourth full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

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

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Responses per Term
First full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	67.0	13.7	104
Second full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	65.0	14.2	104
Third full-length term of the Current Academic Year	3.0	6.0	4.5	2
Fourth full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

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

	%	Responses per Answer
100%: The TA is the only instructor	0%	0
75-99% of the class is taught by a TA	0%	0
50-74% of the class is taught by a TA	0%	0
25-49% of the class is taught by a TA	2%	2
0-24% of the class is taught by a TA	27%	29
Never (the TAs' duties are limited to non-classroom teaching and assistance)	56%	61
Varies by professor	16%	17
<b>Total Responses</b>		109

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

	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	48%	52
No	13%	14
Varies by professor or course	39%	43
<b>Total Responses</b>		109

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

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Term
First full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	28.0	13.4	51
Second full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	28.0	12.9	51
Third full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0
Fourth full-length term of the Current Academic Year	0.0	0.0	0.0	0

**TA Student Load Ranges for First Full-Length Term of the Current Academic Year**

Range	%	Total Responses per Range
0-10 Students	41%	21
11-20 Students	45%	23
21-30 Students	14%	7
31-40 Students	0%	0
41-45 Students	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		51

**TA Student Load Ranges for Second Full-Length Term of the Current Academic Year**

Range	%	Total Responses per Range
0-10	43%	22
11-20	45%	23
21-30	12%	6
31-40	0%	0
41-45	0%	0
<b>Total Response</b>		51

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

Select all that apply.

	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Research	71%	37
Writing (generally)	73%	38
Legal analysis	71%	37
Reviewing citations	92%	48
General law school questions	71%	37
Other	12%	6
Unknown	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		52

**Q17.8 - Explanatory text for “Other” subjects covered by Teaching Assistants:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

**Q17.9 - Are the Teaching Assistants compensated?**

For purposes of this question, compensation includes course credit.

	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	94%	103
No	4%	4
Varies	2%	2
<b>Total Responses</b>		109

**Q17.10 - How are the Teaching Assistants compensated?**

Select all that apply.

	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
<b>With course credit (graded)</b>	11%	14
<b>With course credit (pass/fail, including modified or enhanced pass/fail)</b>	24%	31
<b>Offset against tuition</b>	4%	5
<b>Payment per academic term</b>	15%	19
<b>Payment per hour reported</b>	45%	57
<b>Other</b>	1%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>		127

**Q17.11 - How many credits does a Teaching Assistant typically earn per academic term?**

Credit Type	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per Credit Type
<b>Graded Course Credits</b>	1.0	3.0	2.3	13
<b>Pass/Fail (including modified or enhanced pass/fail) Course Credits</b>	1.0	3.0	1.7	31

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

TA Category	Yes		Varies by professor		Varies based on other factors		Unknown		Total Responses per TA Category
New TAs	47%	51	49%	53	2%	2	3%	3	109
Returning TAs (e.g., second academic term or second year)	42%	46	48%	52	3%	3	7%	8	109

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

TA Category	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Total Responses per TA Category
for New TAs	0.0	45.0	10.5	46
for Returning TAs	0.0	45.0	8.2	41

**Hours of Training for New TAs**

Hours of Training	Total Responses per Range
0 to 10	29
11 to 20	13
21 to 30	2
31 to 40	0
41 to 50	2
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>46</b>

**Hours of Training for Returning TAs**

Hours of Training	Total Responses per Range
0 to 10	29
11 to 20	11
21 to 30	0
31 to 40	0
41 to 50	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>41</b>

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

	%	Count
Only 2L students serve as TAs.	2%	2
Only 3L students serve as TAs.	7%	8
Both 2L and 3L students may serve as TAs.	87%	95
Varies by professor	4%	4
Varies based on other factors	0%	0
Unknown	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		109

**Q17.14 - Explanatory text for “Varies based on other factors”:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “varies based on other factors” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

## Part Q. Writing Specialists

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	10%	15
No	83%	119
Unknown	7%	10
<b>Total Responses</b>		144

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	21%	30
No	79%	114
<b>Total Responses</b>		144

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

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

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

**Full-Time Writing Specialists by Faculty/Staff Category**

	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
<b>Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)</b>	27	0	0	0	0
<b>Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)</b>	26	1	0	0	0
<b>Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term 405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)</b>	23	3	0	0	0
<b>Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term</b>	26	1	0	0	0
<b>Faculty Member: Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status</b>	26	1	0	0	0
<b>Faculty Member: Part-time</b>	26	1	0	0	0
<b>Faculty Member: Adjunct</b>	26	0	1	0	0
<b>Staff Administrator</b>	24	2	0	0	0
<b>Other Category</b>	27	0	0	0	0
<b>Unknown Category</b>	25	1	1	0	0

## Part-Time Writing Specialists by Faculty/Staff Category

	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	26	0	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	27	0	0	0	0
Faculty Member: 405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	24	2	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Short-term	24	3	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	27	0	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Part-time	26	1	0	0	0
Faculty Member: Adjunct	23	4	1	0	0
Staff Administrator	20	7	0	1	0
Other Category	22	4	1	0	1
Unknown Category	26	0	0	0	0

## Q18.4 - Continued

## All Writing Specialists

Although Q18.4 focused on categorizing the writing specialists, responses entered for this question also provide information about the total number of writing specialists at the institution. These tables include all institutions that indicated in Q18.3 that they employ one or more writing specialists.

Number of Writing Specialists (Full-time and Part-time)	Responses per Answer
1	22
2	5
3	1
4	0
5	1
6	1
7	0
8	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	30
<b>Total Number of Writing Specialists (Full-time and Part-time)</b>	46

Number of Full-time Writing Specialists	Responses per Answer
0	20
1	6
2	4
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	30
<b>Total Number of Writing Specialists (Full-time)</b>	14

ALWD/LWI 2021 - 2022 Legal Writing Survey Report .... Part Q. Writing Specialists

Number of Part-time Writing Specialists	Responses per Answer
0	8
1	17
2	3
3	1
4	0
5	0
6	1
7	0
<b>Total Responses</b>	30
<b>Total Number of Writing Specialists (Part-time)</b>	32

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

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

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

**Full-Time Writing Specialists by Degree**

	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
J.D.	21	4	1	0	0
Ph.D. in English	24	1	0	0	0
Other Advanced Degree	26	1	0	0	0
J.D. & Ph.D. in English	26	0	0	0	0
Other Combination of Degrees	26	0	0	0	0
Degrees Unknown	24	1	1	0	0

**Part-Time Writing Specialists by Degree**

	Schools Reporting 0 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 1 Specialist in this Category	Schools Reporting 2 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 3 Specialists in this Category	Schools Reporting 4 Specialists in this Category
J.D.	16	8	1	1	1
Ph.D. in English	21	5	0	0	0
Other Advanced Degree	22	5	0	0	0
J.D. & Ph.D. in English	23	3	0	0	0
Other Combination of Degrees	25	2	0	0	0
Degrees Unknown	26	0	0	0	0

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
First-year LRW Courses	100%	30
Upper-level LRW Courses	80%	24
First-year Non-LRW Courses	37%	11
Upper-level Non-LRW Courses	60%	18
Career Services Office	40%	12
Academic Support/Bar Pass program(s)	20%	6
Students who seek assistance for work that is not connected to a course or program (e.g., assistance with a writing sample)	70%	21
Other	7%	2
Unknown	0%	0
<b>Total Responses</b>		30

**Q18.6 - Explanatory text for “Other” components of the curriculum supported by the writing specialist(s):** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Provide workshops or other programming during new student orientation	40%	12
Provide optional workshops during the Academic Year	60%	18
Provide mandatory workshops during the Academic Year	20%	6
Hold optional student conferences	97%	29
Hold mandatory student conferences	17%	5
Review written work that will be turned in for a grade	63%	19
Review upper-level seminar papers	60%	18
Teach one or more courses as sole or co-teacher	30%	9
Guest lecture/teach	37%	11
Assist ESL and international students	57%	17
Train LRW Faculty	0%	0
Train upper-level students to assist the writing specialist(s)	27%	8
Train upper-level students to assist LRW Faculty	0%	0
Serve on committees	23%	7
Publish	10%	3
Present at conferences	20%	6
Other	7%	2
Unknown	3%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>30</b>

**Q18.7 - Explanatory text for “Other” activities:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes	58%	84
No	3%	4
The university has a writing center, but it is not available to law students.	28%	41
N/A; my law school is not affiliated with a university.	8%	11
Unknown	3%	4
<b>Total Responses</b>		144

**Q18.10 - How often do LRW Faculty recommend that students take advantage of the university writing center?<sup>18</sup>**

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Frequently	2%	2
Occasionally	33%	28
Rarely	46%	39
Never	7%	6
Unknown	11%	9
<b>Total Responses</b>		84

<sup>18</sup> Due to a copying error, the data reported in the 2019-2020 survey for the Occasionally, Rarely, and Never categories was incorrect. The correct data for those categories is as follows: Occasionally: 28%/29 responses; Rarely: 49%/51 responses; Never: 12%/12 responses.

## Part R. Recent Changes

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

Note -- The Survey instrument asked respondents to provide a textual explanation about 1) the “other change” answer options in the following two tables as well as the “other” answer option in Q19.8, and 2) the reason for either an increase or decrease in the number of full-time LRW Faculty (excluding Visitors) for the current year or future years. If you are interested in reviewing these textual responses, please contact the ALWD/LWI Survey Committee to see if data is available.

### Major Changes in the Current Academic Year

Question	Increase/ Improvement		Decrease/ Reduction		No Change		N/A		Responses per Answer
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Number of full-time LRW Faculty (excluding Visitors)	15%	22	8%	11	77%	111	0%	0	144
Employment status of LRW Director(s)	6%	8	2%	3	81%	116	12%	17	144
Employment status of all non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	6%	8	1%	1	92%	132	2%	3	144
Employment status of some non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	7%	10	1%	1	86%	124	6%	9	144
Number of credits for at least some Required LRW Courses	3%	5	1%	1	96%	138	0%	0	144
Number of Required LRW Courses	1%	1	0%	0	99%	143	0%	0	144
Other Change 1	4%	6	1%	1	3%	5	92%	132	144
Other Change 2	1%	1	0%	0	1%	2	98%	141	144

Q19.2 - Continued

Major Changes Approved for a Future Year

Question	Increase/ Improvement		Decrease/ Reduction		No Change		N/A		Responses per Answer
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Number of full-time LRW Faculty (excluding Visitors)	18%	26	2%	3	78%	113	1%	2	144
Employment status of LRW Director(s)	3%	5	2%	3	85%	122	10%	14	144
Employment status of all non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	8%	11	0%	0	90%	129	3%	4	144
Employment status of some non-Director Full-time LRW Faculty	8%	12	0%	0	85%	122	7%	10	144
Number of credits for at least some Required LRW Courses	3%	4	1%	1	96%	138	1%	1	144
Number of Required LRW Courses	2%	3	0%	0	97%	140	1%	1	144
Other Change 1	5%	7	1%	1	4%	6	90%	130	144
Other Change 2	0%	0	0%	0	2%	3	98%	141	144

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

Status	Integrated		Segregated		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	88%	38	12%	5	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	75%	9	25%	3	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	80%	55	20%	14	69
Full-time, Short-term	64%	36	36%	20	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	61%	17	39%	11	28

**Q19.7#2 - In comparison to the offices of Non-LRW Faculty, are the offices of LRW Faculty larger, smaller, or comparable?<sup>19</sup>**

Status	Larger		Smaller		Comparable		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	2%	1	98%	42	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	8%	1	0%	0	92%	11	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1%	1	4%	3	94%	65	69
Full-time, Short-term	0%	0	16%	9	84%	47	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	0%	0	25%	7	75%	21	28

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

Status	More Desirable		Less Desirable		Comparable		Total Responses per Status
	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	
Tenured or Tenure-track with Traditional Tenure (Full-time)	0%	0	2%	1	98%	42	43
Tenured or Tenure-track with Programmatic Tenure (Full-time)	8%	1	8%	1	83%	10	12
405(c) or 405(c)-track (Full-time)	1%	1	13%	9	86%	59	69
Full-time, Short-term	2%	1	18%	10	80%	45	56
Full-time, Long-term without 405(c) status	4%	1	18%	5	79%	22	28

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Our school has a dedicated space for legal writing and/or advocacy, and all legal writing faculty offices are located in that space.	61%	23
Other	39%	15
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>38</b>

<sup>19</sup> For Q19.7#2 and #3, respondents were instructed as follows: “To the extent any difference is the function of a generally applicable policy, please select ‘Comparable.’ For example, if LRW Faculty offices are smaller because those faculty members were the most recent hires and received smaller offices based on seniority, select ‘Comparable.’”

## Part S. Writing Across the Curriculum

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

Answer	%	Responses per Answer
Yes, our school requires a writing assignment in all Non-LRW Courses	2%	3
Yes, our school requires a writing assignment in some Non-LRW Courses that are not seminars	8%	12
No, our school has no such requirement, but some professors choose to include such assignments in their Non-LRW Courses	67%	97
No	17%	25
Unknown	3%	5
Other	1%	2
<b>Total Responses</b>		<b>144</b>

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

Note: Q20.3 was presented to all responders who indicated in their responses to Q20.2 that their school requires a writing assignment in some Non-LRW Courses that are not seminars.

Answers	Number of Responses Giving this Answer
0%	6
3%	1
5%	0
20%	0
50%	1
<b>Total Responses</b>	<b>8</b>

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

Select all that apply.

Answer	% of Total Responses	Responses per Answer
Advanced advocacy	48%	54
Client/opinion letters	60%	67
Drafting-legislation	48%	54
Drafting-litigation	71%	80
Drafting-transactional (contracts, wills, real estate, corporate/business, etc.)	71%	79
Judicial opinions	34%	38
Office memoranda	47%	53
Other	16%	18
Unknown	18%	20
<b>Total Responses</b>		112

**Q20.4 - Explanatory text for “Other” Legal Writing Assignments:** The Survey invited respondents to provide a textual explanation if they selected “other” as an answer option. If you’re interested in reviewing the textual responses for this question, please contact the Survey Committee to see if any responses are available.

## Appendix

### Law Schools Responding to the Survey (144 Total):

1. Albany Law School
2. American University, Washington College of Law
3. Antonin Scalia Law School, George Mason University
4. Arizona State University Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law
5. Ave Maria School of Law
6. Barry University Dwayne O. Andreas School of Law
7. Baylor Law School
8. Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University
9. Boston University School of Law
10. Brigham Young University J Reuben Clark Law School
11. Brooklyn Law School
12. Campbell University School of Law
13. Case Western Reserve University School of Law
14. Catholic University of America Columbus School of Law
15. Chapman University School of Law, Dale E. Fowler School of Law
16. Charleston School of Law
17. Chicago-Kent College of Law, Illinois Institute of Technology
18. Cleveland State University College of Law
19. Columbia Law School
20. Cornell University Law School
21. Creighton University School of Law
22. Cumberland School of Law, Samford University
23. DePaul University College of Law
24. Drake University Law School
25. Duquesne University School of Law
26. Elon University School of Law
27. Florida International University College of Law
28. George Washington University Law School
29. Georgetown University Law Center
30. Gonzaga University School of Law
31. Harvard Law School
32. Hofstra Law
33. Howard University School of Law
34. Indiana University Maurer School of Law
35. Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law
36. Lewis and Clark Law School
37. Lincoln Memorial University, Duncan School of Law

## ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report...Survey Appendix

38. Loyola Law School, Los Angeles
39. Loyola University Chicago School of Law
40. Massachusetts School of Law at Andover
41. McGeorge School of Law, University of the Pacific
42. Mercer University School of Law
43. Mississippi College School of Law
44. Mitchell Hamline School of Law
45. Moritz College of Law, The Ohio State University
46. New York Law School
47. North Carolina Central University School of Law
48. Northeastern University School of Law
49. Northern Illinois University College of Law
50. Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law
51. Notre Dame Law School
52. Nova Southeastern University, Shepard Broad College of Law
53. NYU School of Law
54. Ohio Northern University Pettit College of Law
55. Oklahoma City University School of Law
56. Paul M. Hebert Law Center Louisiana State University
57. Penn State (Dickinson)
58. Penn State Law (University Park)
59. Pepperdine University School of Law
60. Roger Williams University School of Law
61. Rutgers Law School - Camden Campus
62. Rutgers Law School - Newark Campus
63. Santa Clara University Law
64. Seton Hall University School of Law
65. South Texas College of Law Houston
66. Southern Illinois University School of Law
67. Southern Methodist University Dedman School of Law
68. Southwestern Law School
69. St. John's University School of Law
70. St. Louis University School of Law
71. St. Mary's University School of Law
72. Stetson University College of Law
73. Suffolk University Law School
74. Syracuse University College of Law
75. Temple University Beasley School of Law
76. Texas A&M University School of Law
77. Texas Tech University School of Law
78. Thomas R. Kline School of Law, Drexel University
79. Thurgood Marshall School of Law, Texas Southern University
80. Touro University Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center

## ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report...Survey Appendix

81. UC Hastings College of the Law
82. UCLA School of Law
83. UConn School of Law
84. University at Buffalo School of Law
85. University of Akron School of Law
86. University of Alabama School of Law
87. University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law
88. University of Arkansas School of Law
89. University of Baltimore School of Law
90. University of California Davis School of Law
91. University of California, Berkeley School of Law
92. University of Chicago Law School
93. University of Cincinnati College of Law
94. University of Colorado Law School
95. University of Dayton School of Law
96. University of Detroit Mercy School of Law
97. University of Houston Law Center
98. University of Illinois College of Law
99. University of Illinois, Chicago School of Law (UIC Law)
100. University of Iowa College of Law
101. University of Kansas School of Law
102. University of Kentucky J. David Rosenberg College of Law
103. University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law
104. University of Maine School of Law
105. University of Maryland, Carey School of Law
106. University of Massachusetts School of Law - Dartmouth
107. University of Memphis, Cecil C. Humphreys School of Law
108. University of Miami School of Law
109. University of Michigan Law School
110. University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law
111. University of Nebraska College of Law
112. University of New Mexico School of Law
113. University of North Dakota School of Law
114. University of Oklahoma College of Law
115. University of Oregon School of Law
116. University of Pennsylvania Carey Law School
117. University of Pittsburgh School of Law
118. University of Richmond School of Law
119. University of San Diego School of Law
120. University of San Francisco School of Law
121. University of South Carolina School of Law
122. University of South Dakota School of Law
123. University of Southern California Gould School of Law

## ALWD/LWI 2021-2022 Legal Writing Survey Report...Survey Appendix

124. University of St. Thomas School of Law (Minnesota)
125. University of Tennessee College of Law
126. University of Texas School of Law
127. University of Utah SJ Quinney School of Law
128. University of Virginia School of Law
129. University of Wisconsin Law School
130. University of Wyoming College of Law
131. Vanderbilt University Law School
132. Villanova University School of Law
133. Wake Forest University School of Law
134. Washburn University School of Law
135. Washington University School of Law
136. Wayne State University Law School
137. Western Michigan University Cooley Law School
138. Western New England University School of Law
139. Western State College of Law
140. Widener University School of Law, Wilmington
141. Willamette University College of Law
142. William S. Boyd School of Law, UNLV
143. William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawaii at Manoa
144. Yale Law School