

**CENTER FOR THE STUDY
OF
APPLIED LEGAL EDUCATION**

**Report on the
2007 - 2008 Survey**

Prepared By:

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

Technical Consultants:

Catherine Seppanen & Lewis Downey
Cicada Consulting Group, Inc.

For additional information, please contact:

**CENTER FOR THE
STUDY OF APPLIED LEGAL EDUCATION**

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL
363 L.R. BUILDING
801 MONROE STREET
ANN ARBOR, MI 48109
734.763.4319
www.CSALE.org**

A copy of this report is available at www.CSALE.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	OVERVIEW	1
II.	SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY	2
A.	<u>The Master Survey</u>	2
B.	<u>The Staffing Sub-Survey</u>	3
C.	<u>Research Methodology</u>	3
III.	MASTER SURVEY RESULTS	4
A.	<u>Identifying Information and Respondent Characteristics</u>	4
	School Location Characteristics	4
	First Year Class Size	5
	Rankings	5
	Oversight of All Applied Legal Education Programs	6
	Oversight of All In-House, Live Client Clinics	6
	Oversight of All Field Placement Programs	6
	Hiring Practices for Full-time Clinical Faculty	6
	Percentage of Students Enrolled in Applied Legal Education Courses	7
B.	<u>Overview of Programs</u>	8
	Number and Types of In-House, Live Client Clinics	8
	Number and Types of Field Placement Programs	9
	Participation Levels in Applied Legal Education Programs	10
	Demand for In-House, Live Client Clinics	11
	Demand for Field Placement Programs	12
C.	<u>Program Challenges and Support</u>	12
	Major Challenges to In-House, Live Client Clinics	12
	Major Challenges to Field Placement Programs	13
D.	<u>In-House, Live Client Clinics</u>	14
	Length and Terms of Enrollment	14
	Average Class Size	14
	Part-Time and Night Students	14
	Total Credits Awarded	14
	Faculty In Charge	15
	Classroom Student/Teacher Ratio	15
	Credit Hours For, and Focus of the Classroom Component	15
	Grading the Classroom Component	16
	Limitations on Classroom Component Credits	16
	Focus of the Classroom Component	16
	Teaching the Classroom Component	16
	Casework Student / Teacher Ratio	17
	Credit Hours for Casework	17
	Grading the Casework Component	17
	Limitations on Casework Credits	18
	Supervising the Casework Component	18

	Student Practice Rules	18
	Pre- & Co-Requisites	18
	The Use of Technology in Casework	19
	Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Clinics	19
	Number of Clients Represented by Clinics	19
E.	<u>Field Placement Programs</u>	19
	Length and Terms of Enrollment	20
	Average Semester Enrollment	20
	Part-Time and Night Students	21
	Faculty In Charge	21
	Average Number of Placements	22
	Credits Awarded	22
	Grading the Field Placement Program	22
	Limitations on Placements	23
	Limitations on Fieldwork Credits	23
	Journals and Time-Logs	23
	On-Site Visits	23
	Training for On-Site Supervisors	23
	Including a Classroom Component	23
	Grading the Classroom Component	23
	Teaching the Classroom Component	24
	Focus of the Classroom Component	24
	Pre- and Co-Requisites	25
	Student Demand	25
F.	<u>Staffing Sub-Survey Assignments</u>	25
G.	<u>Promotion and Retention Standards</u>	25
	Written Promotion and Retention Standards	25
	Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Clinical Tenure Track	25
	Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Contracts	26
IV.	STAFFING SUB-SURVEY RESULTS	27
A.	<u>Identifying Information</u>	27
B.	<u>Respondent Characteristics and Terms of Employment</u>	27
	Clinical Teaching Experience	27
	Part Time Teaching Experience	27
	Years of Full Time Law Practice Prior to Teaching	27
	Race and Gender	28
	Employment Status	29
	Compensation: Amount, Source, and Summer Funding	30
	Summer Operations: In-House, Live Client Clinics	30
	Summer Operations: Field Placement Programs	30
	Voting Rights	31
	Law School Committee Participation	31
	Teaching Doctrinal Courses	32
	Teaching "Skills" Courses	32
	Scholarship as a Job Requirement	32
	Sabbaticals	32

**CENTER FOR THE STUDY
OF APPLIED LEGAL EDUCATION**

*Report on the 2007 - 2008 Survey**

I. OVERVIEW

This report tabulates the results of the 2007-08 Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education (CSALE) *Survey of Applied Legal Education*. The results provide valuable insight into the state and nature of applied legal education in areas including program design and structure, pedagogical techniques and practices, common program challenges, and the treatment of applied legal educators in the legal academy. And because the *Survey* will be repeated every three years, the results reported herein provide the "baseline" for examining the growth and development of applied legal education going forward.

The *Survey* was composed of two distinct parts. A single *Master Survey* was directed to each of the 188 ABA fully-accredited U.S. law schools,¹ 145 (77%) of which responded. Each school was, in turn, asked to distribute the *Staffing Sub-Survey* to every applied legal educator teaching there.² Three-hundred and fifty-seven applied legal educators at 70 law schools responded.

This report and the "raw" results of the *Survey* (less redacted confidential information) are available at www.CSALE.org. The discussion of the *Survey's* structure and focus which immediately follows this overview provides a description of the various sections of the *Survey* to facilitate easier navigation of the data. With the raw results, scholars, legal educators and others interested in applied legal education will be able to sort and filter the data by almost as many data points as there are *Survey* questions.

Finally, the results reported herein are only made possible by the participants. To each of you, CSALE offers a hearty thanks. Thanks also goes out to the countless people who provided valuable insight and guidance during the vetting of initial iterations of the *Survey*, to the endurance and technological wizardry of Cicada Consulting, and to the brave souls who participated in beta testing. Finally, none of this work would have been possible without the generosity of the American Association of Law Schools Section on Clinical Legal Education, the Clinical Legal Education Association, and the University of Michigan Law School.

* Copyright © 2008 Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education, Inc.

1. At the time the survey was conducted, there were 188 ABA fully-accredited law schools. Schools with provisional ABA accreditation were not included because they had yet to demonstrate – to the ABA at least – that they were in compliance with ABA standards, including those regarding applied legal education and educators. The Judge Advocate General's School also was excluded because of its focus on post-JD courses.

2. The *Survey* defines an "applied legal educator" or "clinician" (these terms are used interchangeably throughout) as a person employed by a law school who is teaching or supervising in either an in-house, live client clinic or a field placement program.

II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS AND METHODOLOGY

A. The Master Survey

The *Survey* is divided into two distinct parts.³ The first is the *Master Survey*, one of which was sent to the person at every ABA fully-accredited law school in the country with primary responsibility for the applied legal education programs at their school.⁴ The *Master Survey* is designed to provide an overview of the applied legal education program at each school, gather detailed information on each in-house, live client clinic and field placement course offered in the program, and gain insight into hiring and retention practices for applied legal educators.

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

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

Section D focuses on in-house, live client clinics. Respondents were asked to provide information on *each* in-house, live client clinic identified in *Section B*. Four hundred and ten clinics at 91 law schools responded, providing detailed information on, among other things: enrollment and its terms; credit load and pedagogy by course component (classroom and field work); faculty teaching in the two different components; grading procedures; pre- and co-requisites; supervision techniques; and the amount of legal services delivered each term by each clinic.

Section E is nearly identical to *Section D* except that its focus is each field placement program the respondent identified in *Section B* and takes into account the pedagogical and supervisory differences between field placement programs and live client clinics. Two hundred and thirty five field placement programs at 73 law schools responded to this section.

3. Both parts of the *Survey* are available for download at www.CSALE.org.

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

In *Section F*, the *Master Survey* respondent was asked to electronically assign the *Staffing Sub-Survey* (discussed below) to every applied legal educator at his or her school.

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

B. The Staffing Sub-Survey

The *Staffing Sub-Survey* is a short survey targeted at each person teaching or supervising an in-house, live client clinic or field placement program (*hereinafter* a “clinician” or “applied legal educator”). *Section A* of the *Sub-Survey* is identical to *Section A* of the *Master Survey* and captures important characteristics of the respondent's school. *Section B* first captures biographical information about the respondent (race, gender, years teaching, *etc.*). It also collects the defining characteristics of the respondent's employment, including, among other things: the nature of employment relationship; promotion and retention standards; compensation; supervision ratios; voting rights; committee participation; and support by and rights within his or her institution. As with the *Master Survey*, the final section of the *Sub-Survey* collects respondent feedback.

C. Research Methodology

The data was collected exclusively on-line. An invitation to complete the *Master Survey* was sent to the person at every law school in the country with primary responsibility for, or considerable knowledge of the applied legal education programs at his or her school. That person was responsible for assigning the *Sub-Survey* to each applied legal educator at his or her school. Invitations to complete the *Master Survey* were first e-mailed on October 1, 2007. CSALE remotely monitored the progress on all invited *Master* and *Sub Surveys* periodically and sent reminders to invitees that had not yet participated. The *Master Survey* closed on February 1, 2008. The *Sub-Survey* closed at the end of that month. The *Survey* will be conducted every three years, with the next iteration starting in October of 2010.

III. MASTER SURVEY RESULTS

SECTION A. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Questions 1, 2 & 4(b): School Location Characteristics

Schools across the country responded to the survey. Sixty percent of respondent schools are private institutions, 40% are public. Their geographic location breaks down by region as follows:

Region I.D.	Region Definition	Percentage of Total Respondents
Region I	Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	15%
Region II	Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	5%
Region III	Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	12%
Region IV	Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	19%
Region V	Southeast and Puerto Rico (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, PR, TN, WV)	13%
Region VI	Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	17%
Region VII	Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (excluding New York City and Long Island), RI, VT)	14%
Region VIII	New York City and Long Island	5%

Respondent schools were distributed across metropolitan area populations sized as follows:

Metropolitan Area Size	Percentage of Total Respondents
500,000 or more	56%
200,000 to 499,999	18%
75,000 to 199,999	14.5%
up to 74,999	11.5%

Question 4a: First Year Class Size

Student enrollment for the incoming 2007 first-year JD class among respondent schools was:

Number of Students	Percentage of Total Respondents
1 - 100	3.5%
101 - 150	17.5%
151 - 200	24%
201 - 250	18%
251 - 300	14.5%
301 - 350	7%
351 - 400	5%
401 - 450	2.5%
451 or more	7.5%

Question 5: Rankings

All respondents were given the option of withholding their identity in connection with their answers to the *Master Survey* Sections A, B, C, F, G and H. Because this might present some problems for scholars attempting to cross reference various fields of the data, CSALE needed some way to permit scholars to make rough comparisons between schools. So, while CSALE does *not* endorse any system of law school rankings, to permit such rough comparisons CSALE asked respondents to provide, within set ranges, their most recent *U.S. News and World Report* ranking. The results are as follows:

Ranking	Percentage of Total Respondents
1 - 25	15%
26 - 50	15%
51 - 75	12%
76 - 100	16%
"3 rd Tier"	20%
"4 th Tier"	22%

Question 7: Oversight of All Applied Legal Education Programs

Roughly 50% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for *all* applied legal education programs. Twenty-seven percent of these individuals' job titles included the word "dean."

Question 8: Oversight of All In-House, Live Client Clinics

Approximately 56% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for *all in-house, live client clinics*. Thirteen percent of these individuals' job titles included the word "dean."

Question 9: Oversight of All Field Placement Programs

Approximately 35% of respondents indicated that there was a single individual at their school with oversight responsibility for *all field placement programs*. Forty percent of these individuals' job titles included the word "dean."

Questions 10 & 11: Hiring Practices for Full-time Clinical Faculty

A vote of the full faculty based upon a committee recommendation was overwhelmingly the most common method of hiring full-time clinical faculty (72.5%). At 17.5% of schools, the process differed depending on the status – at 5% of schools the hiring was done by committee without a faculty vote; at 3.5% of schools the dean made the determination; and at 1.5% the overall director/dean of the clinical program did the hiring. At schools where a committee was involved in some aspect of the hiring, the composition of that committee broke down as follows:

<i>Committee Structure</i>	<i>Percentage of Total Respondents Where Committee Is Involved</i>
Committee without any clinical faculty	12%
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that clinicians are not allowed to chair	20%
Committee with clinical and doctrinal faculty that any member is permitted to chair	41%
Committee solely comprised of clinicians	2%
Committees at schools that do not distinguish between clinical and doctrinal faculty	25%

*Questions 12 & 13: Percentage of Students Enrolled in Applied
Legal Education Courses in a Given Semester*

In an average semester, the following percentage of the entire J.D. student body was enrolled in an in-house, live client clinic:

Percentage of Entire J.D. Student Body Enrolled	Percentage of Total Respondents Reporting Enrollment Level
1 - 10%	50%
11 - 20%	25.5%
21 - 30%	8.5%
31 - 40%	8.5%
41 - 50%	3.5%
51 - 60%	2.0%
81 - 90%	0.5%
91 - 100%	0.5%

In an average semester, the following percentage of the entire J.D. student body was enrolled in a field placement program:

Percentage of Entire J.D. Student Body Enrolled	Percentage of Total Respondents Reporting Enrollment Level
1 - 10%	46.8%
11 - 20%	28.8%
21 - 30%	16%
31 - 40%	4%
41 - 50%	1.4%
51 - 60%	2%
61 - 70%	0.7%

SECTION B. OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS

Questions 1 & 2: Number and Types of In-House, Live Client Clinics

The 131 schools that responded to this question report a total of 809 distinct in-house, live client clinics for an average of 6.2 per school. The number of clinics per school ranged from a high of 25 to, in three instances, a low of 0. Respondents were offered 34 substantive foci (including "other" and "no clinics") and asked to choose only one per clinic. The table below provides the results in descending order of popularity:

<i>Substantive Focus of Clinic</i>	<i>No. Reporting</i>	<i>As Percentage of All Clinics</i>
Criminal Defense	63	7.8%
Civil Litigation / General Civil Clinic	60	7.4%
Mediation/ADR	45	5.6%
Children & the Law	44	5.4%
Immigration	43	5.3%
Other	42	5.2%
Community / Economic Development	38	4.7%
Family Law	34	4.2%
Domestic Violence	33	4.1%
Tax	33	4.1%
Appellate	32	4.0%
Transactional	28	3.5%
Environmental	27	3.3%
Housing	20	2.5%
Human Rights	20	2.5%
Asylum/Refugee	19	2.4%
Criminal Prosecution	19	2.3%
Disability Law	19	2.3%
Health Law	19	2.3%
Innocence	19	2.3%
Civil & Criminal Litigation / General Litigation	18	2.2%
Employment Law	17	2.1%
Death Penalty	15	1.9%
Intellectual Property	16	1.9%
Administrative Law	11	1.4%
Civil Rights	11	1.4%
Prisoners Rights	11	1.4%
Securities	10	1.2%
Bankruptcy	8	1.0%
Legislative	8	1.0%
Wills/Trusts/Estates	8	1.0%
Consumer Law	7	0.9%
Indian Law	7	0.9%
No in-house, live client clinics	3	0.4%
Constitutional Law	2	0.2%
Total Clinics Reporting	809	

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

One hundred and thirty-one schools report a total of 895 distinct field placement programs for an average of 6.8 field placement programs per school. The number of field placement programs ranged from three highs of 40 to, in a single instance, a low of 0. Respondents were offered 39 substantive foci (including "other" and "no field placement programs") and asked to choose only one per field placement program. The table below provides the results in descending order of popularity:

Substantive Focus of FPP	No. Reporting	As Percentage of All FPP's
Judicial	102	11.4%
Public Interest Organizations	71	7.9%
Government Placements	66	7.4%
Criminal Prosecution	62	6.9%
Civil & Criminal Litigation / General Litigation	52	5.8%
Criminal Defense	47	5.3%
Other	42	4.7%
Environmental	33	3.7%
Administrative Law	26	2.9%
Appellate	26	2.9%
Civil Litigation	26	2.9%
Legislative	26	2.9%
Family Law	23	2.6%
Domestic Violence	22	2.5%
Immigration	22	2.5%
Health Law	20	2.2%
Mediation/ADR	20	2.2%
Children & the Law	18	2.0%
Civil Rights	18	2.0%
Bankruptcy	15	1.7%
Employment Law	15	1.7%
Asylum/Refugee	13	1.5%
Human Rights	13	1.5%
Disability Law	12	1.3%
Elderly Law	12	1.3%
Intellectual Property	12	1.3%
Tax	12	1.3%
Housing	11	1.2%
Transactional	11	1.2%
Consumer Law	9	1.0%
Death Penalty	9	1.0%
Community / Economic Development	6	0.7%
Prisoners Rights	6	0.7%
Constitutional Law	5	0.6%
Indian Law	4	0.4%
Wills/Trusts/Estates	4	0.4%
Securities	3	0.3%
No Field Placement Programs	1	0.1%
Total FPP's Reporting	895	

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

Just over 2% of schools require students to enroll in an in-house, live client clinic before graduating, and less than 1% (0.7%) of schools require students to enroll in a field placement program before graduating. Excluding these two groups of schools, 6.3% of the remaining schools require students to enroll in an in-house, live client clinic *or* field placement program before graduating.

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

In-House, Live Client Clinics:

Enrollment Ranges	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range
1 - 5%	7%
6 - 10%	10.6%
11 - 15%	6.1%
16 - 20%	9.7%
21 - 25%	13.1%
26 - 30%	12.3%
31 - 35%	13.2%
36 - 40%	7.9%
41 - 45%	5.3%
46 - 50%	6.1%
51 - 55%	4.4%
56 - 60%	3.5%
61 - 65%	0.8%
66 - 70%	2.6%
76 - 80%	0.8%

Field Placement Programs:

Enrollment Ranges	Percentage of Respondents Reporting Range
1 - 5%	6.2%
6 - 10%	12.3%
11 - 15%	10.5%
16 - 20%	8.7%
21 - 25%	8.8%
26 - 30%	7.8%
31 - 35%	8.7%
36 - 40%	9.6%
41 - 45%	3.5%
46 - 50%	4.3%
51 - 55%	3.5%
56 - 60%	7.8%
61 - 65%	1.7%
66 - 70%	3.5%
71 - 75%	1.7%
76 - 80%	0.8%
81 - 85%	0.8%
86 - 90%	0.8%
91 - 95%	0.8%

Questions 10 & 11: Demand for In-House, Live Client Clinics

Nearly 62% of schools report that, in the last five years, student demand for in-house, live client clinics has increased; 26% report constant demand over the same period; and 12% report that demand has dropped.

Respondents were allowed to select multiple factors to explain the increase or decrease in demand. Of the 61.8 % of schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common reasons were: students believe clinics improve skills (23.1%); students believe clinics improve marketability (21.1%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within clinics offered (20.8%); increased support and promotion by law school (17.3%); other faculty promoting clinics/encouraging students to enroll (12.9%); and "other" (4.5%).

Of the schools reporting a decrease, most attributed it to a combination of clinics taking too much time, students having fewer elective credit hours, and more pressure on students to take "bar courses." Several schools cited the increasing popularity of field placement programs. Nearly 25% of the schools reporting a decrease cited other faculty discouraging clinic enrollment or lack of promotion of clinics by the law school as at least one reason for the decline.

Questions 12 & 13: Demand for Field Placement Programs

Approximately 62.5% of schools report that, in the last five years, demand for field placement programs has increased; 30.5% report constant demand over the same period; and 7% report that demand has dropped.

Respondents were allowed to select multiple factors to explain the increase or decrease in demand. Of the 62.5 % of schools reporting an increase in demand, the most common reasons were: students believe field placement programs improve marketability (27.3%); students believe field placement programs improve skills (24.7%); increased interest in substantive areas of practice within field placement programs offered (19.4%); other faculty promoting field placement programs/encouraging students to enroll (11.6%); increased support and promotion by law school (9%); and "other" (8%). Of the schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons were lack of support and promotion by the law school and other faculty discouraging enrollment.

SECTION C. PROGRAM CHALLENGES AND SUPPORT

Questions 1 & 2: Major Challenges to In-House, Live Client Clinics

From a series of choices (including "other"), respondents were asked to choose the major challenges their in-house, live client clinics faced. The results are: lack of hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (18.1%); other demands on clinical faculty's time (18%); insufficient number of clinical faculty (16.2%); lack of physical/office space (15.7%); lack of support among doctrinal faculty (9.6%); lack of administrative/secretarial support (8.1%); lack of support from the administration (8.1%); "other" (5.3%); and lack of student demand (3.9%).

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

	<i>Inadequate</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Ample</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Office Space:	34.6%	43.4%	19.9%	2.2%
Telephone:	4.4%	50.7%	42.6%	2.2%
Computers:	12.5 %	50.7 %	33.8%	2.9%
Library:	10.3%	44.1%	40.4%	5.1%
Office Supplies:	2.9%	42.6%	52.2%	2.2%
Secretarial Support:	25.0%	44.9%	26.5%	3.7%
Case Expense Funding:	27.2%	47.1%	18.3%	6.6%
Audio Visual:	15.4%	44.9%	32.4%	7.4%

Questions 3 & 4: Major Challenges to Field Placement Programs

Respondents also were asked to choose the major challenges that their field placement programs faced. The results in decreasing order of prevalence are: other demands on clinical faculty's time (23.3%); insufficient number of clinical faculty (21.7%); lack of administrative/secretarial support (12.4%); lack of support among doctrinal faculty (11.6%); lack of hard money (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (7.8%); "other" (7.8%); lack of physical/office space (7.0%); lack of support from the administration (4.3%); and lack of student demand (4.3%).

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

	<i>Inadequate</i>	<i>Sufficient</i>	<i>Ample</i>	<i>Not Applicable</i>
Office Space:	18.1%	46.4%	13.8%	21.8%
Telephone:	4.3%	45.7%	28.3%	21.7%
Computers:	6.5 %	39.9 %	24.6%	25.4%
Library:	6.5%	39.9%	24.6%	29.0%
Office Supplies:	2.9%	40.6%	34.1%	22.5%
Secretarial Support:	21.0%	39.1%	21.0%	18.8%
Case Expense Funding:	21.7%	40.6%	8.0%	29.7%
Audio Visual:	8.7%	30.4%	23.2%	37.7%

SECTION D. IN-HOUSE, LIVE CLIENT CLINICS

In response to Question 1, Section B above, 131 schools report a total of 809 distinct in-house, live client clinics. In this Section, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on each of those clinics. Ninety-one out of those 131 schools did so, providing information on 410 separate in-house, live client clinics. The data in this section of the *Report* is based on the responses of those 410 clinics.

Questions 3 & 6 : Length and Terms of Enrollment

The mandatory term of enrollment for most clinics is one semester, with 65.6% requiring one semester, 25.6% requiring two semesters, and 8.7% reporting "other" (which included the student having the option of choosing one *or* two semesters). A slight majority of clinics (51.7%) permit students to take the clinic for additional semesters beyond the mandatory term of enrollment. Of those clinics that allow additional semester(s):

- Typically, 19-28% of students take a clinic for an additional semester(s), with 40.8% of clinics reporting that 0-10% of their clinic students take the clinic for additional term(s), 23.4% report that 11-20% of their students repeat, and 11.9% report that 21-30% of their students repeat, with all other responses 5% or less.
- 59.0% of clinics report that students are permitted to take the clinic for 1 additional semester, 26.4% allow students to repeat for 2 semesters, and 9.9% allow up to 3 additional semesters.

Question 4: Average Class Size

The average semester enrollment ranges from 8 to 11 students. The most common typical enrollments each semester are 5-8 students (47.3%) and 9-12 (26.6%). In addition, 11.7% of clinics report typical enrollments of 13-16 students, 6.6% report enrollments of 1-4, and 3.7% report enrollments of 17-20, with all other responses less than 2%.

Question 5: Part-Time and Night Students

Of the law clinics at schools that have part-time or night students, 82.1% report that such students are allowed to participate in clinics.

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

The most frequent number of credits per semester for the clinic (*i.e.*, credits for combined classroom *and* casework components) is 4 per semester (25.7%), followed by 3 credits/semester (24.7%), 6 credits/semester (18.2%), 5 credits/semester (10.8%), 7 credits/semester (8.4%) and 2 credits/semester (5.1%), with all other responses 3.0% or less.

Question 7: Faculty In Charge

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

<i>Job Description</i>	<i>Percentage Reporting</i>
Adjunct	15.4%
Tenured	15.4%
Clinical Tenured	13.1%
5 Year Contract	12.8%
3 Year Contract	8%
Other	7.3%
Tenure Track	6.2%
1 Year Contract	6%
6+ Year Contract	6%
Clinical Tenure Track	4.4%
2 Year Contract	3.4%
4 Year Contract	1.4%
Staff Attorney	0.7%

Question 8: Classroom Student/Teacher Ratio

The most frequent student-teacher ratio for the classroom component of in-house clinics is 8 to 1 (38.1%), followed by 4 to 1 (11.2%), 6 to 1 (9.3%), 5 to 1 (8.7%), 10 to 1 (7.9%), and 12 to 1 (5.2%), with all other reporting ratios below 4%.

Questions 9, 10 & 13: Credit Hours For, and Focus of the Classroom Component

The most common number of credits per semester for *just* the classroom component of the clinic is 1 per semester (42.6%), followed by 2 credits/semester (32.0%), 3 credits/semester (19.3%), and 4 credits/semester (4.1%), with all other responses 1.3% or less. On average, clinics spend about 31 hours per semester on the classroom component (a little over 2 hours per week), with the most typical number of hours spent on the classroom component each semester 26 - 30 hours (32.8%) (about 2 hours per week), followed by 41 - 45 hours (12.5%) (about 3 hours per week), and 11 - 15 hours (10.3%) (about 1 hour per week).

The greatest portion of classroom time is devoted to case discussion (21.1%) and skills instruction (21.1%), followed by substantive law (19.4%), simulation (14.1%), procedural law (12.1%), and ethics/professional responsibility (11.5%). Almost all clinics devote some classroom time to the substantive law of the clinic (with only 4.7% reporting no time devoted to that topic), ethics/professional responsibility (only 6.4% reporting no time on the subject), skills instruction (only 7.4% reporting no time), and case discussion (only 8.6% reporting no time). On the other hand, just over one-fifth of clinics (21.0%) report that they spend no time on simulation and 18.5% report no time spent on procedural law.

Question 11: Grading the Classroom Component

Most clinics (63%) grade the classroom component with a mandatory numerical or letter grade. Nearly 30% of clinics give mandatory pass/fail grades for this component. Just over 4% of clinics give mixed pass/fail and numerical/letter grades, and 3.6% offer students the option of taking the classroom component pass/fail or graded.

Question 12: Limitations on Classroom Component Credits

A minority of schools (36%) limit the number of classroom component credits a student may count toward the total needed for graduation.

Question 13: Focus of the Classroom Component

The greatest portion of classroom component time is devoted to skills instruction (22%), followed by case discussion (21%), substantive law (20%), simulation (15%), ethics/professional responsibility (12%), and "other" (9%).

Questions 14: Teaching the Classroom Component

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of the *person teaching* the classroom component of an in-house, live client clinic:

<i>Job Description</i>	<i>Percentage Reporting</i>
Tenured	18%
Adjunct	16%
5 Year Contract	15%
3 Year Contract	8%
6+ Year Contract	7%
Other	7%
Tenure Track	7%
1 Year Contract	6%

Clinical Tenured	4%
2 Year Contract	4%
Clinical Tenure Track	4%
4 Year Contract	2%
Staff Attorney	1%

Question 15: Casework Student / Teacher Ratio

The most common student-teacher ratio for the casework component of in-house clinics is 8 to 1 (33.7%), the same as for the classroom component, followed by 5 to 1 (15.3%), 6 to 1 (15.1%), 4 to 1 (9.3%), and 10 to 1 (7.1%), with all other reporting ratios below 3.3%.

Questions 16: Credit Hours for Casework

Overwhelmingly, most clinic students (82.7%) receive a fixed number of credits for the casework component, rather than a variable number based on the amount of work students commit to doing (17.3%).

Where the number of credits a student receives for casework is *fixed*:

- the most frequent number of credits students receive is 3 (35.1%), followed by 2 (34.7%), 4 (13.6%), and 1 (8.85), with all other responses less than 2.3%.
- on average, students are expected to work about 43 hours over the semester for each fixed credit, with the most frequent number of hours per semester a student is expected to work for each fixed credit 46 - 50 hours (about 3+ hours/week/credit) (13.5%), followed by 56 - 60 hours (about 4 hours/week/credit) (10.7%), 36 - 40 hours (about 2.5 hours/week/credit) (10.4%), and 41-45 hours (about 3 hours/week/credit) (9.7%).

Where the number of credits a student receives is *variable*, on average, students are expected to work about 45 hours over the semester for each variable credit, with the most frequent number of hours per semester a student is expected to work for each variable credit 56 - 60 hours (about 4 hours/week/credit) (30.4%), followed by 46-50 hours (about 3+ hours/week/credit) (20.3%), and 36-40 hours (about 3 hours/week/credit) (11.4%).

Question 17: Grading the Casework Component

As with the classroom component (Question 11), most students (59.8%) are given a mandatory numerical/letter grade for the casework component of the clinic, with nearly 32% of clinics giving mandatory pass/fail grades, 5.4% giving mixed pass/fail and numerical/letter grades, and 2.9% giving students the option of a pass/fail or numerical/letter grade.

Question 18: Limitations on Casework Credits

A slight majority of schools (52.9%) limit the number of credits given for casework that a student may count toward the total needed for graduation.

Questions 19: Supervising the Casework Component

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

Job Description	Percentage Reporting
Adjunct	23%
Staff Attorney	17%
1 Year Contract	11%
Fellow	9%
Other	9%
5 Year Contract	7%
3 Year Contract	5%
Tenured	5%
Clinical Tenure Track	5%
6+ Year Contract	4%
Tenure Track	3%
Clinical Tenured	1%
2 Year Contract	.5%
4 Year Contract	.5%

Question 20: Student Practice Rules

A majority of clinics (60.2%) report that all their students practice under a student practice rule, with 19.3% reporting that some but not all of their students practice under a rule, and 20.5% reporting that none of their students practice under a rule.

Questions 21 & 22: Pre- & Co-Requisites

A slight majority of clinics (51.5%) report that there are pre- or co-requisites for the course. Where there are pre- or co-requisites, evidence is the most common required course (26.8%), followed by a course(s) in the substantive area of the clinic's practice (25.4%), ethics/professional responsibility (24.0%), civil procedure (14.4%), and criminal procedure (9.4%).

Question 23: The Use of Technology in Casework

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

- Case management software is the most common type of technology employed, with 40.5% of clinics reporting its use. Just over 31% report the use of a dedicated clinic web-page.
- The use of e-mail between faculty and students for supervision is widespread, with 92.9% of clinics reporting its use.
- Fewer clinics, but still a substantial majority (71.1%), permit faculty and students to use e-mail for client contact.
- A majority of clinics (58.4%) have a dedicated *intranet* providing students with access to client-related documents/files. In 37.4% of clinics using intranet can students access the network outside of the law school.

Question 24: Hours of Legal Services Delivered by Clinics

Three hundred and ninety-three clinics report a total of 462,356 estimated hours of *civil* legal services provided each semester, or about 1176 hours per clinic per semester. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA accredited law schools, the estimated total amount of *civil* legal services delivered by clinics at these schools during the fall and spring semesters each year (without factoring in service provided during summer sessions) is over 1.8 million hours.⁵

One hundred and twenty clinics report a total of 152,164 estimated hours of *criminal* legal services provided each semester, or about 1268 hours per clinic per semester. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA accredited law schools, the estimated total amount of *criminal* legal services provided by clinics at these schools during the fall and spring semesters each year (without factoring in service provided during summer sessions) is over 600,000 hours.⁶

Question 25: Number of Clients Represented by Clinics

Three hundred and fourteen clinics report a total of 22,441 *civil* clients per semester (with organizational clients counted as 1), or about 71 clients per clinic per semester. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA accredited law schools, the approximate total number of clients provided with *civil* legal services by clinics at these schools during the fall and spring semesters each year (without factoring in clients represented during summer sessions) is almost 90,000.⁷

5. This estimate is calculated as follows: 462,356 total hours per semester for the 50% of ABA accredited law schools responding to this section, multiplied by 2 semesters, multiplied by 2 to adjust for the 50% of schools that did not report in this section. Because some schools completed Section D for less than all the clinics they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 1, the actual aggregate number of hours of civil legal services delivered is likely to be significantly higher.

6. See fn. 5 for the calculation methodology.

7. This estimate is calculated as follows: 22,441 clients per semester for the 50% of ABA accredited law schools responding to this section, multiplied by 2 semesters, multiplied by 2 to adjust for the 50% of schools that did not

One hundred and sixteen clinics report a total of 9,705 *criminal* clients per semester, or about 84 clients per clinic per semester. Extrapolating to all law clinics at all ABA accredited law schools, the approximate total number of clients provided with *criminal* legal services by law clinics at these schools during the fall and spring semesters each year (without factoring in clients represented during summer sessions) is over 38,000.⁸

SECTION E. FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAMS

In response to Question 3, Section B (*supra*), 131 schools report a total of 895 distinct field placement programs. In this Section, respondents were asked to provide detailed information on each of those programs. Seventy three schools chose to do so, providing information on 235 distinct field placement programs. The data in this section of the *Report* is based on the responses of those 235 field placement programs.

Questions 3 & 6: Length and Terms of Enrollment

The mandatory term of enrollment for field placement programs is overwhelmingly one semester, with 91.5% requiring one semester, 1.5% requiring two semesters, 0.5% requiring one or two semesters, and 6.5% reporting "other." A minority of field placement programs (44%) permit students to take the program for additional semesters beyond the mandatory term. Of those programs allowing additional semester(s):

- 65.9% report that students are permitted to take the field placement program for 1 additional semester, 17.6% permit students to take it for 2 semesters, and 16.5% allow more than two additional semesters.
- About 15% of students take a field placement program for an additional term(s), with 60% of field placement programs reporting that 1-10% of their prior students repeat the program, 11.1% of field placement programs reporting that 11-20% repeat, and 18.9% reporting that 21-30% repeat.

Question 4: Average Semester Enrollment

The average semester enrollment in a field placement program is about 14 or 15 students, with the most common semester enrollments 1 - 7 students (35.6% of programs) and 8 - 14 students (30.7% of programs). In addition, 9.9% of field placement programs report enrollments of 15 - 21, 8.4% report enrollments of 22 - 28, 4.0% report enrollments of 29 - 35, and 11.4% report enrollments of more than 36.

report in this section. Because some schools completed Section D for less than all the clinics they acknowledged having in Section B, Question 1, the actual aggregate number of clients provided with civil legal services is likely to be significantly higher.

8. See fn. 7 for the calculation methodology.

Question 5: Part-Time and Night Students

Of the field placement programs at schools that have part-time or night students, 79.8% report that such students are allowed to participate in the field placement program.

Question 7: Faculty In Charge

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of those who *supervise* field placement programs from within the law school:⁹

Job Description	Percentage Reporting
Adjunct	26.3%
Tenured	25.3%
5 Year Contract	12.5%
6+ Year Contract	8.7%
Other	7.6%
1 Year Contract	5.9%
Tenure Track	4.8%
Clinical Tenured	3.1%
2 Year Contract	1.7%
3 Year Contract	1.7%
4 Year Contract	1.7%
Clinical Tenure Track	0.7%

9. At least one law school appears to have mistakenly read this question to include the person(s) who are in the field supervising the students (*i.e.*, the attorney who supervises the student at the placement site), rather than just those at the law school supervising the field placement program. As a result, that one school listed 35 separate field placement programs and 37 persons at the law school supervising the programs. The school's website, however, only lists two field placement programs. To adjust for this misunderstanding, the responses of this school to Questions 7(i) and 26(a)(i) have been collapsed to describe just two persons as "tenured."

Question 8: Average Number of Placements

The average number of placements supervised per person per semester is around 11, with the most common number supervised 5-6 students (17.3%), followed by 1-2 students (15.8%), 3-4 (12.4%), 5-6 (17.3%), 11-12 (7.9%), and 9-10 (7.4%), with all other responses less than 5.9%.¹⁰

Questions 9 & 10: Credits Awarded

A majority of field placement programs (63.4%) provide a fixed (rather than variable) number of credits for student work. The most frequent number of fixed credits students earn per semester is 3 (35.9%), followed by 2 credits (18.8%), 4 (18.0%), 6 (7.0%), 5 (6.3%), more than 10 (6.3%), and 1 (3.9%).

The most frequent number of hours a student must work per fieldwork credit hour is 50-59 hours (about 4 hours/week/credit) (22.3%), followed by less than 10 hours (less than 1 hour/week/credit) (21.3%), 40-49 hours (about 3 hours/week/credit) (16.8%), 70-79 hours (about 5 hours/week/credit) (11.4%), and 60-69 hours (more than 4 hours/week) (10.9%), with all other responses 5.9% or less.¹¹ The most common maximum number of fieldwork credits a student may earn in a single semester is 3 (28.7%), followed by 2 and 4 (each 17.8%), 6 (13.4%), more than 10 (9.9%), and 5 (5.0%), with all other responses 2.5% or less.

Question 11: Grading the Field Placement Program

The overwhelming majority of students receive a pass/fail grade for their fieldwork credit hours (84.2%), while 10.4% receive a letter or numerical grade, 3.0% receive a mixed pass/fail and letter/numerical grade, and 2.5% have the option of a pass/fail or letter/numerical grade.

Question 12: Evaluating Field Placement

The most common means of evaluating field placements is through student evaluations (36.5%), followed by on-site supervisor evaluations (31.2%), site visits (24.6%), and "other" (7.7%).

10. Given the range of responses (with many field placement programs answering "1 - 2"), it is likely that some respondents assumed the question sought the number of students overseen by the on-site supervisor at the placement office, rather than the number of students that the field placement program director at the law school (*i.e.*, the person(s) identified in Question 7) oversees, which was the response sought by this survey question.

11. Given the large number of field placement programs that reported students can work less than 1 hour per week in the field placement office per fieldwork credit hour, it is likely that some field placement programs may have misunderstood the question since students have typically been expected to work more than 40 hours at the placement site for each fieldwork credit. See J.P. Ogilvy & Robert F. Siebel, *Externship Demographics Redux 22-25* (2007) (unpublished manuscript); Robert F. Seibel & Linda H. Morton, *Field Placement Programs: Practices, Problems and Possibilities*, 2 CLIN. L. REV. 413, 428-29 (1996). Because of this likely misunderstanding, no average number of hours worked per fieldwork credit is provided.

Questions 13 & 14: Limitations on Placements

The overwhelming majority of field placement programs (88.6%) place limits on the type of placements permitted. Of the programs that have limitations, the most common limits are "only not-for-profit" (38.0%), "only government" (33.5%), "no private firms" (21.8%), and "only judicial" (19.0%).

Question 18: Limitations on Fieldwork Credits

A majority of schools (72.6%) limit the number of fieldwork credits a student may count toward the total needed for graduation. The most common limit is 12 fieldwork credits (at 15.6% of law schools), followed by 6 (13.7% of schools), 8 and 10 (each at 11.8% of schools), and 15 (9.8% of schools).

Question 19: Journals and Time-Logs

Most field placement programs (70.3%) use student journals in the course. Of those programs that use journals, only 8.5% share the student journal with the on-site field supervisor. A majority of programs (65.3%) use student time logs in the course. Of those using time logs, 51.5% require that the logs be verified by the on-site supervisor.

Question 20: On-Site Visits

Most field placement programs (60.4%) do regular on-site visits to the field placement offices. Where there are regular on-site visits, they are most often done once a semester (36.7%), followed by once a year (30.0%), and every other year (28.3%), with 5.0% of programs visiting more than once a semester.

Question 21: Training for On-Site Supervisors

Most field placement programs do not provide any training programs for the on-site supervisors (62.4%), with 14.9% of programs reporting that they always provide training and 22.7% reporting that they "sometimes" provide training.

Questions 22 & 23: Including a Classroom Component

Most field placement programs (87.6%) include a classroom component to the course, although only a minority of those programs (40.7%) award distinct credits attributable to the classroom component.

Question 24: Grading the Classroom Component

As with the classroom component (Question 11), most field placement program students (62.7%) receive a pass/fail for the classroom component, with 31.1% receiving a letter/numerical grade, 3.4% receiving a mixed pass/fail and letter/numerical grade, and 2.8% having the option of pass/fail or letter/numerical grades.

Questions 26 & 27: Teaching the Classroom Component

The following table shows the frequency of reported job descriptions (*i.e.*, position or status) of the *person teaching* the classroom component of a field placement program:

Job Description	Percentage Reporting
Adjunct	38%
Tenured	21%
Other	10.4%
5 Year Contract	7.6%
1 Year Contract	6.9%
6+ Year Contract	6.2%
Tenure Track	3.4%
Clinical Tenured	1.7%
4 Year Contract	1.7%
3 Year Contract	1.4%
2 Year Contract	1.0%
Clinical Tenure Track	0.3%
Staff Attorney	0.3%

The most common student-teacher ratio for the classroom component is 5 - 6 to 1 (16.4%), followed by 15 - 16 to 1 (13.0%), 7 - 8 to 1 (11.3%), 9 - 10 to 1 (10.7%), 11 - 12 to 1 (9.6%), 3 - 4 to 1 (7.3%), and 19 - 20 to 1 (6.8%), with all other reporting ratios 3.9% or less.

Question 28: Focus of the Classroom Component

The greatest portion of classroom component time is devoted to ethics/professional responsibility (20.8%), followed by case discussion (19.6%), skills instruction (18.8%), substantive law (18.6%), procedural law (14.5%), and simulation (12.8%). Every program devotes at least some percentage of class time to ethics/professional responsibility issues. On the other hand, nearly one-quarter of programs (22.9%) report not spending any time on simulation.

Questions 29 & 30: Pre- and Co-Requisites

A large minority of field placement programs (45%) require pre- or co-requisites for the course. Where there are pre- or co-requisites, ethics/professional responsibility is the most common required course (25.6%), followed by a course in the substantive area of practice in the program (23.8%), evidence (22%), civil procedure (16.1%), and criminal procedure (12.5%).

Question 31: Student Demand

In 42.1% of field placement programs, student demand typically exceeds the number of placements available (*i.e.*, demand greater than supply), while in 39.6% student demand typically does not fill the placements available (*i.e.*, supply greater than demand).

SECTION F. STAFFING SUB-SURVEY ASSIGNMENTS

Master Survey respondents were asked to electronically assign out the *Staffing Sub-Survey* to all persons employed by the law school that were teaching or supervising in any in-house, live client clinic or field placement program. Assignment out of the *Sub-Survey* was to be made regardless of the status of the person teaching (*i.e.*, everyone from tenured clinicians to staff attorneys, fellows, and adjuncts). Seven hundred and fifty four *Sub-Surveys* were assigned, with 357 people responding for a response rate of just over 47%. Part IV below discusses the *Sub-Survey* results.

SECTION G. PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS

Questions 1 & 2: Written Promotion and Retention Standards

Eighty-eight percent of respondent schools have written standards for the promotion, tenure or retention of clinical faculty.¹² At just over 72% of these schools, the written standards differed from the promotion, tenure and retention standards for doctrinal faculty.

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

Clinicians on *clinical tenure track* all report differences in the written standards for their advancement and/or retention as compared to the advancement/retention standards for *doctrinal faculty* at their schools. The chart below displays the various differences respondents were able to choose from, and the percentage of respondents on clinical tenure track who indicated that the difference was present when comparing such standards at their schools.

12. Respondents with written standards were asked to submit copies to CSALE for posting on its website. While the results to this request were limited, the standards that were submitted can be found at www.CSALE.org.

Community involvement, state and local bar activities, public advisory committee or commission participation, and/or participation in continuing professional education through teaching by clinical faculty are considered.	56.7%
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching by clinical faculty.	51.4%
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered.	51.3%
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship by clinical faculty.	51.3%
The number of publications clinical faculty are required to produce is lower.	45.9%
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy.	35.1%
There is a greater emphasis on the administration skills of clinical faculty.	29.7%
Other	29.7%
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for their ability to raise funds to support clinical programs.	21.6%

Question 4: Differences in Standards: Clinicians on Contracts

Clinicians employed on a contract all report some differences in the written standards for their advancement and/or retention as compared to the advancement/retention standards for doctrinal faculty at their schools. The chart below displays the various differences respondents were able to choose from, and the percentage of respondents on contract who indicated that the difference was present when comparing such standards at their schools.

Community involvement, state and local bar activities, public advisory committee or commission participation, and/or participation in continuing professional education through teaching by clinical faculty are considered.	71.7%
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching by clinical faculty.	65.2%
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered.	63%
The number of publications clinical faculty are required to produce is lower.	63%
Greater acceptance of “applied” scholarship by clinical faculty.	60.9%
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for participating in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy.	47.8%
Greater emphasis on the administration skills of clinical faculty.	43.4%
Clinical faculty receive “credit” for their ability to raise funds to support clinical programs.	23.9%
Other	17.3%

IV. STAFFING SUB-SURVEY RESULTS

Of the 145 schools responding to the *Master Survey*, 70 (48.27%), electronically assigned the *Sub-Survey* to people teaching in their applied legal education programs. A total of 754 *Sub-Surveys* were assigned, with 357 people responding for a response rate of just over 47%. The results are set forth below.

SECTION A. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

Section A of the *Sub-Survey* repeated Section A of the *Master Survey* to permit scholars to cross-reference the results of the *Sub-Survey* against the characteristics of the schools at which the *Sub-Survey* respondents teach. Because fewer schools are represented in the *Sub-Survey*, the results will not be reported here because the results to Section A of the *Master Survey* are more comprehensive.

The composition (by type of course taught) of the responding group (*Section B, Question 16*) to the *Sub-Survey* was: 76.8% of respondents taught exclusively in in-house, live client clinics; 13.5% taught exclusively in field placement programs; and 9.7% taught in *both* live client clinics and field placement programs.

SECTION B. RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT

Question 1(a): Clinical Teaching Experience

The number of years of full-time clinical teaching experience ranged from a high of 37 to a low of 0. The *average* years of teaching experience is 9.4, and the *median* number of years is 6.

Question 1(b): Part Time Teaching Experience

Nearly 42% of respondents report having taught part time at some point in their careers. The *average* years of part-time teaching experience is 5.1, and the *median* number of years of part time teaching is 3.

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

The number of years of full-time law practice prior to entering clinical teaching ranged from a high of 33 to a low of 0. The *average* years of practice prior to entering clinical teaching is 8.6, and the *median* number of years is 7.

Question 2: Race and Gender

The respondents were 55.75% female, 44.25% male. The race of the respondents is reported in the table below.

<i>Race</i>	<i>Percentage Reporting</i>
White	86.6%
African American	4.6%
Asian Indian	2.1%
Latin / Hispanic Descent	2.1%
Other	1.2%
Japanese	0.9%
Korean	0.9%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.6%
Chinese	0.6%
Vietnamese	0.3%
Filipino	0%
Guamanian or Chamorro	0%
Native Hawaiian	0%
Samoan	0%

Questions 3 & 4: Employment Status

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

Employment Status	Percentage Reporting
Contractual Appointment	45.7%
Tenured / Tenure Track	23.0%
Clinical Tenured/ Clinical Tenure Track	11.2%
Adjunct	11.8%
Other	4.1% ¹³
Staff Attorney	2.4%
Fellow	1.8%

Among those reporting employment by contract, the contract duration broke down as:

Contract Duration	Percentage Reporting
1 year contract	30.3%
5 year contract	24.5%
3 year contract	16.1%
6 year or more contract	15.5%
2 year contract	9.7%
4 year contract	3.9%

For those reporting contract status, just over 42% had no presumption of renewal. The majority of those falling in this group had contracts of four years or less (60% of the total population of clinicians on contracts).

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

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

Respondents were asked to provide their annual compensation in a series of fixed ranges. That actual dollar amounts can be released (in a form that does not tie the information to the respondent) in limited circumstances upon request to administrator@csale.org. For the purposes of this report, it can at least be noted that the data indicates that salary levels fairly closely correlate to employment status (*i.e., tenure/tenure track, clinical tenure/clinical tenure track, contract, etc...*).

Respondents report the *source* of their salaries as: "hard money" (tuition dollars, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) 80%; "soft money" (grants or other external funding) 10.75%; and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money 9.25%.

Fifty-seven percent of respondents report that their base salary covered a 12-month period, 32% a 9-month period, and 11% a 10-month period. For those whose base salary covered a 9- or 10-month period, 63% could apply for summer funding. Where summer funding was available, respondents were asked to express the amount of the funding as a percentage of their base salary. Percentages ranged from a single high of 33%, to a single low of 1%. The *average* is 10.13% and the *median* is 10%.

Question 11: Summer Operations: In-House, Live Client Clinics

Just over 76% of respondents report that their in-house, live client clinics do *not* operate as student enrolled programs during the summer yet have ongoing "cases." Among these "non-operating" clinics with ongoing cases, 56% received funding to hire interns to assist with case coverage. Among the 44% of clinics that have ongoing cases but receive no funding to hire interns, 10% receive funding to hire an attorney to *assist* with case coverage, and 16% receive funding to hire an attorney to take *primary responsibility* for ongoing cases.

Question 12: Summer Operations: Field Placement Programs

Nearly 53% of field placement programs had active placements over the summer. Among programs with active summer placements, just over 50% of the clinicians teaching in them received funding to allow them to pursue scholarship or other activities not related to supervising placements.

Question 13: Voting Rights

Faculty voting rights are set forth in the table below. In most cases, the nature of the respondent's voting rights closely correlated to their employment status (*i.e., tenure/tenure track, clinical tenure/clinical tenure track, contract, etc...*).

Matters To Be Voted Upon	Percentage of Respondents Entitled to Vote
Vote on All Matters Except Classroom/Doctrinal Faculty Hiring, Promotion, and Tenure	31.0%
Vote on All Matters	30.7%
No Vote But Can Generally Attend Meetings	21.5%
Not Permitted to Attend Faculty Meetings	14.2%
Vote on Administrative Matters Only	2.7%

Question 14: Law School Committee Participation

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

Committee Type	Percentage of Respondents Allowed to Participate
Committees addressing admissions	92.8%
Committees addressing curriculum	91.4%
Committees addressing technology	90.6%
Committees addressing career services/placement	89.2%
Committees addressing academic standards	88.7%
Committees addressing financial aid	87.4%
Committees addressing clinical faculty hiring and promotion	84.3%
Committees addressing budgeting	76.2%
Committees addressing classroom/doctrinal faculty hiring and promotion and tenure	52.9%

Question 17: Teaching Doctrinal Courses

Just over 24% of respondents are *not* permitted to teach doctrinal courses (excludes trial practice, appellate advocacy, and other "applied practice" courses) at their law schools. Of the nearly 76% of respondents who are permitted to teach doctrinal courses, nearly 87% are not relieved of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching such courses. Among those that are not relieved (*i.e.*, teaching both a clinic and doctrinal course), 24.2% received additional compensation for the additional workload.

Question 18: Teaching "Skills" Courses

Just over 17% of respondents are *not* permitted to teach "skills" courses (*e.g.*, trial practice, appellate advocacy, negotiations, and other "applied practice" courses) at their law schools. Of the nearly 83% of respondents who are permitted to teach "skills" courses, over 81% are not relieved of their clinical teaching obligations while teaching such courses.

Question 19: Scholarship as a Job Requirement

Just over 41% of respondents were required to produce scholarship. Of this group, 91% receive financial support for research assistance and 29.5% also have their teaching and supervision obligations reduced at some point (excluding summers) to permit them to pursue scholarship.

Question 20: Sabbaticals

Paid sabbaticals are available to just over 40% of respondents. Among this group, the average number of years of teaching required before the first sabbatical becomes available is 6.2 and the median number of years is 7.