I. INTRODUCTION

Each year, Washington Law Review considers writing submissions by second-year students and may select new editors based on those submissions. This instruction packet explains the second-year application process.

Many second-year students have prepared (or are currently preparing) papers for seminar classes or to fulfill their supervised analytic writing requirement. We encourage you to consider the additional step of submitting your paper as a student comment to Washington Law Review.

Joining Washington Law Review is a rewarding experience, but it is also a serious time commitment. As a Washington Law Review editor, each third-year student must spend a minimum of 180 hours on editing activities. Most of these activities consist of editing student and professional articles. Some additional administrative responsibilities may also be required. Third-year editors may earn academic credits (registered as E600) for editorial work at the rate of one credit per sixty hours of work completed within a single quarter. We encourage you to talk with your classmates about their Law Review experiences and activities. Although most editors agree that the experience is well worth the effort, the workload is substantial.

To preserve the integrity and fairness of the competition, applicants are prohibited from consulting with any Washington Law Review editors about the competition aside from Rachael Clark (rclark@washlrev.org), Sayer Rippey (srippey@washlrev.org), or Jenny Aronson (jaronson@washlrev.org). Applicants may, however, consult with any UW Law Faculty member.

II. ELIGIBILITY

All second-year law students are eligible to participate in this competition, except

- Students who received and declined offers from any of the four University of Washington School of Law Journals; and
- Students who previously applied to the Washington Law Review, but whose applications were rejected due to rules violations.
III. REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSIONS

A. Deadline
Competition materials must be submitted electronically to mylaw@uw.edu by 12:00pm (Noon) on Friday, December 20, 2019. Submissions received after this deadline will not be considered.

B. Submission Materials and Format

1. Cover sheet
   The selection process is anonymous. Your cover sheet is a separate document that includes your name, address, telephone number, word count, and the title of your comment. Your cover sheet will be separated from your comment and prompt response before the selection committee receives it.

2. Student Comment
   DO NOT put your name anywhere on your comment. Please see instructions below for specific comment requirements.

3. “Why WLR?” Prompt
   DO NOT put your name anywhere on your answer to this prompt.

4. Format
   The cover sheet, comment, and the prompt response must be attached as separate Microsoft Word documents.

C. General Instructions for the Student Comment

Please draft a student comment that (1) presents a novel and narrow legal issue, (2) discusses the background of that legal issue, and (3) proposes a potential solution to resolve that legal issue. The background section should demonstrate comprehensive legal research surrounding the issue. The analysis section should explore a unique solution and attempt to predict how the solution may apply in the future.

If accepted as an editor of Washington Law Review, this comment may serve as a starting place for the comment you will be required to write to graduate as a member of Washington Law Review. For that reason, it is beneficial to select a topic that interests you and could easily be expanded into a longer paper. Your comment topic idea may come from a legal issue presented to you in a class, at work, the news, discussions with others, etc. However, your comment submission must be your own work. **We strongly encourage you to look at Notes and Comments previously published in Washington Law Review to get a sense of what topics might be suitable. Four current WLR third-year editors recently published in Vol. 94 n.3. We encourage you to attend these editor’s comment presentations on Monday, October 14th at 12:30pm in Room 127.**
The Selection Committee will evaluate comment topics according to the following criteria:

1. **Interesting**
The comment should analyze a legal issue that engages the attention of the reader and is worthy of resolution. While the comment may also discuss policy issues, the bulk of the issue discussed should be legal.

2. **Original**
The comment should add to existing legal scholarship in its choice of subject matter, its approach to legal analysis, and its conclusion. A comment is less likely to be original when it covers an issue that has been or is likely to be the subject of many law review articles.

3. **Timely**
The comment should analyze an issue of current interest. An older case or subject may warrant publication if it raises a sufficiently important issue, but a comment should not review an area of law that is well settled.

4. **Manageable Within the Length Requirement**
The comment should adequately analyze and resolve the issue it presents within the length set out in section D below.

D. **Length and Format**

Your student comment submission should be between 10 and 20 pages double spaced with 1-inch margins. Text must be in 12-point font. Footnotes must be single-spaced and in 10-point font. Citations should follow the WHITE PAGES of the *Bluebook* (20th ed. 2015). For other grammatical questions, please use the Redbook. High-quality print is appreciated.

E. **Student Comment Organization**

The comment should be structured so that it remains focused on its conclusion and so that the analysis leads the reader logically and inevitably to that conclusion. Every proposition in the comment should be relevant to your argument. Like a brief, the comment should be divided into sections, each of which makes a point that is necessary and relevant to the analysis. Every subsection should relate to the larger section as a whole, and every paragraph should contribute to the analysis of each subsection. Sections and subsections should begin with assertive headings. Please be sure to look at the latest issue of *Washington Law Review*, available at [www.law.washington.edu/wlr](http://www.law.washington.edu/wlr), for examples.

Comments should contain the following separate and mutually exclusive sections: (1) Introduction, (2) Background, (3) Analysis and Proposed Solution, and (4) Conclusion. The following are general guidelines for these sections; however, they
are not strict requirements. Feel free to look at published *Washington Law Review* Comments for examples of what these sections look like in practice.

1. **Introduction**
   A short section that introduces the topic, roadmaps the sections of the comment, and tells the reader your conclusion and your primary argument(s) for it. The introduction usually names the sections as “parts” that correspond to your primary headings. For example: “Part I discusses the development of . . .” or “Part II analyzes the current split among the states as to . . .”

2. **Background**
   The background is generally the longest and most important section of the comment. It discusses the history and development of the area of law relevant to the topic involved, and the current state of the law in the area. It may also discuss non-legal changes, or facts, that are relevant context for the legal issue. For example, if the topic is about regulation of technology, a discussion of how that technology evolved is perfectly appropriate. By the end of reading the background section, the reader should have all of the information they need to evaluate your argument and conclusion.

3. **Analysis/Proposed Solution**
   This section is usually much shorter than the background section. It should present a novel and non-preempted argument that presents a unique solution to the legal issue you raise. Arguments take many forms, all of which are acceptable. Example forms include, but are not limited to, the following:
   
   “The Supreme Court should resolve the circuit split in favor of . . .”
   “The Washington State Legislature should pass a law that clarifies . . .”
   “Practitioners should ensure that they . . .”

4. **Conclusion**
   A short, one or two paragraph, summation of the argument.

5. **Supporting Authority**
   Student comments must be supported by a variety of legal resources, all of which should be the most current statements of the law. Almost every sentence in a student comment should have a supporting footnote with Bluebook formatted citations. The background section should be the most heavily cited, as your readers will look to this section to find a current summary of the law and helpful resources.

   Please create citations that conform to the WHITE PAGES of the Twentieth Edition of the *Bluebook*. Citations should be contained in footnotes and
created for every reference to legal authority or any other type of source (such as law review articles, books, newspaper articles, blog posts, etc.). You will be evaluated based on the accuracy of your citations as well as the variety of sources that you use to support your argument.

IV. SELECTION

A. Selection Committee
A committee of third-year editors of Washington Law Review will evaluate each comment and prompt response (“submission”) to determine whether it meets the requirements described above. The selection process is anonymous. Committee editors will not know who wrote each submission; applicants will not know who reviewed their submissions.

B. Editorship Invitation
Washington Law Review may select as many as six (6) or as few as zero (0) second-year students. The number of invitations varies each year based on the quality of the comments submitted. Washington Law Review will make every effort to inform applicants of the results of the selection process by January 3, 2019. Students applying to become Washington Law Review editors should be prepared to take on editing responsibilities immediately upon acceptance.

V. CONTACT INFORMATION
Washington Law Review is located in room L180 near the entrance to the Gallagher Law Library. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Rachael Clark (rclark@washlrev.org), Sayer Rippey (srippey@washlrev.org), or Jenny Aronson (jaronson@washlrev.org). They will be pleased to answer any questions you have about the competition.