

**Center for the Study of
Applied Legal Education (CSALE)**

***2019-20 Survey of
Applied Legal Education***

by

Robert R. Kuehn
Washington University in St. Louis

Margaret Reuter
University of Missouri-Kansas City

David A. Santacroce
University of Michigan

Technical Consultants: Qualtrics; Ugam
Research Assistance: Erik Leggio; Joseph Malanson

The Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education Board of Directors:

Bradford Colbert - Mitchell Hamline School of Law
Deborah Epstein - Georgetown University School of Law
Paula Galowitz - New York University School of Law (Treasurer)
Peter Joy - Washington University School of Law (Secretary)
Robert Kuehn - Washington University School of Law (Vice President)
Margaret Reuter - University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law
David Santacrose - University of Michigan Law School (President)
Susan Schechter - University of California-Berkeley, School of Law
Charles Weisselberg - University of California-Berkeley, School of Law

© 2020 The Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education. Permission is granted to reprint all or part of this report, provided the use is not for profit and reference is made to this report. All other rights reserved.

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
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
(734) 763-4319
www.CSALE.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW.....	1
II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY	2
A. <i>THE MASTER AND SUB-SURVEY</i>	2
B. <i>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</i>	2
III. MASTER SURVEY RESULTS	3
A. <i>RESPONDENT SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS</i>	3
School Location	3
First-Year Class Size	4
School Rankings	4
B. <i>CLINICAL PROGRAM OVERSIGHT</i>	5
Oversight of Entire Clinical Program	5
Oversight of Only All Law Clinics	5
Oversight of Only All Field Placement Courses.....	6
C. <i>LAW CLINIC COURSES</i>	6
Number and Types of Law Clinics.....	6
Major Challenges	8
Enrollment Eligibility.....	9
D. <i>FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES</i>	9
Types of Field Placement Courses	9
Practice Types Offered	10
Full-Time Externships	10
Compensation	11
Major Challenges	11
Enrollment Eligibility.....	12
E. <i>CLINICAL PARTICIPATION</i>	12
Requiring a Law Clinic or Field Placement Course.....	12
Guarantee of a Law Clinic or Field Placement Course.....	12
Participation in a Law Clinic	13
Participation in a Field Placement Course.....	14
Participation in a Law Clinic or Field Placement Course	15
Credit Limits – Field Placements.....	15
Credit Limits – Law Clinics	16
F. <i>STUDENT DEMAND</i>	16
Law Clinic Demand	16
Field Placement Demand.....	17
G. <i>INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFING</i>	17
Total Law Clinic and Field Placement Teachers	17
Status.....	18
Instructional Staff Changes	19
Clinical Tenure Track Hiring.....	19
Long-Term Contract Track Hiring	20

H.	PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS.....	21
	Written Promotion, Tenure or Retention Standards.....	21
	Clinical Tenure-Track Standards.....	22
	Long-Term Contract Standards	23
I.	EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM.....	23
	Experiential Credits	23
	First-Year Curriculum.....	23
	Curriculum Changes	24
IV.	SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – LAW CLINICS.....	25
A.	INSTRUCTOR PROFILE	25
	Instructor’s Role in Clinic.....	25
	Person in Charge	26
	Number of Students and Total Credits Taught	26
	Other Responsibilities	27
B.	CLINIC FOCUS AND STRUCTURE	27
	Type of Legal Practice.....	27
	Student Practice Rules.....	27
	Length and Terms of Enrollment	27
	Typical Enrollment and Demand.....	28
	Requisites and Eligibility	29
	Hybrid Clinics.....	29
C.	CASE/LEGAL WORK COMPONENT.....	30
	Case/Legal Work Supervision	30
	Case/Legal Work Student-Teacher Ratio.....	30
	Credit Hours for Case/Legal Work	31
	Grading the Case/Legal Work.....	32
	Interdisciplinary Clinics.....	33
D.	CLASSROOM COMPONENT.....	33
	Classroom Component Instructors.....	33
	Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio	33
	Classroom Component Credit	34
	Grading the Classroom Component.....	35
	Focus of the Classroom Component.....	35
E.	ADDITIONAL TERMS.....	35
	Additional Terms	35
F.	TECHNOLOGY	36
	Technology Use in Law Clinic	36
G.	SUMMER LAW CLINIC.....	37
	Summer Law Clinic	37
H.	FREE LEGAL ASSISTANCE	37
	Total Hours of Free Legal Assistance.....	37
	Total Number of Clients Assisted.....	38
V.	SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES.....	39
A.	INSTRUCTOR PROFILE	39
	Role in Field Placement Course	39
	Number of Students and Total Credits Earned	39

	Other Responsibilities	39
	Person In Charge.....	40
B.	<i>FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE STRUCTURE AND FOCUS</i>	41
	Allocation of Responsibility.....	41
	Course and Practice Types.....	42
	Requisites and Enrollment	43
C.	<i>CREDITS</i>	44
	Credits Awarded	44
D.	<i>FIELDWORK COMPONENT</i>	45
	Number of Hours of Fieldwork/Credit	45
	Time Reporting.....	45
	Fieldwork Grading	45
E.	<i>REFLECTION COMPONENT</i>	46
	Reflection Component Approach	46
	Classroom Component Instruction.....	46
	Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio	46
	Classroom Curriculum.....	47
	Assignments	47
	Reflection Component Grading	47
F.	<i>ADDITIONAL TERMS</i>	47
	Repeat Enrollment	47
G.	<i>EVALUATION AND MONITORING OF FIELD PLACEMENT OFFICES</i>	48
	Number of Offices.....	48
	Office Selection	48
	Placement Evaluations	48
	Placement Site Visits	49
	Training for On-Site Supervisors.....	49
H.	<i>SUMMER FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES</i>	49
	Summer Enrollment.....	49
	Summer Credits.....	50
	Summer Reflection Component.....	50
I.	<i>AMOUNT OF FREE LEGAL ASSISTANCE</i>	51
	Total Hours of Free Legal Assistance.....	51
VI.	SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – CLINICAL FACULTY	52
A.	<i>INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS</i>	52
	Teaching Experience in Law Clinic or Field Placement Course.....	52
	Years of Full-Time Law Practice Prior to Teaching	52
	Race and Gender	52
B.	<i>FACULTY STATUS AND COMPENSATION</i>	53
	Employment Status.....	53
	All Respondents – Law Clinic and Field Placement Course Instructors.....	54
	Law Clinic Instructors.....	55
	Field Placement Course Instructors	56
	Compensation	56
C.	<i>GOVERNANCE AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES</i>	58
	Voting Rights	58

Committee Participation.....	59
Additional Clinical Program Positions	59
<i>D. ADDITIONAL TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES</i>	<i>60</i>
Teaching Doctrinal or Podium Courses	60
Teaching Simulation/Skills Courses	61
Professional Development Support	61
Scholarship as a Job Requirement	61
Sabbatical/Developmental Leave	61
<i>E. RECRUITMENT PROCESS.....</i>	<i>62</i>
Recruitment Methods	62
Hiring Process.....	62
Hiring Negotiations.....	62
PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS.....	63

Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education (CSALE)

2019-20 Survey of Applied Legal Education

I. OVERVIEW

This report summarizes the results of the Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education's (CSALE) *2019-20 Survey of Applied Legal Education*. The *2019-20 CSALE Survey* was CSALE's fifth triennial survey 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 oversight agencies rely on CSALE's data. They do so with the summary results provided here, the earlier reports on CSALE's 2007-08, 2010-11, 2013-14, and 2016-17 surveys, and through hundreds of customized reports cross-tabulating various aspects of the data that CSALE provides to schools, legal educators, and scholars. Information on obtaining a free, customized report is available at www.CSALE.org.

The *2019-20 CSALE Survey* is composed of two parts. A *Master Survey* was directed to American Bar Association (ABA) fully-accredited U.S. law schools. The respondent school was, in turn, asked to provide email addresses for all full-time law school employees teaching in a law clinic or field placement course and all part-time employees/adjuncts if they direct a law clinic or field placement course.¹ Each of those persons was invited by email to fill out the *Sub-Survey* that asked about their courses and employment relationship with the law school. The *2019-20 Master* and *Sub-Survey* instruments are available at <https://www.csale.org/#csale-survey>.

CSALE surveys have evolved over their five iterations. Drafting of this survey, like prior iterations, was designed to maintain enough consistency to track responses over time but also edited to capture changes in clinical legal education. Because of these changes, differences in responses to some questions across surveys may not be meaningful. Where they are and where there have been changes worth noting in this summary format, we provide comparisons of the 2019 responses to prior survey responses. The results from prior surveys remain available in summary format under "Survey Results" on the CSALE website (<https://www.csale.org/#results>) and, with some limitations, in raw format from CSALE directly.

1. The Survey does not include field placement work-site supervisors (sometimes referred to as "field supervisors") or law school faculty who are primarily doctrinal/podium teachers but supervise a few students in externship placements or help teach some law clinic or field placement classroom sessions.

The results reported herein are made possible by the over 1,300 participants in the various surveys. To each, CSALE and the many who rely on its data are truly indebted. Finally, much of CSALE's work is made possible by grants from the Law School Admission Council and Section on Clinical Legal Education of the American Association of Law Schools, the generosity of the University of Michigan Law School and Washington University School of Law, and donations from schools and legal educators who rely on CSALE's data.

II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY

A. THE MASTER AND SUB-SURVEY

The *2019-20 CSALE Survey* is divided into two parts. The first is the *Master Survey*, which was sent to the person at ABA accredited law schools with primary responsibility for the clinical education program at the school.² Over 95% of law schools (185) responded (a list of the schools that participated in the survey is found at the end of this report). The *Master Survey* gathered information about each school's law clinic and field placement programs, instructional staffing, and hiring and retention practices for law clinic and field placement instructors.

The *Sub-Survey* was answered by over 1,300 law clinic and field placement instructors and gathered information on over 900 law clinic and 300 field placement courses. The *Sub-Survey* also collected detailed biographical information and employment characteristics from over 1,135 persons teaching full-time in a law clinic or field placement course, 200 more than the 2016-17 survey.

B. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The data was collected on-line through the Qualtrics survey platform after technical assistance with the survey design and operation from Ugam. Invitations to complete the *Master Survey* were sent in October 2019, asking questions about the 2019-20 academic year. Email invitations to participate in the *Sub-Survey* were sent in January, 2020, and closed in early June. The next CSALE survey will be conducted during the 2022-23 academic year.

2. The survey does not include law schools in Puerto Rico as CSALE has been unable to obtain reliable data on law clinic and externship courses and faculties at those schools.

III. **MASTER SURVEY RESULTS**

The *Master Survey* questions about law clinics and field placement courses were grouped into seven sections: management structure of the school's clinical program; law clinic courses; field placement courses; graduation requirements; student demand; instructional staffing; faculty promotion and retention standards; and the school's experiential education program.

A. **RESPONDENT SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS**

School Location

One hundred eighty-five law schools responded to the *Master Survey*. Private schools make up 55% percent of respondents; the balance are public.³ The locations of survey respondents, and their percentage of ABA-accredited schools in the region, are:

TABLE 1

<i>Region</i>	<i>Region Definition</i>	<i>Number Survey Respondents vs. Schools in Region</i>	<i>Respondents as Percent of All Schools in Region</i>
Region I	Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	29 of 29	100
Region II	Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	8 of 8	100
Region III	Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	26 of 28	93
Region IV	Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	33 of 33	100
Region V	Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV)	27 of 30	90
Region VI	Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	31 of 35	89
Region VII	Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (not NY City & Long Island), RI, VT)	20 of 20	100
Region VIII	New York City and Long Island	11 of 11	100

3. The respondents mirror the profile of all ABA accredited law schools, of which 57% are private. See https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/aba_approved_law_schools. Seven of the nine schools that did not participate in the CSALE survey were private schools.

First-Year Class Size

Enrollments for the 2019 first-year, full-time J.D. class among the respondent schools is presented below and reflects the fluctuating class sizes at many law schools over the last four surveys.

TABLE 2

<i>Number of First-Year Students</i>	<i>Percent of Total Respondents</i>			
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
1 – 100	4	9	14	8
101 - 150	19	32	31	28
151 - 200	23	28	25	22
201 - 250	25	16	18	21
251 - 300	13	6	4	8
301 - 350	6	5	3	5
351 - 400	4	1	1	4
401 - 450	3	2	2	2
451 or more	4	3	2	2

Law School Rankings

Many users of CSALE's data seek information on comparable groups of law schools, such as those similarly ranked by *U.S. News and World Report*. *CSALE does not endorse any system of law school ranking and does not provide its data for use in any rankings*. It nonetheless provides this metric for possible use when comparing responses and as a check on the representativeness of schools that participated in the survey. The *U.S. News* school rankings for the *Master Survey* respondents, and the percentage within ranking ranges that responded to the *Master Survey*, are:

TABLE 3

<i>School Ranking</i>	<i>Percent of Survey Respondents within Rank Range</i>	<i>Percent of All Survey Respondents</i>
1 – 25	100 (26 of 26 schools)	14
26 - 50	100 (26 of 26)	14
51 - 75	100 (23 of 23)	12
76 - 100	96 (24 of 25)	13
101-125	100 (25 of 25)	14
126-147	100 (22 of 22)	12
148-194	83 (39 of 47)	21

B. CLINICAL PROGRAM OVERSIGHT

Questions A.3a-d: Oversight of Entire Clinical Program

Fifty-eight percent of schools have a single individual with oversight responsibility for all law clinics and field placement courses at the school (i.e., the clinical education program). This is similar to 56% and 53% in the last two surveys but up from 45% in the 2010-11 Survey.

Of those with oversight of the entire clinical program, 60% have the word “dean” in their job title, up from 49% in the 2016-17 survey, 47% in 2013-14, and 30% in 2010-11. Seventy-seven percent of those with oversight report to the law school dean while 21% report to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs.

Sixty-three percent of those responsible for oversight of clinical education courses also have responsibility for other courses or programs. The most common additional responsibility is for simulation/practicum courses (for 61% of clinical program deans/directors), followed by pro bono programs (36%), trial advocacy (34%), and legal writing/practice and moot court program (both 22%). At a number of schools, the person overseeing the clinical education program also serves as the dean for faculty or academic affairs.

Questions A.3f-h: Oversight of Only All Law Clinics

At thirty-three percent of schools there is a single individual with oversight responsibility for *only* law clinics (albeit all clinics). This result is similar to 31% of schools

in the 2016-17 survey but a decrease from 39% in 2013-14 and 58% in 2010-11 as more schools may now be designating a person to oversee all clinical courses.

Director continues to be the most common title for this position. But at 13% of schools, the title includes the word “dean,” compared to 19% in 2016-17 and 14% in 2013-14.

Of those with oversight of only law clinics, 64% report to the law school dean while 25% to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs and 11% to the experiential/clinical program dean or director.

Questions A.3i-k: Oversight of Only All Field Placement Courses

At two-thirds of schools there is a single individual with oversight responsibility for *only* all field placement courses, an increase from 59% in 2016-17, 55% in 2013-14, and 54% in 2010-11.

Of those with oversight of only all field placement courses, 37% report to the experiential/clinical program dean or director, 34% to the law school dean, and 22% to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs (at 3 schools the person reports to the head of career services; at 2 schools the person reports to the head of public interest programs).

C. LAW CLINIC COURSES

Questions 4a & b: Number and Types of Law Clinics

The 185 schools in the *Master Survey* reported a total 1,521 distinct law clinics offered during the 2019-20 academic year (with clinics offered more than a single term during the year counting as just one). All but six schools offered at least one law clinic. The median number of law clinics is seven per school, unchanged from the last two surveys. (Note that the number of clinics offered at a school is often related to the size of the school and does not reflect the number of students enrolled in a particular clinic or the availability of a law clinic experience to students.)

Respondents were asked to identify the general substantive focus of each of their school’s clinics as best described in the menu of subject areas in the below table. The “other” responses included a number of animal law and prisoner reentry clinics.

TABLE 4

<i>Substantive Focus of Clinic</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Offering</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Immigration	46	47	63
Criminal Defense	54	47	58
Children & the Law/Children's Rights	38	39	38
Civil Litigation/General Civil Clinic	39	36	38
Entrepreneur/Start-Up/Small Business	—	29	37
Intellectual Property/Technology	21	23	37
Mediation/Alternative Dispute Resolution	35	32	32
Family Law	24	34	31
Domestic Violence	26	20	28
Environmental	26	24	27
Appellate	27	30	26
Community/Economic Development	30	23	26
Tax	18	29	26
Other	33	31	24
Human Rights	20	21	23
Innocence	21	21	22
Transactional	26	22	22
Veterans	10	18	22
Criminal Prosecution	18	17	20
Health/Medical Legal Partnership	14	15	20
Housing	21	16	20
Asylum/Refugee	14	16	17
Civil Rights	18	18	17
Disability/Special Education	12	12	16
Community Justice/Lawyering	—	11	15
Death Penalty/Post Conviction	7	6	13
Elder Law	18	15	13
Employment/Labor Law	14	8	13
Legislative/Policy	11	12	13
Consumer Law	13	11	12

Prisoner's Rights	11	9	10
Administrative Law	8	8	9
Civil & Criminal Litigation/General Litigation	9	11	8
Wills/Trusts/Estates	9	7	8
Indian Law	6	8	7
Securities	9	7	7
Bankruptcy	9	8	8
Constitutional Law	5	4	6

Question 4c: Major Challenges

From a menu of choices, schools were asked to identify up to three major challenges their clinics face:

TABLE 5

<i>Major Challenges</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Other demands on clinical faculty's time	47	46	53
Insufficient hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, state subsidies)	64	56	53
Insufficient faculty status	—	24	33
Insufficient administrative/secretarial support	26	29	22
Insufficient number of faculty	40	26	22
Insufficient physical/office space	37	18	20
Insufficient student demand	11	11	12
Insufficient support among non-clinical faculty	25	14	10
Insufficient support from administration	17	11	7

Question 4d: Enrollment Eligibility

Schools were asked if the following groups of students are permitted to enroll in their clinics for academic credit.

1st Year J.D. students: Only 4% of schools permit 1st year students to enroll in a clinic. At 56% of schools, students are not permitted because the school has chosen to prevent them from enrolling; at 40%, a student practice rule was reported to prevent 1st year students from participating.

2nd year, first semester/term J.D. students: Seventy-eight percent of schools permit 2nd year, first semester/term students to enroll in a clinic. Sixteen percent of schools do not permit enrollment because of student practice rule restrictions; at 7% because the school has chosen not to permit them to enroll.

2nd year, second semester/term J.D. students: Ninety-three percent of schools permit 2nd year, second semester/term students to enroll in a clinic. Six percent of schools do not permit enrollment because of student practice rule restrictions; at 1% because the school has chosen not to permit them to enroll.

LL.M. students: Fifty-four percent of schools permit LL.M. students to enroll in a clinic. At 22% of schools, LL.M. students do not participate because the school does not enroll any LL.M. students; 13% of schools with LL.M. students have chosen not to allow those students to enroll in clinics; and 11% do not enroll their LL.M. students because a student practice rule prevents enrollment.

D. FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES

Question 5a: Types of Field Placement Courses

Schools were asked whether they offer students placements in the following types of offices or practice areas:

TABLE 6

<i>Type of Office or Practice Area⁴</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Offering</i>
	2019-20
Government	96
Criminal (prosecution or defense)	95
Judicial	95
Public interest law offices	92
Civil litigation	86
In-house counsel – nonprofit	76
Legislative	71
Transactional	66
Subject matter focus	64
In-house counsel – for-profit	63
International	51

Question 5b: Practice Types Offered

Schools also reported the percentage of their field placements during a typical term where the student's work focused on certain types of legal practice. Sixty-one percent of students are placed in offices with primarily a litigation or dispute resolution focus, 18% in transactional focused offices, 11% in regulatory offices, and also 11% in legislative or policy office settings.

Litigation/dispute resolution focused field placements are offered at every school. Transactional placements are offered at 89%, regulatory at 83%, and legislative/policy at 82%. But non-litigation placements are often limited — 20% of schools place 5% or fewer of their field placement students in transactional settings, 39% place 5% or fewer in regulatory settings, and 45% place 5% or fewer in legislative/policy practice settings.

Question 5c & d: Full-Time Externships

Fifty-four percent of schools allow students to extern full time (10 academic credits or more), compared to 58% in the 2016-17 survey. Of those schools with full-time externships, 56% allow those externships wherever the student has identified an eligible placement, while 44% only allow placements where the school has relationships or a

4. Responses on law firm placements were determined not useable.

designated program. Sixty percent of the schools with full-time externships allow full-time placements in other countries.

Questions 5g & h: Compensation

Eighteen percent of schools allow students to receive compensation in addition to academic credit (beyond reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred from working at the office), up from 10% in the 2016-17 survey. Another 18% of schools allow compensation but with conditions or limits, also an increase from 10% in the last survey.

Of the schools that allow compensation but only with conditions or limits, 74% allow compensation provided it is from a source other than the externship site/office (e.g., fellowship or stipend), while 37% limit compensation to certain types of placement offices (e.g., only government or non-profit).

Question 5i: Major Challenges

From a menu of choices, schools were asked to identify up to three major challenges their field-placement courses face:

TABLE 7

<i>Major Challenges</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Other demands on clinical faculty's time	47	42	45
Insufficient administrative/secretarial support	36	44	37
Insufficient number of clinical faculty	52	36	35
Insufficient faculty status	—	24	24
Insufficient hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, state subsidies)	23	22	21
Insufficient student demand	10	12	10
Insufficient support among non-clinical faculty	14	10	8
Insufficient support from administration	10	10	7
Insufficient physical/office space	12	8	2

Question 5j: Enrollment Eligibility

Schools were asked if the following groups of students are permitted to enroll in their field placement courses for academic credit.

1st Year J.D. students: Only 3% of schools permit 1st year students to enroll in a field placement course. At 84% of schools, students are not permitted because the school has chosen to prevent them from enrolling; at 13%, a student practice rule prevents 1st year students from participating.

2nd year, first semester/term J.D. students: Eighty-seven percent of schools permit 2nd year, first semester/term students to enroll in a field placement course. Nine percent of schools do not permit enrollment because the school has chosen not to permit them to enroll and 4% because of student practice rule restrictions.

2nd year, second semester/term J.D. students: Ninety-five percent of schools permit 2nd year, second semester/term students to enroll in a field placement course. Four percent of schools do not permit enrollment because the school has chosen to not allow them to enroll.

LL.M. students: Fifty-nine percent of schools permit LL.M. students to enroll in a field placement course. At 24% of schools, LL.M. students do not participate because the school does not enroll any LL.M. students; 16% of schools with LL.M. students have chosen not to allow those students to enroll in field placement courses; and 1% do not enroll their LL.M. students because a student practice rule prevents enrollment.

E. CLINICAL PARTICIPATION

Questions 6a & b: Requiring a Law Clinic or Field Placement Course

Twenty-three percent of schools now require J.D. students to participate in a clinic or field placement course as a condition of graduation. Among these schools, 15% require a law clinic, 2% require a field placement course, and 83% require a law clinic or field placement course. In the 2016-17 survey, 20% required a clinical course.

Questions 6f & g: Guarantee of Law Clinic or Field Placement Course

Twenty-eight percent of schools have a written guarantee promising any J.D. student enrollment in a clinic or field placement course. Among these schools, 18% guarantee participation in a clinic, 4% in a field placement course, and 78% in a law clinic or field placement course. In the 2016-17 survey, 13% of schools guaranteed a law clinic or field placement course.

Question 6c: Participation in a Law Clinic

In the table below, schools estimated the percentage of their J.D. students that participate in a law clinic before graduation. The median participation rate for clinics is 50%. In the 2016-17 survey, 46-50% of graduating students participated in a clinic; in 2013-14, 41-45% of graduates, and in 2010-11, 31-35% of graduates.

TABLE 8

<i>Law Clinic Participation Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>
	2019-20
0%	4
1 - 10%	2
11 - 20%	7
21 - 30%	15
31 - 40%	19
41 - 50%	26
51 - 60%	14
61 - 70%	8
71 - 80%	9
81 - 90%	3
91 - 99%	0
100%	4

Question 6d: Participation in a Field Placement Course

The median percent of J.D. students who participate in a field placement course before graduation is 50%, similar to the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys.

TABLE 9

<i>Field Placement Participation Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>
	2019-20
1 - 10%	4
11 - 20%	7
21 - 30%	14
31 - 40%	10
41 - 50%	15
51 - 60%	14
61 - 70%	12
71 - 80%	15
81 - 90%	7
91 - 99%	1
100%	2

*Question 6e: Participation in a Law Clinic **or** Field Placement Course*

The median estimated percent of J.D. students that graduated having participated in a clinic **or** a field placement course is 85%, while in the 2016-17 survey the median was 76-80%, and in 2013-14, 71-75% participated.

TABLE 10

<i>Law Clinic or Field Placement Participation Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>
	2019-20
1 - 10%	0
11 - 20%	2
21 - 30%	2
31 - 40%	2
41 - 50%	5
51 - 60%	6
61 - 70%	9
71 - 80%	19
81 - 90%	21
91 - 99%	10
100	23

Questions 6h & i: Credit Limits - Field Placements

Sixty-two percent of schools limit the number of field placement credits a student may apply toward graduation requirements (in addition to the school-wide restriction on non-classroom credits under ABA Standard 311), a decrease from 71% in 2016-17 and 80% in 2013-14. The most common limit is 12 credits.

Questions 6j & k: Credit Limits – Law Clinics

Slightly over one-third of schools limit the number of clinic credits a student may apply toward graduation requirements (in addition to the school-wide restriction on non-classroom credits under ABA Standard 311). The most common limit is 12 credits.

F. STUDENT DEMAND

Questions 7a-c: Law Clinic Demand

Schools were asked to report whether overall student demand for clinic courses had increased, remained constant, or decreased in the three years since the last survey in 2016-17:

TABLE 11

<i>Demand Over Past 3 Years</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>			
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Increased	80	54	38	46
Remained Constant	19	34	43	45
Decreased	1	12	19	10

Schools were asked to select multiple factors to explain the increase or decrease. Among the schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common reasons were: students believe clinics improve skills (at 75% of the schools); students believe they improve marketability (60%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within clinics offered (60%); increased support and promotion by law school (45%); new ABA 6-credit experiential requirement (40%); and other faculty promoting clinics/encouraging students to enroll (33%).

Among the schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons were: smaller student body (at 74% of the schools); students believe their time should be spent on bar subject courses (68%); time commitment per credit hour was too high (53%); lack of support and promotion by law school (26%); students do not believe clinics improve job marketability (21%); lack of interest in areas of practice offered by clinics (21%); and other faculty discourage students from taking (16%).

Questions 7d-f: Field Placement Demand

Schools were asked to report whether overall student demand for their field placement courses had increased, remained constant, or decreased in the three years since the last survey in 2016-17:

TABLE 12

<i>Demand Over Past 3 Years</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>			
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Increased	76	60	42	47
Remained Constant	20	31	43	46
Decreased	1	9	15	7

Among schools reporting an increase, the most common reasons for the increase are: students believe field placement courses improve marketability (at 80% of the schools); students believe field placements improve skills (70%); new ABA 6-credit experiential requirement (50%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within field placements offered (44%); and increased support and promotion by law school (43%).

Among schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons are: students believe their time should be spent on bar subject courses (at 64% of the schools); smaller student body (55%); other faculty discourage students from enrolling in field placement courses (27%); and lack of interest in areas of practice with the field placements offered (18%).

G. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFING

Questions 8a & b: Total Law Clinic and Field Placement Teachers

Schools reported 2,657 faculty teaching in a clinic or field placement course during the 2019-20 academic year (including part-time, adjuncts, staff attorneys, fellows, etc.). The median number of clinical faculty per school is 12, while in the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys the median was 11 and in 2010-11 the median was 9 clinical faculty.

In the latest survey, 65% of those teaching in a clinic or field placement course are employed full time by the school (i.e., working at least 80% (0.8 FTE) of normal teaching or

administrative hours/loads at the school). This is a decline from 72% full time in 2016-17, 78% in 2013-14, and 82% in 2010-11.

Question 8c: Status

The faculty status of those teaching full time in a clinic or field placement course is:

TABLE 13

<i>Employment Status</i>	<i>Percent of all Full-Time Instructors</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Tenure	21	18	17
Tenure Track	7	5	4
Clinical Tenured ⁵	7	7	6
Clinical Tenure Track	3	2	2
Presumptively Renewable Long-Term Contract ⁶	32	30	27
Probationary Leading to Presumptively Renewable Long-Term Contract	5	6	6
Other Short-Term Contract	19	16	23
Fellow	8	7	8
At Will	—	4	—
Other Employment Terms	—	6	7

5. “Clinical Tenure” (aka “Programmatic Tenure”) is defined in the survey as: A separate tenure system for persons teaching in a law clinic or field placement course that differs from the traditional tenure provided most podium/doctrinal faculty on governance rights and/or standards for hiring and/or promotion, including often different scholarship expectations.

6. “Long-Term Contract” is defined in the survey as a contract of at least 5 years duration. “Presumption of Renewal” tracks ABA Accreditation Standard 405 and defines presumptively renewable contracts as those that include a presumption they will be renewed at the end of each contract term and are generally only subject to termination/non-renewal for good cause.

Questions 8d-f: Instructional Staff Changes

Schools were asked whether, over the three years since the last survey in 2016-17, the total number of full-time persons teaching in their clinic and field placement courses had changed. At 38% of schools, the total number of clinical instructors at the school increased, at 50% it remained constant, and at 12% it decreased.

Where schools reported an increase, the most common reasons are: addition of new clinic or field placement courses (at 71% of the schools); availability of additional funding for courses (61%); expansion of existing clinic or field placement courses (43%); and increased student interest in law clinic or field placement courses (31%).

Where schools reported a decrease, the most common reasons are: retirement/death of clinical faculty without a replacement (at 73% of the schools) and voluntary departure of clinical faculty without a replacement (55%). Only 5% of schools reported faculty layoffs/reductions directed by the school as a factor that contributed to the decrease, the same percentage that reported decreased student interest in clinic or field placement courses as a factor.

Questions 8g-i: Clinical Tenure Track Hiring

Twenty-two percent of schools have a Clinical Tenure Track. The methods of hiring new full-time Clinical Tenure Track faculty are:

TABLE 14

<i>Hiring of Clinical Tenure Track Faculty by</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Faculty vote upon committee recommendation	67
Faculty vote without committee recommendation	15
Law school dean	13
Committee (without later faculty vote)	5
Other	3

At schools where a committee is involved in some aspect of Clinical Tenure Track hiring, the composition of that committee is:

TABLE 15

<i>Hiring Committee Structure</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that any member is permitted to chair	66
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that only clinical faculty can chair	13
Committee without any clinical faculty	11
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that only doctrinal faculty can chair	11

Questions 8j-l: *Long-Term Contract Track Hiring*

Sixty-seven percent of schools have a Long-Term Contract Track. The methods of hiring new full-time Long-Term Contract Track faculty are:

TABLE 16

<i>Hiring of Long-Term Contract Track Faculty by</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Faculty vote upon committee recommendation	67
Law school dean	18
Faculty vote without committee recommendation	10
Committee (without later faculty vote)	3
Other	7

At schools where a committee is involved in some aspect of Long-Term Contract Track hiring, the composition of that committee is:

TABLE 17

<i>Hiring Committee Structure</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that any member is permitted to chair	77
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that only doctrinal faculty can chair	14
Committee without any clinical faculty	4
Other	4

H. PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS

Question 9a: Written Promotion, Tenure or Retention Standards

Eighty-two percent of schools have written standards for the promotion, tenure, or retention of clinical faculty, similar to the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys. Respondents were asked to submit copies of their standards to CSALE, which are available at <https://www.csale.org/#promotion-standards>.

Question 9b: Clinical Tenure-Track Standards

Where the school has a Clinical Tenure Track, differences in promotion, tenure or retention standards for the faculty on that track compared to the standards for doctrinal/podium faculty on the traditional tenure track are reported as:

TABLE 18

<i>Differences from Doctrinal/Podium Tenure Standards</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Consider community involvement, bar activities, public committee or commission participation, teaching CLE	79
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship	65
Require lower number of publications	63
Consider briefs and similar works authored by clinical faculty	58
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching	47
Receive credit for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy	40
Greater emphasis on the administration skills	33
Receive credit for ability to raise funds to support clinical programs	14
Other	5

Question 9c: Long-Term Contract Standards

Where the school had a Long-Term Contract Track, differences in promotion, tenure or retention standards for faculty on that track compared to the standards for doctrinal/podium faculty on the traditional tenure track are reported as:

TABLE 19

<i>Differences from Doctrinal/Podium Tenure Standards</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Require no or fewer number of publications	87
Consider community involvement, bar activities, public committee or commission participation, or teaching CLE	74
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship	57
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching	51
Consider briefs and similar works authored by clinical faculty	51
Receive credit for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy	31
Greater emphasis on the administration skills	23
Receive credit for ability to raise funds to support clinical programs	15
Other	3

I. EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Question 10a: Experiential Credits

Twelve percent of respondent schools now require more experiential credits than the ABA mandated six-credit minimum.

Questions 10b & c: First-Year Curriculum

Twenty-three percent of schools now offer or require an experiential course in the 1st year, J.D. curriculum (beyond the ABA required legal writing course). Seventeen

percent of schools now require an experiential course, while 6% offer an experiential course elective.

Among the schools that offer or require an experiential course in the 1st year, 95% offer or require a simulation course(s), 12% offer or require a clinic(s), and 5% offer or require a field placement course(s).

Question 10d: Curriculum Changes

Schools were asked if they have made any changes to their curriculum in response to the ABA's new 6-credit experiential training requirement (other than requiring the ABA's 6 minimum experiential credits).

TABLE 20

<i>Curriculum Changes</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
No changes	34
Added new clinic, field placement, or simulation course(s)	47
Restructured previously non-experiential course(s) to become experiential	30
Increased slots available in existing clinic, field placement, or simulation course(s)	24
Developed a required or optional component tied to a non-experiential course (aka lab or workshop)	13
Restructured part of the legal research and writing course(s) to be considered experiential	11
Required sequencing of experiential courses	2
Other	2

IV. SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – LAW CLINICS

In the Law Clinics portion of the *Sub-Survey*, *full-time* law school employees with an instructional role in a law clinic were asked to provide information on their position and, if the director, they were also asked details about their clinic(s). Full-time employees were defined in the *Sub-Survey* as working for the school the equivalent of 80-100% of the school's normal teaching/administrative hours (e.g., 4 days/week or 0.8 FTE or more).

Over 1,100 law clinic instructors responded to the invitation, with 925 clinic directors providing detailed information on their clinic(s). The data reported below summarize the responses of those full-time instructors.

A. INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

Questions B.1 & 2: Instructor's Role in Clinic

Clinic instructors were asked to identify the category that best fits their role in the clinic.

TABLE 21

<i>Role in Law Clinic</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
Direct/head of school's law clinic program	25
Direct/head of distinct clinic(s)	52
Assistant director/assistant head up distinct clinic(s)	4
Staff/supervising attorney or fellow	17
Other teaching role	2

Ninety-five percent of clinic instructors teach both the classroom and fieldwork/casework components of the clinic, 4% teach exclusively the fieldwork/casework component, and 1% teach exclusively the classroom component.

Questions A.2 & E.1: Person in Charge

The following table shows the frequency of the most appropriate job description (i.e., status) of the person in charge of a clinic(s), employed full-time by the law school, who does not also have a concurrent director role in a field placement course (i.e., primarily a clinic director):

TABLE 22

<i>Employment Status — Law Clinic Director</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
	2019-20
Tenured (Unitary)	18
Tenure track	8
Clinical tenured	10
Clinical tenure track	4
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	36
Short-term probationary contract	7
Other short-term contract	13
Fellow	1
Administrative position w/ faculty title	1
Administrative position w/out faculty title	1
Other employment term	1

Questions B3 & 4: Number of Students and Total Credits Taught

Clinic instructors on average teach or supervise a total of 15 students in all their clinics during the academic year (excluding any summer term). The median number of credits each individual student generally earns in the instructor's clinic(s) is 6.

Where the instructor also teaches a clinic in a summer term, instructors on average teach or supervise a total of 4 clinic students in their summer clinic(s), with students generally earning 3 credits.

Question B.5: Other Responsibilities

Eighty-nine percent of the directors or persons responsible for a clinic who are full-time law school employees have responsibilities in addition to their clinic teaching. The percentages of time they spend on their various law school responsibilities are:

TABLE 23

<i>Law School Responsibilities</i>	<i>Percent of Time Spent</i>
Teach law clinic course(s)	54
Teach other skills/simulation course(s)	6
Teach non-skills courses (e.g., doctrinal/podium)	10
Manage program (e.g., trial advocacy, pro bono, experiential education)	11
Research and scholarship	9
Other (e.g., school committees)	10

B. CLINIC FOCUS AND STRUCTURE

Question H.3: Type of Legal Practice

Clinic work is primarily focused on litigation or dispute resolution. Sixty-two percent of overall clinic work is focused on litigation/dispute resolution, 19% is primarily transactional, 9% primarily legislative or policy work, and 6% primarily regulatory.

Question H.4: Student Practice Rules

Sixty-nine percent of clinics report that all their students practice under a student practice rule, with 14% reporting that some but not all practice under a rule, and 17% reporting that none practices under a rule.

Questions H.5-7: Length and Terms of Enrollment

The mandatory term of enrollment for most clinics is one semester/trimester/quarter (depending on the length of the school's academic term) — 78% of clinics require students to enroll for one term and 19% require two terms. In the 2016-17 survey, 75% of clinics were for one term; in 2013-14 survey, 74%; and in 2010-11, 64% required one term.

A majority of clinics (59%) are offered twice during the academic year (e.g., fall and spring semester), with 25% offered once, and 16% offered three times (e.g., fall, winter/spring, and summer).

Questions H.8-9: Typical Enrollment and Demand

The typical enrollments in a clinic each term are set out below. The median and most common enrollment each term is 8 students, the same as in 2016-17 and 2013-14.

TABLE 24

<i>Enrollment Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
1 - 2	1	< 1	< 1
3 - 4	5	6	4
5 - 6	14	17	15
7 - 8	31	34	34
9 - 10	16	14	15
11 - 12	13	12	11
13 - 14	4	4	3
15 - 16	8	7	8
17 - 18	4	3	2
19 - 20	1	1	2
21 - 24	1	1	< 1
≥ 25	2	1	3

Directors were asked whether student demand for their clinic over the three years since the 2016-17 survey exceeded, matched, or was fewer than the number of slots/positions available for enrollment:

TABLE 25

<i>Demand for Clinic Over Past 3 Years</i>	<i>Percent of Clinics Reporting</i>			
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Exceeds available slots	75	59	53	57
Matches	21	32	34	32
Does not fill up slots	4	9	13	11

Question H.10-11: Requisites and Eligibility

A majority of clinics (54%) have pre- or co-requisite coursework. In the 2016-17 survey, 56% reported pre- or co-requisites, while in the 2013-14 survey 61% of clinics. In clinics with pre- or co-requisites, the most common are Ethics/Professional Responsibility (47%), a course(s) in the substantive area of the clinic's practice (40%), Evidence (38%), Criminal Procedure (14%), simulation course(s) (13%), and Civil Procedure (10%).

Of the schools with part-time J.D. students, 88% of clinics at those schools permit part-time students to participate. In the 2016-17 survey, 79% of clinics allowed part-time students to participate; in 2013-14, 81% of clinics; and in 2010-11, 70% of clinics. Where part-time students are permitted to participate, only 46% of clinics enrolled any part-time student(s) during the 2019-20 academic year.

Of the schools with LL.M. students, 62% of clinics at those schools permit LL.M. students to enroll in clinics. Where LL.M. students are permitted to participate, only 29% of clinics enrolled any LL.M. student(s) during the 2019-20 academic year.

Question H.13: Hybrid Clinics

Nine percent of law clinics operate as a hybrid (i.e., located off campus in a host office that is not operated by the school). At 79% of those hybrid clinics, the legal matters students work on are primarily the responsibility of the off-campus office or its attorneys, while at the remaining 21% the matters are primarily the responsibility of the school.

In 23% of hybrid clinics, student legal work is primarily supervised by a full-time law school faculty member, while in 56% of clinics the work is primarily supervised by a lawyer(s) from the off-campus host office, and in 20% there is shared supervision between the faculty member and the host office attorney(s).

The employment relationship between the school and the lawyer at the host office responsible for supervision of students varies. In 52% of hybrid clinics, the supervising lawyer in the host office is an adjunct with compensation from the school; at 8% the lawyer is also an adjunct but receives no compensation; at 7% the person is not appointed as an adjunct faculty member but is compensated by the school; and at 21% the person is not an adjunct and receives no compensation from the school.

C. CASE/LEGAL WORK COMPONENT

Question H 14 & 15: Case/Legal Work Supervision

Forty-seven percent of clinics have one person supervising the students' case/legal work, 31% have two persons, 13% have three persons, and 9% have four or more. Seventy-four percent of those who supervise clinic student case/legal work are full-time employees of the law school, a decrease from over 80% in the last two surveys.

Question H.16-17: Case/Legal Work Student-Teacher Ratio

The most common student-teacher ratio for case/legal work supervision is 8 to 1, the same as the three prior surveys. Over 80% of clinics have casework ratios of 8 to 1 or fewer, as in the two prior surveys. (Note that the ratios are not sensitive to the number of credits (and related hours of required work) students receive for the casework.)

TABLE 26

<i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2013-14	2015-16	2019-20
< 4 to 1	7	11	11
4 to 1	12	10	11
5 to 1	6	7	7
6 to 1	18	15	15
7 to 1	4	3	4
8 to 1	35	37	36
9 to 1	3	3	3
10 to 1	11	9	8
11 to 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
12 to 1	2	3	2
≥ 13 to 1	1	3	2

Where a clinic director also teaches a second, distinct clinic, the most common student-teacher ratio drops to four students per supervisor in the second clinic

Question H.18: Credit Hours for Case/Legal Work

The median number of total credits a student receives for the combined case/legal work and classroom component of a clinic is 5 (for courses with variable credits, respondents were asked to choose the most common number of credits students receive).

TABLE 27

Total Number of Combined Clinic Credits	Percent Reporting	
	2016-17	2019-20
1	< 1	< 1
2	6	3
3	19	17
4	23	21
5	12	11
6	24	27
7	9	7
8	3	4
9	< 1	1
10	< 1	1
11	0	< 1
≥ 12	5	6

Eighty percent of students receive a fixed number of academic credits for their case/legal work, rather than a variable number based on the amount of time spent on their work. In the 2016-17 survey, 83% of clinics awarded a fixed number of credits, while in 2013-14, 86% of clinics awarded a fixed number.

Fixed: The table below indicates the number of credits a student receives for case/legal work where the number of credits is fixed. (If credits are not formally divided between the case/legal work and classroom components, respondents were asked to apportion the total credits between the two components).

The most common number of fixed case/legal work credits is 3, the same number as in the last two surveys. Seven percent of clinics award 8 or more fixed credits for casework,

up from 4% and 5% in the last two surveys. Where a clinic director also teaches a second clinic with a smaller enrollment, the median number of fixed case/legal work credits in the second clinic drops to two.

TABLE 28

<i>Number of Fixed Credits</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2013-14	2015-16	2019-20
1	7	7	4
2	23	25	15
3	30	31	30
4	25	23	23
5	5	5	8
6	6	5	12
7	< 1	< 1	2
8	2	1	3
9	1	1	< 1
≥ 10	1	1	3

Variable: Where the credits for casework are variable, the most frequent *minimum* numbers of credits a student may receive are 2/term (27% of clinics), 3 (22%), 4 (20%), and 1 (19%). (If credits are not formally divided between the case/legal work and classroom components, respondents were asked to apportion the total credits between the two components).

The most frequent *maximum* numbers of variable credits a student may receive are 6/term (31% of clinics), 4 (22%), 5 (18%), 3 (8%) and 8 (8%). Eighteen percent of clinics allow students to receive over 6 variable credits; 4% of clinics allow students to earn 10 or more variable credits.

Question H.19: Grading the Case/Legal Work Component

Sixty-nine percent of clinics award a mandatory letter/number grade for casework, while 24% awarded mandatory pass/fail grades, 4% give students the option of a pass/fail or letter/number grade, and 3% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades. These percentages are similar to the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys.

Of those clinics that grade with letters or numbers, only 32% grade on a curve. In 2016-17, 27% graded on a curve, and in 2013-14, 29% graded on a curve. Where graded on a curve, 63% have a curve similar or the same as the curve used by the school in other low

enrollment courses, while 19% apply a curve similar or the same as that used by the school for all courses, 13% have a more flexible or higher curve than the curve used in other courses, and 5% have a curve that is different from the normal law school curve in some other way.

Question H.20: Interdisciplinary Clinics

Sixteen percent of clinics operate interdisciplinarily — students, faculty, or practitioners from disciplines other than law participate using their non-law discipline. The most common non-law disciplines are social work and psychology.

Of the interdisciplinary clinics, 71% enroll students in non-law disciplines for academic credit; 4% permit students in non-law disciplines to participate but they are paid and do not receive credit; 12% percent allow students in non-law disciplines to participate as unpaid volunteers without academic credit; and 17% do not allow non-law students to participate.

The instruction staffing in interdisciplinary clinics varies. At 40% of interdisciplinary clinics, faculty from non-law disciplines assist with case/legal matters, while at 28% non-faculty practitioners from non-law disciplines assist, at 12% clinical program paid staff from non-law disciplines assist, and at 28% no non-law instructors assist with case/legal matter instruction.

D. CLASSROOM COMPONENT

Question H 21-22: Classroom Component Instructors

Fifty-six percent of clinics have one person teaching the classroom component and 29% have two. Eighty percent of those who teach in the classroom component are full-time employees of the school, a decrease from 84% in the last survey.

Question H-22: Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio

Student-teacher ratios for the classroom component of clinics (i.e., number of classroom students per instructor) are set out below. The median and most common ratios in the current, 2016-17, 2013-14, and 2010-11 surveys are 8 to 1. In the latest survey, 12% of clinics have classroom student-teacher ratios greater than 10 to 1. In the 2016-17 survey, 10% of clinics had ratios greater than 10 to 1, and in 2013-14, 7% of clinics.

TABLE 29

<i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
≤ 2 to 1	2	3	2
3 to 1	3	3	4
4 to 1	10	10	11
5 to 1	5	6	5
6 to 1	19	16	14
7 to 1	4	3	4
8 to 1	36	39	36
9 to 1	4	2	2
10 to 1	11	9	9
11 to 1	< 1	< 1	1
12 to 1	3	4	4
13 to 1	0	0	< 1
14 to 1	< 1	2	1
15 to 1	< 1	< 1	1
≥ 16 to 1	2	4	4

Question H.23: Classroom Component Credit

The number of credits per term for just the classroom component is shown below. (If credits are not divided between the classroom and casework components, respondents were asked to apportion the total credits between the two components). The most common number of classroom credits is 2 per term in the latest and two prior surveys:

TABLE 30

<i>Number of Classroom Credits</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>	
	2016-17	2019-20
≤ 1	36	33
2	40	41
3	18	19
≥ 4	5	7

Question H.24: Grading the Classroom Component

Most clinics (73%) grade the classroom component with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 21% give mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 3% give optional pass/fail, and 3% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number. These percentages are similar to the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys.

Where classroom grading is by letters or numbers, 32% grade on a curve, compared to 28% in 2016-17 and 30% in 2013-14. Where graded on a curve, 67% clinics have a curve similar or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses, 22% apply a curve similar or the same as that used by the school for all courses, 6% have a curve more flexible or higher than in similar courses, and 6% have a curve that is different from the normal law school curve in some other way.

Question H.25: Focus of the Classroom Component

The average portion of classroom time devoted to various activities is set out in the table below. Almost every clinic (94%) devotes some classroom time to skills instruction, case discussion/rounds (90%), and substantive law (89%). On the other hand, 30% spend no classroom time on procedural law/rules and 25% spend no time on simulation.

TABLE 31

<i>Classroom Activity</i>	<i>Percent of Time</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Skills instruction	22	23	23
Case discussion/rounds	23	22	21
Substantive law	18	18	20
Simulation	12	13	13
Procedural law/rules	11	11	10
Ethics/professional responsibility	11	11	9
Other	3	3	3

E. ADDITIONAL TERMS

Question H.26: Additional Terms

Sixty-three percent of clinics permit students to enroll for an additional term(s) beyond the mandatory term of enrollment, typically for three credits (38% of clinics), two

credits (29%), or four (19%). The median percentage of students taking a clinic for an additional term(s) is 20%, an increase from 11-15% in the last two surveys.

Of students taking a clinic for an additional term(s), 54% are required to attend a classroom instructional component. Where there is no classroom component, the clinic most often meets the ABA Standard 304(a)(5) requirement for a classroom component through individual or group meetings between the advanced student and clinic instructor.

Most clinics (62%) grade students taking the clinic for an additional term with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 30% give mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 4% give optional pass/fail, and 4% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number.

F. TECHNOLOGY

Questions H.27-32: Technology Use in Law Clinic

Case management: Case management software is now a common feature of most law clinics — 77% report using it in their clinic. In the 2016-17 survey, 73% of clinics employed case management software; in the 2013-14 survey, 59% reported its use; and in 2010-11, only 49%.

Of those employing case management software, Clio is the most common program (69% of clinics), followed by Time Matters (8%), Legal Server (8%), ClinicCases (2%), and Amicus (2%). Seven percent use some other software.

Dedicated Intranet: Sixty percent of clinics (a decrease from 69% in 2016-17 survey) use a dedicated intranet (school-run computer network permitting document sharing) that provides students with access to client-related documents/files. In 79% of those clinics, students can access that intranet from outside the law school (an increase from 64% in 2016-17).

Cloud Computing: Almost two-thirds (64%) of clinics use a cloud computing site (computer network outside school that is accessible over the Internet) providing students with access to client-related documents/files. In 2016-17, 54% used a cloud computing site, while in 2013-14, only 37% used a cloud site.

Student Phones: Seventy-seven percent of clinics permit students to use their personal phones for client contact, compared to 88% in last survey.

Video Recording of Student Work: Thirty-six percent of clinics video record student work for feedback or supervision purposes. Of clinics that record, only half permit recording of student-client interaction.

Courtroom Software: Of clinics where students appear in court, only 9% train their students in courtroom presentation software.

G. SUMMER LAW CLINIC

Question H.33: Summer Law Clinic

Only 23% of clinics run as a student-enrolled, for-credit program during the summer term, the same as the percentage in the 2016-17 survey. In 86% of those summer clinics, the person who directs the clinic during the fall/spring terms also is responsible for teaching and supervising the summer clinic students, while in 14% of clinics someone else assumes responsibility for the summer students, a decrease from 20% in the last survey.

The median enrollment in a summer law clinic is four students, and the most common number of credits students receive is three.

In 81% of clinics, there are on-going matters during the summer that must be handled by the clinic. Fifty-one percent of those clinics are provided funding from the school for additional assistance with cases/legal work. In 49%, the instructor must manage the ongoing cases without additional assistance. Where assistance is provided, 67% of clinics are assisted by paid law students (an increase from 49% in the last survey), 16% are assisted by an attorney who provides partial relief to the instructor, and 16% are fully relieved by an attorney paid by the school (compared to 20% in 2016-17).

H. FREE LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Question H.34: Total Hours of Free Legal Assistance

Civil: Seven hundred twenty-seven clinics estimated their students provided a total of 1,770,000 hours of free *civil* legal assistance during the previous 2018-19 academic year to individuals, governmental entities, or organizations, or approximately 2,400 hours per clinic.

Criminal: Clinics estimated their students provided a total of 359,000 hours of free *criminal* legal services during the 2018-19 academic year, or approximately 490 hours per clinic.

Extrapolating to all clinics at ABA-accredited law schools, students in clinics provided an estimated 4.4 million total hours of free civil or criminal legal assistance during the 2018-19 academic year.⁷

Question 35: Total Number of Clients Assisted

Civil: Seven hundred thirty clinics estimated their students represented a total of over 80,000 *civil* clients during the 2018-19 academic year (organizational clients or serving as a third-party neutral count as 1), or an average of approximately 110 clients per clinic.

Criminal: Clinics estimated their students represented a total of 18,000 *criminal* clients during the 2018-19 academic year, or an average of approximately 25 clients per clinic.

Extrapolating to all clinics at ABA-accredited law schools, students in clinics provided free civil or criminal legal assistance to an estimated 200,000 clients during the 2018-19 academic year.⁸

7. This estimate is calculated by multiplying the number of civil plus criminal hours per clinic by the total number of clinics reported by schools in the *Master Survey*: $2,890 \times 1,521 = 4,395,690$. The estimate does not include the number of student hours provided by the nine schools that did not respond to the *Master Survey* invitation.

8. This estimate is calculated by multiplying the number of civil plus criminal clients per clinic by the total number of clinics reported by schools in the *Master Survey*: $135 \times 1,521 = 205,335$. The estimate does not include the number of clients assisted by the nine schools that did not respond to the *Master Survey* invitation.

V. SUB-SURVEY RESULTS - FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES

In the Field Placement Courses portion of the *Sub-Survey*, full-time law school employees with an instructional role in a field placement course were asked to provide information on their position and, if the director, details about their course(s).

Over 380 field placement instructors responded to the invitation, with 287 field placement directors providing detailed information on their course(s). The data reported below summarize the responses of those full-time instructors.

A. INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

Questions C.1 & 2: Role in Field Placement Course

Eighty-five percent of those who teach in a field placement course either head up the school's overall field placement program or direct a distinct field placement course(s).

Seventy-two percent of field placement instructors teach both the classroom and fieldwork/casework components of the field placement course, 19% teach exclusively the classroom component of the course, and 8% exclusively the fieldwork/casework.

Questions C.3 & 4: Number of Students and Total Credits Earned

The median number of students that field placement instructors teach or oversee in all their field placement courses during the academic year (excluding any summer term) is 25 students. Fourteen percent of instructors teach or oversee 100 or more students.

The median number of credits a student generally earns in a field placement course for all terms (other than summer) for the combined fieldwork and any separate classroom component is 4.

Where the instructor teaches in a summer term, the median number of students in their summer field placement courses is 20. Students in a summer field placement course generally earn 4 credits for the combined fieldwork and any separate classroom component.

Question C.5: Other Responsibilities

Eighty-nine percent of the directors or persons responsible for field placement courses have other law school responsibilities in addition to their field placement course teaching.

The percentage of time these directors spend on their various responsibilities are:

TABLE 32

<i>Law School Responsibilities</i>	<i>Percent of Time Spent</i>
Teach field placement course(s)	28
Teach other skills/simulation course(s)	17
Teach non-skills courses (e.g., doctrinal/podium)	12
Manage programs (e.g., trial advocacy, pro bono, experiential education)	21
Research and scholarship	7
Work in student or career services offices	4
Other (e.g., school committees)	12

Questions A.2 & E.1: Person in Charge

The following table shows the frequency of the most appropriate job description (i.e., status) of the person in charge of a field placement course(s), employed full-time by the law school, who does not also have a concurrent director role in a clinic (i.e., primarily a field placement course director):

TABLE 33

<i>Employment Status — Field Placement Course Director</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
	2019-20
Tenured (Unitary)	15
Tenure track	1
Clinical tenured	5
Clinical tenure track	3
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	27
Short-term probationary contract	4
Other short-term contract	11
Fellow	—
Administrative position w/ faculty title	22
Administrative position w/out faculty title	10
Other employment term	1

B. FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE STRUCTURE AND FOCUS

Question I.3: Allocation of Responsibility

Respondents were asked to identify the person with the greatest responsibility for each element of the field placement course (not necessarily exclusive responsibility). The person with primary responsibility for core elements of field placement courses are:

TABLE 34

<i>Person with Primary Responsibility for Task</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Indicating Person Primarily Responsibility for Task</i>			
	<i>Placement of Students</i>	<i>Host Office/Field Supervisor Relations</i>	<i>Guided Reflection</i>	<i>Grading/Assessment</i>
Field placement course director	68	80	73	75
Administrative assistant to director	6	4	0	0
Career services or pro bono staff	10	4	3	1
Classroom instructor (e.g., adjunct)	5	6	22	19
Other	11	5	4	4

Questions I.4-6: Course and Practice Types

Field placement courses most commonly place students in a mix of different types of field placement/host offices (70% of courses) rather than placing all students in similar types of offices/practices (29%).

The categories that best describe the subject matter of the course are:

TABLE 35

<i>Subject Matter of Field Placement Course</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Criminal Matters (prosecution or defense)	33
Government	32
Public interest organization	32
Judicial	24
Civil litigation	21
Other	18
In-house counsel – nonprofit	14
Legislative	13
In-house counsel – for-profit	12
Private practice (i.e., law firm)	12
Subject matter focus	10
Transactional	10
International	7

The greatest percentage of student placements are with offices that have a litigation or dispute resolution focus (61%), followed by transactional (16%), legislative or policy (9%), regulatory (9%), and other (6%).

Questions 1.7-11: Requisites and Enrollment

Thirty-one percent of field placement courses require pre- or co-requisite coursework, compared to 37% in the 2016-17 survey and 51% in 2013-14. Where there is a requisite, the most common are Ethics/Professional Responsibility (52% of courses); Evidence (38%); course(s) in the substantive area of practice (35%); Criminal Procedure (34%); simulation course(s) (22%); and Civil Procedure (12%).

Typical enrollments per term in field placement courses are set out below. The most common enrollments over the span of the last three surveys show enrollments in the 6 to 15 student ranges (6-10 and 11-15 class sizes). Sixteen percent of field placement courses have enrollments of more than 30 students.

TABLE 36

Enrollment Ranges	Percent of Respondents Reporting		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
1 - 5	13	17	12
6 - 10	25	24	24
11 - 15	19	16	23
16 - 20	5	13	12
21 - 30	14	15	13
31 - 40	9	6	6
41 - 50	4	3	3
> 51	10	6	7

Of the schools with part-time J.D. students, 89% of field placement courses allow part-time students to participate (up from 78% in the 2016-17 survey).

Of the schools with LL.M. students, 56% of field placement courses allow LL.M. students to participate, and 37% of those courses enrolled LL.M. students during the 2019-20 academic year.

C. CREDITS

Questions I.12-15: Credits Awarded

Sixty-one percent of field placement courses combine the fieldwork and reflection components into a single law school course, while 39% identify the fieldwork and reflection components as two separate courses in the school's course catalog/directory.

To determine the number of credits awarded for fieldwork, respondents were asked to apportion the credits between the fieldwork and reflection components whether or not they are formally divided into separate courses. The median number of credits a student receives per term for the combined fieldwork and reflection components is 4. Eleven percent of field placement courses are "full-time," awarding 10 or more credits.

Where the course includes a classroom component, the most common number of credits for the classroom component are 1 credit (57% of courses), 2 credits (35%), and 3 or more credits (11%).

For the fieldwork component, 53% of field placement courses offer variable credits, while 47% require a fixed number. Variable credits are based on the chosen number of hours spent in the course, rather than a fixed number that all students in the course receive. In the 2016-17 survey, 58% offered variable credits; in the 2013-14 survey, 52% offered variable.

Variable: Where the number of credits for fieldwork is variable, the most common *minimum* number of variable credits is 2/term (40% of variable courses), 1/term (23%), and 3/term (22%). (If students could choose to enroll for different/variable credits, respondents were asked to report the most common number students receive.)

The most common *maximum* numbers of variable credits is 5/term (19%), followed by 2/term, 4/term, and 12/term (each in 17% of variable courses).

Fixed: Where the number of credits for fieldwork is fixed, the most common number of credits awarded is 2 per term (38% of courses), 3 per term (29%), and 4 per term (9%).

D. FIELDWORK COMPONENT

Question I.16: Number of Hours of Fieldwork/Credit

The most common hours a student must work during the term per fieldwork credit hour earned is 42.5 hours/credit (23% of courses), followed by 50 hours/credit and 45 hours/credit (both 18%), 55-60 hours/credit (14%), and more than 60 hours (12%).

Question I.17: Time Reporting

Over 94% of field placement courses require students to report their field placement hours in time logs. Fifty-eight percent require time reporting weekly, 16% bi-weekly, and 11% at the end of the term. Of those requiring time reporting, 53% require that logs be reviewed or approved by the on-site supervisor, similar to the percentages in the two prior surveys.

Question I-18: Fieldwork Grading

Eighty-three percent of students receive a mandatory pass/fail grade for their fieldwork, 12% receive a mandatory letter or number grade, 3% receive a mixed pass/fail and letter/number grade, and 1% have the option of a pass/fail or letter/number grade, similar to the percentages in the last two surveys.

Where students are graded with letters/numbers, only 12% of field placement courses grade on a curve, down from 21% in the 2016-17 survey, 38% in 2013-14, and 41% in 2011-12.

E. REFLECTION COMPONENT

Question I-19: Reflection Component Approach

Seventy-five percent of field placement courses meet the ABA requirement for “a classroom instructional component, regularly scheduled tutorials, or other means of ongoing, contemporaneous, faculty-guided reflection” through a classroom instructional component (i.e., related seminar). Twenty-one percent of courses meet the standard through regularly scheduled tutorials and 10% through other means of faculty-guided reflection.

Question I.20a-c: Classroom Component Instruction

Sixty-four percent of field placement courses offer one section of the classroom component, 8% offer two sections, and 6% offer three. Fourteen percent of field placement courses divide the classroom component into ten or more sections.

Where a classroom component, 70% are taught by one person, 16% by two, and 14% by three or more. Eighty-three percent of those who teach in the classroom component are full-time law school employees.

Question I.20d: Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio

The percentage of field placement courses with student-teacher ratios for the classroom component are set out below. The median ratio is 11-15 students per teacher.

TABLE 37

<i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i>	<i>Percent of Courses with Ratios</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
1-5 to 1	9	13	12
6-10 to 1	24	30	32
11-15 to 1	35	28	28
16-20 to 1	8	14	12
21-25 to 1	9	9	8
≥ 26 to 1	15	5	8

Question I.20e: Classroom Curriculum

Eighty percent of courses devote some portion of classroom time to fieldwork discussion/rounds, 77% address ethics/professional responsibility, 67% address professional identify, 62% include skills instruction, and 59% include career development. In contrast, 64% of courses spend no class time on procedural law/rules, 59% spend no time on simulation, and 58% spent no time on substantive law.

The greatest amount of classroom time is devoted to fieldwork discussion/rounds (21% of total classroom time), followed by professional identify formation (15%), ethics/professional responsibility (12%), skills instruction (12%), substantive law (8%), career development (8%), simulation (6%), and procedural law/rules (5%).

Question I.21: Assignments

The most common assignment for students, irrespective of whether the course has a classroom component, is some type of reflective writings/journals (over 95% of courses), though only in 21% of these courses do students share the writings with the on-site field supervisor(s). Seventy-eight percent of field placement courses require a self- assessment by the student, 67% require a learning agenda or plan, 51% require an oral presentation, and 18% include a simulated drafting assignment.

Question I.22: Reflection Component Grading

The most common classroom credit grading method is mandatory pass/fail grades (53%), followed by mandatory letter or number grades (42%), mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades (3%), and optional pass/fail or letter/number grades (1%). In contrast, in the 2016-17 survey, 55% of courses awarded mandatory letter or number grades and 38% mandatory pass/fail grades.

Where students are graded with letters or numbers, only 29% grade the classroom component on a curve, compared to 47% in 2016-17 and 43% in 2013-14. Where graded on a curve, 72% have a curve similar or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses and 28% apply a curve similar or the same as that used by the school for all courses.

F. ADDITIONAL TERMS

Question I.23: Repeat Enrollment

Half of field placement courses permit students to enroll two or more times in the same course, down from 55% in the last survey. Among those permitting additional terms, 61% allow students to continue in the same placement office with conditions/approval,

24% allow students to continue in the same office without any conditions, and 15% require students to work in a different office.

The reflection component for repeat enrollments is most often handled (51%) by a classroom component (perhaps with modifications such as different content, assignments, or attendance rules). Twenty-two percent of schools handle the reflection component for repeat students with regularly scheduled tutorials, while 28% handle it in other ways such as journals or reflective writings.

G. EVALUATION AND MONITORING OF FIELD PLACEMENT OFFICES

Question I.24: Number of Placement Offices

Twenty-three percent of courses place students in five or fewer host offices during terms other than summer. Nineteen percent of courses place students in 6-10 different offices, 12% place students in 11-15 office, and 11% place students in 16-10 offices. Twenty-four percent of courses place students in over 30 separate offices, with 8% utilizing over 60 placement offices.

Question I.25: Office Selection

The most common way students are placed with an office for their fieldwork is by being matched directly by the law school's field placement course faculty or staff (46%). Twenty-seven percent of students find their own placement and then seek school approval of the office, while 26% find their own placement from a list of pre-approved offices supplied by the school.

Question I.26: Placement Evaluation

To assess the methods of evaluation of placement offices, the survey asked respondents to select the three most important methods for evaluation, as reported in the table below. (Note: The low importance of remote video communication reflects that the survey data was collected largely before the pandemic shutdown and widespread move to remote work for student, supervising attorney, and law school faculty.)

TABLE 38

<i>Placement evaluation method</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
Student evaluation of office-supervisor; other student discussion	88
Supervisor evaluation of student	64
Site visits	50
Telephone call(s) with supervisor	35
Email communication with supervisors	63
Remote video communication	14

Question I.27: Placement Site Visits

Site visits to the placement office are conducted in 75% of field placement courses, similar to the last two surveys. Where visits are done, 31% of courses visit sites irregularly/occasionally, 25% visit in semesters when a student is placed at the office, 15% limit visits to new host offices, 13% visit yearly, and 8% visit each term.

Question I.28: Training for On-Site Supervisors

The most common methods of training field placement supervising attorneys are through written materials (86%) and individual discussions with the supervisor (85%). Twenty-three percent of courses do live/in person training, while 8% do some form of on-line training (either asynchronous or synchronous).

H. SUMMER FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES

Questions I.29a-c; C.3a & 4a: Summer Enrollment

Fifty-seven percent of field placement courses are offered during the summer term, similar to the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys. At 8% of schools, summer enrollment is the exclusive or predominant means of providing field placement course instruction (i.e., more than two-thirds of the school's total academic year field placement enrollment is in summer field placement courses).

The median enrollment in a summer field placement course is 20 students, an increase from 15-16 students in the prior surveys. Sixteen percent of summer courses

enroll more than 50 students; 20% enroll 5 or fewer. The median number of field placement/host offices in a summer field placement course is 20.

Questions I.29d-h: Summer Credits

The median number of credits a student receives per summer term for the combined fieldwork and reflection components is 4 credits. (If students could choose to enroll for different/variable credits, respondents were asked to report the most common number students receive).

For fieldwork, 43% of summer field placement course are offered for fixed credits, and the most common number was 3 credits.

Fifty-seven percent of summer field placement courses offer variable credits for student fieldwork (based on the chosen number of hours spent in the course), slightly more frequently than in the other terms (fall, winter, spring).

Where a student receives variable credits, the most frequent *minimum* numbers of credits a student can earn for fieldwork are 2/term (51% of summer courses), 1/term (28%), and 3/term (15%). The most frequent *maximum* number of credits is 6 credits per term (25%), followed by 5/term (20%), 4/term (19%), and 3/term (11%). Fifteen percent of variable credit summer field placement courses allow 10 or more credits.

Questions I.29i-j: Summer Reflective Component

Sixty-four percent of summer field placement courses meet the ABA reflective component requirement through a classroom instructional component, compared to 75% of courses for other terms. Sixteen percent of summer courses meet the requirement through regularly scheduled faculty tutorials, and 20% through other means of faculty-guided reflection.

Where there is a summer classroom component, in 60% the classroom component is run similarly to non-summer classes in terms of frequency and instructional methods. At 19% of schools, the summer classroom component meets less frequently and at 17% it is taught online (with 3% “other”).

I. AMOUNT OF FREE LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Question I.30: Total Hours of Free Legal Assistance

Two hundred thirty field placement courses estimated their students provided a total of over 1,600,000 hours of free legal services during the 2018-19 academic year to nonprofit organizations, governmental offices, and judicial chambers, or almost 7,000 hours per field placement course.

V. SUB-SURVEY RESULTS - CLINICAL FACULTY

Over 1,135 persons teaching *full-time* in a law clinic or field placement course (“clinical faculty”) provided information on their teaching position and courses. The data below are only for full-time clinical faculty, defined as those who are employed by the school the equivalent of 80-100% of the school’s normal teaching/administrative hours (e.g., 4 days/week or 0.8 FTE or more).

A. INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

Question D.1: Teaching Experience in Law Clinic or Field Placement Course

The number of years of teaching/supervision in a clinic or field placement course as the respondent’s primary occupation range from fewer than 1 to 50 years. The median years of clinical teaching experience is 9, the same as the last two surveys.

Question D.2: Years of Full-Time Law Practice Prior to Teaching

The number of years of law practice prior to entering clinical teaching range from fewer than 1 to 40 years. The median number of years of prior practice is 7, the same as the last two surveys.

Questions D3 & 4: Race and Gender

The composition of clinical faculty is 67% female, 33% male (fewer than 1% genderqueer/non-binary). In the 2016-17 survey, 65% were female, in 2013-14, 63% were female, and in 2010-11, 60% were female.

The 2019-20 survey used the American Bar Association categories of race/ethnicity and the U.S. Census protocol to allow respondents to select more than one category if appropriate. Four percent of respondents identified two or more categories for race/ethnicity. The race/ethnicity of full-time clinical faculty are:

TABLE 39

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>			
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
American Indian or Alaska Native	< 1	< 1	< 1	1
Asian	—	—	6	8
Asian Indian	2	3	—	—
Black or African American	5	5	7	9
Chinese	1	< 1	—	—
Filipino	0	< 1	—	—
Latino/Hispanic	2	3	5	6
Japanese	< 1	< 1	—	—
Korean	< 1	< 1	—	—
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	< 1	0	< 1	< 1
Vietnamese	0	< 1	—	—
Samoan	0	< 1	—	—
White	84	84	79	81
Two or more races	—	—	3	—
Other	3	2	—	—

B. FACULTY STATUS AND COMPENSATION

Question E.1: Employment Status

Respondents who are full-time employees of the law school and serve as director or in some other instructional role for a clinic(s) or field placement course(s) were asked to describe their employment status. Grouping by types of appointment, the results are:

All Respondents — Law Clinic and Field Placement Course Instructors

TABLE 40

<i>Employment Status — All Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20
Tenure (Unitary)	21	18	16
Tenure track	6	7	5
Clinical tenure	6	7	8
Clinical tenure track	3	3	4
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	—	—	31
5 year (or more) contract	22	25	—
Short-term probationary contract	—	—	6
Other short-term contract	—	—	13
≤ 4 year Contract	31	28	—
Fellow	4	3	5
Administrative position w/ faculty title	—	3	4
Administrative position w/out faculty title	—	2	2
Other employment term	6	4	6

Law Clinic Instructors

The table below shows the employment status for full-time directors and those with instructional roles in a law clinic(s). This data includes clinic instructors who may have also taught in a field placement course, but not as the director for the course:

TABLE 41

<i>Employment Status — Law Clinic Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
	2019-20
Tenure (Unitary)	16
Tenure track	6
Clinical tenure	8
Clinical tenure track	4
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	31
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term	6
Other short-term contract	14
Fellow	5
Administrative position w/ faculty title	4
Administrative position w/out faculty title	2
Other employment term	5

Field Placement Course Instructors

The table below shows the employment status for full-time directors and those with instructional roles in a field placement course(s). This data includes field placement instructors who may have also taught in a law clinic, but not as the director for the clinic.

TABLE 42

<i>Employment Status — Field Placement Course Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
	2019-20
Tenure (Unitary)	15
Tenure track	< 1
Clinical tenure	4
Clinical tenure track	3
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	26
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term	4
Other short-term contract	11
Fellow	2
Administrative position w/ faculty title	18
Administrative position w/out faculty title	9
Other employment term	6

Questions E.2-5: Compensation

Over 1,100 clinic and field placement course instructors provided their annual base compensation (exclusive of supplements for summer or administrative duties) in a series of fixed ranges. The table below displays the 25th, median, and 75th percentile annual salaries for groups of instructors. Upon request to administrator@csale.org, salary ranges can be provided for other groupings (e.g., by region of country, peer rankings) but never in a form that might tie the information to any respondent.

TABLE 43

<i>Instructors</i>	<i>Annual Salary</i>		
	25th percentile	Median	75th Percentile
All law clinic and field placement instructors	90,000-99,999	110,000-119,999	120,000-129,999
Law clinic instructors	90,000-99,999	110,000-119,999	150,000-159,999
Field placement course instructors	80,000-89,999	100,000-109,000	120,000-129,999
Teaching 3 years or fewer	60,000-69,999	80,000-89,999	100,000-109,999

Typical salaries vary between regions of the country:

TABLE 44

<i>School's Region</i>	<i>Median Annual Salary</i>
Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	120,000-129,999
Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	— ⁹
Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	100,000-109,999
Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	105,000-114,999
Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV)	110,000-119,999
Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	120,000-129,999
Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (not NY City & Long Island), RI, VT)	115,000-124,999
New York City and Long Island	145,000-154,999

9. Too few response ranges to be reliable.

The sources of salaries for instructors are: "hard money" — tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies (78%); "soft money" — grants or other external funding (9%); and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money (13%). The 2016-17 survey results for these categories were 81%, 11%, and 8%, respectively.

The base salary for 64% of respondents covers a 12-month period, an increase from approximately 56% in the two prior surveys. The base salary for 26% cover a 9-month period (a decrease from approximately one-third in the last two surveys), and for 6%, a 10-month period (compared to 9% in the last two surveys).

For those whose base salary covers a 9-, 10-, or 11-month period, nearly 75% can apply for a summer salary supplement, an increase from 58% in the 2016-17 survey. Where summer funding is available, respondents were asked to provide the amount of the funding as a percentage of their base annual salary. Percentages range from a high of 45%, to a low of 1%. The median is 10%, unchanged from 2016-17 and 2013-14.

C. GOVERNANCE AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Question F.1: Voting Rights

Voting rights for clinical faculty are set forth below.

TABLE 45

<i>Faculty Meeting Participation</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents Entitled to Vote</i>	
	2016-17	2019-20
Vote: All matters	23	26
Vote: All except classroom/doctrinal faculty hiring and/or promotion and/or tenure	36	43
Vote: Administrative matters only	4	2
Not vote but can generally attend meetings	23	19
Not permitted to attend meetings	14	9

Question F.2: Committee Participation

The chart below displays various law school committees and the percentage of respondents entitled to participate in and vote on such committees. Note that 14% of full-time clinical faculty (which includes fellows) cannot participate in or vote on any committee.

TABLE 46

<i>Committee Type</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents Allowed to Participate</i>	
	2016-17	2019-20
Classroom/doctrinal faculty hiring, promotion and tenure	46	44
Clinical faculty hiring and promotion	69	67
Budgeting	63	61
Curriculum/academic standards	73	71
Admissions/financial aid	71	69
Career services/placement	73	77
Can participate on some but not vote	—	13
Cannot participate or vote on any	19	14

Question F.3: Additional Clinical Program Positions

In addition to their role in a clinic or field placement course, 30% of the directors or persons primarily responsible for those courses hold the following additional positions within the school's clinical program (note some persons may hold more than one additional position):

TABLE 47

<i>Title</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents</i>
	2019-20
Assoc./Asst. Dean/Director of Experiential Education	10
Assoc./Asst. Dean or Overall Director of Clinical Programs	12
Overall Director of Field Placement Programs/Externships	10
Other clinical/experiential education management position	2

Twenty-eight percent of those who have an additional clinical program position(s) receive a reduction in their normal teaching load. The median amount of any teaching load reduction for the additional position(s) is 50%. Fifty-two percent receive a stipend or increase in their base salary for the additional clinical program position(s). The median amount of any stipend or increase is 10% of their base annual salary. Over one-third of those who have an additional clinical program position(s) receive neither a teaching load reduction nor a stipend or salary increase for the additional duties.

D. ADDITIONAL TEACHING RESPONSIBILITIES

Question F.4: Teaching Doctrinal or Podium Courses

Only 11% of respondents are precluded, whether by rule or practice, by their school from also teaching doctrinal or podium courses (namely courses other than applied practice skills courses like trial practice, appellate advocacy, etc.), similar to the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys. Of those permitted to do so, 55% taught a doctrinal/podium course(s) over the last three years (same as the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys), averaging 3 courses during that time period.

Of those who taught a doctrinal/podium course(s), 22% were relieved of their clinical teaching obligations (fully or partially) while teaching the course(s) (similar to 2016-17 and 2013-14) and 25% received additional compensation for the course(s). Fifty-four percent were neither relieved of their clinical teaching obligations nor received additional compensation for teaching an additional doctrinal/podium course(s).

Question F.5: Teaching Simulation/Skills Courses

Only 8% of respondents are precluded, by rule or practice, by their school from teaching simulation/skills courses, up from 4% in the two prior surveys. Of those permitted to do so, 30% taught a simulation/skills course(s) over the last three years (compared to 37% in 2016-17 and 27% in 2013-14), averaging 3 courses during that time period.

Of those who taught a simulation/skills course(s), 17% were relieved (fully or partially) of their clinical teaching obligations while the teaching the skills course(s) (similar to the 2016-17 survey) and 28% received additional compensation for the course(s). Fifty-three percent were neither relieved of their clinical teaching obligations nor received additional compensation for teaching the additional simulation/skills course(s).

Question F6: Professional Development Support

Ninety-five percent of clinical teachers receive funds from their school for their professional development (e.g., attend conferences, research assistance, membership dues, book purchases, etc.). For 56% of clinical faculty, the amount provided is similar to that provided to doctrinal/podium faculty, for 11% it is less than the amount provided, for 1% the amount is more, and 32% do not know the amount doctrinal/podium faculty at their school receive.

Question F.7: Scholarship as a Job Requirement

Over 31% of respondents are required to produce scholarship as part of their job, compared to 37% in the 2016-17 survey and 43% in 2013-14. For 49%, scholarship is beneficial to their position but not required, while for 20% scholarship is both not required and not beneficial to the faculty member's position within the school.

Of those who are required or for whom it is beneficial, 80% are able to obtain financial support for research assistance with scholarship. Only 15% have their teaching/supervision obligations reduced (excluding summers) for scholarship.

Question F.8: Sabbatical/Developmental Leave

Paid sabbaticals/developmental leaves are available to 45% of respondents. For 90% of this group, the length of time required before leave is first available is the same as the length required for doctrinal/podium faculty and for 95% the length of time off for a sabbatical/development leave is the same as the length provided doctrinal/podium faculty.

E. RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Question G.1 & 2: Recruitment Methods

Twenty-two percent of clinical faculty in the survey have been teaching in a clinic or field placement course three years or fewer. Among these new clinical teachers, 45% learned about available clinical teaching positions from the school's job posting or announcement, 42% through a recommendation from someone, 11% from the law clinic or externship listserv, 10% from the Clinical Legal Education Association (CLEA) job listings, 7% through the AALS Faculty Recruitment Service, and 11% by other means.

Question G.3: Hiring Process

For 83% of new clinical teachers, the hiring process involved a visit to the school for face-to-face interviews, for 7% face-to-face interviews in a place other than at the school, and for 38% telephone or Skype-type interviews. Forty-three percent had informal meetings with groups of faculty as part of the hiring process, while 29% gave a "job talk" to the faculty.

Question G.4: Hiring Negotiations

New clinical teachers were asked which, if any, aspects of their employment they were able to negotiate and change from the original job offer made by the school. Forty-three percent of new clinical teachers were able to change the original offer made by the school.

Of all new clinical teachers, 28% were able to negotiate and change their salary from the original offer, 8% were able to change support for professional development, 8% their teaching load (either the number of courses or students in courses), 7% the subject matter of courses to be taught, 5% the length of their employment term, and 8% other employment matters deemed significant (e.g., length of the term, vacation, moving expenses, title).

CSALE 2019-20 Survey Participating Law Schools (Master Survey respondent)

Albany Law School (Connie Mayer)
American University (Jayesh Rathod)
Arizona State University (Eric Menkhus)
Atlanta's John Marshall School of Law (Bridgett Ortega)
Ave Maria (Elizabeth Donovan)
Barry University (Lee Schinasi)
Baylor University (Stephen Rispoli)
Belmont University (Ellen Black)
Boston College (Judy McMorro
Boston University (Karen Pita Loo
Brigham Young University (Carl Hernandez)
Brooklyn Law School (Stacy Caplow)
California Western (Mark Weinstein)
Campbell University (Roger Manus)
Capital University (Danny Bank)
Case Western Reserve University (Laura McNally-Levine)
Catholic University (Catherine Klein)
Chapman University (Carolyn Larmore)
Charleston School of Law (Elizabeth Hamilton)
Chicago-Kent School of Law (Jenifer Robbins)
City University of New York (Donna Lee)
Cleveland-Marshall College of Law (Carol Heyward)
Columbia University (Brett Dignam)
Concordia University (Latonia Keith)
Cornell University (John Blume)
Creighton University (Catherine Mahern)
DePaul University (Julie Lawton)
Drake University (Suzan Pritchett)
Drexel University (Susan Brooks)
Duke University (Andrew Foster)
Duquesne University (Katherine Norton)
Elon University (Kathy Conner)
Emory University (Sarah Shalf)
Faulkner University (John Craft)
Florida A&M University (Darryll Jones)
Florida State University (Paolo Annino)
Fordham University (Mike Martin)
George Mason University (Annamaria Nields)
George Washington University (Laurie Kohn)
Georgetown University (Kris Henning)

Georgia State University (Lisa Bliss)
Golden Gate University (Allison Wang)
Gonzaga University (Gail Hammer)
Harvard Law School (Dan Nagin)
Hofstra University (Theo Liebmann)
Howard University (Valerie Schneider)
Indiana University - Bloomington (Donna Nagy)
Indiana University - Indianapolis (Cynthia Baker)
UIC John Marshall Law School (Alicia Alvarez)
Lewis and Clark University (Kathy Hessler)
Lincoln Memorial University (Matt Lyon)
Louisiana State University (Bob Lancaster)
Loyola University, Chicago (Josie Gough)
Loyola University, Los Angeles (Cindy Archer)
Loyola University, New Orleans (Bill Quigley)
Marquette University (Thomas Hammer)
Mercer University (Tim Floyd)
Michigan State University (Veronica Thronson)
Mitchell Hamline (Brad Colbert)
New England Law | Boston (Russell Engler)
New York Law School (Frank Bress)
New York University (Randy Hertz)
North Carolina Central University (Fred Williams)
Northeastern University (James Rowan)
Northern Illinois University (Paul Cain)
Northern Kentucky University (Amy Halbrook)
Northwestern University (Julie Biehl)
Notre Dame University (Bob Jones)
Nova Southeastern University (Nancy Sanguigni)
Ohio Northern University (Melissa Kidder)
Ohio State University (Steven Huefner)
Pace University (Elissa Germaine)
Penn State - Dickinson (Camille Marion)
Penn State - Penn State Law (Ross Pifer)
Pepperdine University (Jeff Baker)
Quinnipiac University (Carrie Kaas)
Roger Williams University (Andy Horwitz)
Rutgers Law School (Jon Dubin & Joanne Gottesman)
Samford University (Deborah Young)
Santa Clara University (Sandee Magliozi)
Seattle University (Lisa Brodoff)
Seton Hall (Lori Borgen)
South Texas College of Law (Cathy Burnett)

Southern Illinois University (John Derbes)
Southern Methodist University (Mary Spector)
Southern University (Virginia Listach)
Southwestern Law School (Julie Waterstone)
St. John's University (Ann Goldweber)
St. Louis University (Dana Malkus)
St. Mary's University (Karen Kelley)
St. Thomas University - Florida (Cece Dykas)
Stanford University (Jayashri Srikantiah)
Stetson University (Chrissy Cerniglia)
Suffolk University (Kim McLaurin)
Syracuse University (Debrah Kenn)
Temple University (Jaya Ramji-Nogales)
Texas A&M University (Luz Herrera)
Texas Tech University (Larry Spain)
Touro Law Center (Melina Healey)
Tulane University (Stacy Seicshnaydre)
University of Akron (Joann Sahl)
University of Alabama (Yuri Linetsky)
University of Arizona (Paul Bennett)
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville (Tiffany Murphy)
University of Arkansas at Little Rock (Kelly Terry)
University of Baltimore (Margaret Johnson)
University of Buffalo (Kim Dianna Connolly)
University of California - Berkeley (Elisabeth Semel)
University of California - Davis (Jack Chin)
University of California - Hastings (Ascanio Piomelli)
University of California - Irvine (Carrie Hempel)
University of California - Los Angeles (Sameer Ashar)
University of Chicago (Jeff Leslie)
University of Cincinnati (Christine Szydlowski)
University of Colorado (Deborah Cantrell)
University of Connecticut (Paul Chill)
University of Dayton (Andrea Seielstad)
University of Denver (Tamara Kuennen)
University of Detroit Mercy (Nicholas Schroeck)
University of District of Columbia (Matt Fraidin)
University of Florida (Silvia Menendez)
University of Georgia (Ellie Lanier)
University of Hawaii (Calvin Pang)
University of Houston (Janet Heppard)
University of Idaho (Jessica Long)
University of Illinois (Melissa Frydman)

University of Iowa (John Allen)
University of Kansas (Jean Phillips)
University of Kentucky (Allison Connelly)
University of Louisville (Shelley Santry)
University of Maine (Deirdre Smith)
University of Maryland (Michael Pinard)
University of Massachusetts (Margaret Drew)
University of Memphis (Danny Schaffzin)
University of Miami (Kele Stewart)
University of Michigan (David Santacroce)
University of Minnesota (Laura Thomas)
University of Mississippi (Tucker Carrington)
University of Missouri - Columbia (Kandice Johnson)
University of Missouri - Kansas City (Meg Reuter)
University of Montana (Hillary Wandler)
University of Nebraska (Kevin Ruser)
University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Joan Howarth)
University of New Hampshire (Peter Wright)
University of New Mexico (Serge Martinez)
University of North Carolina (Erika Wilson)
University of North Dakota (Margaret Jackson)
University of North Texas - Dallas (Angela Downes)
University of Oklahoma (Gail Mullins)
University of Oregon (Stuart Chinn)
University of Pacific - McGeorge School of Law (Mary-Beth Moylan)
University of Pennsylvania (Praveen Kosuri)
University of Pittsburgh (Sheila Velez Martinez)
University of Richmond (Margaret Ivey)
University of San Diego (Bob Muth)
University of San Francisco (Bill Hing)
University of South Carolina (Jaclyn Cherry)
University of South Dakota (Ramon Ortiz)
University of Southern California (Laura Riley)
University of St. Thomas (Rachel Moran)
University of Tennessee (Joy Radice)
University of Texas (Eden Harrington)
University of Toledo (Robert Salem)
University of Tulsa (Mimi Marton)
University of Utah (Anna Carpenter)
University of Virginia (Sarah Shalf)
University of Washington (Christine Cimini)
University of Wisconsin (Ursula Weigold)
University of Wyoming (Danielle Cover)

Vanderbilt University (Sue Kay)
Vermont Law School (Beth Locker)
Villanova University (Matthew McGovern)
Wake Forest University (Steve Virgil)
Washburn University (Gillian Chadwick)
Washington and Lee University (John King)
Washington University (Bob Kuehn)
Wayne State University (Rachel Settlege)
Western Michigan University - Cooley (Dustin Foster)
Western New England University (Lauran Carasik)
West Virginia University (Marjorie McDiarmid)
Widener University - Delaware (Frances Catania, Jr.)
Willamette University (Warren Binford)
William and Mary (Patricia Roberts)
Yale Law School (Muneer Ahmad)
Yeshiva University - Cardozo School of Law (Leslie Salzman)