

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

***2022-23 Survey of  
Applied Legal Education***

by

Robert R. Kuehn  
Washington University in St. Louis

David A. Santacroce  
University of Michigan

Margaret Reuter  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

June T. Tai  
University of Iowa

G.S. Hans  
Cornell University

Research Assistance: Alexander Hook

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

Bradford Colbert - Mitchell Hamline School of Law  
Deborah Epstein - Georgetown University Law Center  
G.S. Hans - Cornell Law School  
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 Santacroce - University of Michigan Law School (President)  
Susan Schechter - University of California-Berkeley School of Law  
June T. Tai – University of Iowa College of Law  
Charles Weisselberg - University of California-Berkeley School of Law

© 2023 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  
administrator@csale.org  
[www.CSALE.org](http://www.CSALE.org)

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

	Clinical Tenure Track Standards .....	20
	Long-Term Contract Track Hiring .....	21
	Long-Term Contract Standards .....	22
H.	<i>PROMOTION, TENURE, AND RETENTION STANDARDS</i> .....	22
	Written Promotion, Tenure, or Retention Standards.....	22
	Change to Clinical Instructor Status .....	22
<b>IV.</b>	<b>SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – LAW CLINICS</b> .....	<b>23</b>
A.	<i>INSTRUCTOR PROFILE</i> .....	23
	Instructor’s Role in Clinic.....	23
	Person in Charge.....	24
	Number of Students and Total Credits Earned .....	24
	Other Responsibilities .....	25
B.	<i>CLINIC FOCUS AND STRUCTURE</i> .....	25
	Type of Legal Practice.....	25
	Student Practice Rule.....	26
	Length and Terms of Enrollment .....	26
	Typical Enrollment and Demand.....	26
	Requisites and Eligibility .....	27
	Hybrid Clinics.....	28
C.	<i>CASE/LEGAL WORK COMPONENT</i> .....	28
	Case/Legal Work Supervision .....	28
	Case/Legal Work Student-Teacher Ratio.....	28
	Total Credit Hours for Case/Legal Work and Classroom Component.....	29
	Grading the Case/Legal Work Component.....	31
	Interdisciplinary Clinics.....	31
D.	<i>CLASSROOM COMPONENT</i> .....	32
	Classroom Component Instructors.....	32
	Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio .....	32
	Classroom Component Credit .....	33
	Grading the Classroom Component.....	33
	Classroom Curriculum.....	33
E.	<i>ADDITIONAL TERMS</i> .....	34
	Additional Terms .....	34
F.	<i>TECHNOLOGY</i> .....	34
	Technology Use .....	34
G.	<i>SUMMER LAW CLINIC</i> .....	35
	Summer Law Clinic .....	35
<b>V.</b>	<b>SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES</b> .....	<b>35</b>
A.	<i>INSTRUCTOR PROFILE</i> .....	36
	Role in Field Placement Course .....	36
	Number of Students and Total Credits Earned .....	36
	Other Responsibilities .....	36
	Person In Charge.....	37
B.	<i>FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE STRUCTURE AND FOCUS</i> .....	38
	Allocation of Responsibility.....	38

	Course and Practice Types.....	39
	Requisites and Enrollment .....	40
<i>C.</i>	<i>CREDITS</i> .....	41
	Credits Awarded .....	41
<i>D.</i>	<i>FIELDWORK COMPONENT</i> .....	42
	Fieldwork Format.....	42
	Number of Hours of Fieldwork per Credit.....	42
	Time Reporting.....	42
	Fieldwork Grading .....	42
<i>E.</i>	<i>REFLECTION COMPONENT</i> .....	43
	Reflection Component Approach .....	43
	Classroom Component Instruction.....	43
	Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio .....	43
	Classroom Curriculum.....	44
	Assignments .....	44
	Reflection Component Grading.....	44
<i>F.</i>	<i>ADDITIONAL TERMS</i> .....	45
	Repeat Enrollment .....	45
<i>G.</i>	<i>EVALUATION AND MONITORING OF FIELD PLACEMENT OFFICES</i> .....	45
	Student Office Selection .....	45
	Field Placement Oversight .....	45
	Placement Site Visits .....	46
	Site Supervisor Training .....	46
<i>H.</i>	<i>SUMMER FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES</i> .....	46
	Summer Enrollment .....	46
	Summer Credits.....	47
	Summer Reflective Component Approach.....	47
	Summer Classroom Approach.....	47
<b>VI.</b>	<b>SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – CLINICAL INSTRUCTORS</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<i>A.</i>	<i>INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS</i> .....	48
	Years of Clinical Teaching .....	48
	Years of Law Practice Prior to Teaching.....	48
	Gender and Race/Ethnicity .....	48
<i>B.</i>	<i>EMPLOYMENT STATUS/TERM AND COMPENSATION</i> .....	49
	Employment Status/Term .....	49
	All Respondents – Law Clinic and Field Placement Course Instructors.....	50
	Law Clinic Instructors.....	50
	Field Placement Course Instructors .....	51
	Compensation .....	52
<i>C.</i>	<i>GOVERNANCE AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES</i> .....	54
	Voting Rights .....	54
	Committee Participation.....	55
	Additional Clinical Program Management Positions.....	56
<i>D.</i>	<i>ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES</i> .....	57
	Teaching Podium/Doctrinal Course .....	57

Teaching Simulation/Skills Course .....	57
Professional Development Support .....	57
Scholarship.....	58
Sabbatical/Developmental Leave .....	58
<i>E. RECRUITMENT PROCESS</i> .....	58
Prior Employment Position.....	58
Recruitment Methods .....	59
Hiring Process.....	59
Hiring Negotiations.....	59
<b>PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS</b> .....	<b>60</b>

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

## *2022-23 Survey of Applied Legal Education*

### I. OVERVIEW

This report summarizes the results of the Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education's (CSALE) *2022-23 Survey of Applied Legal Education*. The *2022-23 CSALE Survey* is CSALE's sixth 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, 2016-17, and 2019-20 surveys, and through hundreds of customized reports cross-tabulating 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](http://www.CSALE.org).

The *2022-23 CSALE Survey* is composed of two parts. A *Master Survey of School Programs* was directed to American Bar Association (ABA) accredited 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.<sup>1</sup> Each of those persons was invited by email to fill out the *Sub-Survey of Clinical instructors* that asked about their courses and employment relationship with the law school. The *2022-23 Master* and *Sub-Survey* instruments are available at <https://www.csale.org/#csale-survey>.

CSALE surveys have evolved over their six iterations. This survey, like prior iterations, was designed to maintain enough consistency to track responses over time but also modified 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 2022-23 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 podium/doctrinal teachers who may oversee a few law clinic or field placement students or help teach some clinic or field placement class sessions.

The results reported herein are made possible by the over 1,200 survey participants. To each, CSALE and the many who rely on its data are 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, Washington University School of Law, and University of Iowa College 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 2022-23 CSALE Survey is divided into two parts. The first is the *Master Survey of School Programs*, which was sent to the person at ABA accredited law schools with primary responsibility for the clinical education program at the school.<sup>2</sup> Ninety-six percent of law schools (185) responded (a list of the schools that participated in the survey, and person who provided the school's information, 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.<sup>3</sup>

The second part of the 2022-23 CSALE Survey, the *Sub-Survey of Clinical Instructors*, was answered by over 1,200 law clinic and field placement instructors at 95% of law schools. The *Sub-Survey* collected information on 700 law clinic and 260 field placement courses and biographical and employment information from persons teaching full-time in a law clinic or field placement course.

---

2. The survey does not include law schools in Puerto Rico.

3. "Law Clinic" is defined in the survey as: A credit-bearing course under ABA Standard 304(c) in which students advise or represent actual clients (individuals or organizations) or serve as a third-party neutral, are supervised by a faculty member, and includes a classroom instructional component (includes "hybrids" if your school reports them to ABA as a "law clinic").

"Field Placement" is defined as: A distinct credit-bearing externship course separately listed in the school's course directory/catalogue that under ABA Standard 304(d) provides substantial lawyering experience where students are supervised in a setting outside the law school by persons not primarily employed by the school and which may or may not include a classroom instructional component but does require some means of ongoing, contemporaneous, faculty-guided reflection.



## **B. SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

The survey responses were collected on-line through the Qualtrics survey platform. Invitations to complete the *Master Survey* were sent to a representative at each school in September 2022, asking questions about the 2022-23 academic year. Email invitations to participate in the *Sub-Survey* were sent to law clinic and field placement instructors in January 2023. The survey closed in late May. The next CSALE survey will be conducted during the 2025-26 academic year.

## **III. MASTER SURVEY RESULTS**

The *Master Survey of School Programs* questions about law clinics and field placement courses and staffing were grouped into seven sections: (i) management structure of the school's clinical program; (ii) law clinic courses; (iii) field placement program; (iv) graduation requirements; (v) student demand; (vi) experiential education program; and (vii) promotion and retention standards.

### **RESPONDENT SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS**

#### School Location

Of the 185 law schools that responded to the *Master Survey*, 56% are private schools; the balance are public.<sup>4</sup> The locations of survey respondents, and their percentage of the ABA-accredited schools in the region, are:

**TABLE 1**

<b><i>Region</i></b>	<b><i>Region Definition</i></b>	<b><i>Number Survey Respondents vs. Schools in Region</i></b>	<b><i>Respondents as Percent of All Schools in Region</i></b>
Region I	Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	29 of 30	97
Region II	Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	7 of 7	100
Region III	Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	28 of 28	100

---

4. The respondents mirror the profile of all ABA accredited law schools, of which 56% are also private. See [https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal\\_education/resources/aba\\_approved\\_law\\_schools/](https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/aba_approved_law_schools/). Five of the eight schools that did not participate in the CSALE survey were private schools.

<b><i>Region</i></b>	<b><i>Region Definition</i></b>	<b><i>Number Survey Respondents vs. Schools in Region</i></b>	<b><i>Respondents as Percent of All Schools in Region</i></b>
Region IV	Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	32 of 33	100
Region V	Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV)	28 of 29	97
Region VI	Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	31 of 36	86
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	10 of 10	100

### *First-Year Class Size*

Enrollments for the fall 2022 first-year, full-time J.D. class among the *Master Survey* respondent schools and the corresponding percentage of ABA-accredited schools are:

**TABLE 2**

<b><i>Number of Full-Time First-Year Students</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of ABA Accredited Schools</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Survey Respondents</i></b>
1 – 100	13	12
101 - 150	34	34
151 - 200	22	19
201 - 250	18	19
251 - 300	6	6
301 - 350	4	5
351 - 400	3	3
401 - 450	1	1
451 or more	1	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 ranking metric for possible use when comparing responses and as a check on the representativeness of schools that participated in the survey. The 2023 *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**

<b><i>School Ranking</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Survey Respondents within Rank Range</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of All Survey Respondents</i></b>
1 – 25	100 (26 of 26 schools)	14
26 - 50	96 (23 of 24)	12
51 - 75	96 (26 of 27)	14
76 - 100	100 (27 of 27)	15
101-125	96 (25 of 26)	14
126-150	95 (21 of 22)	11
151-175	93 (25 of 27)	14
176-196	86 (12 of 14)	6

### **A. CLINICAL PROGRAM OVERSIGHT**

#### *Questions A.2a-e: Oversight of Entire Clinical Program*

Sixty-two 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 an increase from 58%, 53%, and 45% in surveys dating back to 2013.

Of those with oversight of the entire clinical program, 70% have the word “dean” in their job title, up from 60% in the 2019-20 survey, 49% in 2016-17, 47% in 2013-14, and 30% in 2010-11. Eighty-one percent of those with oversight of the clinical program report to the law school dean (compared to 77% in the last survey), while 17% report to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs.

Seventy-one percent of those responsible for oversight of clinical education courses have responsibility for law school courses or programs in addition to their law clinic or field placement courses. The most common additional responsibility is for simulation courses (for 64% of clinical program deans/directors), followed by trial advocacy (40%), pro bono programs and moot court (both 32%), and 1L legal writing/practice (27%). At several schools, the person overseeing the clinical education program also teaches podium/doctrinal courses or oversees academic matters.

*Questions A.2f-h: Oversight of Only All Law Clinics*

At 37% of schools there is a single individual with oversight responsibility for *only all* law clinics. This is an increase from 33% and 31% of schools in the two previous surveys but a decrease from 39% in 2013-14 and 58% in 2010-11.

Of those with oversight of *only all* law clinics, 63% report to the law school dean 16% to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs, and 12% to the experiential/clinical program dean or director. Director continues to be the most common title for this position. But at 9% of schools, the title includes the word “dean,” compared to 13% in the 2019-20 survey, 19% in 2016-17, and 14% in 2013-14.

*Questions A.2i-k: Oversight of Only All Field Placement Courses*

At 70% of schools there is a single individual with oversight responsibility for *only all* field placement courses, a further increase from 66% in 2019-20, 59% in 2016-17, 55% in 2013-14, and 54% in 2010-11. Among this 70%, 38% report to the experiential/clinical program dean or director, 34% to the law school dean, and 20% to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs (at 4 schools the person reports to the head of career services).

**B. LAW CLINIC COURSES**

*Questions B.1-2b: Number and Focus of Law Clinics*

Schools in the *Master Survey* reported a total of 1,512 distinct law clinics offered during the 2022-23 academic year (with clinics offered more than a single term during the year counting as one). All but three schools offer at least one law clinic. The median number of law clinics is seven per school, unchanged from the last three 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 following table:

**TABLE 4**

<b><i>Substantive Focus of Clinic</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Offering</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Immigration	46	47	63	60
Criminal Defense	54	47	58	54
Entrepreneur/Start-Up/Small Business	—	29	37	42
Family Law	24	34	31	40
Children & the Law/Children's Rights	38	39	38	36
Intellectual Property/Technology	21	23	37	36
Civil Litigation/General Civil Clinic	39	36	38	34
Mediation/Alternative Dispute Resolution	35	32	32	30
Housing	21	16	20	30
Appellate	27	30	26	26
Tax	18	29	26	26
Innocence	21	21	22	26
Domestic Violence	26	20	28	25
Environmental	26	24	27	25
Transactional	26	22	22	25
Community/Economic Development	30	23	26	22
Veterans	10	18	22	22
Asylum/Refugee	14	16	17	21
Civil Rights	18	18	17	21
Health/Medical Legal Partnership	14	15	20	20
Human Rights	20	21	23	19
Criminal Prosecution	18	17	20	18
Disability/Special Education	12	12	16	16
Legislative/Policy	11	12	13	16
Community Justice/Lawyerling	—	11	15	15
Death Penalty/Post Conviction	7	6	13	15
Prisoner Reentry/Post-Release	—	—	—	13
Wills/Trusts/Estates	9	7	8	13
Employment/Labor Law	14	8	13	11

<b><i>Substantive Focus of Clinic</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Offering</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Elder Law	18	15	13	10
Consumer Law	13	11	12	9
Indian/Native American	6	8	7	9
First Amendment	—	—	—	9
Prisoner's Rights	11	9	10	8
Civil & Criminal Litigation/General Litigation	9	11	8	8
Bankruptcy	9	8	8	8
Administrative Law	8	8	9	7
Securities	9	7	7	4
Constitutional Law	5	4	6	3
Animal Law	—	—	—	3
Other	33	31	24	18

*Question B.3: Major Challenges*

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

**TABLE 5**

<b><i>Major Challenges to Clinics</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Insufficient hard money (tuition, endowment income, state subsidies)	64	56	53	55
Other demands on instructors' time	47	46	53	51
Insufficient number of instructors	40	26	22	34
Insufficient faculty status	—	24	33	27
Insufficient administrative/secretarial support	26	29	22	27
Insufficient physical/office space	37	18	20	23

<b>Major Challenges to Clinics</b>	<b>Percent of Schools Reporting</b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Insufficient support among podium/doctrinal faculty	25	14	10	11
Insufficient support from administration	17	11	7	11
Insufficient student demand	11	11	12	8

*Question B.4: Enrollment Eligibility*

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

*1st Year J.D. students:* Only 5% of schools permit 1st year students to enroll in a clinic.

*2nd year, first semester/term J.D. students:* Eighty-one percent of schools permit 2nd year, first semester/term students to enroll in a clinic, an increase from 78% in the previous survey.

*2nd year, second semester/term J.D. students:* Ninety-six percent of schools permit 2nd year, second semester/term students to enroll in a clinic.

*LL.M. students:* Fifty-one percent of schools permit LL.M. students to enroll in a clinic. At 27% of schools, LL.M. students do not participate because the school does not enroll any LL.M. students; 9% do not enroll their LL.M. students because of a student practice rule limitation; and 13% have chosen to preclude LL.M. students for some other reason.

***C. FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES***

*Question C.1a: Types of Field Placements*

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

**TABLE 6**

<b><i>Type of Field Placement Office or Practice Area</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Offering</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Public interest/nonprofit organizations	92	97
Public Defender	95	96
Judicial	95	96
Other Government	96	95
Prosecutor	95	95
In-house counsel – for-profit	63	69
Legislative	71	63
Private law firm	–	51
Outside the U.S.	51	28

***Question C.1b: Practice Types Offered***

Schools also reported the percentage of their field placements during a typical term where the student's work is primarily focused on certain types of legal practice. Fifty-nine percent of students are placed in offices with primarily a litigation or dispute resolution focus, 17% in transactional, 12% in regulatory, 8% in legislative or policy, and 5% in other practice types.

Litigation/dispute resolution focused field placements are offered at every school. Transactional placements are offered at 88% of schools (comparable to 89% in the 2019-20 survey), regulatory at 88% (compared to 83%), and legislative/policy at 79% (compared to 82%). But non-litigation placements are often limited — 22% of schools place 5% or fewer of their field placement students in transactional settings, 31% place 5% or fewer in regulatory settings, and 48% place 5% or fewer in legislative/policy practice settings. These resemble the percentages in the 2019-20 survey.

***Question C.2: Full-Time/High-Credit Externship***

Fifty percent of schools allow students to extern “full time” (10 or more academic credits), compared to 54% in the 2019-20 survey and 58% in the 2016-17 survey. Of those schools with full-time externships, 63% allow those externships anywhere in the U.S. wherever the student has identified an eligible placement and 26% only allow placements in the U.S. where the school has relationships or a designated program. Forty-six percent of schools with full-time externships allow full-time placements in other countries.



*Question C.3: Placement Setting Restrictions*

Fifty-two percent of schools have restrictions on the practice setting or type of law office where students in field placement courses may be placed. Forty-three percent exclude law firm work in some manner, with 34% excluding all law firm work and 9% only excluding firm work that is fee-generating (e.g., work on pro bono matters is permissible). Thirty-six percent of schools exclude placements with in-house counsel at for-profit entities and 10% exclude other types of placement settings.

*Question C.4: Compensation*

Forty-six percent of schools allow students to receive compensation in addition to academic credit (beyond reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred for working at the placement site). Twenty-six percent allow compensated externships without limitation, up from 18% in the 2019-20 survey and 10% in 2016-17.

Twenty percent of schools allow compensation but with conditions or limits, an increase from 18% and 10% in the two previous surveys. Of those with conditions or limitations: 56% allow compensation if from a source other than the site office (e.g., fellowship or stipend); 53% limit compensation to certain types of placement offices (e.g., only government or non-profit); and 32% allow tuition reimbursement or a scholarship from a source other than the school.

*Question C.5: Major Challenges*

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

**TABLE 7**

<b><i>Major Challenges to Field Placement Courses</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Other demands on instructors' time	47	42	45	52
Insufficient administrative/secretarial support	36	44	37	42
Insufficient number of instructors	52	36	35	26
Insufficient faculty status	—	24	24	26

<b>Major Challenges to Field Placement Courses</b>	<b>Percent of Schools Reporting</b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Insufficient hard money (tuition, endowment income, state subsidies)	23	22	21	26
Insufficient support among podium/doctrinal faculty	14	10	8	11
Insufficient support from administration	10	10	7	7
Insufficient student demand	10	12	10	6
Insufficient physical/office space	12	8	2	5

*Question C.6: Enrollment Eligibility*

Schools were asked if the following groups of students are permitted to enroll in 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.

*2nd year, first semester/term J.D. students:* Eighty-eight percent of schools permit 2nd year, first semester/term students to enroll in a field placement course.

*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.

*LL.M. students:* Fifty percent of schools permit LL.M. students to enroll in a field placement course. At 28% of schools, LL.M. students do not participate because the school does not enroll any LL.M. students; 6% do not enroll their LL.M. students because of student practice rule limitations; and 16% of schools with LL.M. students have chosen not to allow those students to enroll in field placement courses for some other reason.

***D. CLINICAL PARTICIPATION***

*Questions D.1: Clinical Experience Requirement*

Twenty-four percent of schools now require J.D. students to participate in a law clinic *or* field placement course as a condition of graduation. Among these schools, 11% require a clinic, 2% require a field placement course, and 86% require a clinic or field placement course.

*Question D.2a: Participation in Law Clinic*

In the table below, schools estimated the percentage of their J.D. students that will participate in a law clinic before graduation. The median participation rate for clinics is 45%. In the 2019-20 survey, the median participation rate was 41-50%; in the 2016-17 survey, 46-50%; and in the 2013-14 survey, 41-45%.

**TABLE 8**

<b>Law Clinic Participation Ranges</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents in Range</b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
0%	4	1
1 - 10%	2	2
11 - 20%	7	10
21 - 30%	12	23
31 - 40%	19	14
41 - 50%	19	16
51 - 60%	14	11
61 - 70%	8	8
71 - 80%	9	7
81 - 90%	2	2
91 - 99%	0	2
100%	4	3

*Question D.2b: Participation in Field Placement Course*

The table below shows the estimated percentage of J.D. students who will participate in a field placement course before graduation. The median estimated percentage is 50%, comparable to the 2019-20, 2016-17, and 2013-14 surveys.

**TABLE 9**

<b>Field Placement Participation Ranges</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents in Range</b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1 - 10%	4	2
11 - 20%	7	11
21 - 30%	14	12
31 - 40%	10	14
41 - 50%	15	16
51 - 60%	14	12
61 - 70%	12	13
71 - 80%	15	13
81 - 90%	7	5
91 - 99%	1	1
100%	2	2

*Question D.2c: Participation in Law Clinic **or** Field Placement Course*

The median estimated percentage of J.D. students that graduate having participated in either a clinic **or** field placement course is 85%. In the 2019-20 survey the median also was 85%; in 2016-17, 76-80%; and in 2013-14, 71-75%.

**TABLE 10**

<b>Law Clinic or Field Placement Participation Ranges</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents in Range</b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1 - 10%	0	0
11 - 20%	2	0
21 - 30%	2	1

<b><i>Law Clinic or Field Placement Participation Ranges</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
31 - 40%	2	4
41 - 50%	5	7
51 - 60%	6	7
61 - 70%	9	13
71 - 80%	19	15
81 - 90%	21	19
91 - 99%	10	9
100	23	25

***Question D.3: Clinical Experience Guarantee***

Twenty-seven percent of schools have a published guarantee promising any J.D. student enrollment prior to graduation in a clinic or field placement course. Among these schools, 24% guarantee participation in a clinic, 4% in a field placement course, and 72% in a law clinic or field placement course. In the 2016-17 survey, only 13% of schools guaranteed a law clinic or field placement course.

***Question D.4-5: Credit Limits***

Some schools limit the number of law clinic or field placement course credits a student may apply towards graduation. The most common limit for law clinic and for field placement courses is 12 credits.

***E. STUDENT DEMAND***

***Question E.1: Law Clinic Demand***

Schools were asked to report whether overall student demand for law clinic courses had increased, remained constant, or decreased in the three years since the last survey in 2019-20:

**TABLE 11**

<b><i>Demand Over Past 3 Years</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i></b>				
	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Increased	80	54	38	46	51%
Constant	19	34	43	45	42%
Decreased	1	12	19	10	7%

Schools were asked to select multiple factors to explain the increase or decrease. Among schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common reasons were: students believe clinics improve skills (at 81% of schools); increased interest in areas of practice within clinics offered (70%); students believe clinics improve employment opportunities (66%); increased support and promotion by law school (45%); larger student body (31%); non-clinical faculty promoting clinics/encouraging students to enroll (20%); and COVID-related effects (12%).

Among schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons were: students believe their time should be spent on bar subject courses (at 62% of schools); time commitment too high (46%); lack of support and promotion by law school (38%); lack of interest in areas of practice offered by clinics (31%); school has increased the required number of non-clinical courses (31%); COVID-related effects (31%); smaller student body (23%); non-clinical faculty discourage students from taking (15%); and students do not believe clinics improve employment opportunities and students do not believe clinics improve skills (both 8%).

*Question E.2: Field Placement Course 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 2019-20:

**TABLE 12**

<b><i>Demand Over Past 3 Years</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i></b>				
	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Increased	76	60	42	47	50
Constant	20	31	43	46	40
Decreased	1	9	15	7	10

Among schools reporting an increase, the most common reasons for the increase were: students believe field placement courses improve employment opportunities (at 94% of schools); students believe field placements improve skills (72%); increased interest in areas of practice within field placements offered (50%); increased support and promotion by law school (38%); larger student body (36%); COVID-related effects (31%); and school now permits paid externships for academic credit (25%).

Among schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons were: COVID-related effects (at 76% of schools); students believe their time should be spent on bar subject courses and smaller student body (both 29%); and time commitment too high, lack of support and promotion by school, and school has increased the required number of non-clinical courses (all 18%).

## ***F. EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM***

### *Question F.1: Experiential Credits*

Fourteen percent of respondent schools now require more experiential credits than the ABA mandated six-credit minimum, up from 12% in the last survey.

### *Questions F.2: First-Year Curriculum*

Fifteen percent of schools now require an experiential course in the first year, while 7% offer an experiential course elective. Among the schools that offer or require an experiential course in the first year, 92% offer or require a simulation course, 13% offer or require a clinic, and 3% offer or require a field placement course.

## ***G. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFING***

### *Question G.1a: Total Law Clinic and Field Placement Instructors*

Schools reported 2,875 persons teaching in a clinic or field placement course during the 2022-23 academic year (including part-time, adjuncts, staff attorneys, fellows, etc.). The median number of clinical instructors per school is 11. The median was 12 in the 2019-20 survey, 11 in the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys, and 9 in the 2010-11 survey.

In the latest survey, 65% of those teaching in a clinic or field placement course are employed full time by the school.<sup>5</sup> The percentage full time is the same as the 2019-20 survey but a decline from 72% full time in 2016-17, 78% in 2013-14, and 82% in 2010-11.

---

5. Full-time employees were defined in the *Master* and *Sub-Survey* as working the equivalent of 80-100% of the law school's normal teaching/administrative hours (e.g., 4 days/week or 0.8 FTE or more).

*Question G.1b: Employment Status/Term*

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

**TABLE 13**

<b><i>Employment Status/Term</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of all Full-Time Instructors</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Tenured (Unitary)	21	18	17	13
On Tenure Track	7	5	4	5
Clinical Tenured <sup>6</sup>	7	7	6	9
On Clinical Tenure Track	3	2	2	4
Long-Term Presumptively Renewable Contract <sup>7</sup>	32	30	27	29
Short-Term Probationary Leading to Presumptively Renewable Long-Term <sup>8</sup>	5	6	6	6
Other Short-Term Contract or At-Will	19	20	23	21
Fellow	8	7	8	9
Other Employment Terms	—	6	7	5

---

6. “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.

7. “Long-Term Contract” is defined in the survey as: A contract of at least 5 years duration (or other long-term duration acquiesced to by the ABA for a school). “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.

8. “Short-Term Probationary Contract” is defined in the survey as: A contract of less than 5 years that typically mimics the “pre-tenure” employment status of a traditional tenure-track professor (i.e., a contract that places the employee on a track under which the person will ultimately be considered for a long-term presumptively renewable contract).



*Question G.2: Instructional Staff Changes*

Schools were asked whether, over the three years since the last survey in 2019-20, the total number of full-time persons teaching in their clinic and field placement courses had changed. At 44% of schools, the total number of clinical instructors at the school increased (compared to 38% in the prior survey), at 39% it remained constant (compared to 50%), and at 17% it decreased (compared to 12%).

Where schools reported an increase, the most common reasons were: addition of new clinic or field placement courses (at 62% of schools); availability of additional funding for courses (59%); expansion of existing clinic or field placement courses (37%); and increased student interest in law clinic or field placement courses (21%).

Where schools reported a decrease, the most common reasons were: voluntary departure or death of clinical instructor without a replacement (at 90% of schools); faculty layoffs/reductions directed by the school (9%); and decreased student interest in clinic or field placement courses (6%).

*Questions G.3a-b: Clinical Tenure Track Hiring*

Twenty-six percent of schools have a Clinical Tenure Track. Among the schools with a Clinical Tenure Track, the methods of hiring new full-time Clinical Tenure Track faculty are:

**TABLE 14**

<i><b>Hiring of Clinical Tenure Track Faculty by</b></i>	<i><b>Percent of Schools</b></i>
Faculty vote upon committee recommendation	68
Faculty vote without committee recommendation	16
Law school dean	12
Committee (without later faculty vote)	0
Other	4

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

**TABLE 15**

<b><i>Clinical Tenure Track Hiring Committee Structure</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that any member is permitted to chair	86
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that only clinical faculty may chair	5
Committee without clinical faculty	5
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that only doctrinal faculty may chair	5

*Question G.3c: 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 podium/doctrinal faculty on the traditional tenure track are reported as:

**TABLE 16**

<b><i>Clinical Tenure Track Differences from Podium/Doctrinal Tenure Standards</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>
Publications are either not required or fewer	78
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching	70
Community involvement, bar activities, public committee/commission participation, or teaching CLE are considered	65
Greater acceptance of applied scholarship	65
Participation in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy is considered	36
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered	32
Greater emphasis on administration skills	17
Ability to raise funds to support clinical program is considered	15

Questions G.4a-b: Long-Term Contract Track Hiring

Sixty-six percent of schools have a Long-Term Contract Track. Among the schools with a Long-Term Contract Track, the methods of hiring new full-time Long-Term Contract Track faculty are:

**TABLE 16**

<b><i>Hiring of Long-Term Contract Track Faculty by</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>
Faculty vote upon committee recommendation	67
Faculty vote without committee recommendation	9
Law school dean	12
Committee (without later faculty vote)	7
Other	6

Where a committee is involved, the composition of that committee is:

**TABLE 18**

<b><i>Clinical Tenure Track Hiring Committee Structure</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>
Mix of clinical and podium/doctrinal faculty where anyone can chair	68
Mix of clinical and podium/doctrinal faculty but only clinical faculty may chair	10
Mix of clinical and podium/doctrinal faculty but only doctrinal faculty may chair	7
Committee without clinical faculty	7
Committee without podium/doctrinal faculty	4
Other	5

*Question G.4c: Long-Term Contract Standards*

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

**TABLE 19**

<b><i>Long-Term Contract Track Differences from Podium/Doctrinal Tenure Standards</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>
Publications are either not required or fewer	90
Community involvement, bar activities, public committee/commission participation, or teaching CLE are considered	68
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered	68
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching	56
Participation in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy is considered	34
Greater emphasis on the administration skills	21
Ability to raise funds to support clinical programs is considered	15

***H. PROMOTION, TENURE, AND RETENTION STANDARDS***

*Question H.1: Written Promotion, Tenure, or Retention Standards*

Eighty-seven percent of schools have written standards for the promotion, tenure, or retention of clinical faculty, an increase from 82% in 2019-20. Respondents were asked to submit copies of their standards to CSALE, which are available at <https://www.csale.org/#promotion-standards>.

*Question H.2: Change to Clinical Instructor Status*

In the 2022-23 Survey, CSALE for the first time asked if there had been consideration at the school about changing the status or governance rights for law clinic or field placement instructors over the past three years. Almost half of schools (48%) reported that there had been consideration of changes. At 59% of those schools, there had been

consideration at a faculty meeting, at 29% at the law school dean level, at 21% at the university level, and at 21% in a faculty committee.

At 53% of the schools where there had been consideration, the discussion led to a change in the status or governance rights. The changes overwhelmingly increased the status or governance rights, with only a few schools reporting a decrease.

#### ***IV. SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – LAW CLINICS***

In the Law Clinics portion of the *Sub-Survey of Clinical Instructors*, full-time law school employees with an instructional role in a law clinic were asked to provide information on their position. If the respondent directed a clinic(s), they were also asked details about their clinic(s). Respondents who were part-time school employees were only asked for information if they were a director of a clinic and only asked for details about their clinic.

Over 950 law clinic instructors from 183 schools responded to the invitation, with clinic directors providing information on 700 of their clinics. The data reported in this section summarize their responses.

##### ***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 (some respondents reported multiple roles).

**TABLE 21**

<b><i>Role in Law Clinic</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>
Director/head of school's law clinic program	21
Direct/co-direct distinct clinic(s)	66
Assistant director of distinct clinic(s)	4
Staff/supervising attorney or fellow	19
Other teaching role	3

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

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

The following table shows the frequency of the employment status/term of the director of a clinic, employed full time by the law school. This does not include those who also have a concurrent director role in a field placement course (i.e., it includes only those who are primarily a law clinic director):

**TABLE 22**

<b><i>Employment Status/Term — Law Clinic Director</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Tenured (Unitary)	18	17
Tenure track	8	8
Clinical tenured	10	12
Clinical tenure track	4	4
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	36	36
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term	7	7
Other short-term contract or at will	13	12
Fellow	1	≤ 1
Administrative position w/ faculty title	1	≤ 1
Administrative position w/out faculty title	1	≤ 1
Other employment term	1	3

*Questions B.3-4: Number of Students and Total Credits Earned*

On average, clinic instructors teach or supervise a total of 16 students in all their

clinics during the academic year (excluding any summer term). The median number of total credits students typically earn in the academic year (excluding any summer term) 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, with students generally earning 4 credits.

*Question B.5: Other Responsibilities*

Ninety-seven percent of law clinic directors who are full-time law school employees have responsibilities in addition to their law clinic course(s). The percentages of time they spend on their various law school responsibilities are, on average:

**TABLE 23**

<i><b>Law School Responsibilities</b></i>	<i><b>Percent of Time Spent</b></i>
Teach law clinic course(s)	53
Teach field placement course(s)	1
Teach other skills/simulation course(s)	4
Teach non-experiential courses (e.g., podium/doctrinal)	11
Manage other program (e.g., experiential/clinical education, trial advocacy, pro bono)	12
Research and scholarship	7
Committee/school service activity	8
Other	4

***B. CLINIC FOCUS AND STRUCTURE***

*Question H.3: Type of Legal Practice*

Law clinic work is primarily focused on litigation or dispute resolution. Forty-nine percent of overall clinic work is primarily focused on litigation, 7% alternative dispute resolution, 18% transactional, 13% legislative or policy work, 8% regulatory/administrative law, and 5% other legal types.

*Question H.4: Student Practice Rule*

Seventy-two percent of clinics report that all their students practice under a student practice rule, with 11% reporting that some but not all practice under a rule and 18% reporting that none practice under a rule.

*Questions H.5-6: 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). Seventy-nine percent of clinics require students to enroll for one term and 20% require two terms. In the 2019-20 survey, 78% of clinics were for one term; in 2016-17, 75%; in 2013-14, 74%; and in 2010-11, 64%.

Sixty-five percent of clinics are offered twice during the academic year (e.g., fall and spring semester), with 21% offered once and 12% offered three times (e.g., fall, spring, and summer). In the 2019-20 survey, 59% of clinics were offered twice, 25% were offered once, and 16% were offered three times.

*Questions H.7-8: Typical Enrollment and Demand*

The typical enrollments in a law clinic each term are set out below. The median and most common enrollment each term is 8 students, the same as in the 2019-20, 2016-17, and 2013-14 surveys.

**TABLE 24**

<b><i>Clinic Enrollment Ranges</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1 - 2	1	< 1	< 1	< 1
3 - 4	5	6	4	3
5 - 6	14	17	15	14
7 - 8	31	34	34	39
9 - 10	16	14	15	16
11 - 12	13	12	11	13
13 - 14	4	4	3	3
15 - 16	8	7	8	6
17 - 18	4	3	2	1



<b>Clinic Enrollment Ranges</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents in Range</b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
19 - 20	1	1	2	2
21 - 24	1	1	< 1	1
≥ 25	2	1	3	2

Directors were asked whether student demand for their clinic over the three years since the 2019-20 survey exceeded, matched, or was fewer than the number of slots/positions available for enrollment:

**TABLE 25**

<b>Demand for Clinic Over Past 3 Years</b>	<b>Percent of Clinics Reporting</b>				
	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Exceeded available slots	75	59	53	57	69
Matched	21	32	34	32	24
Did not fill up slots	4	9	13	11	7

*Question H.9-10: Requisites and Eligibility*

Forty-seven percent of clinics have pre- or co-requisite coursework. In the 2019-20 survey, 54% reported pre- or co-requisites; in 2016-17, 56%; and in 2013-14, 61%. In clinics with a requisite, the most common are: a course(s) in the substantive area of the clinic's practice (47%); Ethics/Professional Responsibility (46%); Evidence (40%); Criminal Procedure (13%); and a simulation course(s) (12%).

At schools with part-time J.D. students, 83% of their clinics permit part-time students to participate. In the 2019-20 survey, 88% of clinics allowed part-time students to participate; in 2016-17, 79%; in 2013-14, 81%; and in 2010-11, 70%. Where part-time students are permitted to participate, 42% of clinics enrolled a part-time student(s) during the 2022-23 academic year.

At schools with LL.M. students, 64% of their clinics permit LL.M. students to enroll in clinics. Where LL.M. students are permitted to participate, 25% of clinics enrolled an LL.M. student(s) during the 2022-23 academic year.

*Question H.12: Hybrid Clinics*

Four 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 74% 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 26% the matters are primarily the responsibility of the school.

In 33% of hybrid clinics, student legal work is primarily supervised by a full-time law school faculty member; in 52% the work is primarily supervised by a lawyer(s) from the off-campus host office; and in 15% supervision is shared 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 67% of hybrid clinics, the supervising lawyer in the host office is an adjunct with compensation from the school; at 11% the lawyer is also an adjunct but receives no compensation; at 6% the person is not appointed as an adjunct faculty member but is compensated by the school; and at 17% the person is not an adjunct and receives no compensation from the school.

***C. CASE/LEGAL WORK COMPONENT***

*Questions H.13-14: Case/Legal Work Supervision*

Fifty-one percent of law clinics have one person supervising the students' case/legal work, 32% have two, 10% have three, and 7% have four or more. In the 2019-20 survey, 47% of clinics had one person supervising the case/legal work.

Eighty percent of those who supervise clinic student case/legal work are full-time employees of the law school, an increase from 74% in the 2019-20 survey but the same as the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys.

*Questions H.15-16: 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 four prior surveys. Over 80% of clinics have casework ratios of 8 to 1 or fewer, as in the three 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**

<b>Student-Teacher Ratio</b>	<b>Percent Reporting</b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
< 4 to 1	7	11	11	11
4 to 1	12	10	11	11
5 to 1	6	7	7	6
6 to 1	18	15	15	14
7 to 1	4	3	4	3
8 to 1	35	37	36	38
9 to 1	3	3	3	3
10 to 1	11	9	8	8
11 to 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
12 to 1	2	3	2	4
≥ 13 to 1	1	3	2	2

Questions H.17-18: Total Credit Hours for Case/Legal Work and Classroom Component

The median number of credits a student receives for the combined case/legal work and classroom component of a clinic is 5.<sup>9</sup>

**TABLE 27**

<b>Total Number of Combined Clinic Credits</b>	<b>Percent Reporting</b>		
	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1	< 1	< 1	< 1
2	6	3	4
3	19	17	18
4	23	21	21
5	12	11	9
6	24	27	27
7	9	7	9

---

9. For courses with different/variable credits, respondents were asked to choose the most common number of credits students receive.

<b>Total Number of Combined Clinic Credits</b>	<b>Percent Reporting</b>		
	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
8	3	4	5
9	< 1	1	1
10	< 1	1	2
11	0	< 1	< 1
≥ 12	5	6	3

Eighty-two 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 2019-20 survey, 80% of clinics awarded a fixed number of credits; in 2016-17, 83%; and in 2013-14, 86%.

Fixed: The table below indicates the number of credits a student receives for case/legal work where the number of credits is fixed.<sup>10</sup> The most common number of fixed case/legal work credits is 3, the same number as in the last three surveys. Six percent of clinics award 8 or more fixed credits for casework.

**TABLE 28**

<b>Number of Fixed Credits</b>	<b>Percent Reporting</b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1	7	7	4	3
2	23	25	15	15
3	30	31	30	31
4	25	23	23	25
5	5	5	8	6
6	6	5	12	13
7	< 1	< 1	2	2
8	2	1	3	2
9	1	1	< 1	1
≥ 10	1	1	3	3

---

10. 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.

Variable: Where the credits for casework are variable, the most frequent *minimum* numbers of credits a student may receive are 3/term (25%), 2/term (23%), 4/term (23%), and 1/term (17%).

The most frequent *maximum* numbers of variable credits a student may receive are 6/term (35% of clinics), 4/term (22%), 5/term (11%), and 3/term (9%). Twenty percent of clinics allow students to receive more than 6 variable credits; 5% allow students to earn 10 or more variable credits.

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

Seventy-one percent of clinics award a mandatory letter/number grade for casework, 23% awarded mandatory pass/fail grades, 4% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades, and 3% give students the option of a pass/fail or letter/number grade. These percentages are consistent with prior surveys.

Among clinics that grade with letters or numbers, only 32% grade on a curve. In the 2019-20 survey, 32% also graded on a curve; in 2016-17, 27%; and in 2013-14, 29%. Where graded on a curve, 45% have a curve similar to or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses, 25% apply a curve similar to or the same as that used by the school for all courses, 25% have a more flexible or higher curve than the curve used in other courses, and 9% have a curve that is different from the normal law school curve in some other way.

*Question H.20: Interdisciplinary Clinics*

Fourteen percent of clinics operate interdisciplinarily with students, faculty, or practitioners from disciplines other than law participate using their non-law discipline. The most common non-law disciplines are social work, psychology/psychiatry, and health care.

Among interdisciplinary clinics, 69% enroll students in non-law disciplines for academic credit; 5% permit students in non-law disciplines to participate but they are paid and do not receive credit; 11% 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 staffing in these clinics varies. At 38% of them, faculty from non-law disciplines assist with case/legal matters; at 26%, non-faculty practitioners from non-law disciplines assist; at 15%, clinical program paid staff from non-law disciplines assist; and at 21%, no non-law instructors assist with case/legal matter instruction.

## ***D. CLASSROOM COMPONENT***

### *Question H.21: Classroom Component Instructors*

Sixty-three percent of clinics have one person teaching the classroom component and 26% have two. In the 2019-20 survey, 56% had one person teaching the classroom.

Eighty-four percent of those who teach in the classroom component are full-time employees of the school, an increase from 80% in the 2019-20 survey but the same as the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys.

### *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 in the following table. The median and most common ratio in the current and prior surveys is 8 to 1. In the latest survey, 10% of clinics have classroom student-teacher ratios greater than 10 to 1.

**TABLE 29**

<b><i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
≤ 2 to 1	2	3	2	2
3 to 1	3	3	4	3
4 to 1	10	10	11	9
5 to 1	5	6	5	5
6 to 1	19	16	14	13
7 to 1	4	3	4	3
8 to 1	36	39	36	39
9 to 1	4	2	2	4
10 to 1	11	9	9	10
11 to 1	< 1	< 1	1	< 1
12 to 1	3	4	4	6
13 to 1	0	0	< 1	< 1
14 to 1	< 1	2	1	< 1
15 to 1	< 1	< 1	1	< 1
≥ 16 to 1	2	4	4	3

*Question H.23: Classroom Component Credit*

The number of credits per term for just the classroom component is shown below. The most common number of credits is 2 per term in the latest and two prior surveys:

**TABLE 30**

<b><i>Number of Classroom Credits</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>
	<b>2022-23</b>
≤ 1	24
2	39
3	22
4	8
5	2
≥ 6	5

*Question H.24: Grading the Classroom Component*

Most clinics (74%) grade the classroom component with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 20% 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 prior surveys.

Where classroom grading is by letters or numbers, 33% grade on a curve, compared to 33% in the 2019-20 survey, 28% in 2016-17, and 30% in 2013-14. Where graded on a curve, 42% of clinics have a curve similar to or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses, 29% apply a curve similar to or the same as that used by the school for all courses, 21% have a curve more flexible or higher than in similar courses, and 8% have a curve that is different from the normal law school curve in some other way.

*Question H.25: Classroom Curriculum*

The average portion of classroom time devoted to various activities is set out in the table below. Almost every clinic (95%) devotes some classroom time to skills instruction, case discussion/rounds (92%), substantive law (91%), and professional responsibility/ethics (90%). On the other hand, 31% spend no classroom time on procedural law/rules and 25% spend no time on simulation.

**TABLE 31**

<b><i>Classroom Activity</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Time</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Skills instruction	22	23	23	22
Case discussion/rounds	23	22	21	20
Substantive law	18	18	20	18
Simulation	12	13	13	12
Procedural law/rules	11	11	10	9
Bias, cross-cultural competency, and racism	—	—	—	9
Professional responsibility/ethics	11	11	9	8
Other	3	3	3	2

## ***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 (39% of clinics), two credits (31%), or four (18%). The median percentage of students taking a clinic for an additional term is 25%, an increase from 20% in the 2019-20 survey and 11-15% in the 2016-17 and 2013-14 surveys.

Sixty-four percent of clinics grade students taking the clinic for an additional term with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 27% give mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 5% give optional pass/fail, and 4% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number.

## ***F. TECHNOLOGY***

### *Questions H.27-32: Technology Use*

#### File Access Technologies:

All but 8% of clinics provide their students with remote access to client files when they are not in the clinic office. Of those clinics providing access, the most common way students can remotely access files is through a cloud-based case management software such as CLIO (79% of schools), followed by access through a cloud-based generic document sharing tool such as Dropbox or Google Drive (51%), remote desktop/Virtual Desktop



Interface (22%), emailing case files/client information to themselves (10%), and saving case files/client information to their personal computers (9%).

#### Video/Phone Technologies:

The most common technologies clinics use for video or phone calls with clients, third parties, and one another about client matters are: Zoom (90% of clinics); calling on personal cell phones (44%); texting on personal cell phones (37%); Microsoft Teams (36%); Google Voice (32%); WhatsApp (16%); and call forwarding from clinic office to personal cell phones (11%).

#### Email System:

The most common electronic mail system used by clinics is the generic university-issued email account (65%) and clinic-specific email accounts that students only have access to during their clinic enrollment (39%). Only 5% of clinics allow students to use their personal email accounts to communicate with clients.

#### Data Security & Training:

Eighty-two percent of clinics provide students with written policies on data security and the appropriate use of technology. Eighty percent train their students in data security and the appropriate use of technology. Training is most often provided by clinic faculty/staff (61% of clinics), with many clinics also using university or law school IT staff for that training (29%).

#### Video Recording of Student Work:

Fifteen percent of clinics use video recordings of student/client interactions.

### **G. SUMMER LAW CLINIC**

#### *Question H.33: Summer Law Clinic*

Only 16% of clinics run as a student-enrolled, for-credit course during the summer term. In 87% 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 13% of clinics someone else assumes responsibility for the summer students, a decrease from 14% in the 2019-20 survey and 20% in 2016-17.

## **V. SUB-SURVEY RESULTS - FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES**

In the Field Placement Courses portion of the *Sub-Survey of Clinical Instructors*, full-time law school employees with an instructional role in a field placement course were asked to provide information on their position. If the respondent directed a field placement

course(s), they were also asked details about their course(s). Respondents who were part-time school employees were only asked for information if they were a director of a field placement course and only asked for details about their course.

Over 300 field placement instructors responded to the invitation, with 208 field placement directors providing detailed information on their course(s). The data reported below summarize the responses.

## **A. INSTRUCTOR PROFILE**

### *Questions C.1-2: Role in Field Placement Course*

Eighty-one 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.

Sixty-eight percent of field placement instructors teach both the classroom and fieldwork/casework components of the field placement course, 12% teach exclusively the classroom component, and 10% 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 40 students. Nineteen percent of instructors teach or oversee 100 or more students.

The median number of total credits a student typically earns in the academic year (excluding summer term) 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, with students generally earning 3 or 4 credits for the combined fieldwork and any separate classroom component.

### *Question C.5: Other Responsibilities*

Eighty-eight percent of field placement course directors who are full-time law school employees have responsibilities in addition to their field placement course teaching/oversight. The percentage of time they spend on their various school responsibilities are, on average:

**TABLE 32**

<b><i>Law School Responsibilities</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Time Spent</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Teach/oversee field placement course(s)	28	26
Teach law clinic course(s)	–	8
Teach other skills/simulation course(s)	17	7
Teach non-experiential courses (e.g., podium/doctrinal)	12	10
Manage other programs (e.g., experiential or clinical education, pro bono)	21	27
Research and scholarship	7	5
Work in student or career services offices	4	7
Committee/school service activity	–	7
Other	12	3

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

The following table shows the frequency of the employment status/term of the director of a field placement course employed full time by the school. This does not include those who also have a concurrent director role in a law clinic (i.e., it includes only those who are primarily a field placement course director).

**TABLE 33**

<b><i>Employment Status/Term — Field Placement Director</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Tenured (Unitary)	15	8
Tenure track	1	3
Clinical tenured	5	1
Clinical tenure track	3	1
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	27	32
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term contract	4	4
Other short-term contract or at will	11	19
Fellow	—	0
Administrative position w/ faculty title	22	16
Administrative position w/out faculty title	10	13
Other employment term	1	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 persons with primary responsibility for core elements of field placement courses are:

**TABLE 34**

<b><i>Person with Primary Responsibility for Task</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools Indicating Person Primarily Responsibility for Task</i></b>			
	<b><i>Placement of Students</i></b>	<b><i>Host Office/ Field Supervisor Relations</i></b>	<b><i>Guided Reflection</i></b>	<b><i>Grading/ Assessment</i></b>
Field placement course director	75	90	72	74
Administrative assistant to director	4	1	< 1	0
Career services or pro bono staff	11	1	< 1	< 1
Classroom instructor	4	4	26	24
Other	6	3	2	2

*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 (81% of courses) rather than placing all students in similar types of offices/practices (19%). Students work in the following practice types:

**TABLE 35**

<b><i>Practice Type of Field Placement Course</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>	
	<b><i>2019-20</i></b>	<b><i>2022-23</i></b>
Prosecution	33	22
Public Defender	—	23
Government	32	34
Public interest organization	32	38
Judicial	24	30
Civil litigation	21	24
In-house counsel – nonprofit	14	13
Legislative	13	9

<b><i>Practice Type of Field Placement Course</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Schools</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
In-house counsel – for-profit	12	12
Private practice (i.e., law firm)	12	13
Subject matter focus	10	12
Transactional	10	8
International	7	5
Other	18	13

The greatest percentage of student placements are with offices that have a litigation or dispute resolution/judicial focus (62%), followed by transactional (16%), regulatory (12%), legislative or policy (9%), and other (1%).

*Questions 1.7-11: Requisites and Enrollment*

Only 24% percent of field placement courses require pre- or co-requisite coursework, a decrease from 51% in the 2013-14 survey. Where there is a requisite, the most common are: Ethics/Professional Responsibility (60% of courses); Evidence (27%); course(s) in the substantive area of practice (20%); Criminal Procedure (20%), simulation course(s) (20%); and Other (10%).

Typical enrollments per term in field placement courses for non-summer terms are set out below. The median and most common enrollment is 20 students. Thirty-four percent of field placement courses now have enrollments of more than 30 students.

**TABLE 36**

<b><i>Enrollment Ranges</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents Reporting</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1 - 5	13	17	12	5
6 - 10	25	24	24	13
11 - 15	19	16	23	13
16 - 20	5	13	12	14
21 - 30	14	15	13	23
31 - 40	9	6	6	14

<b>Enrollment Ranges</b>	<b>Percent of Respondents Reporting</b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
41 - 50	4	3	3	5
> 51	10	6	7	15

Of the schools with part-time J.D. students, 92% of their field placement courses allow part-time students to participate (an increase from 89% in the 2019-20 survey and 78% in 2016-17).

Of the schools with LL.M. students, 57% of their field placement courses allow LL.M. students to participate.

### ***C. CREDITS***

#### *Questions I.11-14: Credits Awarded*

Fifty-five percent of field placement courses combine the fieldwork and reflection components into a single course in the school's course catalog/directory, while 45% identify the fieldwork and reflection components as two separate courses. The median number of credits a student receives per term for the combined fieldwork and reflection components is 4, but the most common number of credits is 3. Thirteen percent of field placement courses are "full-time," awarding 10 or more credits.

Ninety-one percent of field placement courses include a classroom component to address the ABA faculty-guided reflection requirement. Where the course includes a classroom component, the median and most common number of credits for the classroom component are 1 credit (54% of courses) and 2 credits (28%).<sup>11</sup>

For the fieldwork component, 58% of field placement courses offer variable credits, based on the hours students work in the course, while 42% require a fixed number of credits for all students. In the 2019-20 survey, 53% offered variable credits; in the 2016-17 survey, 58%; and in 2013-14, 52%.

---

11. To determine the number of credits awarded for just the reflection component, respondents were asked to apportion the credits between the fieldwork and reflection components whether or not they are formally divided into separate courses.

Variable: Where the number of credits for fieldwork is variable, the most common *minimum* number of variable credits is 2/term (42% of variable courses), 1/term (26%), and 3/term (17%).<sup>12</sup>

The most common *maximum* numbers of variable credits is 6/term (16% of courses), followed by 5/term (14%), 3/term (14%), 4/term (12%), and 12/term (11%).

Fixed: Where the number of credits for fieldwork is fixed, the most common number of credits is 2/term (37% of courses), 3/term (28%), and 4/term (7%).

#### ***D. FIELDWORK COMPONENT***

##### *Question I.15: Fieldwork Format*

Ninety-two percent of students in field placement courses now perform some of their fieldwork virtually; only 8% of students perform 100% of their fieldwork on-site/in-person. No course reported that 100% of its students were performing all fieldwork virtually.

##### *Question I.16: Number of Hours of Fieldwork per Credit*

The most common hours a student must work during the term for each fieldwork credit hour earned is 42.5 hours/credit (25% of courses), followed by 50 hours/credit (21%), 55-60 hours/credit (17%), and 45 hours/credit (16%). Twelve percent of field placement courses require more than 60 hours of fieldwork per credit.

##### *Question I.17: Time Reporting*

Virtually all (98%) field placement courses require students to report their fieldwork hours. Fifty-seven percent require time reporting weekly, 21% bi-weekly, 9% at the mid-term, and 5% at the end-of-term. Of those requiring time reporting, 52% require that time logs be reviewed or approved by the on-site supervisor, similar to the percentages in the three prior surveys.

##### *Question I.18: Fieldwork Grading*

Eighty-nine percent of students receive a mandatory pass/fail grade for their fieldwork, 6% receive a mandatory letter or number grade, 5% receive a mixed pass/fail and letter/number grade, an increase in mandatory pass/fail grading from 2019-20 (83%).

---

12. If students can choose to enroll for different/variable credits, respondents were asked to report the most common number students receive.



Where the course grades with mandatory letters/numbers, 21% grade on a curve, compared to 16% in 2019-20, 21% in 2016-17, 38% in 2013-14, and 41% in 2010-11.

## **E. REFLECTION COMPONENT**

### *Question I.19: Reflection Component Approach*

Seventy-three percent of field placement courses primarily 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). Nine percent of courses primarily meet the standard through regularly scheduled tutorials and 17% through other means of faculty-guided reflection.

### *Questions I.20a-b: Classroom Component Instruction*

Where there is a classroom component, 57% are taught by one person, 17% by two, and 26% by three or more. Fifty-five percent of those who teach in the classroom component are full-time law school employees.

### *Question I.20c: 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**

<b><i>Student-Teacher Ratio</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Courses with Ratios</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
1-5 to 1	9	13	12	7
6-10 to 1	24	30	32	19
11-15 to 1	35	28	28	24
16-20 to 1	8	14	12	26
21-25 to 1	9	9	8	12
≥ 26 to 1	15	5	8	12

*Question I.20d: Classroom Curriculum*

Ninety-one percent of courses devote some classroom time to professional responsibility/ethics and to professional identity formation, 90% address bias/cross-cultural competence/racism, 88% hold fieldwork discussion/rounds, 70% include career development, and 60% include skills instruction. In contrast, 67% of courses spend no class time on procedural law/rules, 65% spend no time on simulation, and 61% spent no time on substantive law. The average percent of time devoted to these activities are:

**TABLE 38**

<i><b>Classroom Activity</b></i>	<i><b>Percent of Time</b></i>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Fieldwork discussion/rounds	21	19
Professional identity formation	15	19
Professional responsibility/ethics	12	14
Skills instruction	12	12
Bias/cross-cultural competency/racism	–	11
Career development	8	9
Substantive law	8	6
Simulation	6	4
Procedural law/rules	5	4
Other	1	2

*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 (96% of courses). In 17% of these courses the reflective writings are shared with on-site field supervisors. Seventy-five percent of field placement courses require a self-assessment by the student, 72% require a learning agenda or plan, 52% require an oral presentation, 16% include a simulated drafting assignment, and 11% require a research paper.

*Question I.22: Reflection Component Grading*

The most common reflection component grading method is mandatory pass/fail grades (56%), followed by mandatory letter or number grades (40%), and mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades (3%), similar to the results from the previous survey. In

contrast, in the 2016-17 survey, 55% of courses awarded mandatory letter or number grades and 38% mandatory pass/fail grades.

## ***F. ADDITIONAL TERMS***

### *Question I.23: Repeat Enrollment*

Sixty-three percent of field placement courses permit students to enroll two or more times in the same course, an increase from 50% in 2019-20 and 55% in 2016-17. Among those permitting additional terms, 72% allow students to continue in the same placement office with conditions, 14% allow students to continue in the same office without any conditions, and 14% require students to work in a placement office different from the prior enrollment.

The reflection component for repeat enrollments is most often handled (48% of courses allowing repeat enrollment) by a classroom component (perhaps with modifications such as different content, assignments, or attendance rules). Sixteen percent of schools handle the reflection component for repeat students with regularly scheduled tutorials, while 36% handle it in other ways such as journals or reflective writings.

## ***G. EVALUATION AND MONITORING OF FIELD PLACEMENT OFFICES***

### *Question I.24: Student Office Selection*

The most common way students are placed with an office for their fieldwork is by finding their own placement and then seeking approval of the office by the school (44%). In 35% of courses, students are matched to an office by school staff or faculty, while in 31% students find their own placement from a list of pre-approved offices.

### *Question I.25: Field Placement Oversight*

To assess the methods of evaluation of placement offices, the survey asked respondents to select the three most important methods of evaluation:

**TABLE 39**

<b><i>Placement Oversight Method</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>	
	<b><i>2019-20</i></b>	<b><i>2022-23</i></b>
Student evaluation of site supervisor; other student discussion	88	88
Email communication with site supervisors	63	64
Supervisor evaluation of student	64	62
Site visit(s)	50	31
Remote video communication	14	28
Telephone call(s) with supervisor	35	25

***Question I.26: Placement Site Visits***

Site visits to the placement office are conducted in 72% of field placement courses, with 41% done on site and 49% done virtually. Where visits are done, 40% of courses visit sites irregularly/occasionally, 29% visit in semesters when a student is placed at the office, 18% visit yearly, 15% limit visits to new host offices, and 12% visit each term.

***Question I.27: Site Supervisor Training***

The most common methods of training field placement supervising attorneys are through written materials (86%) and individual discussions with the supervisor (85%). Thirty-two percent of field placement courses do some form of on-line training (asynchronous or synchronous) and 9% do in-person training. In the 2019-20 survey (distributed before COVID-19), only 8% of courses used a form of online-training, while 23% used in-person training.

***H. SUMMER FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES******Questions I.2, C.3a & 4a: Summer Enrollment***

Sixty percent of field placement courses are offered during the summer term, similar to prior surveys. At 12% of schools, summer enrollment is the predominant means of providing field placement course instruction (i.e., majority of the school's total academic year field placement enrollment is in summer field placement courses).

The median enrollment in summer field placement courses is 20-25 students, an increase from prior surveys. Sixteen percent of summer courses enroll more than 50 students; 7% enroll 5 or fewer.

*Question I.28: Summer Credits*

The median number of credits a student receives per summer term for the combined fieldwork and reflection components is 3 credits.

For fieldwork, 44% of summer field placement course are offered for fixed credits, with the most common number 3 credits.

Fifty-six percent offer variable credits for student fieldwork, 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 (47% of summer courses), 1/term (29%), and 3/term (12%). The most frequent *maximum* number of credits is 6 credits per term (31%), followed by 3/term (19%), 5/term (16%), and 4/term (9%).

*Question I.29: Summer Reflective Component Approach*

Sixty-two percent of summer field placement courses meet the ABA reflective component requirement through a classroom instructional component, compared to 73% of courses for non-summer terms. Fifteen percent of summer courses meet the requirement through regularly scheduled faculty tutorials and 25% through other means of faculty-guided reflection.

*Question I.30: Summer Classroom Approach*

Where there is a summer classroom component, in 73% the classroom is run similarly to non-summer classes in terms of frequency and instructional methods. In 14% of courses, the summer classroom component meets less frequently and in 17% it is taught online, unlike its non-summer terms.

## **V. SUB-SURVEY RESULTS – CLINICAL INSTRUCTORS**

More than 1,100 people teaching full-time in a law clinic or field placement course (“clinical instructor”) provided information on their teaching position. The data are below.

### **A. INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS**

#### *Question D.1: Years of Clinical Teaching*

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 52 years. The median years of clinical teaching experience is 8, while in the last three surveys it was 9 years.

#### *Question D.2: Years of 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 three previous surveys.

#### *Questions D.3-4: Gender and Race/Ethnicity*

The composition of clinical instructors is 67% female, 32% male, and 1% genderqueer/non-binary. In the 2019-20 survey, 67% were female; in 2016-17, 65%; in 2013-14, 63%; and in 2010-11, 60%.

Within clinical teaching areas, 65% of those who teach law clinic courses and 73% of those who teach field placement courses are female (excluding fellows).<sup>13</sup>

CSALE surveys use the American Bar Association categories of race/ethnicity, which have changed over time. The current U.S. Census protocol allows respondents to select more than one category if appropriate. The race/ethnicity of full-time clinical instructors over the last five CSALE surveys were:

---

13. Fellows are excluded from a number of tables because, as short-term limited employment positions, that data would skew the characteristics of permanent law clinic and field placement course instructors. More detailed information on fellows is available by request to [administrator@csale.org](mailto:administrator@csale.org).

**TABLE 40**

<i><b>Race/Ethnicity</b></i>	<i><b>Percent Reporting</b></i>				
	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	< 1	< 1	< 1	1	1
Asian	—	—	6	8	9
Asian Indian	2	3	—	—	—
Black or African American	5	5	7	9	9
Chinese	1	< 1	—	—	—
Filipino	0	< 1	—	—	—
Hispanics of Any Race	2	3	5	6	6
Japanese	< 1	< 1	—	—	—
Korean	< 1	< 1	—	—	—
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	< 1
Vietnamese	0	< 1	—	—	—
Samoan	0	< 1	—	—	—
White	84	84	79	81	79
Two or more races	—	—	3	—	3
Other	3	2	—	—	—

Within clinical teaching areas, 77% of those who teach law clinic courses and 82% of those who teach field placement courses are white (excluding fellows).

## ***B. EMPLOYMENT STATUS/TERM AND COMPENSATION***

### *Question E.1: Employment Status/Term*

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

All Respondents — Law Clinic and Field Placement Course Instructors

**TABLE 41**

<b><i>Employment Status/Term — All Instructors</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>			
	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Tenure (Unitary)	21	18	16	14
Tenure track	6	7	5	6
Clinical tenure	6	7	8	9
Clinical tenure track	3	3	4	3
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	—	—	31	32
≥ 5-year contract	22	25	—	—
≤ 4-year contract	31	28	—	—
Short-term probationary contract	—	—	6	7
Other short-term contract or at will	—	—	13	16
Fellow	4	3	5	5
Administrative position w/ faculty title	—	3	4	3
Administrative position w/out faculty title	—	2	2	3
Other employment term	6	4	6	5

Law Clinic Instructors

The table below shows the employment status for full-time law school employees with an instructional role in a law clinic. This data includes clinic instructors who may have also taught in a field placement course, but not as the director for the course.



**TABLE 42**

<b><i>Employment Status Term — Law Clinic Instructors</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Tenure (Unitary)	16	15
Tenure track	6	6
Clinical tenure	8	10
Clinical tenure track	4	3
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	31	33
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term	6	7
Other short-term contract	14	16
Fellow	5	7
Administrative position w/ faculty title	4	1
Administrative position w/out faculty title	2	1
Other employment term	5	2

**Field Placement Course Instructors**

The following table shows the employment status/term for full-time law school employees with an instructional role in a field placement course. This data includes field placement instructors who may have also taught in a law clinic, but not as the director for the clinic.

**TABLE 43**

<b><i>Employment Status Term — Field Placement Course Instructors</i></b>	<b><i>Percent Reporting</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Tenure (Unitary)	15	9
Tenure track	< 1	3
Clinical tenure	4	1
Clinical tenure track	3	2
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	26	31
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term	4	3
Other short-term contract	11	19
Fellow	2	2
Administrative position w/ faculty title	18	15
Administrative position w/out faculty title	9	12
Other employment term	6	2

*Questions E.2-5: Compensation*

Over 1,000 law 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, excluding fellows. Upon request to [administrator@csale.org](mailto:administrator@csale.org), salary ranges can be provided for other groupings (e.g., discipline (law clinic or field placement), geographic region, peer schools). The data, however, are not provided in a form that might tie a salary to any respondent.

**TABLE 44**

<b><i>Instructors</i></b>	<b><i>Annual Salary</i></b>		
	<b>25th percentile</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>75th Percentile</b>
Law clinic <u>and</u> field placement instructors	100,000-109,999	120,000-129,999	150,000-159,999
Law clinic instructors <sup>14</sup>	100,000-109,999	120,000-129,999	155,000-164,999
Field placement instructors <sup>15</sup>	85,000-94,999	100,000-109,999	130,000-139,999
Teaching 3 years or fewer	80,000-89,999	100,000-109,999	120,000-129,999

Typical salaries vary among regions of the country:

**TABLE 45**

<b><i>School's Region</i></b>	<b><i>Median Annual Salary</i></b>
Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	130,000-139,999
Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY) <sup>16</sup>	—
Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	110,000-119,999
Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	110,000-119,999
Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV)	120,000-129,999
Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	135,000-144,999
Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (not NY City & Long Island), RI, VT)	110,000-119,000
New York City and Long Island	160,000-169,000

---

14. Clinic instructors who also direct a field placement course are excluded.

15. Field placement instructors who also direct a law clinic are excluded.

16. Too few responses to be reliable.

The sources of salaries for instructors are: "hard money" — tuition, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies (80%); "soft money" — grants or other external funding (10%); and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money (10%). These percentages are similar to the two prior surveys.

The base salary for 66% of respondents covers a 12-month period, for 26% a 9-month period, and for 5% a 10-month period, similar to the last survey.

For those whose base salary covers less than a 12-month period, nearly 81% can apply for a summer salary supplement, an increase from 75% in the 2019-20 survey and 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 the three prior surveys.

### ***C. GOVERNANCE AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES***

#### *Question F.1: Voting Rights*

Voting rights for instructors (excluding fellows) teaching in law clinics and field placement courses are:

**TABLE 46**

<b><i>Faculty Meeting Participation</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents Entitled to Vote</i></b>		
	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Vote on all faculty matters	28	27	34
Vote on all except podium/doctrinal faculty hiring and/or promotion and/or tenure	41	45	35
Vote on administrative matters only	4	2	2
Not vote but can generally attend meetings	16	17	18
Not permitted to attend meetings	5	7	8

As with employment status, there are differences in faculty meeting participation rights between law clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows and those with an instructor role in both a law clinic and field placement course):

**TABLE 47**

<b><i>Faculty Meeting Participation</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents Entitled to Vote</i></b>	
	<b><i>Law Clinic</i></b>	<b><i>Field Placement</i></b>
Vote on all faculty matters	37	20
Vote on all except podium/doctrinal faculty hiring and/or promotion and/or tenure	38	25
Vote on administrative matters only	2	1
Not vote but can generally attend meetings	15	39
Not permitted to attend meetings	8	15

*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 12% of full-time clinical instructors (excluding fellows) cannot participate in or vote on any committee.

**TABLE 48**

<b><i>Participation in Types of Committee Addressing</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents Allowed to Participate</i></b>	
	<b><i>2019-20</i></b>	<b><i>2022-23</i></b>
All committees	44	45
Podium/doctrinal faculty hiring, promotion and tenure	45	47
Clinical faculty hiring and promotion	71	72
Academic standards	73	72
Admissions/financial aid	71	71
Budgeting	64	64
Career services/placement	74	74

<b><i>Participation in Types of Committee Addressing</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents Allowed to Participate</i></b>	
	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2022-23</b>
Curriculum	75	74
Can participate on some but not vote	8	6
Cannot participate or vote on any	10	12

*Question F.3: Additional Clinical Program Management Positions*

In addition to their role in a clinic or field placement course, 36% of clinical instructors (excluding fellows) hold the following additional management positions within the school's clinical program (note some persons may hold more than one additional position):

**TABLE 49**

<b><i>Title</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents</i></b>
	<b>2022-23</b>
Assoc./Asst. Dean/Director of Experiential Education	18
Assoc./Asst. Dean or Overall Director of Clinical Programs	19
Overall Director of Law Clinic Program	2
Overall Director of Field Placement Programs/Externships	12
Other clinical/experiential education management position	10
No other additional position	64

Twenty-eight percent of those who have an additional clinical program management position receive a reduction in their normal teaching load. The median amount of any teaching load reduction for the additional position is 40-50%. Fifty-three percent receive a

stipend or increase in their base salary for the additional clinical program position. The median amount of any stipend or increase is 10% of their base annual salary. Almost 40% of those who have an additional clinical program position receive neither a teaching load reduction nor a stipend or salary increase for the additional management duties.

#### **D. ADDITIONAL PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES**

##### **Question F.4: Teaching Podium/Doctrinal Course**

Only 6% of full-time law clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) are precluded, whether by rule or practice, by their school from also teaching podium/doctrinal courses. Twenty-two percent are required to teach those courses as part of their normal teaching load; the remaining 72% are allowed or required to teach those courses though not part of their normal load. Of the 72% for whom it was not their normal teaching load, 42% taught a doctrinal/podium course over the last three years.

Of those who taught a course even though it was not part of their normal teaching load, 17% were relieved of their clinical teaching obligations (fully or partially) while teaching the course and 46% received additional compensation for the course. Thirty-eight percent for whom the course was in addition to their normal teaching load were neither relieved of their clinical teaching obligations nor received additional compensation for teaching an additional podium/doctrinal course.

##### **Question F.5: Teaching Simulation/Skills Course**

Only 3% of full-time law clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) are precluded, by rule or practice, by their school from teaching simulation/skills courses. Eighty-seven percent were required or allowed though not part of their normal teaching load, and 10% were required to teach those course as part of their normal load. Of those allowed or required though not part of their normal teaching load, 20% taught a simulation/skills course over the last three years.

Of those who taught a simulation/skills course even though it was not part of their normal teaching load, 16% were relieved (fully or partially) of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching the skills course(s) and 45% received additional compensation for the course. Forty-one percent for whom the course was in addition to their normal teaching load were neither relieved of their clinical teaching obligations nor received additional compensation for teaching the additional simulation/skills course.

##### **Question F.6: Professional Development Support**

Ninety-five percent of clinical instructors (excluding fellows) receive funds from their school for their professional development (e.g., attend conferences, research

assistance, membership dues, book purchases, etc.). For 54%, the amount provided is similar to that provided to podium/doctrinal faculty, for 11% it is less than the amount provided, for 2% the amount is more, and 33% do not know the amount podium/doctrinal faculty at their school receive.

*Question F.7: Scholarship*

Thirty-one percent of clinical instructors (excluding fellows) are required to produce scholarship as part of their job, for 52% scholarship is beneficial to their position but not required, and for 17% scholarship is neither required nor beneficial to the instructor's position within the school.

Of those for whom scholarship is required for their position, 95% can obtain financial support for research assistance and 30% have their teaching obligations reduced for scholarship. Of those for whom scholarship is beneficial but not required, 74% are able to obtain financial support for research assistance and 11% have their teaching obligations reduced for scholarship.

*Question F.8: Sabbatical/Developmental Leave*

Paid sabbaticals/developmental leaves are available to 48% of clinical instructors (excluding fellows). For 76%, the length of time off for a sabbatical/development leave is the same as the length provided podium/doctrinal faculty, while for 17% it is different (17% of respondents did not know if it is the same or different).

Sabbaticals are available for 79% of those for whom scholarship is required for their position, and available for 26% of those for whom scholarship is beneficial but not required.

***E. RECRUITMENT PROCESS***

*Question G.1-2: Prior Employment Position*

Twenty-two percent of clinical instructors (excluding fellows) have been teaching in a clinic or field placement course three years or fewer. Their employment types prior to their current position are:

**TABLE 50**

<i><b>Prior Employment</b></i>	<i><b>Percent of Respondents</b></i>
Public Defender	10
Prosecutor	1



<b><i>Prior Employment</i></b>	<b><i>Percent of Respondents</i></b>
Other government	10
Law firm	16
Legal Services	10
Other nonprofit	15
For-profit/corporate	1
Clinical fellow	21
Other	17

*Question G.3: Recruitment Methods*

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.4: 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/Zoom-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.5: 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., vacation, moving expenses, title).

**CSALE 2022-23 Survey**  
**Participating Law Schools (*Master Survey* respondent)**

Albany Law School (Sarah Roge)  
American University (Llezie Green)  
Arizona State University (Jennifer Barnes)  
Atlanta's John Marshall Law School (Jymmyca Wyatt)  
Ave Maria School of Law (Maureen Milliron)  
Barry University (Lee Schinasi)  
Baylor University (Josh Borderud)  
Belmont University (Kristi Arth)  
Boston College (Mary Holper)  
Boston University (Karen Loor)  
Brigham Young University (Curtis Anderson)  
Brooklyn Law School (Stacy Caplow)  
California Western School of Law (Hannah Johnson)  
Campbell University (Zeke Bridges)  
Capital University (Danny Bank)  
Case Western Reserve University (Laura McNally)  
Catholic University (Catherine Klein)  
Chapman University (Carolyn Larmore)  
Charleston School of Law (Michelle Condon)  
Chicago-Kent College of Law (Jenifer Robbin)  
City University of New York (Carmen Huertas-Noble)  
Cleveland State University (Carole Heyward)  
Columbia University (Philip Gentry)  
Cornell University (Beth Lyon)  
Creighton University (Diane Uchimiya)  
DePaul University (Julie Lawton)  
Drake University (Suzan Pritchett)  
Drexel University (Richard Frankel)  
Duke University (Ryke Longest)  
Duquesne University (Katherine Norton)  
Elon University (Alan Woodlief)  
Emory University (Randee Waldman)  
Faulkner University (John Craft)  
Florida A & M University (Mark Dorosin)  
Florida State University (Larry Krieger)  
Fordham University (Michael Martin)  
Georgetown University (Alicia Plerhoples)

George Washington University (Laurie Kohn)  
Georgia State University (Ted Afield)  
Golden Gate University (Helen Kang)  
Gonzaga University (Gail Hammer)  
Harvard University (Christopher Bavitz)  
Hofstra University (Lauris Wren)  
Indiana University - Bloomington (Donna Nagy)  
Indiana University – Indianapolis (Carrie Hagan)  
Lewis and Clark Law School (Libby Davis)  
Lincoln Memorial University (Matthew Lyon)  
Louisiana State University (Bob Lancaster)  
Loyola University - Chicago (Breanna Kantor)  
Loyola University - Los Angeles (Aimee Dudovitz)  
Loyola University - New Orleans (Davida Finger)  
Marquette University (Thomas Hammer)  
Mercer University (Tim Floyd)  
Michigan State University (David Thronson)  
Mississippi College of Law (Deborah Challener)  
Mitchell Hamline (Kate Kruse)  
New England Law | Boston (Russ Engler)  
New York Law School (Kim Hawkins)  
New York University (Randy Hertz)  
North Carolina Central University (Nakia Davis)  
Northeastern University (Hemanth Gundavarem)  
Northern Illinois University (Wendy Vaughn)  
Northern Kentucky University (Jennifer Kinsley)  
Northwestern University (Shobha Mahadev)  
Nova Southeastern University (Nancy Sanguigni)  
Ohio Northern University (Melissa Kidder)  
Ohio State University (Steven Huefner)  
Oklahoma City University (Michael Mitchelson)  
Pace University (Elissa Germaine)  
Pennsylvania State University – Dickinson Law (Mae Quinn)  
Pennsylvania State University – Penn State Law (Michele Vollmer)  
Pepperdine University (Jeff Baker)  
Quinnipiac University (Carrie Kaas)  
Regent University (Kathleen McGee)  
Roger Williams University (Andy Horowitz)  
Rutgers Law School (Joanne Gottesman)  
Samford University, Cumberland (LaJuana Davis)

Santa Clara University (Santee Magliozzi)  
Seattle University (Paul Holland)  
Seton Hall University (Lori Borgen)  
South Texas College of Law Houston (Cathy Burnett)  
Southern Methodist University (Mary Spector)  
Southern University (Virginia Listach)  
Southwestern University (Julie Waterstone)  
St. John's University (Ann Goldweber)  
St. Louis University (Brendan Roediger)  
St. Mary's University (Karen Kelley)  
St. Thomas University - Florida (Cece Dykas)  
Stanford University (Jayashri Srikantiah)  
Stetson University (Christine Cerniglia)  
Suffolk University (Sarah Boonin)  
Syracuse University (Rob Nassau)  
Temple University (Jen Bretschneider)  
Texas A&M University (Luz Herrera)  
Texas Southern University (Thelma Harmon)  
Texas Tech University (Larry Spain)  
Touro University (Myra Berman)  
Tulane University (Tonya Jupiter)  
Univ. at Buffalo (Kim Diana Connolly)  
Univ. of Akron (Joann Sahl)  
Univ. of Alabama (Yuri Linetsky)  
Univ of Arizona (Kristine Huskey)  
Univ. of Arkansas (Tiffany Murphy)  
Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock (Kelly Terry)  
Univ. of Baltimore (Margaret Johnson)  
Univ. of California - Berkeley (Roxanna Altholz)  
Univ. of California College of Law, San Francisco (Gail Silverstone)  
Univ. of California - Davis (Jack Chin)  
Univ. of California - Irvine (Michael Robinson Dorn)  
Univ. of California – Los Angeles (David Babbe)  
Univ. of Chicago (Jeff Leslie)  
Univ. of Cincinnati (Yolanda Vazquez)  
Univ. of Colorado (Violeta Chapin)  
Univ. of Connecticut (Jessica Rubin)  
Univ. of Dayton (Andrea Seielstad)  
Univ. of Denver (Patience Crowder)  
Univ. of Detroit Mercy (Nicholas Schroeck)

Univ. of District of Columbia (Lindsay Harris)  
Univ. of Florida (Silvia Menendez)  
Univ. of Georgia (Jason Cade)  
Univ. of Hawaii (Calvin Pang)  
Univ. of Houston (Christopher Heard)  
Univ. of Idaho (Jessica Long)  
Univ. of Illinois (Melissa Frydman)  
Univ. of Illinois Chicago (Alicia Alvarez)  
Univ. of Iowa (John Allen)  
Univ. of Kansas (Jean Phillips)  
Univ. of Kentucky (D'lorah Hughes)  
Univ. of Louisville (Heend Sheth)  
Univ. of Maine (Deirdre Smith)  
Univ. of Maryland (Michael Pinard)  
Univ. of Massachusetts (Margaret Drew)  
Univ. of Memphis (Danny Schaffzin)  
Univ. of Miami (Becky Sharpless)  
Univ. of Michigan (Debra Chopp)  
Univ. of Minnesota (Steve Meili)  
Univ. of Mississippi (Tucker Carrington)  
Univ. of Missouri - Columbia (Angela Drake)  
Univ. of Missouri - Kansas City (Meg Reuter)  
Univ. of Montana (Hillary Wandler)  
Univ. of Nebraska (Kevin Kruser)  
Univ. of Nevada Las Vegas (Dawn Nielsen)  
Univ. of New Hampshire (Melissa Davis)  
Univ. of New Mexico (Serge Martinez)  
Univ. of North Carolina (Barbara Fedders)  
Univ. of North Dakota (Patricia Hodny)  
Univ. of North Texas - Dallas (Cheryl Wattley)  
Univ. of Notre Dame (Bob Jones)  
Univ. of Oklahoma (Gail Mullins)  
Univ. of Oregon (Laurie Hauber)  
Univ. of Pacific - McGeorge (Mary-Beth Moylan)  
Univ. of Pennsylvania (Praveen Kosuri)  
Univ. of Pittsburgh (Sheila Velez Martinez)  
Univ. of Richmond (Alexandra Silva)  
Univ. of San Diego (Bob Muth)  
Univ. of San Francisco (Laura Bazelon)  
Univ. of South Carolina (Emily Suski)

Univ. of South Dakota (Tamara Nash)  
Univ. of Southern California (Niels Frenzen)  
Univ. of St. Thomas - Minneapolis (Lisa Brabbit)  
Univ. of Tennessee (Joy Radice)  
Univ. of Texas (Eden Harrington)  
Univ. of Toledo (Robert Salem)  
Univ. of Tulsa (Mimi Martin)  
Univ. of Utah (Jacqueline Morrison)  
Univ. of Virginia (Sarah Shalf)  
Univ. of Washington (Christine Cimini)  
Univ. of Wisconsin (Ursula Weigold)  
Univ. of Wyoming (Danielle Cover)  
Vanderbilt University (Sue Kay)  
Vermont Law & Graduate School (Beth Locker)  
Villanova University (Caitlin Barry)  
Wake Forest University (Allyson Gold)  
Washburn University (Gillian Chadwick)  
Washington and Lee University (John King)  
Washington University in St. Louis (Sarah Narkiewicz)  
Wayne State University (Rebecca Robichaud)  
West Virginia University (Nicole McConlogue)  
Western Michigan University - Cooley (Tracey Brame)  
Western New England School of Law (Lauren Carasik)  
Widener University - Commonwealth (Mary Catherine Scott)  
Willamette University (Terry Wright)  
William & Mary (Stacy Kern-Scheerer)  
Yale University (Muneer Ahmad)  
Yeshiva University - Cardozo (Betsy Ginsberg)