

*Center for the Study  
of  
Applied Legal Education*

The 2010-11 Survey  
of Applied Legal Education

by

David A. Santacroce, University of Michigan Law School  
Robert R. Kuehn, Washington University School of Law

*Technical Consultants:*

Cicada Consulting Group, Inc.

University of Michigan Center for Statistical Consultation and Research (CSCAR)

Washington University Center for Empirical Research in the Law (CERL)

For Additional Information or Customized Reports on CSALE Data, please contact:

The Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education

University of Michigan Law School

801 Monroe Street, 363 L.R. Building

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

734.763.4319

[www.CSALE.org](http://www.CSALE.org)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>OVERVIEW</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
A.	<i>THE MASTER SURVEY</i> .....	2
B.	<i>THE SUB-SURVEYS</i> .....	3
C.	<i>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</i> .....	3
<b>III.</b>	<b>MASTER SURVEY RESULTS</b> .....	<b>4</b>
A.	<i>IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS</i> .....	4
	School Location Characteristics .....	4
	First Year, Full-Time Class Size and Part-Time Opportunities.....	5
	Rankings .....	5
	Oversight of All Applied Legal Education Programs.....	6
	Oversight of All Live-Client Clinics.....	6
	Oversight of All Field Placement Programs .....	6
	Hiring Practices for Full-Time Clinical Faculty .....	6
B.	<i>PROGRAMS OVERVIEW</i> .....	7
	Number and Types of Live-Client Clinics.....	7
	Number and Types of Field Placement Programs .....	8
	Participation Levels in Applied Legal Education Programs.....	9
	Demand for Live-Client Clinics.....	11
	Demand for Field Placement Programs .....	11
	Applied Legal Education Programs Staffing .....	11
C.	<i>PROGRAM CHALLENGES AND SUPPORT</i> .....	12
	Major Challenges to Live-Client Clinics .....	12
	Major Challenges to Field Placement Programs.....	13
D.	<i>LIVE-CLIENT CLINIC SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS</i> .....	13
E.	<i>FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS</i> .....	13
F.	<i>FACULTY SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS</i> .....	14
G.	<i>PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS</i> .....	14
	Written Promotion and Retention Standards .....	14
	Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Clinical Tenure Track .....	14
	Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Contracts .....	15
<b>IV.</b>	<b>LIVE-CLIENT CLINIC SUB-SURVEY RESULTS</b> .....	<b>15</b>
A.	<i>STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING</i> .....	15
	Length and Terms of Enrollment.....	15
	Average Class Size .....	16
	Part-Time and Night Students.....	16
	Total Credits Awarded.....	16
	Faculty In Charge.....	16
B.	<i>CLASSROOM COMPONENT</i> .....	17
	Classroom Student/Teacher Ratio.....	17
	Credit Hours For, and Focus of the Classroom Component.....	17
	Grading the Classroom Component.....	17

	Limitations on Classroom Component Credits.....	17
	Teaching the Classroom Component.....	17
C.	<b><u>CASEWORK COMPONENT</u></b> .....	18
	Casework Student-Teacher Ratio .....	18
	Credit Hours for Casework.....	18
	Grading the Casework Component.....	18
	Limitations on Casework Credits.....	18
	Supervising the Casework Component.....	19
	Student Practice Rules .....	19
	Pre- & Co-Requisites .....	19
	The Use of Technology in Casework.....	19
	Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Clinics.....	20
	Number of Clients Represented by Clinics.....	20
V.	<b>FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM SUB-SURVEY RESULTS.....</b>	<b>21</b>
A.	<b><u>STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING</u></b> .....	<b>21</b>
	Length and Terms of Enrollment.....	21
	Average Enrollment.....	21
	Part-Time and Night Students.....	21
	Faculty In Charge.....	21
	Average Number of Placements Supervised.....	22
B.	<b><u>FIELDWORK ASPECTS</u></b> .....	<b>22</b>
	Credits Awarded .....	22
	Grading the Field Placement Program.....	23
	Evaluating Field Placements.....	23
	Limitations on Placements.....	23
	Limitations on Fieldwork Credits .....	23
	Journals and Time-Logs.....	23
	On-Site Visits.....	23
	Training for On-Site Supervisors.....	24
C.	<b><u>CLASSROOM ASPECTS</u></b> .....	<b>24</b>
	Including a Classroom Component.....	24
	Grading the Classroom Component.....	24
	Teaching the Classroom Component.....	24
	Student-Teacher Ratio .....	25
	Focus for the Classroom Component.....	25
	Pre- and Co-Requisites .....	25
	Student Demand.....	25
	Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Field Placement Programs.....	25

<b>VI.</b>	<b>FACULTY SUB-SURVEY RESULTS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
A.	<u>OVERVIEW</u> .....	26
B.	<u>RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT</u> .....	26
	Clinical Teaching Experience .....	26
	Part-Time Teaching Experience .....	26
	Years of Full-Time Law Practice Prior to Teaching.....	26
	Race and Gender .....	26
	Employment Status .....	27
	Compensation: Amount, Source, and Summer Funding .....	28
	Summer Operations: Live-Client Clinics .....	28
	Summer Operations: Field Placement Programs .....	28
	Voting Rights .....	28
	Law School Committee Participation .....	29
	Teaching Doctrinal Courses.....	29
	Teaching "Skills" Courses .....	29
	Scholarship as a Job Requirement .....	30
	Sabbaticals .....	30

*Center for the Study  
of Applied Legal Education*

*The 2010-11 Survey of Applied Legal Education\**

I. **OVERVIEW**

This report summarizes the results of the Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education's (CSALE) *2010-11 Survey of Applied Legal Education*. The *2010-11 Survey* was CSALE's second triennial survey. The results provide valuable insight into the state and nature of applied legal education in areas like program design, capacity, administration, funding, pedagogy, and the role of applied legal education and educators in the legal academy. Law schools, legal educators, scholars, and governmental agencies examining or navigating issues in these and other areas rely on CSALE's data. They do so with the summary results provided here, in the *Report on the 2007-08 Survey*, and through discussions with CSALE which, since spring 2008, has provided more than 330 customized reports cross-tabulating various aspects of the data. Information on obtaining a free, customized report is available at [www.CSALE.org](http://www.CSALE.org).

The *2010-11 Survey* was composed of four distinct parts. A single *Master Survey* was directed to each of the 194 American Bar Association (ABA) fully-accredited U.S. law schools,<sup>1</sup> 163 (84%) of which responded. Each school was, in turn, asked to distribute the *Live-Client Clinics* and *Field Placement Program Sub-Surveys* to the person responsible for each distinct clinic and field placement program at its school. Each school was also asked to distribute the *Faculty Sub-Survey* to every clinician teaching there.<sup>2</sup>

The discussion of the *Survey's* structure which follows this overview provides a description of the various sections of the *Survey* to facilitate easier navigation of the data. With the raw results, scholars, legal educators, and others interested in applied legal education are able to sort and filter the data by almost as many data points as there are *Survey* questions.

Based on user feedback from the *2007-08 Survey*, numerous changes were made to the *2010-11 Survey*. Because of these changes and statistical differences in the response rates, results from the *2007-08 Survey* are not provided here alongside the 2010-11 results. The 2007-08 results remain

---

\* Copyright © 2012 *Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education, Inc.*

1. At the time the *Survey* was conducted, there were 195 ABA fully-accredited law schools. Schools with provisional ABA accreditation were not included because they had yet to demonstrate, to the ABA at least, that they were in compliance with ABA standards, including those regarding applied legal education and educators. The Judge Advocate General's School was also excluded because of its focus on post-JD courses.

2. The *Survey* defines a "clinician" as "a person who teaches *or* supervises in either a live-client clinic or a field placement program." The survey emphasizes that persons who are primarily employed by the employer where a student is placed in a field placement program or who are only supervising students in that capacity (sometimes referred to as a "field supervisor") are not considered clinicians for purposes of the *Survey*.

available in summary format in the *Report on the 2007-08 Survey* and, with some limitations, in raw format from CSALE directly.

The results reported herein are only made possible by the participants. To each, CSALE and the many who rely on its data are truly indebted. Thanks also go to the countless people who provided valuable assistance during the redrafting and vetting of this iteration of the *Survey* and to the technological wizards at Cicada Consulting, the University of Michigan Center for Statistical Consultation (CSCAR), and the Washington University Center for Empirical Research in the Law (CERL). Finally, much of CSALE's work is made possible by a grant from the Law School Admission Council, the generosity of the University of Michigan Law School, and law schools and legal educators who rely on CSALE's data.

## **II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY**

### **A. THE MASTER SURVEY**

The *2010-11 Survey* is divided into four parts.<sup>3</sup> The first is the *Master Survey*, one of which was sent to the person at every ABA fully-accredited law school with primary responsibility for the applied legal education programs at the school.<sup>4</sup> The *Master Survey* gathers demographic information about each school and provides an overview of its applied legal education program and insight into its hiring and retention practices for applied legal educators. The *Master Survey* is also the vehicle through which the various "sub-surveys" described below are electronically assigned to the proper persons.

The *Master Survey* questions are grouped into seven sections. *Section A* captures important characteristics of each responding law school including: JD enrollment; geographic region; metropolitan setting; live-client clinics and field placement program enrollment; structure of applied legal education department; and hiring and retention practices for applied legal educators.

*Section B* provides an overview of the clinical and field placement courses at the respondent's school. It gathers the substantive focus of each of these courses, school policies about enrollment in such courses, and trends in student demand for the courses. *Section C* gathers information about institutional support for, and challenges to, these courses.

*Section D* electronically assigns out the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey* to the director of each live-client clinic at the school.<sup>5</sup> It does so by gathering the name and email address of each director and emailing each a unique link to the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey*, which the director is then asked to complete. *Section E* functions identically to *Section D*, except it assigns each field placement program

---

3. All parts of the *Survey* are available at [www.CSALE.org](http://www.CSALE.org).

4. At schools where there was no single person with such responsibility, the *Master Survey* was directed to a person with considerable knowledge of such programs and, typically, that person sought the assistance of his or her colleagues.

5. A "live-client clinic" is defined in the *Survey* as a program in which "students represent actual clients (individuals or organizations), are supervised by an attorney who is employed by the law school (faculty, adjunct, fellow, staff attorney, etc.), and the course includes a classroom component."

director the *Field Placement Program Sub-Survey*.<sup>6</sup> *Section F* functions like *Sections D & E* except it assigns the *Faculty Sub-Survey* to each person teaching in a field placement program or live-client clinic.

*Section G* collects information on promotion and retention standards for applied legal educators. Additionally, it asks respondents to submit a copy of their school's promotion and retention standards for posting on CSALE's website. Finally, *Section H* collects feedback for use in future iterations of the *Survey*.

## B. THE SUB-SURVEYS

Each of the three *Sub-Surveys* is answered independently of the *Master Survey* and gives rise to separate pockets of data. In the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey*, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on each live-client clinic identified in *Section B* of the *Master Survey*. Four hundred six clinics at 121 schools responded, providing information on, among other things: enrollment and its terms; credit load and pedagogy by course component (classroom and field work); faculty teaching in the two different components; grading procedures; pre- and co-requisites; supervision techniques; and the amount of free legal services delivered each term by each clinic.

The *Field Placement Program Sub-Survey* is nearly identical to *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey* except that its focus is each field placement program the respondent identified in *Section B* of the *Master Survey* and takes into account the pedagogical and supervisory differences between field placement programs and live-client clinics. One hundred sixty-five distinct field placement programs at 88 schools responded, providing information on their enrollment, structure, operations, and pedagogical methods.

The *Faculty Sub-Survey* is a short survey targeted at each person teaching or supervising a live-client clinic or field placement program (hereinafter a “clinician” or “applied legal educator”). This sub-survey captures biographical information about the respondent (race, gender, years teaching, etc.). It also collects the defining characteristics of the respondent's employment, including: the nature of employment relationship; promotion and retention standards; compensation; supervision ratios; voting rights; committee participation; and support by and rights within the institution. As with the *Master Survey*, the final section of each of the *Sub-Surveys* collects respondent feedback.

## C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data was collected exclusively on-line. An invitation to complete the *Master Survey* was sent by email to the person at every ABA law school with primary responsibility for, or considerable knowledge of, the applied legal education programs at the school. That person was responsible for assigning the *Sub-Surveys*.

Invitations to complete the *Master Survey* were sent in October, 2010. CSALE remotely monitored the progress on all invited *Master* and *Sub-Surveys* and periodically sent reminders to invitees

---

6. A “field placement program” is defined as “externships or internships (typically off-site) that are field supervised by persons not employed by the law school for which students receive credit and which may or may not include a classroom component.”

that had not yet participated. The *Survey* closed in March, 2011. It will next be conducted in the fall of 2013.

### III. MASTER SURVEY RESULTS

#### SECTION A. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

##### *Questions 1, 3 & 4(c):* School Location Characteristics

Schools across all regions of the country responded to the survey. Nearly 57% percent of respondent schools are private institutions; the balance are public.<sup>7</sup> Their geographic locations by region are:

<b>Region I.D.</b>	<b>Region Definition</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Respondents</b>
Region I	Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	16.3
Region II	Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	4.4
Region III	Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	13.8
Region IV	Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	18.8
Region V	Southeast and Puerto Rico (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, PR, TN, WV)	13.1
Region VI	Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	16.3
Region VII	Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (excluding New York City and Long Island), RI, VT)	12.5
Region VIII	New York City and Long Island	5.0

Respondent schools were distributed across metropolitan area populations as follows:

<b>Metropolitan Area Size</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Respondents</b>
500,000 or more	59.2
200,000 to 499,999	17.8
75,000 to 199,999	14.7
up to 74,999	8.3

7. The public/private distinction among respondents closely mirrored reality - 59% of ABA-accredited law schools are private and 41% are public. See [http://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal\\_education/resources/aba\\_approved\\_law\\_schools/private\\_law\\_schools.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/aba_approved_law_schools/private_law_schools.html).



*Questions 4(a) & (b): First-Year, Full-Time Class Size and Part-Time Opportunities*

Student enrollment for the incoming 2010 first-year, full-time J.D. class among respondent schools is presented in the table below. Fifty-nine percent of respondents offered part-time enrollment.

<b>Number of First-Year, Full-Time Students</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Respondents</b>
1 - 100	3.9
101 - 150	18.7
151 - 200	23.2
201 - 250	24.5
251 - 300	12.9
301 - 350	5.8
351 - 400	3.9
401 - 450	3.2
451 or more	3.9

*Question 5: Rankings*

Many users of CSALE’s data seek multiple metrics when cross referencing various fields of data. The *U.S. News and World Report* ranking is one of these metrics. *CSALE does not endorse any system of law school ranking and does not provide its data to anyone for use in any rankings.* It nonetheless gathers this metric for its users. The rankings for the *Survey* respondents are as follows:

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>Percentage of Total Respondents</b>
1 - 25	15.4
26 - 50	15.4
51 - 75	11.4
76 - 100	13.4
"3 <sup>rd</sup> Tier" <sup>8</sup>	24.9
"4 <sup>th</sup> Tier"	19.5

---

8. *U.S. News and World Report* no longer employs the “tier” system but did when the *Survey* was conducted in 2010-11.

*Question 6: Oversight of All Applied Legal Education Programs*

Roughly 45% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for all applied legal education programs (*i.e.*, clinics and field placement programs). Thirty percent of their job titles included the word "dean."

*Question 7: Oversight of All Live-Client Clinics*

Approximately 58% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for all live-client clinics. Eleven percent of their job titles included the word "dean."

*Question 8: Oversight of All Field Placement Programs*

Approximately 54% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for all field placement programs. Twenty-three percent of their job titles included the word "dean."

*Questions 9 & 10: Hiring Practices for Full-Time Clinical Faculty*

A vote of the full faculty based upon a committee recommendation is the most common method of hiring full-time clinical faculty (52.8%). At 4.9% of schools, the process differed depending on the status; at 2.5% of schools the hiring was done by committee without a faculty vote; at 4.3% of schools the dean made the determination; and at 1.2% the director/dean of the clinical program did the hiring.

At schools where a committee was involved in some aspect of the hiring, the composition of that committee broke down as follows:

<b><i>Committee Structure</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage of Total Respondents Where Committee Is Involved</i></b>
Committee without any clinical faculty	5.8
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that clinicians are not allowed to chair	13.0
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that any member is permitted to chair	44.6
Committee solely comprised of clinicians	2.9
Committees at schools that do not distinguish between clinical and doctrinal faculty	19.4
Varies based on position being filled	14.4

**SECTION B. PROGRAMS OVERVIEW**

**Questions 1 & 2: Number and Types of Live-Client Clinics**

The 156 schools that responded to question 1 reported a total of 1036 distinct live-client clinics offered in the fall 2010 term for an average of 6.6 clinics per school. The number of clinics per school ranged from a high of 25 to, in three instances, a low of 0.

In question 2, respondents were asked to identify the single predominate substantive focus of each clinic they identified in question 1 from a menu of 35 choices including “other.” In doing so, respondents identified 105 more clinics than they identified in Question 1 leading the authors to conclude that some respondents either: i) didn’t follow the request to choose only one substantive area per clinic; or ii) failed to include a clinic in their response to question 1 but identified it in question 2. Nevertheless, the table below still provides a fair representation of the population of clinics in the fall 2010 academic term and their substantive foci in descending order of popularity:

<b>Substantive Focus of Clinic</b>	<b>No. Reporting</b>	<b>As Percentage of All Clinics</b>
Civil & Criminal Lit. / General Lit.	163	14.3
Criminal Defense	70	6.1
Other	60	5.3
Civil Lit. / General Civil Clinic	57	5.0
Immigration	55	4.8
Children & the Law	53	4.6
Mediation/ADR	53	4.6
Appellate	41	3.5
Domestic Violence	40	3.5
Family Law	39	3.4
Community/Economic Develop.	38	3.3
Environmental	37	3.2
Innocence	33	2.9
Transactional [domestic]	31	2.7
Housing	30	2.6
Human Rights	30	2.6
Tax	29	2.5
Civil Rights	25	2.2
Criminal Prosecution	24	2.1
Elder Law	24	2.1
Asylum/Refugee	22	1.9
Disability Law	20	1.7
Intellectual Property	18	1.6
Health Law	17	1.5
Consumer Law	16	1.4
Bankruptcy	15	1.3
Legislative	15	1.3

Employment Law	14	1.2
Death Penalty	13	1.1
Administrative Law	12	1.0
Prisoner's Rights	10	0.9
Securities	11	0.9
Wills/Trusts/Estates	10	0.9
Indian Law	9	0.8
International Transactions	5	0.4
Constitutional Law	2	0.2

*Questions 3 & 4: Number and Types of Field Placement Programs*

The 145 schools that responded to question 3 reported a total of 1393 distinct field placement programs offered in the fall 2010 term for an average of 9.6 per school. The number of field placement programs ranged from a high of 40 to, in seven instances, a low of 0.<sup>9</sup>

In question 4 respondents were asked to identify the single predominate substantive focus of each of the field placement programs they identified in question 3 from a menu of 38 choices including "other." In doing so, respondents identified the substantive focus of 1016 field placement programs. In descending order of popularity, the results are as follows:

<b>Substantive Focus of FPP</b>	<b>No. Reporting</b>	<b>As Percentage of All FPPs</b>
Judicial	87	8.6
Criminal Prosecution	76	7.5
Government Placements	64	6.3
Public Interest Organizations	61	6.0
Criminal Defense	60	6.0
Civil & Criminal Lit. / General Lit.	54	5.3
Other	53	5.2
Civil Litigation	33	3.2
Children & the Law	29	2.9
Health Law	29	2.9
Appellate	28	2.7
Environmental	27	2.7
Administrative Law	25	2.5
Employment Law	24	2.4
Legislative	23	2.3
Domestic Violence	23	2.3
Immigration	23	2.3
Bankruptcy	21	2.1
Family Law	21	2.1

9. The high of 40 was likely the result of the respondent misreading the question and identifying field placement program sites, not separate field placement program courses as requested.

Mediation/ADR	21	2.1
Civil Rights	20	2.0
Human Rights	20	2.0
Transactional [domestic]	20	2.0
Tax	19	1.9
Intellectual Property	18	1.8
Consumer Law	15	1.5
Housing	14	1.4
Community/Economic Develop.	13	1.3
Elder Law	12	1.2
Disability Law	12	1.1
Securities	11	1.1
Asylum/Refugee	11	1.0
Death Penalty	10	1.0
International Transactions	10	1.0
Wills/Trusts/Estates	10	1.0
Constitutional Law	7	0.7
Prisoner's Rights	7	0.7
Indian Law	5	0.5

*Questions 5 through 9: Participation Levels in Applied Legal Education Programs*

Approximately 3.2% of schools require students to enroll in a live-client clinic before graduating; 2.6% of schools require students to enroll in a field placement program before graduating. Excluding these two groups of schools, 4.5% of the remaining schools require students to enroll in a live-client clinic or field placement program before graduating.

In schools where participation in neither a live-client clinic or field placement program is required, respondents estimate that students participate in at least one of these programs before graduation in the following percentages:

*Live-Client Clinics:*

<b>Enrollment Ranges</b>	<b>Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range</b>
1 - 5%	3.7
6 - 10%	3.7
11 - 15%	2.9
16 - 20%	11.8
21 - 25%	11.0
26 - 30%	8.1

31 - 35%	21.3
36 - 40%	5.9
41 - 45%	6.6
46 - 50%	6.6
51 - 55%	4.4
56 - 60%	5.2
61 - 65%	1.5
66 - 70%	3.7
71 - 75%	1.5
76 - 80%	1.5
81 - 85%	0
86 - 90%	0.7

*Field Placement Programs:*

<b>Enrollment Ranges</b>	<b>Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range</b>
1 - 5%	3.7
6 - 10%	3.7
11 - 15%	2.9
16 - 20%	11.8
21 - 25%	11.0
26 - 30%	8.1
31 - 35%	21.3
36 - 40%	5.9
41 - 45%	6.6
46 - 50%	6.6
51 - 55%	4.4
56 - 60%	5.2

61 - 65%	1.5
66 - 70%	3.7
71 - 75%	1.5
76 - 80%	1.5
81 - 85%	0
86 - 90%	0.7
91 - 95%	0.8

*Questions 10 & 11: Demand for Live-Client Clinics*

Nearly 80% of schools report that, in the last five years, student demand for live-client clinics has increased; 19% report constant demand over the same period; and less than 1% report decreased demand.

Respondents were allowed to select multiple factors to explain the increase or decrease in demand. Among the schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common factors identified were: students believe clinics improve marketability (64%); students believe clinics improve skills (63%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within clinics offered (50%); increased support and promotion by law school (47%); other (38%); and other faculty promoting clinics/encouraging students to enroll (26%).

*Questions 12 & 13: Demand for Field Placement Programs*

Approximately 75.7% of schools report that, in the last five years, demand for field placement programs has increased; 20% report constant demand over the same period; and just over 4% report decreased demand.

Of the 75.7% of schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common reasons were: students believe field placement programs improve marketability (63.8%); students believe field placement programs improve skills (53.4%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within field placement programs offered (34.4%); increased support and promotion by law school (33.7%); other (33.7%); and other faculty promoting field placement programs/encouraging students to enroll (22.7%). Of the few schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons were lack of support and promotion by the law school and time commitment per credit hour.

*Questions 14: Applied Legal Education Programs Staffing*

In this new question, CSALE sought to gain an overview of the employment status of persons teaching in live-client clinics and field placement programs. Of the 1500 such persons reported by their school, nearly 82% were full-time employees. The reported “status” of those *full-time* clinicians is:

<b><i>Employment Status</i></b>	<b><i>As Percentage of all Full-Time Instructors Reporting</i></b>
Tenure	21.3
Tenure Track	7.0
Clinical Tenured	6.7
Clinical Tenure Track	3.5
Six Year (or more) Contract	4.6
Five Year Contract	14.7
Four Year Contract	1.1
Three Year Contract	9.5
Two Year Contract	2.6
One Year Contract	12.3
Adjunct	1.1
Fellow	7.3
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	2.2
Other	6.2

***SECTION C. PROGRAM CHALLENGES AND SUPPORT***

***Questions 1 & 2: Major Challenges to Live-Client Clinics***

From a menu of choices, respondents were asked to identify the major challenges their live-client clinics faced. Respondents cited these factors: other demands on clinical faculty's time (50.0%); lack of hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (46.0%); insufficient number of clinical faculty (44.2%); lack of physical/office space (35.6%); lack of support among doctrinal faculty (27.0%); lack of administrative/secretarial support (26.4%); lack of support from the administration (15.3%); and lack of student demand (3.1%).

Respondents were next asked to select the most appropriate description of various aspects of their overall live-client clinical programs. The percentage response rates to each are set forth below:

	<b><i>Inadequate</i></b>	<b><i>Sufficient</i></b>	<b><i>Ample</i></b>
Office Space	31.8	47.2	17.9
Telephone	6.6	44.4	47.4



Computers	10.7	50.7	37.3
Library	2.7	44	48.7
Office Supplies	38.0	52.8	1.8
Secretarial Support	22.5	50.3	25.8
Case Expense Funding	25.7	51.4	18.3
Audio Visual	9.3	45.3	39.3

*Questions 3 & 4: Major Challenges to Field Placement Programs*

Respondents were asked to identify the major challenges their field placement programs faced. Respondents cited these factors: insufficient number of clinical faculty (37.4%); lack of administrative/secretarial support (28.8%); lack of support among doctrinal faculty (14.3%); lack of physical/office space (12.9%); lack of hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (7.8%); lack of support from the administration (8.0%); and lack of student demand (4.3%).

Respondents were next asked to select the most appropriate description of various aspects of their overall field placement programs. The percentage response rates to each are set forth below:

	<i>Inadequate</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Ample</i>
Office Space	20.0	47.1	13.6
Telephone	4.4	41.6	33.6
Computers	3.7	43.4	30.9
Library	3.7	37.5	30.2
Office Supplies	2.9	34.6	37.5
Secretarial Support	28.3	42.8	14.5
Audio Visual	5.1	35.8	29.3

***SECTION D. LIVE-CLIENT CLINIC SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS***

In this section, *Master Survey* respondents were asked to electronically assign out the *Live-Client Clinic Sub-Survey*. The results of that sub-survey are reported in Section IV *infra*.

***SECTION E. FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS***

In this section, *Master Survey* respondents were asked to electronically assign out the *Field Placement Program Sub-Survey*. The results of that sub-survey are reported in Section V *infra*.

**SECTION F. FACULTY SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS**

In this section, *Master Survey* respondents were asked to electronically assign out the *Faculty Sub-Survey*. The results of that sub-survey are reported in Section VI *infra*.

**SECTION G. PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS**

**Questions 1 & 2: Written Promotion and Retention Standards**

Nearly 87% of respondent schools have written standards for the promotion, tenure, or retention of clinical faculty<sup>10</sup>. At 75% of these schools, the written standards differed from the promotion, tenure, and retention standards for doctrinal faculty.

**Question 3: Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Clinical Tenure Track**

Clinicians on *clinical tenure track* all report differences in the written standards for their advancement and/or retention as compared to the advancement/retention standards for *doctrinal faculty* at their schools. The chart below displays the prevalence of these differences:

Differences	Percentage Reporting
Community involvement, state and local bar activities, public advisory committee or commission participation, and/or participation in continuing professional education through teaching by clinical faculty are considered.	27.2
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching by clinical faculty.	41.0
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered.	51.1
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship by clinical faculty.	59.3
The number of publications clinical faculty are required to produce is lower.	54.2
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy.	48.6
Greater emphasis on the administration skills of clinical faculty.	21.5
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for their ability to raise funds to support clinical programs.	7.9
Other	25.4

---

10. Respondents with written standards were asked to submit copies to CSALE for posting on its website. The standards that were submitted can be found at [www.CSALE.org](http://www.CSALE.org).

*Question 4: Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Contracts*

Clinicians employed on a *contract* all report some differences in the written standards for their advancement and/or retention as compared to the advancement/retention standards for *doctrinal faculty* at their schools. The chart below displays the prevalence of these differences:

Differences	Percentage Reporting
Community involvement, state and local bar activities, public advisory committee or commission participation, and/or participation in continuing professional education through teaching by clinical faculty are considered.	75.5
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching by clinical faculty.	63.7
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered.	58.2
The number of publications clinical faculty are required to produce is lower.	58.0
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship by clinical faculty.	64.6
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy.	36.4
Greater emphasis on the administration skills of clinical faculty.	23.3
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for their ability to raise funds to support clinical programs.	20.8
Other	9.1

**IV. LIVE-CLIENT CLINICS SUB-SURVEY RESULTS**

In response to Question 1 of *Master Survey* Section B, 156 schools reported over 1,000 live-client law clinics. In the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey*, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on those clinics. Of the 156 schools reporting live-client clinics in the *Master Survey*, 121 responded to the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey* providing detailed information on 406 separate clinics. The data discussed below summarizes that information.

**A. STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING**

*Questions 3 & 6: Length and Terms of Enrollment*

The term of enrollment for most law clinics is one semester/quarter/trimester (depending on the length of the school’s academic term), with 64.2% of clinics requiring students to enroll for one term, 26.7% requiring students to enroll for two terms, and the remainder requiring three or more terms. A majority of clinics (62.1%) permit students to take the clinic for additional terms beyond the mandatory term of enrollment.

*Question 4: Average Class Size*

The typical enrollment in a law clinic each term ranges from 5 to 12 students. The most common enrollments each term are 5-8 students (40.9%) and 9-12 students (32.3%). In addition, 16.0% of clinics report typical enrollments of 13-16 students, 4.2% report enrollments of 17-20, 2.5% report enrollments of 21-24, 1.7% report enrollments of 1-4, with all other responses less than 1.3%.

*Question 5: Part-Time and Night Students*

Of the law clinics at schools that have part-time or night students, 69.8% report that such students are allowed to participate in those clinics.

*Questions 9 & 16(b)(i): Total Credits Awarded*

The most frequent number of credits per term for the clinic (*i.e.*, credits for combined classroom and casework components) is 6 per term (22.6%), followed by 4/term (19.1%), 5/term (15.6%), 7/term (11.7%), 3/term (10.3%), and 8/term (6.4%), with all other responses 3.5% or less.

*Question 7: Faculty In Charge*

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of the *person in charge* of a clinic:

<b><i>Job Description</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage Reporting</i></b>
Tenured	22.8
Tenure Track	6.8
Clinical Tenured	8.0
Clinical Tenure Track	5.0
6 Year (or more) Contract	4.5
5 Year Contract	14.0
4 Year Contract	1.5
3 Year Contract	7.5
2 Year Contract	3.3
1 Year Contract	9.3
Adjunct	8.5
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	1.5
Other	7.5

## B. CLASSROOM COMPONENT

### Question 8: Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio

The most frequent student-teacher ratio for the classroom component of live-client clinics is 8 to 1 (38.5%), followed by 6 to 1 (13.7%), 10 to 1 (12.2%), 4 to 1 (7.1%), and 12 to 1 (5.6%), with all other clinics reporting ratios below 4 to 1.

### Questions 9 & 13: Credit Hours For, and Focus of the Classroom Component

The most common number of credits per term for *just* the classroom component of the clinic is 2 per term (32.9%), followed by 1/term (29.2%), 3/term (19.6%), and 4/term (10.2%), with all other responses 3.1% or less.

On average across clinics, the greatest portion of classroom time is devoted to case discussion (22.0%) and skills instruction (22.0%), followed by substantive law (19.8%), simulation (14.3%), ethics/professional responsibility (12.7%), and procedural law (12.5%).

All clinics devote at least some classroom time to ethics/professional responsibility. Almost all clinics also devote some classroom time to skills instruction (only 1.1% reporting no time), the substantive law of the clinic (with only 2.6% reporting no time devoted to that topic), and case discussion (only 3.5% reporting no time). On the other hand, 13.7% of clinics report that they spend no time on simulation and 11.4% report no time spent on procedural law.

### Question 11: Grading the Classroom Component

Most clinics (70.5%) grade the classroom component with a mandatory numerical or letter grade; 20.0% give mandatory pass/fail grades for this component. Just over 5% of clinics offer students the option of taking the classroom component pass/fail or graded and 4.4% give mixed pass/fail and numerical/letter grades. Where grading is done with letters or numbers, a minority of clinics (29.5%) grade on a curve.

### Question 12: Limitations on Classroom Component Credits

A minority of schools (39.8%) limit the number of classroom component credits a student may count toward the total needed for graduation.

### Questions 14 & 19: Teaching the Classroom Component

Of those who teach the classroom component, 84.1% are full-time employees of the school. Ninety percent of the persons identified as being in charge of the clinic also teach the classroom component. The table below shows the reported position or status of *full-time* clinicians teaching the classroom component of a clinic.

<b><i>Job Description</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage Reporting</i></b>
Tenured	19.8
Tenure Track	6.2
Clinical Tenured	6.9
Clinical Tenure Track	5.1

6 Year (or more) Contract	4.9
5 Year Contract	12.7
4 Year Contract	1.3
3 Year Contract	7.8
2 Year Contract	2.7
1 Year Contract	12.6
Adjunct	1.6
Fellow	8.6
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	2.4
Other	7.5

### C. CASEWORK COMPONENT

#### *Question 15: Casework Student-Teacher Ratio*

The most common student-teacher ratio for the casework component of live-client clinics is 8 to 1 (36.8%) (the same as for the classroom component), followed by 6 to 1 (15.1%), 10 to 1 (11.6%), 4 to 1 (9.1%), 12 to 1 (5.9%), 7 to 1 (4.6%), and 5 to 1 (4.0%), with all other reporting ratios below 3.3%. Over 75% of law clinics have student-teacher ratios of 8 to 1 or less; over one third have ratios of 6 to 1 or less.

#### *Questions 16: Credit Hours for Casework*

Overwhelmingly, most clinic students (79.9%) receive a fixed number of credits for the casework component, rather than a variable number based on the amount of work students commit to doing. Where the number of credits a student receives for casework is *fixed*, the most frequent number of credits students receive is 3 per term (37.6%), followed by 2/term (21.0%), 4/term (20.3%), 1/term (6.6%), 5/term (5.9%), and 6/term (4.8%), with all other responses 2% or less. Only 3.1% of clinics award 8 or more credits for casework.

#### *Question 17: Grading the Casework Component*

As with the classroom component (Question 11), most students (65.1%) are given a mandatory numerical/letter grade for the casework component of the clinic, with 24.8% of clinics giving mandatory pass/fail grades, 5.5% giving students the option of a pass/fail or numerical/letter grade, and 4.6% giving mixed pass/fail and numerical/letter grades. Of those that grade with letters or numbers, only 29.8% grade on a curve.

#### *Question 18: Limitations on Casework Credits*

A majority of schools (56.7%) limit the number of credits given for casework that a student may count toward the total needed for graduation.

*Questions 19: Supervising the Casework Component*

The table below shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of the person supervising the casework component of a live-client clinic:

<b>Job Description</b>	<b>Percentage Reporting</b>
Tenured	19.1
Tenure Track	6.0
Clinical Tenured	6.8
Clinical Tenure Track	4.5
6 Year (or more) Contract	4.9
5 Year Contract	13.3
4 Year Contract	1.3
3 Year Contract	7.7
2 Year Contract	3.0
1 Year Contract	11.6
Adjunct	1.5
Fellow	9.4
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.0
Other	7.9

*Question 20: Student Practice Rules*

Two thirds of clinics (68.0%) report that all their students practice under a student practice rule, with 14.0% reporting that some but not all of their students practice under a rule, and 17.9% reporting that none of their students practice under a rule.

*Questions 21 & 22: Pre- & Co-Requisites*

A majority of clinics (56.3%) report that there are pre- or co-requisites for the clinic. Where there are pre- or co-requisites, evidence is the most common required course (24.7%), followed by a course(s) in the substantive area of the clinic's practice (20.9%), ethics/professional responsibility (19.7%), criminal procedure (10.2%), and civil procedure (8.8%).

*Question 23: The Use of Technology in Casework*

Respondents report the following uses of technology to assist in casework and case supervision:

- Case management software is the most common type of technology employed, with 48.5% of clinics reporting its use. Just over 40% report the use of a dedicated clinic web-page.
- The use of e-mail between faculty and students for supervision is widespread, with 96.2% of clinics reporting its use.

- An increasing number of clinics permit students to use e-mail for client contact, with 85.2% reporting they permit it in the 2010-11 Survey compared to 71.1% in the last 2007-08 Survey.
- Similarly, an increasing number of clinics have a dedicated *intranet* that provides students with access to client-related documents/files, with 75.4% reporting its use in the latest survey compared to 58.4% in the 2007-08 Survey. Also, an increasing number of clinics are allowing their students to access the clinic's intranet from outside the law school – 50.4% in this survey; 37.4% in the last survey.

*Question 24: Hours of Free Legal Services Delivered by Clinics*

Two hundred sixty-seven clinics reported a total of 789,361 estimated hours of *civil* legal services provided by the students in the clinic during the 2009-10 academic year, or about 2,956 hours per clinic. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA-accredited law schools, the estimated total amount of free *civil* legal services delivered by the students in law clinics during the 2009-10 academic year is over 1.38 million hours.<sup>11</sup>

One hundred nineteen clinics reported a total of 165,922 estimated hours of *criminal* legal services provided by the students during the 2009-10 academic year, or about 1,394 hours per clinic. Extrapolating to all clinics at all ABA-accredited law schools, the estimated total amount of free *criminal* legal services provided by the students in clinics during the 2009-10 academic year is over 440,000 hours.<sup>12</sup>

*Question 25: Number of Clients Represented by Clinics*

Two hundred seventy-four clinics reported representing a total of 17,326 *civil* clients during the 2009-10 academic year (with organizational clients counted as 1), or about 63 clients per clinic. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA-accredited law schools, the estimated total number of clients provided with free *civil* legal services by clinics during the 2009-10 academic year is almost 30,000.<sup>13</sup>

One hundred fifteen clinics reported representing a total of 5,050 *criminal* clients during the 2009-10 academic year, or about 44 clients per clinic per year. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA-accredited law schools, the estimated total number of clients provided with free *criminal* legal services by clinics during the 2009-10 academic year is over 15,000.<sup>14</sup>

---

11. This estimate is calculated as follows: 789,361 total hours for the 57% of ABA-accredited law schools responding to this question, multiplied by 1.75 to adjust for the schools that did not answer. Because some schools completed the *Live-Client Clinic Sub-Survey* for less than all the clinics they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 1 of the Master Survey, the actual aggregate number of hours of free civil legal services delivered is likely significant higher.

12. This estimate is calculated as follows: 165,922 total hours for the 38% of ABA-accredited law schools responding to this question, multiplied by 2.66 to adjust for the schools that did not answer. Because some schools completed the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey* for less than all the clinics they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 1 of the Master Survey, the actual aggregate number of hours of free criminal legal services delivered is likely significantly higher.

13. This estimate is calculated as follows: 17,326 clients for the 58% of ABA-accredited law schools responding to this question, multiplied by 1.73 to adjust for the schools that did not answer. Because some schools completed the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey* for less than all the clinics they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 1 of the Master Survey, the actual aggregate number of clients provided with free civil legal services is likely significantly higher.

14. This estimate is calculated as follows: 5,050 clients for the 33% of ABA-accredited law schools responding to this



## V. FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM SUB-SURVEY RESULTS

In response to Question 3 of *Master Survey* Section B, 145 schools reported a total of over 1,300 distinct field placement programs, though the true number of distinct programs is probably less than half this amount.<sup>15</sup> In this *Field Placement Program Sub-Survey*, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on those field placement programs. Of the 145 schools reporting field placement programs in the *Master Survey*, 88 provided detailed information on 165 distinct field placement programs in the *Field Placement Program Sub-Survey*. Below is summary of that information.

### A. STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT, AND PERSONS TEACHING

#### *Questions 3 & 6: Length and Terms of Enrollment*

The mandatory term of enrollment for field placement programs is overwhelmingly one term (whether semester, trimester, or quarter), with 67.8% requiring one term, 10.1% requiring two terms, and the remainder reporting more terms or "other." A majority of field placement programs (55.8%) permit students to take the program for additional terms beyond the mandatory term. Of those programs allowing additional term(s), most allow students to take the course for just 1 (32.9%) or 2 (41.8%) additional terms.

#### *Question 4: Average Enrollment*

The typical enrollment in a field placement program is about 14 or 15 students, with the most common being 8-14 students (27.0% of programs) and 1-7 students (21.7% of programs). In addition, 12.5% of field placement programs report enrollments of 15-21, 8.6% report enrollments of 22-28, and 5.3% report enrollments of 29-35. Twenty-five percent report enrollments of 36 or more, with 6.6% reporting enrollments of 100 or more.

#### *Question 5: Part-Time and Night Students*

Of the field placement programs at schools that have part-time or night J.D. students, 84.5% report that such students are allowed to participate in the field placement program.

#### *Question 7: Faculty In Charge*

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of those who *supervise* field placement programs from within the law school:

---

question, multiplied by 3.03 to adjust for the schools that did not answer. Because some schools completed the *Live-Client Clinics Sub-Survey* for less than all the clinics they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 1 of the *Master Survey*, the actual aggregate number of clients provided with free criminal legal services is likely significantly higher.

15. Given the number of schools that reported more than 30 "distinct" field placement "programs," it is likely that some schools misunderstood the intent of the question. The question sought the number distinct field placement courses that might, nonetheless, place students in different types of externship experiences and not the number of different field placement offices where students might work for credit. The most frequent number of distinct field placement programs identified in response to this survey question were, in descending order, 3, 1, 4, and 2 programs, with over two thirds of the responses between 1 and 6 programs. Nonetheless, 11 programs stated that they had 40 distinct field placement programs, with 16 schools reporting 30 or more distinct programs. The fact that 88 schools provided detailed information on 165 programs (an average of 2 per school) suggests that the true number of distinct field placement programs (or perhaps better stated as distinct field placement courses) at the 194 accredited law schools is far less than 1,300 and perhaps closer to 500.

<b><i>Job Description</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage Reporting</i></b>
Tenured	26.9
Tenure Track	4.0
Clinical Tenured	2.7
Clinical Tenure Track	0
6 Year (or more) Contract	0.7
5 Year Contract	10.7
4 Year Contract	0
3 Year Contract	7.4
2 Year Contract	1.3
1 Year Contract	16.1
Adjunct	20.8
Fellow	0.7
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.4
Other	5.4

*Question 8: Average Number of Placements Supervised*

The most common number of placements supervised per term by the instructor in charge of the field placement program is 7-8 students (13.3%), followed by 1-2 (11.2%), 5-6 (9.8%), 5-6 (17.3%), 11-12 (9.1%), and 14-15 (7.7%). Fourteen percent of the instructors in charge of a field placement program supervise 50 or more students each term, with 7.7% supervising 75 or more and 3.5% supervising more than 100 students each term.

***B. FIELDWORK ASPECTS***

*Questions 9 & 10: Credits Awarded*

A majority of field placement programs (59.3%) provide a fixed (rather than variable) number of credits for student work. Where the credits are fixed, the most frequent number of fixed credits students earn per term is 3 (32.6%), followed by 4 credits/term (22.5%), 2/term (15.7%), 5/term (10.1%), and 1/term (4.5%). Nine percent of fixed credit programs award 11 or more credits per term. This high number of credits likely results from a student working full-time at a placement site, though with 40.7% of programs awarding variable credits the percentage of programs that permit a student to work full-time at a placement site is higher than 9%.

Respondents indicated that the most frequent number of hours a student must work per fieldwork credit hour earned is 50 hours (18.0%) (about 4 hours/week/credit under a semester system) and 60 hours (17.3%).<sup>16</sup> The most common maximum number of fieldwork credits a student may earn in a single term is 3 (25.6%), followed by 4 (16.5%), 2 and 5 (13.4%), 6 (8.7%), and 10 (4.7%).

---

16. Given the large number of field placement programs that reported students can work less than 10 hours per credit hour earned (10.8%), it is likely that some respondents may have misunderstood the intent of the question since students have

*Question 11: Grading the Field Placement Program*

The overwhelming majority of students receive a pass/fail grade for their fieldwork credit hours (81.5%), while 12.3% receive a letter or numerical grade, 5.5% receive a mixed pass/fail and letter/numerical grade, and 0.7% have the option of a pass/fail or letter/numerical grade. Where the students are graded with letters or numbers, 41.2% of field placement programs grade on a curve.

*Question 12: Evaluating Field Placements*

The most common means of evaluating field placements is through student evaluations (74.6%), followed by on-site supervisor evaluations (65.5%) and site visits (49.1%).

*Questions 13, 14 & 15: Limitations on Placements*

The overwhelming majority of field placement programs (77.7%) place limits on the type of placements permitted. Of the programs that have limitations, the most commonly permitted types of field placements are public interest (43.6%), government (41.2%), judicial (37.6%), criminal prosecution (33.9%), and non-profit criminal defense (32.7%). The placement types that are generally *not* permitted are for-profit criminal defense (only allowed at 3.0%), for-profit law office (only 6.1% allow), and corporate/in-house counsel (only 17.6% allow). Most programs also impose geographical restrictions on field placements (54.7%).

*Question 18: Limitations on Fieldwork Credits*

A majority of schools (79.2%) limit the number of fieldwork credits a student may count toward the total needed for graduation. The most common limit is 10 fieldwork credits (17.6% of schools), followed by 6 and 12 (each 9.9%), and 4 (8.8%).

*Question 19: Journals and Time-Logs*

Most field placement programs (75.2%) use student journals in the course. Of those programs that use journals, only 3.8% share the student journal with the on-site field supervisor. A majority of programs (83.5%) use student time logs in the course. Of those using time logs, 56.0% require that the logs be verified by the on-site supervisor.

*Question 20: On-Site Visits*

Most field placement programs (58.5%) do regular on-site visits to the field placement offices. Where there are regular on-site visits, they are most often done once a year (43.9%), followed by once a term and every other year (each 24.4%). Only 7.3% of programs visit more than once a term.

---

typically been expected to work more than 40 hours at the placement site for each fieldwork credit. See J.P. Ogilvy & Robert F. Siebel, *Externship Demographics Redux* 22-25 (2007) (unpublished manuscript) (reporting an average of 4.4 and median of 4 hours of fieldwork per week per credit from a 2002-03 survey); Robert F. Seibel & Linda H. Morton, *Field Placement Programs: Practices, Problems and Possibilities*, 2 CLIN. L. REV. 413, 428-29 (1996) (finding that 85% of FPP courses surveyed in 1992-93 required 3 to 5 hours of fieldwork per week for each credit earned). Because of this likely misunderstanding, no average number of hours worked per fieldwork credit is provided.

*Question 21: Training for On-Site Supervisors*

A slight majority of field placement programs do not provide any training programs for their on-site supervisors (50.7%).

**C. CLASSROOM ASPECTS**

*Questions 22 & 23: Including a Classroom Component*

Most field placement programs (87.9%) include a classroom component to the course; only a slight majority (50.4%) award distinct credits attributable to the classroom component.

*Question 24: Grading the Classroom Component*

The most common classroom credit grading method is to award mandatory letter or number grades (47.9%), although almost the same percentage of programs award just pass/fail grades for the classroom component (45.4%), 5.0% receive a mixed pass/fail and letter/numerical grade, and 1.7% have the option of pass/fail or letter/numerical grades.

*Question 26: Teaching the Classroom Component*

Only 54% of the persons teaching the classroom component of field placement programs are full-time law school employees. The table below shows the reported position or status of *full-time* clinicians teaching the classroom component of a field placement program.

<b>Job Description</b>	<b>Percentage Reporting</b>
Tenured	30.2
Tenure Track	3.2
Clinical Tenured	3.2
Clinical Tenure Track	1.6
6 Year (or more) Contract	0.8
5 Year Contract	10.3
4 Year Contract	0
3 Year Contract	5.6
2 Year Contract	3.4
1 Year Contract	20.6
Adjunct	4.8
Fellow	3.2
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.2
Other	9.5

*Question 27: Student-Teacher Ratio*

The most common student-teacher ratio for the classroom component is 8 to 1 (13.6%), followed by 15 to 1 (11.0%), 10 to 1 (10.2%), 12 to 1 (8.5%), 20 to 1 and 40 to 1 (each 7.6%), and 25 to 1 (6.8%). About half of schools have student-teacher classroom ratios of 12 to 1 or less (49.2%) and about half have ratios of 13 to 1 or greater (50.8%).

*Question 28: Focus of the Classroom Component*

The greatest portion of classroom component time is devoted to ethics/professional responsibility (24.8%), followed by skills instruction (23.9%), case discussion (21.9%), substantive law (18.3%), simulation (12.1%), and procedural law (11.9%). Every program (except one) devotes at least some percentage of class time to ethics/professional responsibility issues. On the other hand, over one-quarter of programs (28.2%) devote no classroom time to simulation.

*Questions 29 & 30: Pre- and Co-Requisites*

A very slight majority of field placement programs (50.8%) require pre- or co-requisites for the course. Where there are pre- or co-requisites, evidence is the most common required course (18.8%), followed by a course in the substantive area of practice in the program (17.6%), ethics/professional responsibility (16.4%), criminal procedure (10.9%), and civil procedure (7.9%).

*Question 31: Student Demand*

In 35.5% of field placement programs, student demand typically exceeds the number of placements available (*i.e.*, demand greater than supply), while in 21.7% student demand typically does not fill the placements available (*i.e.*, supply greater than demand). In 42.8% of programs student demand typically matches the available supply of placement slots.

*Question 32: Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Field Placement Programs*

One hundred sixty-five field placement programs report a total of 692,584 estimated hours of legal services delivered by the students enrolled in the program in a typical term, or about 4,197 hours per field placement program. Extrapolating to all field placement programs at all ABA-accredited law schools, the estimated total amount of legal services delivered by students enrolled in field placement programs each year is over 1.9 million hours.<sup>17</sup>

## **VI. FACULTY SUB-SURVEY RESULTS**

Four hundred seventy applied legal educators from 99 law schools responded to CSALE's *Faculty Sub-Survey*. Nearly 13% of respondents worked less than full-time as applied legal educators. The data this sub-group of part-time instructors provided in response to this and the *2007-08 Survey* is important and has been repeatedly relied upon by legal educators. However, this group's less than full-time status can, in some instances, skew summary results. Thus, data from this small but important group has been excluded in some instances where indicated below.

---

17. This estimate is calculated as follows: 692,584 total hours for the 37% of ABA-accredited law schools responding to this question, multiplied by 2.7 to adjust for the schools that did not answer. Because some schools completed the Field Placement Program Sub-Survey for less than all the field placement programs they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 3, of the Master Survey, the actual aggregate number of hours of free legal services delivered is likely significantly higher.

A. OVERVIEW

In this section respondents were asked to provide basic demographic information, including which type of applied legal education programs they taught in, its substantive focus, and their role in its administration and teaching. This information is critical for CSALE in providing guidance on program design, structure and staffing, but has less value in summary form and is not reported herein.

B. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

*Question 1(a): Clinical Teaching Experience*

The number of years of full-time clinical teaching experience ranged from a high of 39 to a low of 0. The *average* years of teaching experience is 10.7, and the *median* number of years is 7.0.

*Question 1(b): Part-Time Teaching Experience*

Nearly 46% of respondents report having taught part-time at some point in their careers. Of those with part-time teaching experience, the *average* number of years of such experience is 8.5 and the *median* number of years is 10.7.

*Question 1(c): Years of Full-Time Law Practice Prior to Teaching*

For full-time clinical faculty, the number of years of full-time law practice prior to entering clinical teaching ranged from a high of 36 to a low of 0. The *average* years of practice prior to entering clinical teaching is 8.6, and the *median* number of years is 7.3.

*Question 2: Race and Gender*

The composition of both the full- and part-time respondents who answered this question was 60.2% female, 39.8% male. The race of the respondents is reported below.

<b>Race</b>	<b>Percentage Reporting</b>
African American	4.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7
Asian Indian	2.3
Chinese	1.2
Filipino	0
Japanese	0.7
Korean	0.7
Latin / Hispanic Descent	2.1
Native Hawaiian	0.2
Vietnamese	0
Guamanian or Chamorro	0

Samoan	0
White	84.7
Other	2.8

*Questions 3 & 4: Employment Status*

Respondents were asked to describe their employment status. Grouping by type of appointment, the results are:

<b>Employment Status</b>	<b>Percentage Reporting</b>
Tenured	19.3
Tenure Track	6.0
Clinical Tenured	5.3
Clinical Tenure Track	2.7
6 year (or more) Contract	6.8
5 year Contract	10.6
4 year Contract	1.0
3 year Contract	8.2
2 year Contract	2.4
1 year Contract	13.5
Adjunct	13.0
Fellow: Degree Conferring Program	0.5
Fellow: Not Part of a Degree Conferring Program	2.9
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.1
Other	4.6 <sup>18</sup>

Of the approximately 42.5 % of respondents reporting contract employment, nearly 61% reported that it contained a presumption of renewal. The vast majority of those reporting a presumption of renewal were employed on contracts of 4 or more years in duration. For respondents whose contracts don't contain a presumption of renewal, 13.7% reported that the contracts were "probationary," defined as a contract that places the employee on a track under which the person will ultimately be considered for a longer-term presumptively renewable contract.

---

18. The overwhelming majority of "other" respondents described themselves as "visitors."

*Questions 7, 8, 9 & 10: Compensation: Amount, Source, and Summer Funding*

Respondents were asked to provide their annual compensation in a series of fixed ranges. These dollar amounts can be released (in a form that does not tie the information to the respondent) in limited circumstances upon request to [administrator@csale.org](mailto:administrator@csale.org). For the purposes of this report, it can at least be noted that the data indicates that salary levels fairly closely correlate to employment status (*i.e.*, tenure/tenure track, clinical tenure/clinical tenure track, contract, etc.). That is, those with what are perceived to be higher or greater employment status generally earn more than those with lower or less status.

Full-time respondents report the *source* of their salaries as: "hard money" (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) 80%; "soft money" (grants or other external funding) 8.4%; and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money 11.6%. Part-time respondents report the *source* of their salaries as: "hard money" 81.6%; "soft money" 6.1%; and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money 12.2%.

Nearly 51 percent of full-time respondents report that their base salary covered a 12-month period, 37.8% a 9-month period, 9.2% a 10-month period, and 2.2% an 11-month period. For those whose base salary covered a 9- or 10-month period, 82.3% could apply for summer funding.

Where summer funding was available, respondents were asked to express the amount of the funding as a percentage of their base salary. Percentages ranged from two instances of 30%, to a single low of 1%. The *average* is 11.4% and the *median* is 10.1%.

*Question 11: Summer Operations: Live-Client Clinics*

Just over 73% of all respondents report that their live-client clinics do *not* operate as student enrolled programs during the summer yet the clinic still has ongoing cases or matters. Among these "non-operating" clinics with ongoing cases, 55.5% received funding to hire interns to assist with case coverage. Among the 44.5% of clinics that have ongoing cases but receive no funding to hire interns, 1% receive funding to hire an attorney to *assist* with case coverage. Of the 99% of clinics who do not receive funds to hire an attorney to *assist* with case coverage, just over 15% receive funding to hire an attorney to take *primary responsibility* for ongoing cases.

*Question 12: Summer Operations: Field Placement Programs*

Approximately 54.4% of field placement programs had active placements over the summer. Among programs with active summer placements, just over 27% of the clinicians teaching in them received funding to allow them to pursue scholarship or other activities not related to supervising placements.

*Question 13: Voting Rights*

Faculty voting rights for full-time clinicians are set forth in the table below. In most cases, the nature of the respondent's voting rights closely correlated to her or his employment status.



<b><i>Matters To Be Voted Upon</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage of Respondents Entitled to Vote</i></b>
Vote on All Matters	36.8
Vote on All Matters Except Classroom/Doctrinal Faculty Hiring, Promotion, and Tenure	30.5
No Vote But Can Generally Attend Meetings	19.1
Not Permitted to Attend Faculty Meetings	12.4
Vote on Administrative Matters Only	1.1

**Question 14: Law School Committee Participation**

The chart below displays various types of law school committees. The percentage next to each type of committee reflects the percent of all full-time respondents who are entitled to participate and vote on such committees.

<b><i>Committee Type</i></b>	<b><i>Percentage of Respondents Allowed to Participate</i></b>
Committees addressing classroom/doctrinal faculty hiring and promotion and tenure	60.5
Committees addressing clinical faculty hiring and promotion	85.0
Committees addressing budgeting	80.0
Committees addressing curriculum	85.5
Committees addressing academic standards	90.5
Committees addressing admissions	89.5
Committees addressing financial aid	88.0
Committees addressing technology	89.9
Committees addressing career services/placement	91.3

**Question 16: Teaching Doctrinal Courses**

Approximately 79% of respondents are permitted to teach doctrinal courses (*i.e.*, courses other than trial practice, appellate advocacy, and other “applied practice” courses). Of those who are permitted to teach doctrinal courses, just over 70% are not relieved of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching such courses and approximately 25% are “partially relieved” of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching such courses. Among those that are not relieved (*i.e.*, teaching both a clinic and doctrinal course), 30.7% received additional compensation for the additional workload.

**Question 17: Teaching "Skills" Courses**

Nearly 86% of respondents are permitted to teach non-doctrinal “skills” courses. Of those who are permitted to teach skills courses, just over 78% are not relieved of their clinical teaching obligations

while teaching such courses and approximately 19% are “partially relieved” of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching such courses.

*Question 18: Scholarship as a Job Requirement*

Just over 48% of full-time respondents are required to produce scholarship as part of their job. Of this group, 95.1% receive financial support for research assistance and 28.9% also have their teaching and supervision obligations reduced at some point (excluding summers) to permit them to pursue scholarship.

*Question 19: Sabbaticals*

Paid sabbaticals are available to 44.8% of full-time respondents. Among this group, the average number of years of teaching required before the first sabbatical becomes available is 6.2 and the median number of years is 7.