

**Center for the Study
of
Applied Legal Education**

***2013-14 Survey
of Applied Legal Education***

by

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

Technical Consultants:
Cicada Consulting Group, Inc.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW.....	1
II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY.....	2
A. <u>THE MASTER SURVEY</u>	2
B. <u>THE SUB-SURVEYS</u>	3
C. <u>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</u>	4
III. MASTER SURVEY RESULTS.....	4
A. <u>IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS</u>	4
School Location Characteristics.....	4
First Year, Full-Time Class Size and Part-Time Opportunities.....	5
Rankings.....	5
Oversight of All Clinical Education Courses.....	6
Oversight of Law Clinics.....	6
Oversight of Field Placement Courses.....	6
Hiring Practices for Full-Time Clinical Faculty.....	6
B. <u>PROGRAMS OVERVIEW</u>	7
Number and Types of Law Clinics.....	7
Number and Types of Field Placement Courses.....	9
Participation Levels in Clinical Courses.....	10
Demand for Law Clinics.....	13
Demand for Field Placement Courses.....	14
Remote or “Distant” Field Placements.....	14
Staffing Structure.....	14
C. <u>PROGRAM CHALLENGES AND SUPPORT</u>	14
Major Challenges to Law Clinics.....	14
Major Challenges to Field Placement Courses.....	15
D. <u>LAW CLINICS SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS</u>	15
E. <u>FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS</u>	15
F. <u>FACULTY SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS</u>	15
G. <u>PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS</u>	15
Written Promotion and Retention Standards.....	15
Differences in Standards: Faculty on Clinical Tenure Track.....	15
Differences in Standards: Faculty on Contracts.....	16
IV. LAW CLINICS SUB-SURVEY RESULTS.....	17
A. <u>STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING</u>	17
Length and Terms of Enrollment.....	17
Typical Enrollment.....	17
Student Demand.....	18
Part-Time and Night Students.....	18
Person In Charge.....	19

B.	<u>CLASSROOM COMPONENT</u>	19
	Classroom Student/Teacher Ratio.....	19
	Credit For Classroom Component.....	20
	Grading the Classroom Component.....	21
	Limitations on Classroom Component Credits	21
	Focus of the Classroom Component.....	21
	Person Teaching the Classroom Component.....	21
C.	<u>CASEWORK COMPONENT</u>	22
	Casework Student-Teacher Ratio.....	22
	Credit Hours for Casework - Fixed and Variable.....	23
	Grading the Casework Component.....	24
	Limitations on Casework Credits	24
	Supervising the Casework Component.....	24
	Student Practice Rules.....	25
	Pre- & Co-Requisites	25
	Use of Technology in Casework.....	25
	Hours of Free Legal Services Delivered by Clinics.....	26
	Number of Clients Represented by Clinics	27
V.	FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE SUB-SURVEY RESULTS	27
A.	<u>STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING</u>	27
	Length and Terms of Enrollment	27
	Average Enrollment.....	28
	Student Demand	28
	Part-Time J.D. Students	28
	Faculty In Charge.....	29
	Average Number of Students Supervised	30
B.	<u>FIELDWORK ASPECTS</u>	31
	Credits Awarded	31
	Number of Hours Fieldwork/Credit	32
	Grading the Fieldwork Component.....	32
	Evaluating Field Placements	32
	Limitations on Placements	33
	Limitations on Fieldwork Credits	33
	Tasks and Responsibilities at Placements	33
	Journals and Time-Logs	33
	On-Site Visits.....	34
	Training for On-Site Supervisors.....	34
C.	<u>CLASSROOM ASPECTS</u>	34
	Including a Classroom Component.....	34
	Grading the Classroom Component.....	35
	Classroom Hours.....	35
	Teaching the Classroom Component	35
	Student-Teacher Ratio.....	36
	Focus for the Classroom Component.....	36

Pre- and Co-Requisites	37
Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Field Placement Courses	37
D. <u>SUMMER CREDIT-BEARING FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES</u>	37
Courses and Enrollment	37
Number of Credits	38
Placement Limitations.....	38
VI. FACULTY SUB-SURVEY RESULTS...	38
A. <u>RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT</u>	38
Clinical Teaching Experience	38
Years of Full-Time Law Practice Prior to Teaching.....	39
Race and Gender	39
Employment Status.....	39
Compensation: Amount, Source, and Summer Funding.....	40
Summer Operations: Law Clinics	41
Summer Operations: Field Placement Courses.....	41
Voting Rights	41
Law School Committee Participation	42
Teaching Doctrinal or Podium Courses	42
Teaching Skills Courses.....	43
Scholarship as a Job Requirement	43
Sabbaticals	43

Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education

2013-14 Survey of Applied Legal Education*

I. **OVERVIEW**

This report summarizes the results of the Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education's (CSALE) *2013-14 Survey of Applied Legal Education*. The *2013-14 Survey* was CSALE's third triennial survey of applied legal education, which consists of law clinic and field placement (i.e., externship) courses and educators. The results provide insight into the state of applied legal education in areas like program design, capacity, administration, funding, and pedagogy, and the role of applied legal education and educators in the legal academy. Law schools, legal educators, scholars, and governmental agencies rely on CSALE's data. They do so with the summary results provided here, the *Reports* on CSALE's *2007-08 Survey* and *2010-11 Survey*, and through discussions with CSALE which, since spring 2008, has provided hundreds of customized reports cross-tabulating various aspects of the data. Information on obtaining a free, customized report is available at www.CSALE.org.

The *2013-14 Survey* was composed of four parts. A single *Master Survey* was directed to each of the 198 American Bar Association (ABA) fully-accredited U.S. law schools,¹ 174 (88%) of which responded. Each school was, in turn, asked to distribute the *Law Clinics* and *Field Placement Course Sub-Surveys* to the person responsible for each distinct clinic and field placement course at its school. Each school was also asked to distribute the *Faculty Sub-Survey* to every person teaching in a law clinic or field placement course at the school.²

The discussion of the *Survey's* structure that 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.

* Copyright © 2015 Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education, Inc.

1. At the time the *Survey* was conducted, there were 198 ABA fully-accredited law schools. Schools with provisional ABA accreditation were not included because they had yet to demonstrate fully, to the ABA at least, that they were in compliance with all 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-J.D. courses.

2. The *Survey* defines a person who teaches in a clinic or field placement course as "everyone from tenured clinical faculty to staff attorneys, fellows, and adjuncts, and applies if they teach in a classroom or in the fieldwork/supervisory component of a clinic or teach in or are responsible for a field placement course." The *Survey* emphasizes that it does not include field placement course work-site supervisors (sometimes referred to as "field supervisors").

The *Survey* has evolved over its three iterations, with changes based on user feedback and experience after the *2007-08* and *2010-11 Surveys*. Because of these changes, the differences in response rates to some questions across *Surveys* may not be statistically meaningful. Still, where they are and where there have been changes worth noting in this summary format, we have provide comparisons of 2013-14 *Survey* answers to prior *Surveys*. The full 2007-08 and 2010-11 results remain available in summary format in the *Reports* on the CSALE website 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 assistance during the redrafting and vetting of this iteration of the *Survey* and to the technological wizards at Cicada Consulting. 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 Washington University School of Law, and the law schools and legal educators who rely on CSALE's data.

II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY

A. THE MASTER SURVEY

The *2013-14 Survey* is divided into four parts.³ The first is the *Master Survey*, which was sent to the person at every ABA fully-accredited law school with primary responsibility for the clinical education program at the school.⁴ 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 characteristics of each responding law school including: J.D. enrollment; geographic region; metropolitan setting; law clinic and field placement course enrollment; structure of the clinical education department; and hiring and retention practices for clinical faculty.

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

3. All parts of the *Survey* are available at 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.

Section D electronically assigns the *Law Clinics Sub-Survey* to the director of each law clinic at the school.⁵ It does so by gathering the name and email address of each director and emailing each a unique link to the *Law Clinics Sub-Survey*, which the director is then asked to complete. *Section E* functions identically, except it assigns each field placement program director the *Field Placement Course Sub-Survey*.⁶ *Section F* functions like *Sections D & E* except it assigns the *Faculty Sub-Survey* to each person teaching in a field placement or law clinic course. *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 surveys.

B. THE SUB-SURVEYS

Each of the three *Sub-Surveys* is answered independently of the *Master Survey* and provides separate pockets of data. In the *Law Clinics Sub-Survey*, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on each law clinic identified in *Section B* of the *Master Survey*. Four hundred ninety-six clinics at 134 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 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 Course Sub-Survey* is similar to *Law Clinics Sub-Survey* except that its focus is each field placement course identified in *Section B* of the *Master Survey* and takes into account the pedagogical and supervisory differences between field placement courses and law clinics. One hundred seventy distinct field placement courses at 97 schools responded, providing information on their enrollment, structure, operations, and pedagogical methods.

The *Faculty Sub-Survey* is targeted at each person teaching or supervising a clinic or field placement course (hereinafter "clinical faculty"). This sub-survey captures biographical information (race, gender, years teaching, etc.) and defining characteristics of the respondent's employment, including: the nature of the 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 the *Sub-Surveys* collects respondent feedback.

5. A "law clinic" is defined as a "credit-bearing courses in which students advise or represent 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." The definition of law clinic and field placement course was taken from the ABA Section of Legal Education and Admission to the Bar's *Annual Questionnaire Instructions*.

6. A "field placement course" is defined as "credit-bearing externship courses where the students are supervised at the off-site workplace by persons not employed by the law school for which students receive credit and which may or may not include a classroom component."

C. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data was collected on-line. An invitation to complete the *Master Survey* was sent by email to the person at the school with primary responsibility for, or considerable knowledge of, its clinical program. That person was responsible for assigning the *Sub-Surveys*.

Invitations to complete the *Master Survey* were sent in April, 2014. CSALE remotely monitored the progress on all invited *Master* and *Sub-Surveys* participants and periodically sent reminders to invitees that had not yet filled out a survey. The 2013-14 *Survey* closed August, 31, 2014. It will next be conducted after the fall of 2016.

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*. Just over 59% percent of respondents are private institutions; the balance are public.⁷ Their geographic locations are:

Region I.D.	Region Definition	Percentage of Total Respondents
Region I	Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	17.8
Region II	Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	1.7
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)	18.4
Region V	Southeast and Puerto Rico (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, PR, TN, WV)	12.1
Region VI	Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	19.5
Region VII	Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (excluding New York City and Long Island), RI, VT)	12.1
Region VIII	New York City and Long Island	4.6

7. The respondents closely match the profile of all ABA accredited law schools - 58.5% of fully-accredited law schools are private. See 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

Enrollment for the incoming 2013 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.

Number of First-Year, Full-Time Students	Percentage of Total Respondents	
	2010 - 11	2013 - 14
1 – 100	3.9	9.2
101 - 150	18.7	31.6
151 - 200	23.2	27.6
201 - 250	24.5	15.5
251 - 300	12.9	6.3
301 - 350	5.8	4.6
351 - 400	3.9	0.6
401 - 450	3.2	1.7
451 or more	3.9	2.9

Rankings

Many users of CSALE’s data seek multiple metrics when cross-referencing fields of data. The *U.S. News and World Report* ranking of law schools 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 provides this metric for its users. The *U.S. News* school rankings for the Survey respondents are:

Ranking	Percentage of Total Respondents
1 - 25	14.4
26 - 50	13.2
51 - 75	14.4
76 - 100	14.4
101-146	21.8
"Second Tier"/"Not Ranked"	21.8

Question 5: Oversight of All Clinical Education Courses

Roughly 53% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for all law clinics and field placement courses. This is up from 45% in the *2010-11 Survey*. Just over 47% of their job titles included the word "dean," up from 30% in 2010-11.

Question 6: Oversight of Law Clinics

Approximately 39% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for only law clinics, a drop from 58% in 2010-11 as, presumably, people move into the *Question 5* classification. Just over 14% of their job titles included the word "dean."

Question 7: Oversight of Field Placement Courses

Approximately 55% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for all field placement courses, similar to 2010-11. Just over 20% of their job titles included the word "dean," compared to 23% in 2010-11.

Questions 8 & 9: 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 (66.7 %, up from 52.8% in the *2010-11 Survey*). At 10.5% of schools, the process differed depending on the status of the hire; at 2.9% of schools the hiring was done by committee without a faculty vote; and at 7.6% the dean made the determination.

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

Committee Structure	Percentage of Total Respondents Where Committee Is Involved	
	2010-11	2013-14
Committee without any clinical faculty	5.8	5.5
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that clinical faculty are not allowed to chair	13.0	11.5
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that any member is permitted to chair	44.6	52.7
Committee solely comprised of clinical faculty	2.9	1.8
Committees at schools that do not distinguish between clinical and doctrinal faculty	19.4	21.2
Varies based on position being filled	14.4	7.3

SECTION B. PROGRAMS OVERVIEW

Questions 1 & 2: Number and Types of Law Clinics

The 173 schools that responded to question 1 reported a total of 1322 distinct law clinics offered in the fall 2013 term for an average of 7 per school.

Respondents were asked to identify the single substantive focus of each their school’s clinics from a menu. The table below shows the distribution of clinics in the fall 2013 academic term and their substantive focus (with comparisons to the *2010-11 Survey* responses):

Substantive Focus of Clinic	As Percentage of All Clinics	
	2010-11	2013-14
Criminal Defense	7.0	7.6
Immigration	5.5	6.4
Children & the Law	5.3	5.3
Mediation/ADR	5.3	4.9
Other	5.5	4.7
Community/Economic Development	3.8	4.2

Appellate	4.1	3.9
Domestic Violence	4.0	3.6
Environmental	3.7	3.6
Transactional (domestic)	3.1	3.5
Civil Litig./General Civil Clinic	5.8	3.4
Family Law	3.9	3.3
Housing	3.0	2.9
Innocence	3.5	2.9
Intellectual Property	1.8	2.9
Human Rights	3.0	2.8
Civil Rights	2.7	2.5
Criminal Prosecution	2.4	2.5
Elder Law	2.4	2.5
Tax	3.0	2.5
Asylum/Refugee	2.2	2.0
Employment Law	1.4	2.0
Health Law	1.7	1.9
Consumer Law	1.6	1.8
Disability Law	2.0	1.6
Prisoner's Rights	1.0	1.6
Legislative	1.5	1.5
Veterans	-	1.4
Wills/Trusts/Estates	1.0	1.3
Bankruptcy	1.5	1.2
Civil & Criminal Litig/General Litig.	1.5	1.2
Securities	1.1	1.2
Administrative Law	1.2	1.1
Death Penalty	1.3	1.0
Indian Law	0.9	0.8
Constitutional Law	0.2	0.7
International Transactions	0.5	0.1

Questions 3 & 4: Number and Types of Field Placement Courses

The 164 schools that responded to question 3 reported a total of 934 distinct field placement courses for an average of over 5 per school.

Respondents were asked to identify the single substantive focus of each of their school's field placement courses from a menu. The table shows the distribution of field placement courses and their substantive focus (with comparisons to the *2010-11 Survey* responses):

Substantive Focus of Field Placement	As Percentage of All Field Placements	
	2010-11	2013-14
Judicial	8.6	12.5
Other	5.2	9.9
Government Placements	6.3	8.2
Public Interest Organizations	6.0	7.3
Criminal Prosecution	7.5	7.0
Civil & Criminal Litig./General Litig.	5.3	6.5
Criminal Defense	6.0	5.9
Legislative	2.3	3.3
Civil Litigation	3.2	2.6
Environmental	2.7	2.5
Administrative Law	2.5	2.3
Appellate	2.7	2.3
Family Law	2.1	2.1
Health Law	2.9	2.0
Immigration	2.3	1.9
Transactional (domestic)	2.0	1.9
Bankruptcy	2.1	1.8
Children & the Law	2.9	1.8
Tax	1.9	1.6
Civil Rights	2.0	1.5
Intellectual Property	1.8	1.5
Domestic Violence	2.3	1.4
International Transactions	1.0	1.4
Mediation/ADR	2.1	1.3

Human Rights	2.0	1.1
Housing	1.4	1.0
Consumer Law	1.5	0.9
Community/Economic Development	1.3	0.9
Death Penalty	1.0	0.9
Employment Law	2.4	0.9
Disability Law	1.1	0.8
Asylum/Refugee	1.0	0.6
Elder Law	1.2	0.6
Constitutional Law	0.7	0.5
Indian Law	0.5	0.4
Prisoner's Rights	0.7	0.4
Securities	1.1	0.4
Wills/Trusts/Estates	1.0	0.4

Questions 5 through 9: Participation Levels in Clinical Courses

As of the 2014 fall semester, 46 schools required or guaranteed J.D. student enrollment in a law clinic or field placement course before graduating. Six schools required students to enroll in a law clinic, one requires enrollment in a field placement, and 24 required either a law clinic *or* field placement. One school guaranteed every student an opportunity to enroll in an externship and 14 guaranteed every student a law clinic *or* field placement experience.

In the tables below, respondents estimate the percentage of students that participate in a law clinic or externship before graduation, excluding schools that require a clinical experience. The median enrollment range for clinics in the *2013-14 Survey* was 41-45%; in 2010-11 it was 31-35%.

Law Clinics:

Enrollment Ranges	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range	
	2010-11	2013-14
1 - 5%	3.7	1.4
6 - 10%	3.7	2.7
11 - 15%	2.9	2.7
16 - 20%	11.8	5.5
21 - 25%	11.0	9.6
26 - 30%	8.1	6.2
31 - 35%	21.3	10.3
36 - 40%	5.9	11.0
41 - 45%	6.6	6.8
46 - 50%	6.6	11.6
51 - 55%	4.4	3.4
56 - 60%	5.2	6.2
61 - 65%	1.5	4.1
66 - 70%	3.7	4.1
71 - 75%	1.5	4.8
76 - 80%	1.5	3.4
81 - 85%	0	1.4
86 - 90%	0.7	2.7

The median enrollment range for field placement courses in the *2013-14 Survey* was 51-55%; in 2010-11 it was 31-35%.

Field Placement Courses:

Enrollment Ranges	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range	
	2010-11	2013-14
1 - 5%	3.7	1.4
6 - 10%	3.7	2.1
11 - 15%	2.9	2.1

16 - 20%	11.8	5.7
21 - 25%	11.0	5.7
26 - 30%	8.1	4.3
31 - 35%	21.3	8.5
36 - 40%	5.9	7.1
41 - 45%	6.6	2.8
46 - 50%	6.6	6.4
51 - 55%	4.4	14.2
56 - 60%	5.2	7.1
61 - 65%	1.5	7.1
66 - 70%	3.7	6.4
71 - 75%	1.5	9.2
76 - 80%	1.5	3.5
81 - 85%	0	2.8
86 - 90%	0.7	2.8
96-100%		0.7

The median enrollment range for law clinics **or** field placement courses in the *2013-14 Survey* was 71-75%, excluding schools that require a clinical experience.

Law Clinic or Field Placement Course:

<i>Enrollment Ranges</i>	<i>Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range</i>
1 - 5%	0.8
6 - 10%	0
11 - 15%	0.8
16 - 20%	0
21 - 25%	1.7

26 - 30%	0.8
31 - 35%	4.2
36 - 40%	1.7
41 - 45%	2.5
46 - 50%	4.2
51 - 55%	5.0
56 - 60%	3.3
61 - 65%	6.7
66 - 70%	7.5
71 - 75%	14.2
76 - 80%	17.5
81 - 85%	12.5
86 - 90%	9.2
91 - 96%	1.7
96 - 100%	0.8

Questions 10 & 11: Demand for Law Clinics

Nearly 54% of schools report that, in the last three years, student demand for law-client clinics has increased; just over 34% report constant demand over the same period; and less than 12% report decreased demand. In the *2010-11 Survey*, nearly 80% of schools reported that student demand had increased over the past five years and less than 1% reported decreased demand.

Respondents were allowed to select multiple factors to explain the increase or decrease. Among the schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common factors were: students believe clinics improve marketability (96%); students believe clinics improve skills (92%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within clinics offered (67%); increased support and promotion by law school (58%); and other faculty promoting clinics/encouraging students to enroll (41%). Of the schools reporting a decrease, the most common reason was the time commitment was too great (33%), students don't believe it improves job marketability (27%), lack of support and promotion by the school (20%), and other faculty discourage students from

taking (13%). The *Survey* did not ask if decreased enrollment was a factor in any decrease in demand.

Questions 12 & 13: Demand for Field Placement Courses

Approximately 60% of schools report that, in the last three years, demand for field placement programs has increased; 31% report constant demand over the same period; and nearly 9% report decreased demand. In the *2010-11 Survey*, 76% of schools reported that student demand had increased and just over 4% reported decreased demand.

Of the schools reporting an increase, the most common reasons were: students believe field placement programs improve marketability (91%); students believe field placement programs improve skills (74%); increased support and promotion by law school (70%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within field placement programs offered (54%); and other faculty promoting field placement programs/encouraging students to enroll (36%). Of the schools reporting a decrease, the most common reason (61%) was time commitment per credit hour. Again, the *Survey* did not ask if decreased enrollment was a factor in any decrease.

Question 14: Remote or "Distant" Field Placements

Nearly 65% of respondent schools permit remote or "distant" field placements. Over 80% of these placements included a classroom component

Question 15: Staffing Structure

Respondents were asked to provide the employment status of persons teaching in law clinics or field placement courses. Of the 2478 persons reported by their school, 1937 (78.2%) were full-time employees (compared with nearly 82% in the *2010-11 Survey*).

SECTION C. PROGRAM CHALLENGES AND SUPPORT

Questions 1 & 2: Major Challenges to Law Clinics

From a menu of choices, respondents were asked to identify the major challenges their law clinics faced. Respondents cited: lack of hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (64.1% vs. 46.0% in the *2010-11 Survey*); other demands on clinical faculty's time (47.4% vs. 50.0%); insufficient number of clinical faculty (40.4% vs. 44.2%); lack of physical/office space (37.2% vs. 35.6%); lack of administrative/secretarial support (26.3% vs. 26.4%); lack of support among doctrinal faculty (25.0% vs. 27.0%); lack of support from the administration (16.7% vs. 15.3%); and lack of student demand (10.9% vs. 3.1% in 2010-11).

Questions 3 & 4: Major Challenges to Field Placement Courses

Respondents were asked to identify the major challenges their field placement courses faced. Respondents cited: insufficient number of clinical faculty (51.8% vs. 37.4% in the 2010-11 Survey)); lack of administrative/secretarial support (35.8% vs. 28.8%); lack of hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (22.6% vs. 7.8%); lack of support among doctrinal faculty (13.9% vs. 14.3%); lack of physical/office space (12.4% vs. 12.9%); lack of support from the administration (9.5% vs. 8.0%); and lack of student demand (10.2% vs. 4.3% in 2010-11).

SECTION D. LAW CLINICS SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS

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

SECTION E. FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS

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

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.

SECTION G. PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS

Questions 1 & 2: Written Promotion and Retention Standards

Just over 88 % of respondent schools have written standards for the promotion, tenure, or retention of clinical faculty.⁸ At 71% of these schools, the written standards differed from the promotion, tenure, and retention standards for doctrinal faculty.

Question 3: Differences in Standards: Faculty on Clinical Tenure Track

Faculty 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:

8. 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.

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.	20.0
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching by clinical faculty.	17.8
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered.	22.2
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship by clinical faculty.	27.4
The number of publications clinical faculty are required to produce is lower.	28.1
Clinical faculty receive credit for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy.	3.7
Greater emphasis on the administration skills of clinical faculty.	11.1
Clinical faculty receive credit for ability to raise funds to support clinical programs.	6.7
Other	9.6

Question 4: Differences in Standards: Faculty on Contracts

Clinical faculty 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.	37.8
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching by clinical faculty.	29.6
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered.	28.1
The number of publications clinical faculty are required to produce is lower.	34.8
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship by clinical faculty.	34.1
Clinical faculty receive credit for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy.	17.0
Greater emphasis on the administration skills of clinical faculty.	14.8
Clinical faculty receive credit for ability to raise funds to support clinical programs.	8.9
Other	11.9

IV. LAW CLINICS SUB-SURVEY RESULTS

In response to Question 1 of *Master Survey* Section B, 173 schools reported over 1,322 law clinics. In the *Law Clinics Sub-Survey*, respondents (each person identified in the *Master Survey* as directing a law clinic at that school) were asked to provide detailed information on those clinics. Of the schools reporting law clinics in the *Master Survey*, 134 responded to the *Law Clinics Sub-Survey* providing detailed information on 496 separate clinics. The data discussed below summarize that information.

A. STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING

Questions 3 & 23: Length and Terms of Enrollment

The term of enrollment for most clinics is one semester/quarter/trimester (depending on the length of the school's academic term), with 74.1% of clinics requiring students to enroll for one term, 21.9% requiring students to enroll for two terms, and the remaining 4% requiring three or more terms or other (which included providing the option for one or two terms).

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 64.2% of clinics required one term and 26.7% required two terms.

A majority of clinics (59.9%) permit students to take the clinic for additional terms beyond the mandatory term of enrollment; 34.3% of the additional terms still include a classroom component. The median percentage of students taking a clinic for an additional term(s) is 13%.

Question 4a: Typical Enrollment

The most common enrollments in a clinic each term are set out below. The median enrollment each term is 7-8 students.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, the most common enrollments were 5-8 students (40.9%), 9-12 students (32.3%), 13-16 (16.0%), and 17-20 (4.2%); the median enrollment was 9-12.

<i>Enrollment Ranges</i>	<i>Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range</i>
1 - 2	1.4
3 - 4	4.5
4 - 6	14.0
7 - 8	31.4
9 - 10	16.2
11 - 12	13.1
13 - 14	3.9
15 - 16	7.6
17 - 18	3.5
19 - 20	0.8
21 - 24	1.2
25 - 28	0.8
29 - 32	0.4
≥ 33	1.0

Question 4b: Student Demand

Over the past three years, student demand has typically exceeded the number of available positions in 58.5% of law clinics. In 9.1% of clinics, student demand has typically not exceeded the number of available positions; in 32.3% the number of available slots has matched student demand.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, student demand typically exceeded available positions in 75.1% of law clinics, matched demand in 21.2%, and was less than available positions in 3.7%.

Question 5: Part-Time and Night Students

Of the schools with part-time J.D. students, 81.1% report that part-time students are allowed to participate in that clinic.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 69.8% of clinics with part-time programs permitted those students to participate in the clinic.

Question 6: Person in Charge

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of the person in charge of the clinic (where co-directors, the person with the most seniority at the school):

Job Description	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
Tenured	22.8	24.6
Tenure Track	6.8	6.7
Clinical Tenured	8.0	8.1
Clinical Tenure Track	5.0	4.3
6 Year (or more) Contract	4.5	3.7
5 Year Contract	14.0	14.0
4 Year Contract	1.5	0.6
3 Year Contract	7.5	10.2
2 Year Contract	3.3	2.0
1 Year Contract	9.3	8.7
Adjunct	8.5	12.8
Fellow	-	0.6
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	1.5	1.4
Other	7.5	2.2

Where the person is on a contract (54.1% of those in charge), 75.9% of those contracts are presumptively renewable and 16.7% are probationary.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 50.5% of the persons in charge were on contracts, with 72.3% of the contracts presumptively renewable and 24.8% probationary.

B. CLASSROOM COMPONENT

Question 7: Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio

The student-teacher ratios for the classroom component of law clinics are set out below. The median ratios in the *2013-14*, *2010-11*, and *2007-08 Surveys* were all 8 to 1. In the *2013-14 Survey*, 6.7% of clinics have ratios greater than 10 to 1.

Student-Teacher Ratio	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
2 to 1	1.3	1.5
3 to 1	3.5	2.9
4 to 1	7.1	9.8
5 to 1	12.6	4.8
6 to 1	13.6	19.3
7 to 1	3.8	3.5
8 to 1	38.4	36.2
9 to 1	3.8	3.5
10 to 1	12.1	11.4
11 to 1	0	0.2
12 to 1	5.6	3.3
13 to 1	0	0
14 to 1	1.3	0.4
15 to 1	0.2	0.4
16 to 1	2.3	1.2
17 to 1	0	0.2
≥ 18	3.3	1.0

Questions 8: Credit for Classroom Component

The number of credits per term for *just* the classroom component of the clinic is shown below. The median number of classroom credits is 2 per term.

Number of Classroom Credits	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
1	29.2	21.2
2	32.9	31.2
3	19.6	25.1
4	10.2	11.7
5	2.3	3.6
6	3.1	7.2

Question 10: Grading the Classroom Component

Most clinics (74.9%) grade the classroom component with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 18.6% give mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 3.3% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades, and 3.1% give optional pass/fail or letter/number grades. Where grading is done with letters or numbers, a minority of clinics (29.6%) grade on a curve, the same percentage as in the 2010-11 Survey.

Question 11: Limitations on Classroom Component Credits

A minority of schools (37.1%) limit the number or type of classroom component credits a student may count toward the total needed for graduation.

Question 12: Focus of the Classroom Component

The portion of classroom time devoted to various activities is set out below. Almost all clinics devote some classroom time to skills instruction (97.9%), ethics/professional responsibility (97.3%), and substantive law (96.0%). On the other hand, 13.8% of clinics spend no classroom time on simulation and 13% spend no time on procedural law or rules.

Classroom Activity	Percentage of Time	
	2010-11	2013-14
Case Discussion	22.0	23.0
Skills Instruction	22.0	21.9
Substantive Law	19.8	17.8
Simulation	14.3	12.4
Procedural Law/Rules	12.5	10.9
Ethics/Professional Responsibility	12.7	10.7
Other	6.7	3.3

Question 13: Person Teaching the Classroom Component

Of those who teach the classroom component, 84.3% 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* faculty teaching the classroom component of a clinic.

Job Description	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
Tenured	19.8	21.2
Tenure Track	6.2	7.1
Clinical Tenured	6.9	6.8
Clinical Tenure Track	5.1	4.3
6 Year (or more) Contract	4.9	4.6
5 Year Contract	12.7	14.4
4 Year Contract	1.3	0.5
3 Year Contract	7.8	10.9
2 Year Contract	2.7	2.8
1 Year Contract	12.6	10.6
Adjunct	1.6	2.1
Fellow	8.6	9.2
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	2.4	2.8
Other	7.5	2.8

C. CASEWORK COMPONENT

Question 14: Casework Student-Teacher Ratio

The student-teacher ratios for the casework component are set out below. The median ratio in the *2013-14 and 2010-11 Surveys* was 8 to 1. In the *2013-14 Survey*, over 80% of law clinics (81.8%) have casework student-teacher ratios of 8 to 1 or less; 43.3% have ratios of 6 to 1 or less.

Student-Teacher Ratio	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
≤ 4 to 1	7.3	6.8
4 to 1	9.1	12.4
5 to 1	4.0	6.3
6 to 1	15.1	17.8
7 to 1	4.6	3.7
8 to 1	36.8	34.8
9 to 1	3.2	3.3
10 to 1	11.6	10.9
11 to 1	0.3	0.4
12 to 1	5.9	2.0
≥ 14 to 1	1.7	1.1

Questions 15: Credit Hours for Casework - Fixed and Variable

Most clinics students (86.2%) receive a fixed number of credits for their casework, rather than a variable number based on the amount of time students spend on their case.

Fixed: The table below indicates the number of credits a student receives for casework where the number of credits is fixed.⁹ The median number of fixed casework credits is 3. Only 5.4% of clinics award 8 or more fixed credits for casework; in the 2010-11 Survey, only 3.1 awarded 8 or more.

Number of Fixed Credits	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
1	6.6	6.6
2	21.0	23.2
3	37.6	29.7
4	20.3	24.5
5	5.9	4.7
6	4.8	5.5
7	0.7	0.5
8	2.1	2.4
9	0.7	1.1
10	0.3	0.8
≥ 11	0	1.1

Whether a clinic’s credits are fixed or variable, the median number of hours a student is expected to devote to casework per week for each credit is 4 hours/week/credit.

Variable: Where the credits for casework are variable, the most frequent *minimum* numbers of credits a student may receive in a term are 1/term (31.1%), 2/term (27.0%), and 3/term (21.6%). The most frequent *maximum* numbers of credits are 4/term (28.0%), 3/term (18.7%), 2 and 6/term (both 14.7%), and 5/term (6.7%).

The median minimum number of variable credits is 2/term; the median maximum number is 4/term. Just over five percent (5.3%) of variable credit clinics allow 10 or more credits/term.

⁹ If credits in a law clinic are not formally divided between the classroom and casework components, respondents were instructed to apportion the total credits between the two components.

Question 16: Grading the Casework Component

As with the classroom component (Question 10), most students (69.8%) are given a mandatory letter/number grade for their casework, with 23.6% of clinics giving mandatory pass/fail grades, 4.0% giving students the option of a pass/fail or letter/number grade, and 2.6% giving mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades. Of those that grade with letters or numbers, only 28.5% grade on a curve.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 65.1% of students received a mandatory number/letter grade, 24.8% mandatory pass/fail grades, 5.5% optional pass/fail or number/letter grades, and 4.6% mixed pass/fail and number/letter grades. Only 29.8% of clinics graded casework on a curve. In the *2007-08 Survey*, 59.8% of clinics gave mandatory number/letter grades, 32.0% mandatory pass/fail grades, 5.4% mixed pass/fail and number/letter grades, and 2.9% optional pass/fail or number/letter grades.

Question 17: Limitations on Casework Credits

A majority of schools (53.0%) limit the number of credits for clinic casework that a student may count toward the total needed for graduation. In the *2010-11 Survey*, 56.7% of schools limited the number of casework credits.

Questions 18: Supervising the Casework Component

Of those who supervise the casework component of a law clinic, 76.4% are full-time employees of the school. In the *2010-11 Survey*, 84.1% were full-time employees. Eighty-seven percent of those who supervise casework also teach the classroom component.

The table below shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of *full-time* persons supervising the casework component of a law clinic.

Job Description	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
Tenured	19.1	18.7
Tenure Track	6.0	6.7
Clinical Tenured	6.8	6.5
Clinical Tenure Track	4.5	3.7
6 Year (or more) Contract	4.9	3.9
5 Year Contract	13.3	14.8
4 Year Contract	1.3	0.3
3 Year Contract	7.7	11.1
2 Year Contract	3.0	3.4
1 Year Contract	11.6	10.6
Adjunct	1.5	1.5
Fellow	9.4	11.1
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.0	5.4
Other	7.9	2.4

Question 19: Student Practice Rules

Two thirds of clinics (64.6%) report that all their students practice under a student practice rule, with 15.9% reporting that some but not all of their students practice under a rule, and 19.5% reporting that none of their students practice under a rule.

Questions 20 & 21: Pre- & Co-Requisites

A majority of clinics (60.5%) report that they have pre- or co-requisites. Where there are pre- or co-requisites, the most common are Evidence (49.6%), Ethics/Professional Responsibility (47.8%), a course in the substantive area of the clinic's practice (37.7%), and Civil or Criminal Procedure (both 20.3%).

Question 22: Use of Technology in Casework

Case management software is the most common type of technology employed in casework with 58.6% reporting its use, up from 48.5% in the 2010-11 Survey and 40.5% in 2007-08.

A dedicated clinic web-page is used by 41.0% of clinics.

The use of email between faculty and students for supervision is widespread, with 95.4% reporting its use. Email use between students and clients is permitted by 84.2% of clinics.

At 69.8% of clinics, students can use a dedicated intranet site for access to client-related files. In the *2010-11 Survey*, 75.4% of clients reported its use; in the *2007-08 Survey*, only 58.4% of clinics. Significantly more clinics (61.8%) are now allowing students to access the dedicated intranet site from outside the law school than in the 2010-11 (50.4%) or 2007-08 (37.4%).

Over one-third of clinics (36.7%) now use a cloud computing site to provide students access to client related documents and files.

Few clinics (7.3%) train students in courtroom presentation software.

Almost half (43.7%) of clinics make use of video recording of student work for feedback or supervision purposes. Of those who do use recordings, 51.6% permit recording of student-client interaction.

Question 24: Hours of Free Legal Services Delivered by Clinics

Three hundred fourteen clinics reported a total of 1,040,132 estimated hours of pro bono *civil* legal services provided by the students in the clinic during the 2012-13 academic year, or about 3,313 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 2012-13 academic year was over 3.4 million hours.¹⁰

Eighty five clinics reported a total of 272,817 estimated hours of pro bono *criminal* legal services provided by the students during the 2012-13 academic year, or about 3,210 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 2012-13 academic year was over 900,000 hours.¹¹

10. This estimate is calculated as follows: 1,040,132 total hours for the 30.2% of law clinics from the 1,322 total number of law clinics identified by schools in Section B, Question 1, of the Master Survey that provided estimates for this question (i.e., $1,040,132 \times 3.3 = 3,432,435$). The estimates of hours of civil and criminal services and numbers of civil and criminal clients do not include the 12% of law schools that did not respond to the Master Survey invitation.

11. This estimate is calculated as follows: 272,817 total hours for the 30.2% of law clinics from the 1,322 total number of law clinics identified by schools in Section B, Question 1, of the Master Survey that provided estimates for this question (i.e., $272,817 \times 3.3 = 900,296$).

Question 25: Number of Clients Represented by Clinics

Three hundred twenty-nine clinics reported representing a total of 26,366 *civil* clients during the 2012-13 academic year (organizational clients count as 1), or about 80 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 2012-13 academic year was over 70,000.¹²

Ninety three clinics reported representing a total of 8,782 *criminal* clients during the 2012-13 academic year, or about 64 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 2012-13 academic year was over 27,000.¹³

V. FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE SUB-SURVEY RESULTS

In response to Question 3 of *Master Survey* Section B, 164 schools reported a total of over 934 distinct field placement courses. In the *Field Placement Course Sub-Survey*, respondents (each person identified in the *Master Survey* as directing a field placement course at that school) were asked to provide detailed information on those externship courses. Of the schools reporting field placement courses in the *Master Survey*, 97 schools provided detailed information on 170 distinct courses in the *Field Placement Course Sub-Survey*. Below is a summary of that information.

A. STRUCTURE, SIZE, ENROLLMENT AND PERSONS TEACHING

Questions 3 & 31: Length and Terms of Enrollment

The mandatory term of enrollment for field placement courses is overwhelmingly one term (whether semester, trimester, or quarter), with 84.4% requiring one term, 6.0% requiring two terms, and the remainder reporting more terms or "other."

A bare majority of field placement courses (51.4%) permit students to take the course for additional terms beyond the mandatory term. Of those programs allowing additional term(s), most allow students to take the course for just 1 (44.4%) or 2 (36.1%) additional terms.

12. This estimate is calculated as follows: 26,366 clients for the 31.9% of law clinics from the 1,322 total number of law clinics identified by schools in Section B, Question 1, of the Master Survey that provided estimates for this question (i.e., $26,366 \times 3.1 = 71,188$).

13. This estimate is calculated as follows: 8,782 clients for the 31.9% of law clinics from the 1,322 total number of law clinics identified by schools in Section B, Question 1, of the Master Survey that provided estimates for this question (i.e., $8,782 \times 3.1 = 27,224$).

Question 4: Average Enrollment

The average enrollments in field placement courses are set out below. The median enrollment is 14. Twenty-five percent report enrollments of 29 or more.

<i>Enrollment Ranges</i>	<i>Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range</i>
1 - 2	4.8
3 - 4	4.9
5 - 8	9.1
7 - 8	9.7
9 - 10	9.7
11 - 12	10.3
13 - 14	3.6
15 - 16	5.5
17 - 18	0.6
19 - 20	4.3
21 - 28	12.2
29 - 35	6.1
36 - 42	6.7
43 - 49	1.2
50 - 56	3.7
57 - 70	2.4
71 - 84	1.2
≥ 85	3.6

Question 5: Student Demand

Over the past three years, student demand has typically exceeded the maximum permissible enrollment in 23.8% of field placement courses, matched the permissible enrollment in 48.2%, and been less than the permissible enrollment 28.0%.

Question 6: Part-Time J.D. Students

Of the field placement courses at schools that have part-time J.D. students, 90.0% report that part-time students are allowed to participate.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 84.5% of field placement courses at schools with part-time students reported that they were allowed to participate. In the *2007-08 Survey*, 79.8% allowed part-time student participation.

Question 7: Faculty In Charge

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of the faculty member in charge of the field placement course:

Job Description	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
Tenured	26.9	25.8
Tenure Track	4.0	1.3
Clinical Tenured	2.7	0.6
Clinical Tenure Track	0	1.9
6 Year (or more) Contract	0.7	3.1
5 Year Contract	10.7	13.2
4 Year Contract	0	0
3 Year Contract	7.4	7.5
2 Year Contract	1.3	3.1
1 Year Contract	16.1	18.9
Adjunct	20.8	14.5
Fellow	0.7	0
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.4	1.9
Other	5.4	8.2

Where the person is on a contract (61.0% of field placement faculty), 75.3% of those contracts are presumptively renewable and 16.9% are probationary. In the *2010-11 Survey*, half (51.0%) of all faculty were on contracts, with 81.6% of the contracts presumptively renewable and 11.1% probationary.

Compared to those who direct law clinics (Section IV.A, Question 6), field placement faculty are less likely to have some type of tenure or long-term contract of at least 5 year (45.9% vs. 61.4%) and twice as likely to be at will or on contracts of 2 years or less (23.9% vs. 12.1%).

Question 8: Average Number of Students Supervised

The average number of students that the faculty member supervises each term are set out below. In the *2013-14 Survey*, the median number of students supervised is 15. In the *2010-11 Survey*, the median number supervised was 12 students; in 2007-08, the median was 7-8.

Over thirty percent of field placement faculty supervise 25 or more students per term; almost 10% supervise 50 or more.

Number of Students Supervised	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
1 - 2	11.6	4.9
3 - 4	3.6	4.9
5 - 6	10.1	9.8
7 - 8	13.8	9.9
9 - 10	6.5	7.4
11 - 12	9.4	8.0
13 - 14	0.7	3.0
15 - 16	9.4	8.6
17- 18	0.7	2.5
19 - 20	5.8	6.7
21 - 24	5.1	2.5
25 - 29	6.5	7.3
30 - 34	2.9	6.7
35 - 39	3.6	5.5
40 - 49	1.4	2.4
50 - 59	5.1	4.9
60 - 69	1.4	0
70 - 79	3.6	2.4
≥ 80	0.2	2.4

B. FIELDWORK ASPECTS

Question 9: Credits Awarded

A slight majority of field placement programs (51.6%) provide variable credits (based on the number of hours spent in the course), rather than a fixed number, for student work.

In the 2010-11 Survey, 59.3% of programs provided a fixed (rather than variable) number of credits; in 2007-08, 63.4% provided a fixed number of credits.

Fixed: The table below indicates the number of credits a student receives for fieldwork where the number of credits is fixed.¹⁴ The median number of fixed credits awarded is 4/term. Almost nineteen percent of fixed credit programs award 10 or more credits per term.

In the 2010-11 Survey, the median was 3 credits/term; nine percent awarded 10 or more credits per term. In the 2007-08 Survey, the median was 3/term; only 3.4% awarded 10 or more.

Number of Fixed Credits	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
1	4.5	5.3
2	15.7	14.7
3	32.0	20.0
4	22.5	24.0
5	10.1	5.3
6	3.4	8.0
7	0	0
8	1.1	4.0
9	0	0
10	0	2.7
11	2.2	2.7
12	2.2	9.3
≥ 13	4.5	4.0

Variable: Where the credits a student receives is variable, the most frequent *minimum* numbers of credits are 2/term (36.4%) and 3/term (27.1%). The most frequent *maximum*

14 If credits in a field placement course are not formally divided between the classroom and fieldwork components, respondents were instructed to apportion the total credits between the two components.

numbers of credits are 4/term (22.4%) and 5 and 6/term (both 14.0%). The median minimum number of variable credits is 3 to 4/term; the median maximum number is 5 to 6/term. Twenty nine percent of variable credit field placement courses allow 10 or more credits/term.

Question 10: Number of Hours Fieldwork/Credit

The most common numbers of hours a student must work during the term per fieldwork credit hour earned are 50 hours/credit (22.4%) (about 4 hours/week/credit under a semester system), 60/credit (14.5%), 56/credit (13.2%), and 45/credit (7.2%). The median number of hours/credit is 50, the same as in the *2010-11 Survey*.

The most common maximum numbers of fieldwork credits a student may earn in a single term are 4 credits/term (23.4%), 3/term (16.6%), 12/term (13.85), 6/term (11.7%), and 2/term (8.3%). The median maximum number of fieldwork credits was 5/term. Twenty eight percent of field placement courses permit 10 or more fieldwork credits.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, the most common maximum numbers of fieldwork credits were 3 (25.6%), 4 (16.5%), 2 and 5 (13.4%), 6 (8.7%), and 10 (4.7%). The median maximum number was 4 credits; 14.2% allowed 10 or more fieldwork credits. In the *2007-08 Survey*, the median maximum number was 3 credits; 9.9% allowed 10 or more fieldwork credits.

Question 11: Grading the Fieldwork Component

The overwhelming majority of students receive a pass/fail grade for their fieldwork (79.2%), while 11.3% receive a mandatory letter or number grade, 7.5% receive a mixed pass/fail and letter/number grade, and 1.9% have the option of a pass/fail or letter/number grade. Where the students are graded with letters or numbers, 37.5% of field placement courses grade on a curve.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 81.5% of students received a mandatory pass/fail grade for fieldwork, 12.3% received a letter or number grade, 5.5% received a mixed pass/fail and letter/number grade, and 0.7% had the option of a pass/fail or letter/numerical grade. Where students were given letter or number grades, 41.2% were graded on a curve.

Question 12: Evaluating Field Placements

The most common means of evaluating field placements are through student evaluations of the placement office and supervisor (81.8%), e-mail communications with field supervisors (78.8%), field supervisor evaluations of students (74.1%), telephone calls with field supervisors (67.6%), site visits (59.4%), and remote video connections with field supervisors (11.2%).

In the *2010-11 Survey*, the most common means were student evaluations of the placement (74.6%), field supervisor evaluations of the student (65.5%), and site visits (49.1%).

Questions 13, 14, 15 & 16: Limitations on Placements

An overwhelming majority of field placement courses (77.6%) place limits on the type of placements permitted. Of those that have limitations, the least commonly permitted type of field placements are for-profit law firm (only allowed at 4.1%), for-profit corporate/in-house counsel (16.5%), and not-for-profit corporate/in-house counsel (35.3%).

A slight majority of courses impose geographical restrictions on field placements (51.0%). The most common geographical restrictions are that they be in the same or adjoining city, county, or metropolitan area (35.0%), within the state of the school (12.5%), or within the same region of the country (11.3%) (with 32.5% reporting “other” geographic restrictions). Forty-five percent now allow a student to extern full-time at a remote or distant placement site

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 77.7% placed limits on the placements permitted. The placement types that were most commonly *not* permitted were for-profit criminal defense (only allowed at 3.0%), for-profit law office (6.1%), and corporate/in-house counsel (17.6%).

Question 17: Limitations on Fieldwork Credits

Eighty percent (79.6%) of schools limit the number of fieldwork credits a student may count toward the total needed for graduation. Of those schools that do limit credits, the most common limits are 12 fieldwork credits (18.9% of schools), 10 credits (15.3%), 15 credits (11.7%), 8 credits (9.0%), 6 credits (8.1%), and 18 credits (7.2%). The median limitation is 12 credits.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 79.2% of schools limited the number of fieldwork credits, with the most common limitations 10 fieldwork credits (17.6%), 6 and 12 (each 9.9%), and 4 (8.8%). The median limit was 10 credits.

Question 18: Tasks and Responsibilities at Placements

The most common tasks or responsibilities students perform or assume at a placement site in order of frequency are: substantial legal work (to some degree in 99.3% of placements); observation of the attorney or judge’s practice with debriefing conversations (94.4%); principle for specific assignments (91.5%); works under a student practice rule (74.5%); and directly responsible for the client’s welfare (63.3%).

Question 19: Journals and Time-Logs

Most field placement programs (80.5%) use student journals in the course but only 3.2% share them with on-site field supervisors. Journals are most often read by the faculty member with overall responsibility for the course (91.1%); in 21.0% of courses the journals also are read by a person teaching the classroom portion of the course who is not also the lead faculty member.

A majority of programs (86.2%) use student time logs in the course. Of those using time logs, 52.7% require that the logs be verified by the on-site supervisor.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 75.2 of programs used student journals; only 3.8% shared them with the on-site field supervisor. An overwhelming majority of programs (83.5%) used student time logs. In 2007-08, 70.3% of programs required journals; 65.3% used time logs.

Question 20: On-Site Visits

On-site visits to the placement site are done in 77.8% of field placement courses. Where visits are done, 43.6% of field placement courses visit every other year, 25.5% once a year, 24.5% once a term, and 6.4% more than once a term.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 58.5% of field placement programs did regular on-site visits, which were most often done once a year (43.9%), followed by once a term and every other year (each 24.4%) and more than once a term (7.3%). In the 2007-08 survey, 60.4% of programs did regular on-site visits, 36.7% visited once a term, 30.0% once a year, 28.3% every other year, and 5.0% more than once a term.

Question 21: Training for On-Site Supervisors

A majority of courses (64.0%) provide training for the on-site supervisor of a student's placement, with most providing that training every term (43.6%), followed by annually (22.3%) and when there is a new supervisor to the program (21.3%). Where there is training, 64.7% provide written material and 13.7% provide an online video.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 49.3% of programs provided training for on-site supervisors; in 2007-08, only 37.6% provided training.

C. CLASSROOM ASPECTS

Questions 22 & 23: Including a Classroom Component

An overwhelming majority of field placement courses (84.2%) include a classroom instructional component. In 56.8% of those courses, separate credit is awarded for the classroom component.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 87.9% of programs included a classroom component; of those, 50.4% awarded distinct credits for the classroom component.

Question 24: Grading the Classroom Component

The most common classroom credit grading methods are to award mandatory letter or number grades (52.19%), mandatory pass/fail grades (41.3%), mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades (4.15), and the option of pass/fail or letter/number grades (2.5%). Where the students are graded with letters or numbers, 42.9% grade the classroom component on a curve.

In the 2010-11 Survey, the most common grading methods were mandatory letter/number (47.9%), pass/fail (45.4%), mixed pass/fail and letter/number (5.0%), and optional pass/fail or letter/number (1.7%).

Question 25: Classroom Hours

Half of the field placement courses (50.4%) spend 1 hour per week in the classroom component, 41.0% spend 2 hours, and 8.6% spend 3 or more.

Question 26: Teaching the Classroom Component

Only 58.3% of the persons teaching the classroom component of a field placement course are full-time law school employees; 26.9% are less than one-quarter time employees. The table below shows the reported position or status of *full-time* employees teaching the classroom component of a field placement course.

In the 2010-11 Survey, 54.0% of those teaching the classroom component were full-time employees.

Job Description	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
Tenured	34.4	32.5
Tenure Track	3.3	2.6
Clinical Tenured	3.3	1.3
Clinical Tenure Track	1.1	2.0
6 Year (or more) Contract	1.1	2.6
5 Year Contract	12.2	12.6
4 Year Contract	0	0
3 Year Contract	6.6	6.6
2 Year Contract	1.1	6.6
1 Year Contract	20.0	17.2

Adjunct	5.5	2.6
Fellow	1.1	0
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	4.4	4.0
Other	5.5	9.3

Question 27: Student-Teacher Ratio

The student-teacher ratios for the classroom component are set out below. The median ratio is 15 to 1; 21.8% have ratios of 25 to 1 or greater.

In the 2010-11 Survey, the median ratio was 11 to 1; 22.9% had ratios of 25 to 1 or greater.

Student-Teacher Ratio	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
≤ 2 to 1	1.7	2.4
3 - 4 to 1	2.5	2.4
5 - 6 to 1	9.3	7.4
7 - 8 to 1	13.6	11.4
9 - 10 to 1	11.0	9.7
11 - 12 to 1	11.0	9.8
13 - 14 to 1	3.4	6.5
15 - 16 to 1	13.6	18.7
18 - 19 to 1	0	0.8
20 - 21 to 1	9.3	7.3
24 - 25 to 1	8.5	8.3
30 to 1	4.2	8.9
≥ 31 to 1	11.9	6.4

Question 28: Focus of the Classroom Component

The greatest amounts of classroom time are devoted to professional/career development (18.4% of total classroom time), case discussion/rounds (18.0%), ethics/professional responsibility (17.4%), skills instruction (15.7%), substantive law (9.8%), simulation (8.1%), and procedural law (6.9%). Almost every course (94.2%) devotes some percentage of class time to ethics/professional responsibility issues; only half spend any time on simulation or procedural law or rules.

In the *2010-11 Survey*, classroom time was devoted to ethics/professional responsibility (24.8%), skills instruction (23.9%), case discussion (21.9%), substantive law (18.3%), simulation (12.1%), and procedural law (11.9%).

Questions 29 & 30: Pre- and Co-Requisites

A slight majority of field placement courses (51.4%) require pre- or co-requisites. Where there are pre- or co-requisites, Ethics/Professional Responsibility is the most common (39.5%), followed by Evidence (23.7%), Civil Procedure and a course in the substantive area of practice (both 11.8%), and Criminal Procedure (11.8%).

In the *2010-11 Survey*, 50.8% of programs required pre- or co-requisites. The most common were evidence (18.8%), a course in the substantive area of practice (17.6%), ethics/professional responsibility (16.4%), criminal procedure (10.9%), and civil procedure (7.9%).

Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Field Placement Courses

One hundred twenty-eight field placement courses report a total of 433,377 estimated hours of legal services delivered by the students enrolled in the course, or 3,385 hours per course. Extrapolating to all field placement programs at all ABA-accredited law schools, the estimated total amount of free legal services delivered by students enrolled in field placement courses each year is over 3.1 million hours.¹⁵

D. SUMMER CREDIT-BEARING FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES

Questions 1 & 2: Courses and Enrollment

Over half (57.8%) of field placement courses operate in both the summer and some other term; 4.1% only operate during the summer.

The median enrollment in a summer field placement course is 23 students, with the most common enrollments 1-3 students (13.0%), 4-6 and over 96 students (both 11.7%), 7-9 and 10-12 students (both 7.8%), 46-50 students (6.5%), and 13-15 students (5.2%). Over 28% of summer field placement courses enroll more than 50 students.

15. This estimate is calculated as follows: 3,385 hours/course for the 934 total field placement courses identified by schools in Section B, Question 1, of the Master Survey (i.e., 3,385 x 934 = 3,161,590). This estimate does not include the 12% of law schools that did not respond to the Master Survey invitation.

Questions 3: Number of Credits

Half (49.4%) of summer field placement courses award fixed credits; half (50.6%) allow variable credits.

Where the number of credits a student receives is *fixed*, the most frequent number of credits are 3 and 6 (both 27.3%), 2 (15.9%), 4 (11.4%), 5 (9.1%), and 1 (4.6%). Only 4.6% of summer field placement courses award more than 6 fixed credits.

Where the credits a student receives is *variable*, the most common minimum is 2 credits (50% of variable credit summer courses). The most common maximum is 5 or 6 credits (both 20.3% of courses), with 21.8% allowing 8 or more summer credits.

Questions 4 & 5: Placement Limitations

The most common types of placements permitted in summer field placement courses are public interest organizations, government (including prosecutor and public defender), and judicial, all allowed in 66.7% of courses. The least permitted placements are for-profit law offices (permitted in only 7.2% of courses) and for-profit corporate/in-house counsel (20.3%).

Only 26.7% of summer courses restrict the geographical location of the placement. Of those that do, the most common restrictions were that the placement be in the same or adjoining area as the law school (34.8%), within the United States (17.4%), and within the same state as the school (13.0%) (with 21.7% reporting “other” geographic restrictions).

The overwhelming majority of summer students were at placements within 100 miles of the school (79%), with 16% outside 100 miles but within the United States. Only 3% of summer placements were outside the country.

VI. FACULTY SUB-SURVEY RESULTS

Five hundred and eleven persons teaching in a law clinic or field placement course from 110 law schools responded to CSALE’s *Faculty Sub-Survey*. Approximately 15% of respondents worked less than full-time as applied legal educators. The data on part-time instructors from this and prior *Surveys* 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 group has been excluded in some instances where indicated below.

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 40 to a low of 0. The median years of teaching experience is 9. In the *2010-11 Survey*, the median was 7.

Question 1(b): 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 median number of years of practice is 7, nearly identical to the 2010-11 Survey.

Question 2: Race and Gender

The composition of both the full- and part-time respondents was 63.1% female and 36.9% male, an increase in female clinical faculty from 60.2% in the 2010-11 Survey. The race of the respondents is below.

Race	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
African American	4.7	4.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7	0.6
Asian Indian	2.3	2.8
Chinese	1.2	0.9
Filipino	0	0.4
Japanese	0.7	0.4
Korean	0.7	0.9
Latin / Hispanic Descent	2.1	2.4
Native Hawaiian	0.2	0
Vietnamese	0	0.2
Guamanian or Chamorro	0	0
Samoan	0	0.2
White	84.7	84.0
Other	2.8	2.4

Questions 3 & 4: Employment Status

Respondents were asked to describe their employment status. Grouping by type of appointment, the results for *full-time* respondents are:

Employment Status	Percentage Reporting	
	2010-11	2013-14
Tenured	22.4	21.0
Tenure Track	7.3	3.8
Clinical Tenured	6.4	4.1
Clinical Tenure Track	3.2	2.5
6 year (or more) Contract	7.6	4.9
5 year Contract	11.9	16.7
4 year Contract	0.8	0.5
3 year Contract	9.3	9.3
2 year Contract	2.6	4.9
1 year Contract	13.4	12.8
Adjunct	3.5	9.3
Fellow: Degree Conferring Program	0.6	1.1
Fellow: Not Part of a Degree Conferring Program	3.5	3.0
Non-Adjunct At Will Employee	3.2	2.7
Other ¹⁶	4.4	3.3

Of the approximately 49% of respondents on contract employment, just over 60% reported that it contained a presumption of renewal (nearly identical to the *2010-11 Survey* results). 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 do not contain a presumption of renewal, 13.2% 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. These results are virtually unchanged from the *2010-11 Survey*.

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. For purposes of this report, it can at least be noted that the data indicates that salary levels fairly closely correlate

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

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) 79.8%; "soft money" (grants or other external funding) 5.4%; and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money 14.8%. The *2010-11 Survey* results for these categories were 80%, 8.4%, and 11.6% respectively.

Just over 58% of full-time respondents report that their base salary covered a 12-month period, up from 51% in the *2010-11 Survey*. Nearly 34% report that it covered a 9-month period, down from nearly 38% in 2010-11. Just over 6.5% report that it covered a 10-month period, down from 9% in 2010-11.

For those whose base salary covered a 9- or 10-month period, nearly 83% could apply for summer funding, virtually unchanged from the *2010-11 Survey*. 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 a few instances of 33%, to a several lows of 1%. The median is 10.1%, virtually unchanged from 2010-11.

Question 11: Summer Operations: Law Clinics

Just over 77% of all respondents report that their law clinics do *not* operate as student-enrolled, for-credit programs during the summer yet the clinic still has ongoing cases or matters. This is an increase from 73% in the *2010-11 Survey*. Among these "non-operating" clinics with ongoing cases, 53.5% received funding to hire interns or an attorney to assist with case coverage, similar to the *2010-11* results.

Question 12: Summer Operations: Field Placement Courses

Fifty-seven percent of field placement courses had active placements over the summer, an increase from 54.4% in the *2010-11 Survey*. Among programs with active summer placements, just over 24% of the faculty teaching in them were provided relief from field placement obligations to allow them to pursue scholarship or other activities not related to supervising placements, down from 27% in 2010-11.

Question 13: Voting Rights

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

Matters To Be Voted On	Percentage of Respondents Entitled to Vote	
	2010-11	2013-14
Vote on All Matters	36.8	33.1
Vote on All Matters Except Classroom/Doctrinal Faculty Hiring, Promotion, and Tenure	30.5	36.2
No Vote But Can Generally Attend Meetings	19.1	22.9
Not Permitted to Attend Faculty Meetings	12.4	6.6
Vote on Administrative Matters Only	1.1	1.9

Question 14: Law School Committee Participation

The chart below displays various types of law school committees and the percentage of full-time respondents entitled to participate in and vote on such committees.

Committee Type	Percentage of Respondents Allowed to Participate	
	2010-11	2013-14
Committees addressing classroom/doctrinal faculty hiring and promotion and tenure	60.5	59.5
Committees addressing clinical faculty hiring and promotion	85.0	85.7
Committees addressing budgeting	80.0	80.7
Committees addressing curriculum	85.5	93.0
Committees addressing academic standards	90.5	91.0
Committees addressing admissions	89.5	89.4
Committees addressing financial aid	88.0	88.4
Committees addressing technology	89.9	91.0
Committees addressing career services/placement	91.3	92.4

Question 16: Teaching Doctrinal or Podium Courses

Nearly 91% of respondents are permitted to teach doctrinal or “podium” courses (*i.e.*, courses other than trial practice, appellate advocacy, and other “applied practice” courses), up from 79% in the 2010-11 Survey.

Of those permitted to teach a doctrinal course, 55.8% taught a doctrinal or podium course over the last three years, averaging 3.3 courses over that time period.

Of those permitted to teach doctrinal courses, nearly 80% are not relieved of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching such courses, up from 70% in *2010-11 Survey*. Approximately 17% are partially relieved of their clinical teaching obligations, down from 25% in 2010-11. Among those that are not relieved (*i.e.*, teaching both a clinic and doctrinal course), 20% received additional compensation for the additional workload, down from 30.7% in 2010-11.

Question 17: Teaching Skills Courses

Nearly 97% of respondents are permitted to teach non-doctrinal skills courses, up from 86% in the *2010-11 Survey*.

Of those permitted to teach a skills course, 26.7% taught a course over the last three years, averaging around 3.5 courses over that time period. Of those permitted to teach a doctrinal *or* skills course, 62.0% taught one or both of those types of courses over the last three years.

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. These results are consistent with the *2010-11 Survey*.

Question 18: Scholarship as a Job Requirement

Just over 43% of full-time respondents are required to produce scholarship as part of their job, down from 48% in the *2010-11 Survey*. Of this group, 94% receive financial support for research assistance and 29% also have their teaching and supervision obligations reduced at some point (excluding summers) to permit them to pursue scholarship. These results are consistent with the *2010-11 Survey*.

Question 19: Sabbaticals

Paid sabbaticals are available to nearly 41% of full-time respondents. Among this group, the median number of years of teaching required before the first sabbatical becomes available is 7. These results are consistent with the *2010-11 Survey*.