University of Wisconsin Law School
UPPER-LEVEL WRITING REQUIREMENT FORM

Per Law School Rule 3.11.1, J.D. candidates have an "Upper-level Writing Requirement" and are required to complete one rigorous, faculty-supervised, writing experience subsequent to the completion of the First-Year Program.

Instructions to the student: To have your completion recorded by the Law School, you must complete this form, sign and date the form, obtain the faculty evaluation and signature on the back of this form, and turn in the form to the Law School Registrar. If an externship, the supervisor and faculty member must both sign.

I completed a writing project (or projects) that included each of the following:

(1) at least 20 pages (double-spaced) of written work;

(2) submission of at least one draft on which my instructor provided, for the entirety of this written work, feedback which specifically assessed my writing (apart from any substantive content);

(3) the instructor's feedback was provided in time for me to assess it prior to submitting the final product.

NOTE: The upper-level writing requirement may not be met by a student in the same course/clinic in which the student is simultaneously fulfilling any of the requirements of either Rule 3.07 ("Experiential Course Requirement") or Rule 3.12 ("Professional Responsibilities Requirement"). For example, a summer clinic student who chooses to use summer writing projects to satisfy this writing requirement may not count summer credits from the same clinic to meet the 6-credit experiential learning requirement. That student, however, can use clinic credits in the following academic year toward the experiential learning requirement.

I completed the above in _____ with Professor _____
Name of course/clinic Name of instructor

in the following semester (**check one**): ☐ Fall ☐ Spring ☐ Summer Year: _____

The above course is not being used to fulfill the experiential course requirement or the professional responsibilities requirement (see note above).

Student name (print): _____

Student Signature: _____ Date: _____

Note to faculty: Factors to be considered in evaluating the rigor of a writing experience include the number and nature of writing projects assigned to students, the form and extent of individualized assessment of a student's written products, and the number of drafts that a student must produce for any writing experience. *(ABA Standards: Interpretation 303-2)*

Assessment Rubric for the Upper-Level Writing Requirement

Institutional Student Learning Outcome #2 (for the J.D. Degree)

Students will demonstrate competency in legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, problem-solving, and written and oral communication appropriate for a variety of legal contexts.

Your evaluation on this rubric will **NOT** affect whether the student has met the Upper-Level Writing Requirement. Instead, it will help the Law School to assess where additional or different instruction may help students attain competency related to our Student Learning Outcome #2.

Please check the appropriate box to rate the student's work on a scale of 1 to 5. If the skill doesn't apply, please check "N/A." For a more detailed explanation of the rating scale, see the next page.

SLO #2 Skill Assessed	**1** Not competent	**2** Below average	**3** Competent	**4** Above average	**5** Excellent	**N/A**
Using effective legal research tools and strategies to find relevant rules or sources						
Reading sources critically and accurately to extract relevant information						
Analyzing, synthesizing, and applying legal rules or sources to answer questions or solve problems						
Organizing legal material logically and coherently for the intended audience						
Writing clearly, concisely, and professionally for the intended audience						
Communicating information orally in an effective way for the audience and context						

Type of course (**check one**):

☐ Seminar ☐ Supervised Research ☐ Clinic ☐ Advanced Legal Writing ☐ Other

Faculty Signature: _____ Date: _____

If appropriate, Externship Supervisor Signature: _____

Return this form to Amy Arntsen, Registrar

SLO Skill Assessed	1 Not competent	2 Below average	3 Competent	4 Above average	5 Excellent
Using effective legal research tools and strategies to find relevant rules or sources	The work doesn't contain key sources, even with research guidance.	The work contains some key sources, with research guidance.	The work contains most key sources, with some research guidance.	The work contains most key sources, with rare research guidance.	The work contains all key sources, with rare or no research guidance.
Reading sources critically and accurately to extract relevant information	The work doesn't reflect a basic grasp of key sources and issues or has significant mistakes or omissions.	The work reflects some grasp of key sources and issues but also has mistakes or omissions.	The work reflects a solid grasp of key sources and issues and some larger implications and significance.	The work reflects a strong grasp of key sources and issues and most larger implications and significance.	The work reflects a nuanced grasp of key sources and issues and also larger implications and significance.
Analyzing, synthesizing, and applying legal rules or sources to answer questions or solve problems	The work only restates rules/sources and doesn't reflect critical thinking or problem solving skills.	The work reflects some critical thinking and limited problem solving skills.	The work reflects solid critical thinking, reasoning, and problem solving skills.	The work reflects strong critical thinking, reasoning, and problem solving skills.	The work reflects advanced critical thinking, reasoning, and problem solving skills.
Organizing legal material logically and coherently for the intended audience	The work doesn't have a clear structure, organization, and logical flow of information.	The work shows some problems in the structure, organization, and logical flow of information.	The work shows an appropriate structure, organization, and logical flow of information.	The work shows some skill in its structure, organization, and logical flow of information.	The work shows great skill in its structure, organization, and logical flow of information.
Writing clearly, concisely, and professionally for the intended audience	The writing is hard to follow, wordy, full of technical errors, or inappropriate for the audience.	The writing is often hard to follow, wordy, or inappropriate for the audience. There may be many technical errors.	The writing is generally easy to follow, concise, and geared to the audience. There are few technical errors.	The writing is easy to follow, concise, and geared to the audience. There may be rare technical errors.	The writing is articulate, polished, concise, and geared to the audience. There are no technical errors.
Communicating information orally in an effective way for the audience and context	The student conveys information orally in an ineffective way for the audience and context.	The student conveys information orally in a limited way for the audience and context.	The student conveys information orally in an effective way for the audience and context.	The student conveys information orally in an adept way for the audience and context.	The student conveys information orally in a skilled and articulate way for the audience and context.