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Executive Summary

Introduction and Task Force’s Charge

In February 2012, President Brennan wrote, “So, I resolve to address proactively questions of confidence in the quality of legal services and professionalism by focusing on the concerns of our young lawyers and providing the training, mentoring, and support they need to succeed in practice.” Likewise, President Brennan was concerned that new lawyers were entering the job market when it was at an all-time low while trying to support an unprecedented debt burden. The Task Force was created to first help the State Bar and other interested parties understand the current challenges facing new lawyers. The Task Force was also charged with making recommendations and developing a plan of action for the State Bar’s response.

The Task Force did not set out to provide wholesale recommendations to change the structure and future of the legal education system or law school curriculum. By and large, the Task Force used its time to gather specific information from the newest members of the Wisconsin State Bar and to make preliminary recommendations to help alleviate concerns. The Task Force considered and has incorporated into its report some of the findings of the ABA Task Force on the Future of Legal Education’s Draft Report and Recommendations issued on September 20, 2013 (the “ABA Report”). It is the position of this Task Force that any changes to the structure of the legal education system and curriculum must be led by a united effort on the national level, with the ABA leading such efforts. It is nearly impossible for Wisconsin’s law schools to make drastic changes absent a corresponding change on a national scale.

The first step in this process involved inviting individuals from different segments of the State Bar to join the Task Force who could provide a variety of perspectives. Three members of the Task Force were young lawyers and directors of the Young Lawyers Division Board at the time the Task Force began its work. A representative of each of the law schools in Wisconsin joined the Task Force to collaborate in finding solutions for soon to be graduating lawyers. Members of the Task Force were selected to promote diverse practice areas, geographic locations, gender, age, race and experience.

To accomplish its goals, members of the Task Force extensively reviewed written reports, articles, previous surveys conducted by the State Bar and the Young Lawyer’s Division (“YLD”) of their membership, and other written sources that have addressed the severe challenges facing the newest members of the legal profession. The efforts of the Task Force’s State Bar Liaison, Kris Wenzel, should not be overlooked because she routinely forwarded articles she received to members of the Task Force for our review. For a more comprehensive list of these written sources please see the Bibliography.

The Task Force determined that listening sessions should be held at both law schools to hear from current law students. A listening session was held on September 24, 2012 at the UW Madison Law School (“UW Madison”). Then, a listening session was held on September 26, 2012 at the Marquette University Law School (“Marquette”). Anecdotal findings and comments from these listening sessions are included in the report. It should be noted that participation in the listening sessions was very small despite the Task Force’s best efforts to advertise to
students. The views expressed during the sessions have been included, but they should not necessarily be extrapolated to account for larger trends or opinions of the entire student body at both institutions, or young lawyers as a whole in Wisconsin.

Members of the Task Force also attended meetings of other organizations to receive input from a variety of sources for the development of this report. These meetings include without limitation, the State Bar Section Leader’s Council meeting in July 2012, the annual retreat of the Milwaukee County Judges held in Lake Geneva in the Fall of 2012, and an Inns of Court meeting in Madison in September 2013. The Task Force also reached out directly to the YLD Board on at least two occasions for comments regarding the report and recommendations set forth therein. Throughout the time the Task Force has conducted its work members of the State Bar have approached us with comments, feedback and advice. Although these comments were too numerous to attribute, the Task Force would like to thank all members of the State Bar who have reached out to contribute to this report.

Finally, the Task Force completed a survey in August 2013 with help from Fred Petillo, Market Research Manager of the State Bar. The survey specifically focused on the economic hardships and pressures facing young lawyers, including without limitation, 71 in-depth questions about debt, employment and lifestyle choices.

Invitations for the survey were sent to 5,987 young lawyers on July 23, 2013. Young lawyers who qualified as members of the YLD received the invitation, including those lawyers in an inactive status or who were not in good standing because of nonpayment of dues. The survey closed on August 7, 2013 with 599 young lawyers responding, giving a response rate of 10.0%. The margin of error for this survey is ± 3.80 percentage points with 95.0% confidence for 599 responses.

I. What Challenges Does the New Lawyer Today Face?

A. Insights Gained from Young Lawyers in Wisconsin

To better understand exactly what challenges are encountered by young lawyers the Task Force held listening sessions at each law school. The following comments, insights and burdens were poignantly told by participants in these sessions. We have included these comments to provide a comprehensive report, but note again that the comments arising from the listening sessions came from a small number of participants and may not necessarily reflect the views of the larger student bodies at both institutions, or young lawyers as a whole in Wisconsin. Finally, true understanding of the challenges facing young lawyers would be impossible without including and referencing survey results obtained by the Task Force.

---

1 Approximately 3 current law students, 1 recent graduate of UW Madison and 1 recent graduate from an out-of-state law school residing in Madison, attended the listening session at UW Madison. Approximately 1 current law student and 2 recent graduates of Marquette Law School attended the listening session at Marquette.
1. Marquette University Law School Listening Session

"Not how I imagined my life was going to be," said a recent law school graduate who attended the listening session at Marquette. This particular student had a corporate job that she left to go to law school and had tried to plan things out financially. Even with a plan, she did not anticipate interest rates which resulted in loan payments that were one-half of her monthly take home pay. She stated that a number of job opportunities not only paid poorly, including some that paid even less than one might expect to earn as a barista at Starbucks, but they also did not offer basic benefits such as health insurance.

Another student tried to branch out after graduation to a JD advantage position. Participants in the Marquette listening session felt that some of these positions are more geared to paralegal duties. The NALP definition of a JD advantage position would indicate a larger scope. One participant explained that when recently interviewing for a position, the student was constantly asked "Why aren't you a lawyer?" The Task Force did not have enough information to interpret this comment. This may reflect a situation where that particular non-legal employer did not seemingly understand the transferable skills of holding a law degree. Or this comment may reflect routine questions by an employer about the interest and commitment of a JD candidate to a position that does not involve practicing law. Participants at the Marquette listening session explained that they are considering jobs based on availability as opposed to jobs that match with their interests, practice areas and/or practice settings.

2. University of Wisconsin Madison Listening Session

Discussion during the UW Madison listening session focused on loan repayment and public interest positions. Participants felt that many young lawyers cannot afford to take jobs in a public interest or pro bono sector, because they could not afford to repay their loans and finance their life. Furthermore, getting a public interest job is just as difficult as a law firm because competition is so much greater. Participating in Americorps only gave a law student $1,000 a summer to survive.

However, it should be noted that all public sector positions qualify for Public Service Loan Forgiveness ("PSLF"), discharging all qualifying federal loan debt after 10 years or 120 qualifying payments. Since the passage of the College Cost Reduction and Access Act, which provides for PSLF, public sector jobs may have become much more appealing. For further in-depth discussion of this topic, the Task Force encourages any interested party to read the Illinois

---

2 Using the National Association for Law Placement ("NALP") definition as a guide, the following would describe what could be considered a JD advantage position: "This category covers positions for which a law degree is required, preferred, or simply provides a demonstrable advantage in obtaining or performing the job, but does not require bar passage, an active law license, or involve practicing law. Examples of such positions include corporate contracts administrator, alternative dispute resolution specialist, government regulatory analyst, FBI special agent, accountant, as well as jobs with investment banks, jobs in personnel or human resources, jobs doing compliance work for college athletic departments or business and industry, and jobs in law school administration. Doctors or nurses who plan to work in a litigation, insurance, or risk management setting, or as expert witnesses, could fall into this category, as could journalists and teachers (in a higher education setting) of law and law-related topics."

UW Madison and Marquette have partnered to create the Wisconsin Public Interest Interview Program that has been very successful the last three years. Unfortunately, the availability of post-graduate positions (as opposed to positions for students) is limited since public sector budgets/funding has been so tight.

Another participant in the UW Madison listening session indicated that PILF awarded scholarships for 22 students but each student only received $2,500.\(^3\) With some student loans at fixed interest rates of 6.8% or 8.5%, according to participants at the UW Madison listening session, seeking a job in the public interest sector is financially impossible. It was noted that most young lawyers are making tough decisions to try to stay afloat financially. Many have not bought a house because they did not want to add to their debt-burden.

3. *Survey Results from Young Lawyer Members of Wisconsin State Bar*

   i. Background

   Before beginning a review of the challenges facing young lawyers, it is helpful to understand some background information about the individuals who participated in the survey. Approximately 81.5% of respondents to the survey have a primary residence in Wisconsin. About 8.5% of respondents do not live in Wisconsin, with the highest number of non-residents residing in Illinois and Minnesota.

   The largest percentage of respondents has a primary residence in the more urban counties of the State. Just over 28.3% of respondents reside in Milwaukee County. Residents of Milwaukee and Dane Counties make up approximately 49.8% of the respondents.

   Most of the respondents were graduates of one of the law schools in Wisconsin (approximately 64.7%). Another 20.8% of respondents were graduates of law schools in neighboring states (Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota).

   Most respondents graduated from law school in 2011, and the median year of graduation was 2010. Almost 71.8% of the respondents graduated law school since 2008.

   When asked about their primary practice area, respondents could provide unlimited responses. The top six practice areas were: contracts (16.7%), criminal law (15.7%), family law (14.0%), estate planning (13.0%), municipal/government issues (12.0%), and general practice

\(^3\) These types of scholarships are available for law student summer placements only and are comparable to earnings many students obtain in other summer placements. All students who applied for these funds in the last three years received funding, except for students who received remuneration from their summer employment.
(11.5%). These top six practice areas represented approximately 33.6% of all the areas mentioned.

Most respondents worked in smaller firms. About 48.5% of respondents worked in firms with up to 5 attorneys. Nearly 74.2% of respondents worked in a firm of up to 20 attorneys. The mean firm size for the survey respondents was 6.9 attorneys.

The mean age for respondents was 31.3 years. Women accounted for 58.1% of the sample surveyed, and men accounted for 41.9%.

ii. Financial Burdens Associated with Debt, Employment and Salaries

It should come as no surprise that survey respondents reported suffering tremendous burdens as a result of their debt. The responses that the Task Force received from its survey appear in line with other data currently available. However, the survey has brought to light several interesting concepts that may help guide efforts to alleviate these challenges.

To provide background, more than 9 out of 10 respondents used loans to finance their law school education. The median cost of a law school education for the respondents was $95,000, the mean was $94,822. The middle half of respondents ranged in law school costs from $68,000 to $120,000. About half of respondents (53.8%) had educational debt before they entered law school with a median value of $20,000. Overall, respondents reported still owing a median of $90,000 on their law studies. The survey also confirmed that the overall amount of loans borrowed for law school from 2005 to 2008 increased by approximately 36.8%.

About 8 in 10 respondents reported that their current law school debt was more than they expected it to be. Those with more debt were also more likely to report that their debt was more than they expected. Respondents considered themselves moderately knowledgeable about alternative loan repayment options. The survey highlighted an interesting phenomenon. The closer respondents’ debt matched their expectation of the level of debt, the less important the respondents felt information about alternative loan repayment options was.

More than half of respondents reported that as a result of having law school debt they have: delayed a major purchase, had their happiness impaired, made suboptimal career choices, delayed marriage or having children, requested a forbearance or deferment, or found it difficult to pay Bar dues or court fees. About 24.5% of respondents thought that they would experience these negative effects of law school debt for 6-10 years. More than a third (35.2%) expected the effects to last more than 20 years.

The mean time it took for respondents to find employment that required a law degree was 5 months. Seventy-five percent of respondents found their first job in less than 6 months. More than a third of respondents (33.5%) reported zero months to find their first job. The maximum time to find the first law job was 72 months (6 years). However, almost 39.2% of respondents reported being in this first job for less than 12 months.
Getting a job is still very dependent on who you know. Respondents identified the methods they most commonly used to find a first job as follows: networking (39.2%), and a job board (30.9%). It is important to note that these survey results are limited to what was used, and cannot be construed to imply what methods were most effective.

While the data suggests that students were less surprised about their debt levels, a much larger percentage of the respondents (78.9%) indicated that their earnings were less than they expected during law school. These individuals had an average law practice compensation of $41,591. Only 6.6% of respondents indicated that their salary was more than expected. These individuals had an average law practice compensation of $147,250. About 14.5% of respondents felt their salary met their prior expectations. These individuals had an average law practice compensation of $79,865. Usually respondents working for an employer had a higher mean income ($67,896), than those who were self-employed ($40,448).

Not only was income lower than expected for most law school graduates, but most (71.4%) said that they had benefits less than expected. Many attorneys were not covered by benefits. Fifteen to twenty percent of respondents had their benefits, including health, dental or vision, covered by a spouse or partner.

Knowledge and awareness about the levels of debt, employment options and salary levels was not always known by graduates before going to law school. About 1 in 7 respondents were aware that law school graduates were facing difficulties prior to entering law school. However, a majority (58.2%) first learned of the difficulties when they were enrolled in law school.

Almost two-thirds of respondents (64.2%) reported that they went to law school despite knowing the difficulties lying ahead because they wanted to help others or serve justice. More than half of respondents thought the risk was worth the reward or they trusted that they would find a way to succeed. A very small number (2.5%) went to law school with the preconceived expectation that they would start their own practice.

A sample of some of the comment from the survey sums up the current experience of respondents, and their sheer frustration:

- “I have two finance degrees, and I still wasn’t prepared for this.”
- “I am an indentured servant. But a professional.”
- “I have come to terms that I will never be able to pay off my student loans so I have started to relax more now.”
- “I am satisfied with my salary, but it took me 6 years to get here.”

More than 4 in 10 respondents said that they would not go to law school if they had to do it again, given what they know now. Given that many of these respondents may be trapped in a profession because of debt, there are huge risks to the profession as a whole with such a large number of individuals who now have buyer’s remorse.

When asked about whether respondents considered a career change, the largest percentage (38.3%) responded that they thought about changing their profession. The number of
respondents who actually changed their profession was only 1.2%. This signifies a large measure of unrest by young lawyers, which could become unrest for the profession at large.

Always present on the minds of the respondents is how they will handle their debt. As one respondent explained, “I think about my debt several times every day. Unfortunately there is no solution to it, so I just drag this debt around with me, like Jacob Marley was forced to drag his chains around for all eternity.”

B. Insights Gained from Other Sources

1. 2013 Economics of the Law Practice in Wisconsin Survey Report

The 2013 Economics of Law Practice in Wisconsin Survey Report echoes some of these statistics. According to the results of this survey, attorneys who work in private practice with 2 years or less of experience earned a median gross income of $47,496. The median gross income of all attorneys who were age 40 or younger in private practice was $66,000.

The mean annual salary of associate attorneys in private practice with no experience was $59,521. The median annual salary of associate attorneys in private practice with no experience was $50,000. The annual salary and billing rates increased steadily with the number of years of experience. The mean annual salary of associate attorneys in private practice with one to four years of experience was $64,639. The median annual salary of associate attorneys in private practice with one to four years of experience was $60,000.

According to this survey, the annual salary and billing rates for associate attorneys is positively correlated with the number of attorneys in the office, so as the size of the office increases so does the annual salary and billing rates of the attorneys. For example, a solo practitioner with no experience had a typical annual salary of $25,000, an associate attorney working in an office of 2 to-5 attorneys had a typical annual salary of $42,000, an associate with no experience in an office of 6 to25 attorneys earned $50,000 but an associate attorney with no experience working in an office of 26 or more attorneys had a typical annual salary of $85,000 a year. These figures were based on relatively small subsamples of respondents though.

The 2013 Economics of Law Practice in Wisconsin Survey Report was sponsored by the State Bar of Wisconsin and is currently scheduled to be discussed in the December 2013 edition of the Wisconsin Lawyer.

2. Illinois State Bar Association Report

The Illinois Report was issued on March 8, 2013, which detailed similar challenges facing young lawyers in Illinois. The Illinois Report was primarily based upon comments received during a series of public hearings, which were well attended and geographically diverse, and information reviewed by the members of the Special Committee.

The Illinois Report made three conclusions about the current situation facing young lawyers: “(1) excessive law school debt decreases the quantity and quality of legal services available to the public, (2) existing loan repayment programs are inadequate and do not solve the
problem, and (3) there is need to reform legal education to address the realities of the marketplace- the problem goes beyond cost.” More specifically, the Illinois Report attributes high debt burdens in young lawyers as the potential cause for larger systemic challenges: “smaller firms are challenged in hiring and retaining lawyers, fewer lawyers take public interest positions, the access to justice gap grows larger for the poor and middle class, more attorneys enter solo practice, less attorneys take on pro bono work, and young lawyer do not pursue careers in rural areas.” The Special Committee was concerned that high debt burdens are particularly troublesome for minority law school students and may lower the diversity of graduating students and practicing attorneys over time. Finally, the Illinois Report was concerned that the financial challenges of young lawyers could lead to a rise in ethical complaints for a variety of reasons.4

II. What Can We Do Today to Help Relieve These Challenges?

A. New Approaches to CLEs

While law students can usually attend State Bar CLEs for free, young lawyers do not get much of a discount. Participants at the Marquette listening session felt the State Bar could try to offer more discounts or reduced rates for CLEs. While the newest lawyers come from a high-tech generation, they prefer a high touch approach to CLEs. Participants in the UW Madison listening session reported that they would prefer to attend CLEs in person to network and meet other lawyers, but the in-person cost was too expensive.

Many law firms and JD advantage employers do not pay for associates to miss a day of work to attend a CLE. This puts new lawyers in a situation where they are forced to take webinar CLEs on their own time, or face double costs to attend a live seminar in the form of increased attendance costs for in-person CLEs and reduced salary for missing work.

One solution discussed during the UW Madison listening session was to encourage local bar associations to plan and carry out CLE’s using a low cost, luncheon format. The Dane County Bar Association, among many others, has already started to offer this option to young lawyers. Local bar associations could meet the high-touch preferences of new lawyers, while keeping costs at a manageable level. The Eastern District of Wisconsin Bar Association tried this approach for its Fall 2012 session by offering a reduced combination membership/event pricing which would encourage young lawyers to participate. Making a slight concession of $50 for a package price provided a valuable opportunity for young lawyers to network.

To the extent the State Bar could offer reduced CLEs to young lawyers, this would provide much needed relief. More long-range CLE objectives could be to focus content on more beginner topics or practical skills building. Possibly the State Bar and other legal education

4 Admittedly, the Illinois Report noted that there had not been a rise in the number of reported malpractice claims as of the time the report was issued. It was noted with concern that claims sometimes lag 3 to 4 years behind. If there is a correlation between the financial burdens facing young lawyers and malpractice claims, the data to support this correlation would not exist for a while.
providers could look to provide simultaneous alternative tracks at the same location for both experienced and young lawyers, with a joint networking or educational component.

In addition to seminars, to the extent the State Bar could offer reduced pricing to young lawyers for Books Unbound, Pinnacle membership or other printed materials for at least the first several years of practice, it would provide young lawyers with access to much needed educational materials.

B. Mentorship

Mentorship continues to be something that was discussed by young lawyers attending the listening sessions. More specifically, young lawyers were seeking guidance and mentorship designed to give tips for how to practice and bring in business. Almost 83.9% of young lawyer respondents to the Task Force’s survey have not participated in a mentorship program.

A participant at the UW Madison listening session informed the Task Force that she did not feel classes were offered in law school that addressed client relationships or lawyering skills. Admittedly, the UW Madison does regularly offer both an in-depth Lawyering Skills class with attorneys that come from all over the state, as well as, a class specifically focused on client interviewing and counseling. This comment may indicate a lack of awareness of program offerings which UW Madison reports it is addressing by redesigning its website and reorganizing its curricular offerings.

One of the participants at the Marquette Law School listening session noted that in South Carolina, every newly admitted lawyer in South Carolina must complete one year of mentoring with an experienced attorney. This mandatory Lawyer Mentoring Program has been in effect since April 2012. The program is designed to help new lawyers learn the practical and ethical aspects of the profession, develop professional relationships within the legal community, and develop practical skills to be successful in the profession. Mentors receive four (4) hours of CLE credit at the end of the one-year period.

Another function of a mentorship program would be to help younger lawyers find jobs in the area where they wish to practice. This might lead to opportunities for the practice sections and specialty bars in Wisconsin to connect younger lawyers with more seasoned members.

Perhaps a long-range objective for mentorship would include State Bar involvement to establish a career counseling and/or mentorship hotline. Experienced attorneys could staff such a hotline on a volunteer basis to address concerns about career development.

One of the biggest challenges to a mentorship program is getting approval by the Board of Bar Examiners ("BBE") for the structure of the program. The State of Illinois currently approves a certain amount of CLE credit for participation in a mentorship program through its ISBA Lawyer-to-Lawyer Mentoring Program. Participants in the ISBA Program can receive up to 15 credits toward CLE, including ethics credits. The fact that a neighboring state offers this type of solution is proof that mentoring can and does provide valuable legal education to the newest segment of lawyers, and participants should receive credit for their efforts.
C. Practice Management/Business Training

Although both law schools offer curriculum designed to help new lawyers start, build and manage their own law firms, many recent graduates who choose to hang out their own shingle do so only after graduation and unsuccessful pursuit of other job options. In response to the Task Force survey, 103 open-ended comments were made by respondents indicating that some kind of practical skills training was available in law school, but they did not take the training for a variety of reasons.

Accordingly, many graduates who went solo were not planning to do so when they were students and therefore did not take advantage of the courses being offered. In fairness, students do take these courses, but perhaps not enough or perhaps students do not realize the importance of the classes until it's too late. It is only after graduation and after unsuccessfully obtaining a law firm job that these graduates decide to hang out their shingle. The Task Force feels that it may be worthwhile to increase communication about the importance of these types of classes from a variety of fronts to stress that students should take the courses when they are offered.

There are limited options for a young lawyer to take business related courses at a reasonable rate. At the time this report was written, the Law and Entrepreneurship Clinic of the UW Madison Law School, the State Bar of Wisconsin, the Solo Small Firm General Practice Section of the State Bar of Wisconsin and Wisconsin Lawyer Mutual Insurance Company have agreed to collaborate in the development of an entrepreneurial training and mentorship program to assist attorneys in starting their own law practice. The challenges facing this type of program are determining who owns the materials which are subsequently developed and determining the appropriate pricing of this type of programming so that underemployed and unemployed attorneys can afford it. The program is still in the development stages at this time. UW Madison is also trying to bridge this gap by offering the Law & Entrepreneurship Clinic and opportunities of collaboration with the Business School. With potentially hundreds of young lawyers opting to hang out their shingle, the State Bar and other organizations may need to offer additional alternatives.

A huge challenge facing any entrepreneurial or business training program is accreditation by BBE. Consistent with the recommendations made by the Challenges to the Profession Committee, this Task Force also recommends that BBE find ways that law practice management, technology and business related learning can qualify for CLE credit.

D. Subsidize Bar Exam Costs

The State Bar can work to reduce the financial burden of becoming a new lawyer. One participant in the UW Madison listening session was an out-of-state law school graduate who took a bar exam. She reported having to pay $100 to attend the swearing-in ceremony and another $100 to take the bar exam on a computer, versus taking the handwritten exam. These types of costs become a frustration to a population of lawyers who are already making tough financial decisions.
E. Dues Structure Changes

Both listening sessions confirm that new lawyers would benefit by the dues structure approved by the Board of Governors. Most law school graduates attending the listening sessions did not know there was a mechanism to seek a hardship reduction for dues payments. (However, one survey commentator reported difficulty in obtaining this reduction.) Other participants in the listening sessions were delighted to hear that steps were being taken to reduce assessments for up to 5 years to help new lawyers make ends meet. Widely disseminating information about the dues structure change seems warranted.

F. Publicize and Promote Survey Results Conducted by State Bar

One of the key concerns reported by the Massachusetts Bar Association, Task Force on Law, the Economy and Underemployment (the “MBA Task Force”) focused its efforts on availability of data on admissions and post-graduate employment of law students in its Report entitled “Beginning the Conversation” issued on May 17, 2012 (the “Massachusetts Report”). The ABA and NALP have both taken a more active role in monitoring surveys done by law schools and the collection of information from recent graduates. The concern about available data is that entering law students do not have accurate expectations of life after graduation.

As of the date this report is issued, the YLD has conducted two surveys of its membership. While the focus of these surveys was not exclusively on employment, they provide insights about debt, employment and mentorship. Furthermore, the Task Force’s survey done in August 2013 explored questions about employment, debt and expectations. These are three ready made groups of data that can and should be widely available. There is no reason why this information should be locked away.

In fairness, there has been a significant focus on transparency of information provided by law schools regarding employment outcomes as well as admissions statistics, cost, scholarships, enrollment, and other information. Both UW Madison and Marquette should be applauded for working in conjunction with the organization Law School Transparency (“LST”), the ABA and NALP regarding information currently provided on school websites and other sources of information provided to prospective students. The amount and nature of the information provided now is considerably more extensive and detailed than just two years ago. The law schools in Wisconsin have made significant strides with regard to transparency, and they should continue to be vigilant toward this goal.

The State Bar should also actively seek to distribute and publicize the findings of these three surveys in a widely available format that can be easily reviewed by all members and the public at large. The State Bar should also continue to obtain feedback from its membership. To the extent participants in various future surveys could be given the opportunity to review their submissions in real time, this would allow participants to confirm that their comments were received.

The State Bar has the experience to conduct scientific surveys and can offer data obtained from surveys in an independent voice. For these reasons, the State Bar should consider
continuing periodic surveys that would provide relevant, independent and valuable insights to students before they are committing themselves to repaying educational debt for decades, or not being able to financially sustain their lives due to educational debt. This work would also help maintain an effective State Bar for what are becoming its growing, and soon to be typical, members.

G. Limited Assistance Representation

The MBA Task Force suggested a Limited Assistance Representation ("LAR") whereby a lawyer helps a client with discreet parts of a legal matter, and the client self-represents for the remainder. Massachusetts began LAR programs on a limited basis in 2006 and grew the program to several different areas by 2009. The MBA Task Force admitted that this program could be better suited to lawyers with some experience versus newly minted lawyers because there is less direct supervision or mentorship. Part of the MBA Task Force’s recommendations would be to expand their program to provide additional mentorship, training and support. While LAR has been alive and well in Massachusetts for some time, it is a new venture being undertaken in Wisconsin.

This past summer John Voelker, Director of State Courts, filed a Petition (Rule Petition 13-10) to amend the Rules of Professional Conduct for Attorneys, Rules of Civil Procedure, and Rules of Appellate Procedure to support and expand limited scope representation. This petition was submitted on behalf of the Court’s Planning and Policy Advisory Committee (PPAC), which is the court’s advisory committee on planning initiatives, the administrative structure of the court system and the expeditious handling of judicial matters. The rule changes will provide guidance to lawyers on how limited scope representation should take place including the service of court documents, communications from opposing counsel, and drafting of court documents. They are intended to provide guidance and help to ensure that limited scope representation supports and protects the interests of the client and the lawyer, both procedurally and ethically. The Petition is currently pending before the Supreme Court and is supported by Wisconsin’s Access to Justice Commission. If the Petition is granted, it will facilitate the ability of lawyers to engage in LAR in Wisconsin and similar mentorship, training or support may be necessary for newer attorneys.

H. Current Programs that Could be Enhanced

In trying to accomplish the objectives of its mission and get the process going, the Task Force did not have the resources to intensely review existing programs offered by the State Bar (including its committees, divisions and sections), local and specialty bars, law schools and others to provide comprehensive recommendations. For purposes of providing some direction, the Task Force highlights the following programs that have been emphasized by others who are simultaneously studying this situation. Admittedly, more work may be needed to understand the complexities of these programs and how they can assist young lawyers.

1. Lawyer Referral Services

The State Bar currently offers a Lawyer Referral Services program by which members of the public can call and speak to a lawyer. The MBA Task Force suggested this program as an
off-the-shelf way to help young lawyers build their practice and gain experience in certain practice areas. It is unknown at this time how many lawyers participate in this program, whether there is a cost to participate, what requirements must be met to be eligible and how many calls or contacts come through. That said, fine tuning an existing program could help get more immediate relief to those in need.

2. **Reduced Fee Panels**

The State Bar currently sponsors a modest means panel designed to serve people who earn too much to qualify for free legal services but too little to pay an attorney's standard rate. State Bar members agree to provide services at reduced cost to moderate income clients who have been screened by the Bar's Lawyer Referral and Information Service ("LRIS") for income and case qualifications. The cases include bankruptcy, consumer law, criminal law, family law, foreclosure, and probate. Attorney panelists agree to limit their hourly rates and amount of initial retainers.

In Massachusetts, several local bar associations and the Massachusetts Bar Association itself offer a reduced fee panel designed to serve marginally indigent clients who do not qualify for representation by legal assistance agencies but who also cannot afford typical private counsel. The cases handled in Massachusetts are not designed as a contingent fee and would be in areas such as mortgage foreclosure, collections, probate, family cases and criminal cases. Client participants must have an income that does not exceed 200% of the federal poverty guidelines. Attorney panelists agree to limit their hourly rates and amount of initial retainers. This type of program may also provide some immediate relief for young lawyers.

3. **Court Appointments in Federal, State and Family Courts**

Wisconsin has several existing programs that provide court appointed attorneys to clients in federal, state and family courts. Setting aside the issue of hourly rates and pay, which is a huge obstacle for the long term growth of these programs, the Task Force recognizes that these programs may offer opportunities to young lawyers with some minor and simple enhancements. The MBA Task Force advocated for expanding several of its bar appointment programs. The Task Force recommends a joint effort to look at expanding these programs which would not only help young lawyers, but would positively impact the entire judicial system and members of the public.

III. **What Long Term Strategies Must Be Pursued to Alleviate These Challenges?**

Overcoming the challenges facing young lawyers will require the State Bar, practicing lawyers, law firms, pro bono legal providers, law schools, and bar associations to develop a long range plan that may entail shifting certain paradigms. With all the time and effort spent so far, the Task Force does not have one shining example or recommendation that will hail an end to the challenges in Wisconsin. To be true to our mission, we present the recommendations below to the State Bar Board of Governors and leadership with the hope that these proposals will move things forward. It is up to leadership at the State Bar to take the next steps.
The recommendations set forth below are not exhaustive, and are gathered from a variety of sources. However, they present concrete and actionable steps that could make a difference, and the Task Force presents these discussion points to be taken up now that the Task Force’s work has concluded.

A. Small Business Incubator

Use the resources of the State Bar to create and develop a small business incubator designed to encourage solo and small firm businesses, with a particular emphasis in helping young lawyers who are hanging out their own shingle.

B. Sponsored Law Firm

Use the resources of the State Bar to form a law firm that would provide short term apprenticeship experience for recent graduates. The focus could be on providing legal assistance to the underserved and poor.

C. Legal Match Program

Explore opportunities where the State Bar can help younger lawyers find jobs in more rural or other outlying areas. Law school representatives agree that these areas are not on the “radar screen” for most recent graduates because there may be a lack of interest or a lack of information. The State Bar could work with law schools, or on its own, to provide this type of job board for experienced attorneys and young attorneys to meet.

D. Legal Residency Program and Clinical Classes

This recommendation focuses upon the curriculum offered at law schools. Without a doubt, both law schools in Wisconsin have a long history of offering clinical classes in a variety of focus areas to provide hands-on training to students. All evidence suggests that large numbers of law students take at least one clinical class in the course of their studies. At UW Madison, a significant number of students participate in the live-client clinics. A majority of each year’s class enrolls in a clinic, and many enroll in more than one clinic. Many of these clinics offer a summer immersion program as well as semester long projects. The clinical offerings teach a wide range of lawyering skills that range from litigation to patient advocacy or business planning.

Many other students are involved in externships with a variety of government agencies and not-for-profit legal organizations. At the UW Madison, in order to receive academic credit for an externship, a student must devote a minimum of forty-five hours of work for each academic credit, and submit periodic reports on the externship experience, including a final paper reflecting upon the value of the externship and a written evaluation of the externship. (Students enrolled in the Law Externship course for academic credit may not receive compensation for their work.) Offering a broader spectrum of hands on training would enhance the practical education of law students and increase their marketability.
Although both law schools provide clinical experiences as part of the overall curriculum, there is no requirement at this time forcing a student to take them prior to graduation. Nor does the Board of Bar Examiners require a certain number of clinical class credits to become licensed in the State of Wisconsin. As noted by the MBA Task Force, the U.S. News & World Report (U.S. News) ranking system does not appreciate or calibrate curriculum at the law school and rate its effectiveness to prepare students for life after graduation. Admittedly, taking on the ranking developed by U.S. News would not be for the faint of heart. Currently there is no national movement among law schools to challenge the U.S. News rankings which would be necessary to make those rankings more useful to potential enrollees. Clearly, for such a movement to ever occur would require collaboration from entities other than just law schools.

The MBA Task Force proposed that the entire third year of law school should be retuned to follow the mold of a medical or dental residency program. They proposed that students should spend the last year of law school doing a variety of clinical courses and hands on training in different practice areas. According to the MBA Task Force, a residency program would give students the hands on training that normal law school curriculum could not. The benefit to business participants is that they would get lawyers at a reduced rate. The benefit to participants is that they can build clinical experience.

The ABA has recently convened a task force of experts in legal education, legal aid, and legal service delivery (The BA Legal Access Job Corps Task Force) to examine the possibilities for providing legal services to underserved populations while offering new lawyers both work and legal experience. The task force will examine existing models as well as new initiatives such as legal residency and incubator programs highlighted above.

The MBA Task Force highlighted Northeastern University’s School of Law, Cooperative Legal Education Program. Northeastern University integrates four quarters of full-time employment into its 2L and 3L curriculum. Work experiences vary, can be tailored, and would provide opportunities for students to gain real-life work experience in over 900 types of jobs across the country and in other countries. According to data provided by Northeastern University, approximately 40% of graduates from the cooperative program find employment after graduation with one of the employers they worked for during school.

E. Legal Temp Placement Agency

Consider and explore whether the State Bar can serve as a “Manpower” or legal temp placement resource for firms and corporations to obtain temporary and contract lawyer assistance on a project basis.

F. Law School Funded Court Clerk Positions

The MBA Task Force proposed to continue an existing program whereby law schools employ their students as clerks in the court system, while providing needed assistance to the judiciary facing shrinking resources due to budget cuts. In Massachusetts, the law schools decide to create these paid positions, set the salary range (stipend), handle applications and select
initial candidates. These candidates are then presented to a panel of judges who make the hiring decision. This program has only been done for approximately two years in Massachusetts.

G. Cross Training for Financial Planning and Retirement Planning

Offer financial planning and retirement planning to young lawyers at a reduced rate, because these lawyers may not be able to afford these types of services, and many survey comments expressed a desire for them.

H. Explore or Enhance Alternative Loan Repayment Options

Responses from the Task Force survey indicate that young lawyers do not have a lot of information about loan repayment options or financial planning, and did not have the help to appropriately enroll in the right programs. The State Bar could serve in an ombudsman capacity to provide much needed information about these programs, and to provide individuals to assist with program enrollment, as needed.

Several verbatim responses received from the Task Force survey indicated that respondents owed more than when they graduated from the alternative loan repayment options because of such plans’ design calling for only small interest or principal payments. For example one of these comments was, “I can’t even pay off the interest every month, so my balance is going UP not down!” Many of the alternative loan repayment options lower the payments in the short term which causes interest to continue to accrue over time. At the end of the term of the loan, individuals will have paid significantly more.

Other concerns have been expressed at great length in the Illinois Report. These concerns include without limitation, private loans usually do not qualify for these programs, debt forgiveness could lead to substantial income tax burdens, qualifying married individuals are analyzed for eligibility based upon their spouse’s income, and the terms for the debt forgiveness are too long. The Task Force does not repeat in great detail all the aspects of these concerns here, but would strongly suggest that the State Bar and others follow the recommendations set forth in the Illinois Report.

To the extent the recommendations set forth in the Illinois Report require the lobbying of state and federal legislators by attorneys’ respective state and national representative organizations, these steps should be considered to try and provide relief to young lawyers.

I. Continue To Promote Technology Development

The State Bar should continue to strive to provide the most updated platforms for technology for its membership. One of the areas the State Bar could explore is to shift from email listservs to topical forums, which would preserve conversations into a more stable FAQs format. This would allow experienced and young attorneys to easily reference topics. The State Bar should harness technology to promote and communicate with its membership, including young lawyers, about programs mentioned in this report in a targeted fashion so that these issues of greatest importance to the young lawyers affected are able to come to their fore.
J. Young Lawyers Division Initiatives

An immediate recommendation to be considered by the State Bar and implemented as soon as possible is that all members of the State Bar who are eligible for membership in the YLD should be automatically enrolled in the YLD listserv as they become a member of the State Bar. The YLD Board uses its listserv to connect with its membership about upcoming programs, including programs of the State Bar. In addition, the listserv serves as a real time resource for young lawyers with questions who do not have the luxury of walking down the hall to ask a partner. The YLD Board’s efforts to provide networking, leadership training, educational opportunities and pro bono or public service options should continue to receive the full support of the State Bar.

Most importantly, the YLD Board believes that its participation is essential to any future steps taken to implement the recommendations of this Task Force. The YLD Board has striven in recent years to reform its member participation in elections, its Annual Meeting and the other activities mentioned above. Although not a final decision making body as to State Bar policies or services, this board’s efforts to be constituent-representative should not be ignored. That is to say, this Task Force and the YLD Board serve different angles towards the same member demographic. The possibilities of the YLD Board and any successor entity to this Task Force working in conjunction seem strong.

Several recommendations were presented to the Task Force from a portion of the YLD Board. It is the Task Force’s position that the following issues should be vetted more fully with the YLD Board and that any future steps taken on these issues should be done in consultation with the YLD Board: (1) consider how to possibly involve the YLD in lobbying programs, especially as it might relate to lobbying efforts involving student loans or alternative loan repayment options; (2) amend the voting criteria of the ABA House of Delegates YLD representative to a vote of the YLD, whether its membership at large or its Board, versus a vote of the State Bar Board of Governors to create a more directly representative construct on this nationally organized attorney representative body that addresses issues beyond the capacity of the State Bar alone; and (3) consider whether the ratio of seats allocated to YLD members on the State Bar Board of Governors should be increased, by for instance, reallocating one seat to be designated for a young lawyer from any district with multiple seats.

IV. Closing Comments

One of the final recommendations of the MBA Task Force was to establish a permanent committee that would continue to study the factors contributing to law school graduate underemployment and strategies to overcome this challenge. This is perhaps the single recommendation that could most provide additional assistance to guide the future steps taken in Wisconsin to overcome the challenges enumerated in the Task Force survey and report. Task Forces and Boards of Governors come and go, but establishing a permanent body to monitor the situation, oversee new programs and push for new incentives could be the key between success and failure.
For these reasons, the Task Force joins in the recommendation of the MBA Task Force and recommends that a permanent committee of the State Bar composed of particularly qualifying individuals should be established to assist in future the efforts to lessen the challenges facing young lawyers.
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