The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law

CUA Law Scholarship Repository

Scholarly Articles and Other Contributions

Faculty Scholarship

2007

Externship Demographics Redux

J.P. "Sandy" Ogilvy

The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law

Robert Seibel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.edu/scholar>

Part of the [Legal Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

J.P. "Sandy" Ogilvy & Robert Seibel, Externship Demographics Redux, CUA COLUMBUS SCHOOL OF LAW LEGAL STUDIES RESEARCH PAPER NO. 2007-13 (2007).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at CUA Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarly Articles and Other Contributions by an authorized administrator of CUA Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact edinger@law.edu.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

COLUMBUS SCHOOL OF LAW

Legal Studies Series

Working Paper No. 2007-13 Date: 2007

Externship Demographics Redux

J.P. Ogilvy & Robert F. Seibel

This paper can be downloaded without charge from
the *Social Science Research Network* electronic library at:

<http://ssrn.com/abstract=1077551>

Legal Studies Series Editor – Elizabeth Edinger: edinger@law.cua.edu

The Columbus School of Law – <http://law.cua.edu/>

Externship Demographics Redux

by J. P. Ogilvy & Robert F. Seibel¹

Introduction

What we now call externships have a long history in legal education.² Indeed, in the century following the American Revolution, most preparation for admission to practice law was by way of the precursors of today's externships: apprenticeships, clerkships, and law office study. Until late into the 19th century or early 20th century, the number of students engaged in pre-admission legal education in a college, university, or stand-alone law school was quite small. Most lawyers in the United States learned their craft by some combination of training in the offices of judges or attorneys, self-directed reading, and on-the-job training. In contrast, today, almost everyone applying for admission to the bar has studied law in a law school; only a handful of applicants have prepared exclusively through law office study; and many have worked in law offices under the auspices of their law school as part of a formal externship.

This article seeks to describe some aspects of the current state of externships within American legal education by reporting on the findings of a national survey of externship programs conducted during fall 2002 and spring 2003. First, however, it may be instructive to

¹J. P. "Sandy" Ogilvy is an Ordinary Professor of Law at Columbus School of Law, The Catholic University of America and the Director of the Office of Law and Social Justice Initiatives. Robert F. Seibel is a Visiting Professor of Law at California Western School of Law

²In this article, we use the term externship to refer to courses in which a student earns course credit for engaging in law-related work at a placement, usually outside of the law school, and in which the work of the student is guided and supervised by an employee of the placement rather than a faculty member of the law school. The course may have a contemporaneous seminar or tutorial that is, generally, taught by a full-time or part-time member of the law school faculty. Other terms for the same concept are used, including field placement program, internship, and mentorship.

review some of the history of law office study as preparation for admission to the bar.

Unfortunately, this only can be a sketch of that story because of the paucity of good historical data on the nature and extent of this form of preparation for practice.

It is commonly believed that until the 1920s or 1930s, lawyers-to-be were trained principally through an apprenticeship lasting several years. This view, however, significantly overstates the case. Law office study as a prerequisite to admission to practice had its zenith as early as 1800 when, according to Robert Stevens, “fourteen out of nineteen jurisdictions required a definite period of apprenticeship, often extending five years.” Between 1800 and the end of the Civil War, in part as a result of the impact of Jacksonian democracy’s distrust of professional privilege, the states generally swept away educational requirements for entering the legal profession. By 1840 only eleven out of thirty jurisdictions required law office study, and by 1860 only nine of thirty-nine jurisdictions did so.³ With few formal requirements in place, admission to the bar largely was dependent on and controlled by local courts and the lawyers who practiced before them.⁴ After the Civil War, states increasingly began to prescribe a minimum period of law study as a prerequisite for admission to practice. According to A.Z. Reed, this was in response to agitation by local bar associations and, with its organization in 1878, the American Bar Association, both responding to the “perceived connection between low standards for admission to the bar and the existing corruption of judges and politicians.”⁵

Even after this wave of reform, by 1881 only sixteen of thirty-nine jurisdictions required

³ROBERT STEVENS, TWO CHEERS FOR 1870 417 (1971).

⁴See ALFRED ZANTZINGER REED, TRAINING FOR THE PUBLIC PROFESSION OF THE LAW 68-78 (1921) [hereinafter REED, TRAINING].

⁵REED, TRAINING, *supra* note 3 at 90-91.

a definite term of clerkship (six of these allowed entrants to substitute law school for some of the term of pupillage, but only one excused more than a year of apprenticeship).⁶ By 1890 the number of jurisdictions prescribing a period of study had risen to twenty-three out of forty-nine and in 1917 to thirty-six out of forty-nine. In percentage terms, this was still lower than it had been in 1800.⁷ By 1921, most jurisdictions allowed, but did not require, an applicant to substitute attendance at law school for most, if not all, of the prescribed period of study.⁸

This period, 1890-1920, appears to be the cross-over period when more applicants for admission to the bar were trained in law schools than by self-study and law office study. In the twenty years between 1890 and 1910, the number of law schools jumped from 61, enrolling 4,418 law students, to 124, enrolling 19,567 students.⁹ It has been estimated that in 1890, seventy-five percent of lawyers entered practice without any law school training but that by 1910 the numbers were reversed: eighty percent of the applicants for admission were law school graduates.¹⁰

More detailed data from some of the larger jurisdictions is consistent with these

⁶4 A.B.A. REP. 302-304 (1881) (Table of requirements for admission to the Bar in the several states of the United States and the District of Columbia).

⁷REED, TRAINING, *supra* note 3 at 91-92.

⁸*Id.* at 258.

⁹*See* 4 A.B.A. REP., *supra* note 5 at 318.

¹⁰PETER DEL. SWORDS AND FRANK K. WALWER, THE COSTS AND RESOURCES OF LEGAL EDUCATION 33 (1974) citing Eldon R. James, *The Law School and the Practicing Lawyer*, 24 A.B.A. REP. 678 (1916). Writing in 1916 and using figures of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, James found that graduates from law schools accounted for about forty percent of all admissions to the bars of the various jurisdictions during the forty years from 1870 to 1910, increasing from about twenty-five percent of the admissions in 1870 to about sixty-seven percent in 1910.

aggregate numbers. In New York in 1900 eighteen percent of those seeking admission to the bar had no law school training; by 1919 it was less than three percent and in 1922, only nine out of 643 first-time bar examination takers had no law school training.¹¹ In 1915-1916 less than nine percent (104) of the 1,182 lawyers admitted to the Illinois bar had prepared through law office study. Although here the differential was greater in Chicago (38 persons or 4% of the total admitted) than for downstate applicants (66 persons or 22%).¹²

This dramatic shift from law office study to law school education was not due to any legislated requirements. In 1923, no state required entrants to attend law school,¹³ and as late as 1934-1935, forty-five jurisdictions continued to admit applicants who prepared for the bar examination through law office study.¹⁴

Why did academic education eclipse law office study as a means of preparing for admission to the profession and why did it do so in such a short period of time? Commentators have advanced a number of theories to attempt to explain this phenomenon.

W.G. Hammond, writing in 1881, attributed the rise in the number of law schools to two principal factors, the ascendancy of the railroads and the adoption of Code Pleading.¹⁵ The

¹¹RICHARD L. ABEL, *AMERICAN LAWYERS* 42 (1989), citing WAYNE K. HOBSON, *THE AMERICAN LEGAL PROFESSION AND THE ORGANIZATIONAL SOCIETY 1890-1930*, 106 (1986).

¹²ABEL, *supra* note 10 at 42, citing Henry Winthrop Ballantine, *The Place in Legal Education of Evening and Correspondence Schools*, 48 A.B.A. Rep. 418-19 (1918).

¹³THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, *LEGAL EDUCATION* 7 (1923).

¹⁴THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, *ANNUAL REVIEW OF LEGAL EDUCATION*, table between 36-37 (1935).

¹⁵W.G. Hammond, *American Law Schools, Past and Future*, 7 S.L. REV. n.s. 400, 407-09 (1881-1882).

growth of rail travel loosened the bonds of lawyers to the place where they had been trained. A lawyer trained in the common law practice of Boston would find practice in California quite different. Similarly, the adoption of Code Pleading by many jurisdictions lessened the need to learn the arcana of the specific pleading forms of a local jurisdiction and thus, for both reasons, local law office training lost a significant benefit.

A.Z. Reed attributed the growth of law schools to the growing complexity of American law and the perceived need for students of the law to supplement their law office training with theory, available only in the law schools.¹⁶

Abel suggests that apprenticeship positions became scarce as lawyers increasingly chose not to admit apprentices or chose instead to hire permanent clerks or secretaries.¹⁷ He also suggests that the increasing numbers of new immigrants to this country seeking entry into the profession were unlikely to be welcomed by the lawyers who did accept apprentices but who were of a different class, ethnicity, religion and culture than the immigrants.¹⁸

Next Abel suggests that the introduction of a common, written bar examination in each jurisdiction may have caused applicants to believe that training in a law school offered a better chance of surmounting that barrier than law office study.¹⁹ By 1917, thirty-seven of forty-nine jurisdictions (75%) had central boards of bar examiners, replacing the systems of admission that

¹⁶REED, TRAINING, *supra* note 3 at 73, 90-91, & 281.

¹⁷See ABEL, *supra* note 10 at 43. The introduction of the typewriter by Remington Arms in 1873 has been credited with drying up clerkship opportunities for young aspiring lawyers as their employers no longer relied on hand copying of documents, which could be prepared faster and more legibly by typewriter.

¹⁸*Id.*

¹⁹*Id.*

relied on local courts to administer.²⁰

During some times and in some places between the American Revolution and the late 19th century, well-designed apprenticeships did provide a solid preparation for practice, but just as often the apprenticeship consisted of little more than repeated opportunities for copying documents and running errands and many would-be lawyers were able to gain admission to the profession by doing only enough to pass an undemanding oral examination administered by a local judge.²¹ However much practical training for law practice was lost by the disappearance of apprenticeships, law schools did not pick up the task of teaching the practical skills formally learned from a well-designed apprenticeship. Reed, writing in 1921, said, “The failure of the modern American law school to make any adequate provision in its curriculum for practical training constitutes a remarkable educational anomaly. . . [T]here is nothing in American legal education that corresponds in any way with the elaborate clinical facilities or shopwork provided by modern medical and engineering schools. Nor, so far as the writer is aware, is there any foreign country in which education for the practice of law is so largely theoretical as it is in America.”²²

By the 1930s, some isolated voices within the academy and bar joined Reed in

²⁰REED, TRAINING, *supra* note 3 at 102-103 and ROBERT STEVENS, LAW SCHOOL: LEGAL EDUCATION IN AMERICA FROM THE 1850s TO THE 1980s 25 (1983).

²¹*See, e.g.*, John Samuel, “John Cadwalader’s Office,” in Law Association of Philadelphia, *Centennial Addresses* 366-374 (1906); F. CHASE, LEMUEL SHAW 120-21 (1918), quoted in ANTON-HERMANN CHROUST, 2 THE RISE OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION IN AMERICA 174 (1965); CHROUST, *id.* at 175 (“It goes without saying that ‘apprenticeship training’ was of widely varying thoroughness and quality, and that particularly in the lesser law office much of it was of a purely mechanical type”); and REED, TRAINING, *supra* note 3 at 95-100.

²²REED, TRAINING, *supra* note 3 at 280.

questioning the law school's exclusive reliance on doctrinal analysis to prepare students for practice.²³ From the late 1890s through the early 1960s, a small number of law schools experimented with clinical legal education. Most of these programs, like the legal dispensary begun by a law club at the University of Pennsylvania in 1893, functioned with law student volunteers who received no course credit for their work.²⁴ In 1928, the University of Southern California established an experimental six-week clinical program under the guidance of John S. Bradway,²⁵ who later created the first full-fledged in-house clinical program at Duke University.²⁶ These programs were the first to integrate theory and practice in a single setting within a law school.

In 1958, discussions principally between William Pincus, then a program officer at the Ford Foundation, and Emery A. Brownell, the executive director of the National Legal Aid Association, concerning the "American system of justice and the structure of legal education"

²³See, e.g., Jerome Frank, *Why Not a Clinical Lawyer-School?*, 81 PA. L. REV. 107 (1933); George K. Kardiner, *Why Not a Clinical Lawyer-School? – Some Reflections*, 82 U. PA. L. REV. 785 (1934); and Karl N. Llewellyn, *On What Is Wrong with So-Called Legal Education*, 35 COLUM. L. REV. 651 (1935).

²⁴ALFRED ZANTZINGER REED, PRESENT-DAY LAW SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA 217 (1928) [hereinafter REED, PRESENT-DAY]. Reed's research revealed that in addition to legal aid activities by students at Pennsylvania (1893) and Harvard (1913), other independent legal aid societies were started among students at George Washington (1914), Yale (1915), and Tennessee (1916). Reed asserts that the law faculty of the University of Denver was the first to recognize the educational possibilities of legal aid work when, in 1904, it organized a 'Legal Aid Dispensary' as part of the regular work of the school. The experiment was abandoned after about six years because of its expense and the practical difficulties that arose in assigning cases to the students.

²⁵See John S. Bradway, *The Beginning of the Legal Clinic of the University of Southern California*, 2 S. CAL. L. REV. 252 (1929).

²⁶See John S. Bradway, *Legal Aid Clinics in Less Thickly Populated Communities*, 30 MICH. L. REV. 905 (1932).

eventually led to the creation of the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR) and a significant growth in clinical courses in American law schools.²⁷ CLEPR urged law schools to create in-house, live-client clinics, but funds were provided for a wide variety of clinical experiences. Although Bill Pincus, through the use of CLEPR funding, sought to create the conditions necessary for in-house, live-client clinics to become the dominant form of clinical legal education in American law schools, it is far from certain that this in fact occurred, except in terms of the percentage of law schools' operating budgets devoted to clinical education. Several surveys of clinical programs dating from 1969 and later show the continuing strength of "farm-out" clinics, which would now be called externships.

A survey of law schools begun by the Legal Aid Committee of the American Bar Association's Law Student Division in March 1968, and completed by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association in 1969, found 86 law schools had legal aid clinics. Of these only 48 granted credit for student participation, although another three required student participation as a

²⁷Their collaboration first led to a grant of \$800,000 awarded by the Ford Foundation to the National Legal Aid Association to establish the National Council on Legal Clinics (NCLC). Between 1959 and 1965 NCLC made grants to nineteen law schools totaling \$500,000 for a variety of clinical experiences for law students. Then, in 1965, the Ford Foundation made a grant of \$950,000, plus the balance of funds unexpended by NCLC, to the Association of American Law Schools to continue the work of NCLC for five more years. NCLC changed its name to the Council on Education in Professional Responsibility (COEPR). From 1965 to 1968, COEPR made grants totaling approximately \$290,000 to twenty-one law schools. "Half of these grants were for summer internships . . . [T]he remaining grants were for clinical programs conducted during the regular school year." In the spring of 1968, the Ford Foundation authorized the creation of the Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR) and agreed to provide funds. See Orison S. Marden, *CLEPR: Origins and Program in CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION FOR THE LAW STUDENT* 5-7 (1973); Lester Brickman, *CLEPR and Clinical Education: A Review and Analysis, in CLINICAL LEGAL EDUCATION FOR THE LAW STUDENT* 57 (1973); and News from the Ford Foundation (Jun. 12, 1968) (announcing the establishment of an independent Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility (CLEPR) and an appropriation of approximately \$6 million for its work over the first five years of an expected ten-year program) (photocopy on file with the author Ogilvy).

graduation requirement. Of the 48 reporting schools that granted credit for student participation in the legal aid activities of the law school, 36 indicated that the law school was primarily responsible for some or all of the program; 9 reported that a paid attorney was primarily responsible; 2 ascribed primary responsibility to a volunteer attorney; and 1 indicated that students had primary responsibility for program supervision.²⁸

A CLEPR survey that examined clinical and other extra-classroom experiences in law schools during the 1970-71 academic year found 48 law schools had a Law School Clinic, defined by CLEPR in the report as a law school-run neighborhood law office, or a legal services office located at the law school itself, where policy for the office is made by the clinical director or other law school agency. The report found that 63 law schools had some form of externship (some schools had both Clinics and externship programs).²⁹ The report divided externship experiences into General Placements, Selected Placements, and Class with Field Component. In General Placements, students were placed with public and private law offices and faculty involvement was confined to arranging the placements. In Selected Placements, students were placed in a law office, usually a public agency, and were under the joint supervision of agency personnel and law school faculty, although the faculty member had no policy-making role in regard to the placements. With respect to the Class with Field Component category, students

²⁸JEWEL KLEIN, LAW SCHOOL LEGAL AID PROGRAMS: A SURVEY 4-11 (1969). The report does not indicate the total number of ABA-accredited law schools responding to the survey. In 1968 there were 138 ABA-accredited law schools, and in 1969 there were 144. See First Year Enrollment in ABA Approved Law Schools 1947-2002 (Percentage of Women) <http://www.abanet.org/legaled/statistics/femstats.html> page 2 of 2.

²⁹COUNCIL ON LEGAL EDUCATION FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, SURVEY OF CLINICAL AND OTHER EXTRA-CLASSROOM EXPERIENCES' IN LAW SCHOOLS 1970-1971, 409-418 (Louis Parley ed., 1971).

were enrolled in a substantive law course and were required to engage in extra-classroom activity, such as handling cases or doing empirical research.³⁰ In 1978, CLEPR reported that about sixty percent of clinical programs were still of the farm-out or externship type.³¹

In 1982 Marc Stickgold sent National Clinical Study Project survey forms to 172 ABA-accredited law schools, 105 (61%) of which returned forms. Data showed that for the 105 responding schools, 76 percent had in-house clinics and 75 percent had field placement clinics.³²

In 1986, William B. Powers conducted a study of contemporary law school curricula for the Office of the Consultant on Legal Education to the American Bar Association. Powers's survey obtained data from 164 of the 175 law schools (93%) approved by the ABA in 1986. His data show that the 164 reporting schools had 143 judicial externship courses and 289 non-judicial externship courses for a total of 432 externship courses. These schools also reported approximately 498 in-house clinics and 120 legal aid clinics.³³ Therefore, in 1986, depending on how one categorizes legal aid clinics, as externships or as clinics, externships represented 53% (552 of 1,050 courses) or 41% (432 of 1,050 courses) of non-simulation professional skills courses.³⁴

Despite the fact that there have been a significant number of externship courses within

³⁰*Id.* at 409.

³¹COUNCIL ON LEGAL EDUCATION FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, FIFTH BIENNIAL REPORT 7, 41 (1977-78).

³²Marc Stickgold, *Exploring the Invisible Curriculum: Clinical Field Work in American Law Schools*, 19 N.M. L. REV. 287, 298 (1989).

³³WILLIAM B. POWERS, 2 A STUDY OF CONTEMPORARY LAW SCHOOL CURRICULA 16-29 (1987).

³⁴See *Id.* at 5.

American law schools since the late 1960s, the development of legal externship pedagogy is a recent phenomenon. Presentations at AALS-sponsored professional conferences devoted to clinical legal education overwhelmingly have been on topics related to the interests of in-house clinical programs and faculty.³⁵ In addition, since its creation in 1973, the focus of the AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education has been on the concerns of in-house clinics, and the Section's leadership has been dominated by clinicians associated with in-house clinics. There was not a Committee on Externships within the Section on Clinical Legal Education until 1987.³⁶

The concerns of externship programs and faculty first began to receive some attention in 1986 when a small group gathered in Boulder, Colorado during the 1986 AALS Conference on Clinical Legal Education to discuss externships. As reported in a 1986 Newsletter of the AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education, "[l]ittle agreement was found about what an externship is, [and] scant information was available about whether there was enough interest in the topic to warrant a meeting on the subject."³⁷ As an outgrowth of the Boulder meeting, Liz Ryan Cole (Vermont Law School) organized a followup meeting at Vermont Law School that was attended by 11 legal educators. One of the decisions reached at that meeting was to recommend to the

³⁵AALS has sponsored an unbroken string of annual clinical teaching conferences or workshops since 1977, when it sponsored a Workshop at Cleveland State University, October 20 – 22, 1977.

³⁶*Committee Assignments, Externships*, NEWSLETTER (AALS Sec. Clin. L. Educ.), Mar. 1987, at 5 (Peter Hoffman (Nebraska), chair of the AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education, named Janet Motley (California Western) and Liz Ryan Cole (Vermont) to chair the newly created Externship Committee).

³⁷*Externship Meeting Held*, NEWSLETTER (AALS Sec. Clin. L. Educ.), [Dec.?]1986, at 13.

AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education the creation of an ad hoc committee on externships.³⁸

In 1987, Peter T. Hoffman, chair of the AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education, created the first Externship Committee. Over the next several years the Externship Committee worked to put topics of concern to externship faculty on the Annual Meeting programs of the Section and during the annual AALS Conferences and Workshops on Clinical Legal Education. The Committee also fostered discussion of ABA Accreditation Standard 306 (now 305) and its interpretation as applied to externship programs. In May 1991, the Externship Committee sponsored a short program – Saturday evening through mid-day Sunday – following the AALS Workshop on Clinical Legal Education. Over forty people met at the Georgetown Conference Center in Washington, D.C. to discuss topics specific to externship programs.³⁹ This was followed two years later, in May 1993, by an externship conference in McLean, Virginia, sponsored by the Clinical Legal Education Association attended by about 60 persons.

Beginning with the publication of the symposium issue of the New Mexico Law Review, arising out of the ABA National Conference on Professional Skills and Legal Education, October 15-18, 1987, which published (among other pieces) three articles related to field placement programs by participants of the conference,⁴⁰ a modest number of articles on externships began

³⁸ *Id.* at 13-14.

³⁹ Leah Wortham, *Report of the Externship Committee*, NEWSLETTER (AALS Sec. Clin. L. Educ.), 91-2, at 5.

⁴⁰ See, e.g., Liz Ryan Cole, *Training the Mentor: Improving the Ability of Legal Experts to Teach Students and New Lawyers*, 19 N.M. L. REV. 163 (1989); Janet Motley, *Self-Directed Learning and the Out-of-House Placement*, 19 N.M. L. REV. 211 (1989); and Marc Stickgold, *Clinical Field Work*, 19 N.M. L. REV. 287 (1989) (reporting on a survey of clinical programs). Certainly there were earlier publications that discussed externships or field placement programs. Stickgold, *id.* at 297 n.51 collects some of the literature.

to appear. In 1995, the first textbook for any type of externship program was published.⁴¹ Then, in 1998, with the publication of *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE: A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEXT FOR LEGAL EXTERNS*, a general textbook became available for use in all types of externship seminars.⁴²

The publication of *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE* followed by a few months an externship conference sponsored by Columbus School of Law, The Catholic University of America, *Learning from Practice: Developments in Legal Externship Pedagogy*, March 5-8, 1998. This conference attracted over 170 externship teachers and administrators from over 100 law schools and spawned another round of scholarship devoted to externship topics, some of which was published by the *Clinical Law Review* in its spring 1999 issue.⁴³ Other results of the 1998 CUA conference were the creation, in 1999, of the LEXTERN listserv to facilitate communication among teachers and administrators of externship courses and programs⁴⁴ and the launch, in 2004, of the LexternWeb web portal site for legal externships.⁴⁵

⁴¹REBECCA A. COCHRAN, *JUDICIAL EXTERNSHIPS: THE CLINIC INSIDE THE COURTROOM* (2005). This text is now in its third edition.

⁴²OGILVY, WORTHAM AND LERMAN, *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE: A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEXT FOR LEGAL EXTERNS* (1998). The second edition of this text was published in 2007.

⁴³See J. P. Ogilvy, *Introduction to the Symposium on Developments in Legal Externship Pedagogy*, 5 CLIN. L. REV. 337 (1999) for a brief description of each article.

⁴⁴LEXTERN is a private mailing list hosted by The Catholic University of America, created February 10, 1999. Subscription requests may be sent to listserv@lists.cua.edu. As of Feb. 10, 2006, the list had 177 subscribers.

⁴⁵LexternWeb <<http://www.law.cua.edu/lexternWeb/index.htm>> provides quick access to the externship web pages of American law schools as well as to the manuals, handbooks, and materials of a growing number of programs.

The success of the 1998 CUA externship conference led to calls for a reprise, which was held at Columbus School of Law March 7-8, 2003.⁴⁶ To prepare for the 2003 conference, the planning committee decided to conduct a survey of law school externship programs in order to ascertain whether and in what ways the demographics of externship programs had changed or remained the same since the 1992-1993 survey conducted by Robert Seibel and Linda Morton.⁴⁷ This article reports the findings of the 2002-2003 survey.

Methodology

During 2002-2003, we conducted a nationwide survey of legal externship programs at American law schools. The survey instrument was designed to collect data on externship programs that would allow for comparative analysis with some of the data collected by Marc Stickgold in his 1987 survey of clinical programs⁴⁸ and with most of the data collected by Seibel and Morton in their 1992-1993 survey of externship programs.⁴⁹ Several questions added to the 2002-2003 survey had not been included on either the Stickgold or Seibel/Morton surveys.⁵⁰

Survey instruments initially were mailed in October 2002 to 195 law schools in the

⁴⁶A third conference, Externships³, co-hosted by Loyola Law School, Los Angeles and Southwestern University⁴ School of Law, was held on March 24 - 25, 2006, and a fourth conference, Externships⁵, is scheduled for February 15 - 16, 2008, hosted by Seattle University School of Law.

⁴⁷See Robert F. Seibel & Linda H. Morton, *Field Placement Programs: Practices, Problems and Possibilities*, 2 CLIN. L. REV. 413 (1996).

⁴⁸Stickgold, *supra* note 31.

⁴⁹Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45.

⁵⁰The 2002-2003 survey asked for more information about the available placements (questions 5 - 9) and about the status of each faculty member teaching an externship course (question 19).

United States and Puerto Rico. This included all 186 ABA-accredited law schools as well as nine law schools not accredited by the American Bar Association.⁵¹ A second mailing to schools that had not responded to the first mailing was sent in November 2002. In April and May 2003, volunteers organized by Francis Catania and Harriet Katz, co-chairs of the AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education Externship Committee, attempted to contact someone at each ABA-accredited law school that still had not responded to the survey to encourage a response. Ultimately, 112 schools responded to the survey, a response rate of 57%.

Data Analysis

Of the 112 schools returning surveys (110 from ABA-accredited law schools), only 4 schools indicated that they did not have at least one externship course. One of these, Northeastern University School of Law, has an extensive Co-Op program,⁵² which, due to its unique nature, is not included in our data analysis. Two other schools without externship programs were, in 2003, newly created law schools that did not have upper level students at that time. Both of these schools, the University of St. Thomas School of Law (Minnesota), and Florida International University College of Law, has since established an externship program.⁵³ Independent of the survey, we reviewed the web pages of every ABA-accredited law school and

⁵¹The mailings were sent from a list of law school deans obtained from the Dean of Columbus School of Law, which contained contact information for 186 ABA-accredited law schools and nine others.

⁵²See <http://www.slaw.neu.edu/coop/>.

⁵³The University of St. Thomas School of Law, <http://www.stthomas.edu/law/> recently created a Mentorship Externship program. See the school's webpage for details, <http://www.stthomas.edu/law/programs/mentor/default.html>. Florida International University College of Law has a Judicial Clinic externship program. Visit http://law.fiu.edu/legal_clinic/judicial_clinic.htm for more information.

found that of the 186 ABA-accredited schools, 183 (98%) have at least one externship course for JD candidates.⁵⁴

When Bob Seibel and Linda Morton reported data from their 1992-1993 survey of field placement programs, they had reports from sixty-eight schools, of which fifty-eight offered an externship for credit (85%).⁵⁵ Seventeen of fifty-eight schools (29%) described more than one externship course, so Seibel and Morton had data for ninety-eight courses. In the 2002-2003 survey, fifty-six programs (52%) reported data for more than one course, but seventy-six (72%) programs indicated in other responses that they offered more than one externship course. Thus, in the ten years following the 1992-1993 survey, the number of schools offering an externship course and the number of schools offering multiple externship courses rose significantly.⁵⁶ See Table I.

In part the increase in the number of schools offering one or more externship courses may be attributable to the increase, between 1992 and 2002, in the number of law schools approved for accreditation by the ABA. In 1992-93 there were 176 ABA-approved law schools;

⁵⁴Only Arkansas – Little Rock, NYU, and the Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico appear not to have at least one externship course for JD students.

⁵⁵Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 423.

⁵⁶Data from our survey demonstrating an increase in externship opportunities in the ten year period between 1992 and 2002, is consistent with the findings from the American Bar Association Section on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar survey of law school curricula, published in 2004, which found “[a] total of 147 of the 152 respondents (96.7 percent) offered at least one externship opportunity in 2002,” and that “[b]etween 1992 and 2002 . . . [e]xternship placement opportunities increased an average of 29.8 percent regardless of the type of externship, except for placements in corporate counsel offices, which increased 79.3 percent. . .” AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, SECTION OF LEGAL EDUCATION AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR, A SURVEY OF LAW SCHOOL CURRICULA: 1992-2002 36 (2004).

by 2002-2003 there were 186, an increase of 10.⁵⁷ In addition to the increase in the number of law schools, during the same period, the ABA modified the Standards for Approval of Law Schools to emphasize “real-life practice experiences” and greater emphasis on lawyering skills instruction⁵⁸ and published the MacCrate Task Force Report, which, *inter alia*, called upon the law schools to provide more instruction in the skills and values of the profession.⁵⁹ Law schools may have reacted to the leadership of the ABA by creating more opportunities for students to participate in externships, a relatively low cost response when compared with adding more live-client clinic seats. Another possible explanation is student demand for externships that the schools were prepared to honor. Our experience at Columbus School of Law is an example of this. In the 1992-1993 academic year, we had 161 externship enrollments; in 2002-2003, there were 251, an increase of 90 placements. During the same period, total JD enrollment rose only from 943 students in 1992-1993 to 955 students in 2002-2003, and increase of 12 students.

⁵⁷http://www.abanet.org/legaled/statistics/le_bastats.html

⁵⁸In 1992 Section 302(a) of the Standards for Approval of Law Schools provided, *inter alia*, that “The law school shall . . . (iii) offer instruction in professional skills.” The standard was amended in 1996 to provide that “A law school shall offer to all students . . . (2) an educational program designed to provide its graduates with basic competence in legal analysis and reasoning, legal research, problem solving, and oral and written communication; . . . (4) adequate opportunities for instruction in professional skills . . . (d) A law school shall offer live-client or other real-life practice experiences. This might be accomplished through clinics or externships. A law school need not offer this experience to all students.” In 1999 the Standard again was amended to provide “A law school shall offer to all students in its J.D. program: (1) instruction in the substantive law, values, and skills (including legal analysis and reasoning . . .) generally necessary to effective and responsible participation in the legal profession.”

⁵⁹ABA Sec. Of Legal Educ. & Admissions to the Bar, Legal Education and Professional Development – An Educational Continuum: Report of the Task Force on Law Schools and the Profession: Narrowing the Gap (1992) [hereinafter MacCrate Report].

TABLE I
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS WITH AN EXTERNSHIP COURSE

	Number of ABA- accredited law schools	Schools reporting one or more externship courses	Schools reporting multiple courses
1992-1993 (N = 68)	176	58 (85%)	17 (29%)
2002-2003 (N=108)	186	106(98%)	76(70%)
Webpages 2004	186	183(98%)	n/a

(N=Surveys from ABA-accredited schools)

Number of Credits.

We asked the schools to report the number of credits that could be earned by a student enrolled in an externship course. Of the 108 schools reporting usable data, ninety offered an externship course in the range of 1 - 4 credits; thirty-eight in the range of 5 - 6 credits; nineteen in the range of 7 - 10 credits; and sixteen in the range of 11 - 15 credits. Because of the way that the data was coded for analysis, we cannot report whether a school offers the opportunity to the student for credit at each number within the range. That is, if a school reported offering a one-credit externship, another school reported offering a three-credit externship, and a third school reported offering an externship for either three or four credits, each of these schools was coded as offering an externship in the 1 - 4 credit range. In some circumstances, the school reported offering a course that crossed more than one range, e.g., three to eight (3 - 8) credits. In those cases, we coded the course as being offered for 1 - 4, 5 - 6, and 7 - 10 credits.

Because many schools reported offering more than one distinct externship course, we have some data reported on 264 courses. In the range of 1 - 4 credits, 217 courses are offered,

68 in the range of 5 - 6 credits, 32 in the range of 7 - 10 credits, and 25 for 11 - 15 credits. The sum of the courses in all ranges exceeds 264 because, as noted above, some courses allow students to earn credits over more than one range category.

In their 1992-93 survey, Seibel and Morton found that eighty-two of ninety-eight courses were offered for six or fewer credits and of those eighty-two, fifty-four awarded three or fewer credits. Sixteen courses (at fourteen schools) allowed greater than six credits, but eleven of those sixteen courses also allowed students to earn fewer than six credits. Only five courses required the student to take the course for seven or more credits.⁶⁰

TABLE II
NUMBER OF COURSES BY
NUMBER OF CREDITS AWARDED

Courses with reported data: 1992-1993, N=98; 2002-2003, N=264

Number of schools: 1992-1993, N=58; 2002-2003, N=106

Credits	1 - 3	1 - 4	1 - 6	5 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 15
1992 - 93	54(55%)		82(83%)		>6 16(16%)	
2002 - 03	179(76%)	271(82%)	119(45%)	68(26%)	32(12%)	25(9%)

(Totals greater than 264 and 98 because some courses cross credit categories)

These data suggest that the percentage of low credit externship courses has grown. Eighty-three percent of the courses in academic year 2002-2003 were offered in the range of 1 - 3 credits compared with fifty-five percent in 1992-1993. The percentage of high credit courses has also increased to twenty-one percent in the 2002-2003 survey, compared to sixteen percent ten years ago.

The growth in the percentage of low credit externship courses might be expected if

⁶⁰Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 426.

schools are adding externship courses either in response to ABA pressures for more real practice experiences, student demand, or both, since satisfaction of these pressures is as easily met through low-credit externships as high-credit externships, and the administrative burdens associated with low-credit externships are, at least in theory, lighter than with high-credit externships (during this period, those awarding more than six credits) because of the increased demands on the schools, in terms of conducting site visits of placements and delivering a contemporaneous classroom component to the fieldwork, derived from the enhanced requirements for high-credit externships in the ABA Standards for the Approval of Law Schools.⁶¹ Although there was an increase in the percentage of high-credit externship courses during the period, the size of the increase was much smaller, an increase of twenty-eight percent in the case of low-credit courses but only five percent in high-credit courses. We suspect that the increase in high-credit courses is a result of schools adding summer programs, which more easily permit the student to engage in a large number of fieldwork hours, since the student is not usually taking other courses at the same time. Also, it is reasonable to assume that schools did not create more high-credit summer externship courses, especially where the students were permitted to do fieldwork at placements remote from the law school (statewide or out-of-state), because of the difficulties associated with satisfying the ABA requirements for site visits and a contemporaneous classroom component. However, our data is not sufficiently detailed to

⁶¹Before the 2004 amendment to Standard 305, the ABA required schools to conduct site visits and have a contemporary classroom component for externships that awarded six or more credits. The 2004 revision of the Standard, lowered the threshold to programs where four or more credits are awarded for fieldwork, but also ameliorated the site visit requirement by permitting an “equivalent” method of oversight (Standard 305(e)(5)) and the classroom component requirement by permitting this to be met by a contemporaneous, “seminar, tutorial, or other means of guided reflection” (Standard 305(e)(7)).

demonstrate this.

Restrictions on placements

We asked whether programs placed geographical limits on placements. This question sought to ascertain the number of courses in which students could work at a placement remote from the law school. Of the 271 courses in this survey, data for this question was available for 270. Of these 270 courses, 202 (75%) placed geographical limits on placements. We interpret this to mean that forty-four schools (involving sixty-eight courses (25%)) permit students to work at remote placements.

We also asked whether placements were limited as to type. For instance, we were interested in learning whether placements were limited to public interest placements (however defined). Because of the vague nature of the question, the results tell us only the number of courses that allow unrestricted placements. Data for this question was returned for 269 courses. 231 of these (81%) placed some type of non-geographic limitation on placements. Therefore, we can assume that at least thirty-eight courses (14%) at fifteen schools are general externships with no restrictions on the nature of the placement.⁶²

We know from perusing the course names in the database that a fair number of externship courses are limited to a specific subject matter or setting. Eighty-six of the 146 courses (fifty-nine percent) for which names were provided, suggest a limited scope. That there might be a higher number of specific externship courses would not be surprising as experience tells us that it is somewhat easier to create a coherent seminar or tutorial for a specific subject

⁶²In fact, the number of general externship courses may be smaller because a few schools indicated no non-geographic limitation, but the course title, such as judicial externship, indicated that the course was limited to judicial placements.

matter or setting externship than for one in which each student may be in a very different setting, doing quite different tasks at the placement, or both. The materials for a limited subject matter or setting externship are more easily assembled, and the students can readily share, compare, and reflect on common experiences. Similarly, a faculty member may feel that he or she can maintain quality control over the placements where they are limited by subject matter or setting because of the commonality of experience among the students and because the faculty member may have or develop a greater familiarity with the work of the specific placement.

Hours of fieldwork required

We asked the respondents to tell us how many fieldwork hours were required each week for every hour of course credit. We received useable data on 257 courses. In some cases, adjustment of the data was required because of the manner in which schools reported the data to us. For instance, some schools reported the total number of hours of fieldwork required for the semester. To make all of the data comparable, we converted those figures to a weekly number by assuming a fourteen week semester, unless it was clear from the school report that the semester was thirteen or fifteen weeks in length. Where the school reported a range, e.g., 3 - 4 hours per week per credit, we coded the course with the highest number in the range (e.g., 4).

Across all credit ranges, the average number of hours of fieldwork per week per credit is 4.4; the median is 4, the mode is 4, and the range is 2 - 10. (One school reported offering a course that required full-time (forty hours a week) work over two weeks for one credit.)

Seibel and Morton found that eighty-eight percent of the courses surveyed in 1992-93 required three to five hours of fieldwork for each credit earned.⁶³ Our data shows the same

⁶³Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 428-29 (Forty-five courses required three hours of fieldwork each week; twenty-nine courses required four hours of fieldwork; and twelve courses

percentage (88%); 226 courses of the 257 courses for which we have reliable data require three to five (3 - 5) hours of fieldwork each week for each credit awarded. Thus an externship would require between 126 and 210 hours of fieldwork over a fourteen week semester for three credits.

TABLE III
HOURS OF FIELDWORK REQUIRED EACH WEEK FOR
EVERY HOUR OF COURSE CREDIT

Survey Year	Average	Median	Mode	Range
1992-93 (N=98 schools)	3.81	4	4	1 - 7+
1995 (N=124 schools)				3.21 - 4.64
2002-03 (N=226 courses; 108 schools)	4.4	4	4	2 - 10
In-house* (N=70 schools)	3.88			2.52 - 5.34 (68%)

*This data is from the AALS Section on Clinical Legal Education, *Report on the Future of the In-House Clinic* (Aug. 1990; rev'd Oct. 1991), 42 J. LEGAL EDUC. 508, 546-47 (1992).

Standard 305 provides that credit for externships “shall be commensurate with the time and effort required and the anticipated quality of the educational experience of the student.” The same language is found in Interpretation 304-3 (e), authorizing schools to count a clinical course as a regularly scheduled class session for purposes of Standard 304(b), which sets out the amount of instructional time required as a condition for graduation. A study of in-house programs published in 1992 found that approximately sixty-eight (68%) of in-house clinics required between 2.52 and 5.34 hours of work each week per credit awarded. The average was

required five hours.)

3.88 with a Standard Deviation of 1.46.⁶⁴ Since externship courses and live-client clinics coexist in most law schools, it is not surprising that a similar work/credit ratio is found in both types of courses.

The classroom component

Of the 271 courses in our survey, 241 (90%) have a classroom component, twenty-six (26) do not have one, and four (4) schools did not supply data on classroom component for the course. This represents a notable increase in the number of courses with classroom components over the 1992-93 Seibel and Morton survey, which reported classroom components in sixty-nine percent (69%) of courses (sixty-eight of ninety-eight).⁶⁵

⁶⁴Association of American Law Schools, Section on Clinical Legal Education, *Report of the Committee on the Future of the In-House Clinic* (August 1990, Revised October 1991), 42 J. LEGAL EDUC. 508, 547 (1992). More recently, a report from the Clinics Committee of Georgetown University Law Center determined that clinic credit should be determined by reference to ‘structured interaction time,’ defined as ‘all planned activities that require development of professional skills.’ The Clinics Committee recommended that clinics be allocated credit equal to the number of student hours spent on structured interaction time divided by 3.5. Following this definition, the Georgetown clinical program, Center for Applied Legal Studies, applied for ten credits after calculating that students in that clinic spent, on average, about 35.6 hours per week on tasks involving structured interactions. Memorandum from David A. Koplow and Philip G. Schrag to Dean Areen, re: Increased Academic Credit for CALS (Jan. 10, 2000) at 8 & 15 (on file with author Ogilvy).

⁶⁵Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 429.

Table IV
COURSES WITH CLASSROOM COMPONENTS
BY NUMBER OF CREDITS AWARDED

Credits	1 - 3	1 - 4	5 - 6	7 - 10	11 - 15
	177	214	119	68	25
2002-03 seminar N=241(90%)	157 (89%)	197 (92%)	59 (89%)	24 (79%)	19 (76%)
no seminar N=26	19	17	7	6	6
1992-93 seminar N=68(69%)		48 (68%)	8 (73%)	(7 or more) 12 (75%)	
no seminar N=30		23	3	4	
1986					
Judicial N=143 seminar 19% Non-judicial N=289 seminar 35%					

(Totals greater than 271 for 2002-03, because some courses cross credit categories and are counted in all applicable credit categories)

As Table IV shows, for courses awarding 1 - 3 credits, eighty-nine percent have a classroom component, and for courses awarding more credits, the percentage with a classroom component are as follows: 1 - 4 credits, ninety-two percent; 5 - 6 credits, eighty-nine percent; 7 - 10 credits, seventy-five percent; and 11 - 15 credits, seventy-six percent. The Seibel and Morton survey had data from fewer courses, and they reported their data using slightly different credit range categories. Still, some comparisons are possible. The 1992-93 data show that for courses awarding 1 - 4 credits (N=71), sixty-seven percent (N=48) offered a classroom

component; for courses awarding 5 - 6 credits (N=11), seventy-three percent (N=8) offered a classroom component; and for courses awarding 7 or more credits (N=16), seventy-five percent offered a classroom component.⁶⁶ In the ten years since the Seibel and Morton survey, schools tended to add classroom components to courses at all ranges of credits. For courses awarding 1 - 4 credits, the percentage with a classroom component has risen from sixty-seven (67%) to ninety-two percent (92%); for courses awarding 5 - 6 credits, from seventy-three (73%) to eighty-nine percent (89%); and for courses awarding 7 or more credits, from seventy-five (75%) to seventy-eight percent (78%).

The increase in the number of externship courses in which a classroom component is in part is probably attributable to ABA accreditation pressures, the increasingly sophisticated externship pedagogy, and the movement of regular faculty into externship courses.

From 1986 forward, the ABA increasingly has sought to have the law schools include a classroom component in their externship programs. In 1986, Interpretation 2 of Standard 306 (now Standard 305) required the Accreditation Committee in evaluating externships to consider, *inter alia*, whether the program had a classroom component.⁶⁷ The 1993 version of Interpretation 2 added in subsection (e)(5) that in all field placements in which a field instructor is responsible for the direct supervision of students . . . a contemporaneous classroom component is preferred.⁶⁸ In the 2003 version of Standard 305, subsection (f)(4) provided that a

⁶⁶Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 429.

⁶⁷AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND INTERPRETATIONS, Interpretation 2-306 (1988).

⁶⁸AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND INTERPRETATIONS, Interpretation 2 of Standard 306 (1995).

contemporaneous classroom or tutorial component taught by a faculty member is preferred, but required if the field placement program awarded six or more academic credits per semester.⁶⁹

It may be that as the number of externship courses began to rise, law schools, independently of ABA accreditation standards, recognized the desirability of adding a classroom component to what had been, for the most part, an educational experience entirely external to the law school. Our experience at Columbus School of Law reflects this trajectory. Initially, many of our externship placements were sponsored by our special certificate programs. Students were required to do one or more unpaid or paid externships along with taking specialized courses in order to qualify for certificate upon graduation. Gradually these externships were incorporated into our general externship program and classroom components were required of all externships.

As more classroom components were added, the experiences were shared through conferences and publications. Catholic University sponsored externship conferences focused on externship pedagogy in 1998 and 2003 and as the attached bibliography demonstrates, there has been a growing literature on externship pedagogy. We suspect these activities made it easier for faculty at schools without established classroom components to find resources and support for their efforts, which facilitated the growth of classroom components.

Class Meetings

For all courses reporting a classroom component, the average number of hours of classroom instruction during the semester is eighteen, or slightly more than an hour a week over

⁶⁹SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR, AMERICAN BAR ASS'N, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS, Standard 305 (2003). The subsection, however, also provides that "if the classroom or tutorial component is not contemporaneous, the law school shall demonstrate the educational adequacy of its alternative (which could be a pre- or post-field placement classroom component or tutorial)."

fourteen or fifteen weeks. The median is fourteen hours and the mode is twenty-eight hours, which means that most courses involve one to two hours of instruction each week over a fourteen week semester.

The Seibel & Morton survey found a range of one to nine hours of instruction each week for the sixty-eight courses for which there was a classroom component. Eighteen of sixty-eight (26%) required one hour of instruction each week; twenty-five courses (37%) met for two hours once a week; and thirteen courses (19%) met two hours three times a week.⁷⁰

TABLE V
LENGTH OF CLASS SESSIONS
(Hours/Week)

Survey Year	Average	Median	Mode	Range
1992-93 (N= 56 schools)	2.14	2	1	1 - 9
2002-03 (N=241 courses)	1.3	1	2	1 - 6

These data suggest that in 1992-93 sixty-three percent (63%) of the courses with a classroom component met one to two hours each week of the semester and in academic year 2002-03, one to two hours of class time also was the norm.

Classroom component format

We asked schools to report on the format of the classroom component including the percentage of time devoted to instruction in substantive or procedural law, skills, legal process,

⁷⁰Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 431. Seibel and Morton's analysis does not account for the other twelve courses with classroom components – they report on only 56 of 68 courses. They also calculated the average hours of classroom instruction each week by credit category, finding that courses awarding more than six credits averaged 6.16 hours of weekly instruction, whereas courses awarding six or fewer credits averaged 2.65 hours of instruction each week.

legal institutions, professional roles and responsibility, career choices, student reflection on their placements, and other topics.

Of the 271 courses in the survey, we had useable data from 196 for this query. Table VI reports the data.

TABLE VI
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF COURSES DEVOTING CLASSROOM TIME TO TOPICS

Courses with reported data: N=196

Substantive/Procedural Law	N=104 (53%)	Lawyering Skills	N=140 (71%)
Legal Process	N=101 (52%)	Legal Institutions	N=104 (53%)
Professional Roles and Resp.	N=167 (85%)	Career Choices	N=65 (33%)
Reflection on Placements	N=134 (68%)	Other Activities	N=15 (7%)

TABLE VII
PERCENTAGE OF COURSES DEVOTING CLASSROOM TIME TO TOPICS
(1992-1993 Survey)*

Substantive/Procedural Law	>35%	Lawyering Skills	59%
Legal Process	<30%)	Legal Institutions	30%
Professional Roles and Resp.	59%	Career Choices	n/a
Reflection on Placements	>50%	Other Activities	n/a

*This table is derived from the data reported in Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 431-32. Seibel and Morton did not inquire about the topic “career choices” and did not offer an option to report “other activities,” so no comparisons are possible for those topics. Also the raw numbers were not presented in their report, so we only can compare percentages.

Comparing the data presented in Tables VI and VII suggests that since the 1992-1993 survey, more externship courses now devote class time to every category of reported topics.

We also calculated the average percentage of time devoted to each topic in courses reporting data for the category. We totaled the percentage of time devoted to the topic for each

course reporting data and divided that number by the number of courses reporting data. Table VIII presents this data. For example, of the 104 courses that reported devoting classroom time to discussions of substantive or procedural law, on average, thirty-five percent (35%) of instructional time was devoted to this topic.

TABLE VIII
PERCENTAGE OF CLASSROOM TIME DEVOTED TO VARIOUS TOPICS

Courses with reported data: N=200

Substantive/Procedural Law	35% (N=104)	Lawyering Skills	27% (N=140)
Legal Process	15% (N=101)	Legal Institutions	15% (N=104)
Professional Roles and Resp.	23% (N=167)	Career Choices	13% (N=65)
Reflection on Placements	25% (N=134)	Other Activities	35% (N=15)

These data, showing an increase in time devoted to substantive and procedural law, are consonant with our finding that many externship courses are subject matter or setting specific. The more unitary focus allows the instructor to target a substantial amount of classroom time on the substantive and procedural law that the students in the placements are likely to face. This is less likely to occur when students are placed in widely different settings. The increase in class time devoted to reflection on placements is consistent with the ABA accreditation standard's focus on reflection as a key component of externships.⁷¹ Likewise, the increase in time spent on lawyering skills may reflect the schools' greater attention to using

⁷¹See e.g., AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND INTERPRETATIONS (1995), Interpretation 2(c) of Standard 306: "The field instructor or a full-time faculty member must engage the student on a regular basis throughout the term in a critical evaluation of the student's field experience."

externships to meet the MacCrate and ABA accreditation pressures to increase opportunities for lawyering skills instruction.⁷²

The other format query asked schools to report on the principal methods of instruction including lecture/discussion, use of guest speakers, student presentations, student facilitated discussions, and other methods. Table IX reports data for 200 courses for which useable data was obtained.

TABLE IX
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF COURSES
USING SPECIFIC TEACHING METHODS IN THE CLASSROOM COMPONENT

Courses with reported data: N=200

Lecture/Discussion	N=189 (95%)	Guest Speakers	N=104 (52%)
Student Presentations	N=115 (58%)	Student Facilitation	N=37 (19%)
Other Methods	N=32 (16%)		

Lecture/discussion (95% of courses), student presentations (58%), and guest speakers (52%) were the most frequently employed teaching methods reported. We also calculated the average percentage of time devoted to each instructional method by totaling the percentages reported for all courses reporting data in each category and dividing the sum by the number of courses reporting data. Table X reports this data.

⁷²See text *supra* at note 57.

TABLE X
AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF TIME DEVOTED TO
SPECIFIC TEACHING METHODS IN THE CLASSROOM COMPONENT

Courses with reported data: N=200

Lecture/Discussion	58% (N=189)	Guest Speakers	26% (N=104)
Student Presentations	32% (N=115)	Student Facilitation	29% (N=37)
Other Methods	44% (N=32)		

For example, these data show that for courses reporting the use of student presentations as a method of instruction (N=115), on average, student presentations consumed 32% of instructional time in the course. If more than half of the class components use student presentations, and of those that use this method nearly one third of class time is devoted to student presentations, then students might be exerting significant control over the content of such courses. This would be consistent with the general nature of externship pedagogy in which emphasis is placed on students setting learning agendas for themselves in the selection of placement sites and often through agreements with the supervising attorneys.⁷³

This also raises some questions about the specific meaning of “student presentations.” Some programs have entire class meetings taught or facilitated by students. This approach emphasizes the skills involved in preparing and delivering presentations, a lawyering skill that often is not covered elsewhere in the curriculum. Field placement experiences usually do not involve students in the responsibility for such presentations either, so this is an activity that supplements and builds on experiences students have at the field placements. On the other hand,

⁷³See, Leah Wortham, *Setting Goals for the Externship*, in *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE: A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEXT FOR LEGAL EXTERNS*, 11-15, 25-26 (J.P. Ogilvy, et al. eds., 2d ed. 2007).

student presentations could be shorter pieces of a class, perhaps on a particular theme. Some programs require students to make a presentation at the end of the course that pulls together the most significant elements of what they learned from the course during the semester.⁷⁴ Or students might be asked to make a presentation earlier in the semester that describes in some detail their externship environment and work. This is particularly useful where students in the course are placed at a wide variety of placements and can benefit from more detailed and perhaps more structured descriptions of other students' work. It also can have the supplemental effect of reinforcing the notion that students are responsible for teaching each other rather than relying on the faculty member in a more traditional and hierarchical fashion.

Classroom component materials

We asked schools to report the types of teaching materials employed in the classroom component. We obtained useable data for 203 of the 271 courses in the survey. Over half of the instructors compiled and assigned their own course materials. About fourteen percent (N=33) used a published text and another twenty-two percent (N=51) used both published and self-compiled materials. Over ten percent (N=25) reported using no materials. Table XI reports this data.

**TABLE XI NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF COURSES
USING VARIOUS INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS**

Courses with reported data: N=200

Published Text	33 (14%)	Compiled Materials	119 (51%)
Both Text and Compiled	51 (22%)	Other Materials	6 (3%)
No Materials Used	25 (11%)		

⁷⁴See Leah Wortham, *Presentations*, in *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE: A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEXT FOR LEGAL EXTERNS*, 437-450 (J.P. Ogilvy, et al. eds., 2d ed. 2007).

Seibel and Morton did not report on the use of materials in the classroom component of field placement programs other than to note that only twelve (12) of the sixty-eight (68) programs with a classroom component (18%) used published materials.⁷⁵ As Table XI demonstrates, our survey found that eighty-four (84) of two hundred (200) courses reporting data on the question (42%) assigned published materials either alone or together with other materials. This increase in the use of published materials probably is due, in large part, to the publication, since the 1992-93 survey was conducted, of two textbooks specifically aimed at externships.⁷⁶

These data are consistent with the limited availability of published materials for externship seminars and the specific substantive or placement focus of many externship courses, which favors the use of compiled materials. The fact that over ten percent of courses reported using no materials is puzzling and merits further investigation.

Journaling

Nearly two-thirds of the courses in our survey require students to keep academic journals as part of the pedagogy. Of the 271 courses in the survey, 262 reported useable data, and these courses require one or more journals entries (66% of courses). This is an increase of eleven percent since the Seibel and Morton survey, which reported forty-four of ninety-eight courses required journals as part of the externship pedagogy.⁷⁷ Of the 262 courses where some journal use was reported, only 150 reported actual numbers of journal entries required. For these 150 courses, the journal requirement ranged from one to fifty journal entries over the course of the

⁷⁵Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 431 n.46.

⁷⁶See *supra* nn. 40-41.

⁷⁷Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45 at n.50.

semester, with the average number of journal entries required during the semester being about eleven. The median figure is about thirteen entries and the mode is fourteen entries. This suggests that in most courses using journals as a pedagogical tool, students are required to submit one entry each week during the semester. We also calculated the range, mean, median, and mode for the number of journal entries required during the semester in courses based on the number of credits awarded, using the credit categories of 1 - 4; 1 - 6; 5 - 6; 7 - 10; and 11 - 15. This data is summarized in Table XII.

TABLE XII
NUMBER OF JOURNAL ENTRIES REQUIRED DURING A SEMESTER
BY CREDITS AWARDED

Courses with reported data: N=150

Credits (# courses)	Mean	Median	Mode	Range
1 - 4 (N=99)	9.49	14	14	1 - 50
1 - 6 (N=128)	10	12	14	1 - 50
5 - 6 (N=24)	11.5	14	14	1 - 16
7 - 10 (N=12)	11.8	14	14	5 - 14
11 - 15 (N=14)	13.7	14	14	3 - 35
1986				
Judicial 13.5% Non-judicial 18.8%				

The data show that as the number of credits awarded increases there is a slight, but not

significant, increase in the number of journal entries required. Over all credit categories, the number of required journal entries remains at about fourteen, or one each week of the semester.

The growth in the use of journaling as a pedagogical tool probably reflects a growing awareness of the usefulness of journals as an important method for encouraging and structuring student reflection on the externship experience. The use of journals as a pedagogical tool frequently is mentioned in published materials advising faculty on the design of externship courses.⁷⁸ Thus the journal is a well-tested tool for reflection and substantial guidance is available to externship faculty regarding the costs and benefits of journaling and techniques for use. This suggests that other teaching methods may become more common as the expanding literature makes them known to teachers.

Grading

We looked at how grades for both the classroom component and fieldwork component were assigned. For the 271 courses in the survey, we have partially useable data on grading practices for 267 courses. First we looked at courses without a classroom component. This represents only twenty-five of the 267 courses (11%) analyzed. Of these twenty-five courses, the fieldwork component is graded pass/no pass or credit/no credit in twenty (80%) and graded either numerically or alphabetically in five (20%).

Next we analyzed grading practices in courses with a classroom component, representing

⁷⁸See e.g., OGILVY, WORTHAM & LERMAN, *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE: A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEXT FOR LEGAL EXTERNS*, Chapter 6 (1998); Mary Jo Eyster, *Designing and Teaching the Large Externship Clinic*, 5 CLIN. L. REV. 347, 385-86 (1999); Harriet N. Katz, *Personal Journals in Law School Externship Programs: Improving Pedagogy*, 1 T. M. COOLEY J. PRAC. & CLIN. L. 7 (1997); J.P. Ogilvy, *The Use of Journals in Legal Education: A Tool for Reflection*, 3 Clin. L. Rev. 55, 84-86 (1996); and William P. Quigley, *Reflections from the Journals of Prosecution Clinic Students*, 74 MISS. L.J. 1147 (2005).

240 of the courses for which we have some data (90%).⁷⁹ Table XIII summarizes the data on grading practices for courses with a classroom component.

TABLE XIII
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF COURSES UTILIZING LETTER OR NUMBER GRADES OR
PASS/FAIL GRADES FOR THE CLASSROOM COMPONENT, FIELDWORK COMPONENT, OR BOTH

Courses with Classroom Component: N=240

	Grades reported as letter or number grade	Grades reported pass/fail or credit/no credit	Total
Classroom (seminar)	41% (N=91)	59% (N=131)	222
Fieldwork	24% (N=54)	76% (N=174)	228
Both seminar and fieldwork	40% (N=85)	60% (N=127)	212

The table shows that forty percent (40%) of all externship courses with a classroom component report grades as a number or letter for both the seminar and fieldwork components. Independently, forty-one percent (41%) of courses with a classroom component, report letter or number grades for the seminar, but only twenty-four percent (24%) do so for the fieldwork component. By comparison, the 1992-93 Seibel and Morton survey found that, overall, thirty-two of ninety-eight (33%) courses awarded letter or number grades for the course and that twenty-nine of sixty eight (43%) courses with a classroom component awarded letter or number grades for the course.⁸⁰ These data show that the percentage of courses with a classroom

⁷⁹We have useable data on grading methods for the classroom (seminar) component from 222 courses, on the fieldwork component from 228 courses, and on both from 212 courses.

⁸⁰Seibel & Morton, *supra* note 45, at 434-35. Seibel and Morton did not collect data that would have enabled them to differentiate grading practices for the classroom and fieldwork components of the courses.

component that utilize number or letter grades for some portion of the course grade has remained relatively constant, despite the large increase in the number of externship courses offered.

We suspect that this constancy in grading practices reflects a general discomfiture among clinical faculty in assigning grades in clinical courses,⁸¹ including externships, and historic resistance by law schools to assigning grades in clinical courses, such as externships, that would be included in a student's grade point average out of concern that clinic grades are inflated, do not represent a comparable demonstration of competency as grades in traditional seminars, and would cause an influx of students in search of higher grades into these courses.

Faculty status

The data from 104 of the 108 schools in the sample permits us to identify the number of programs in which at least one tenured or tenure-track faculty member is teaching in the externship program. In examining this data, we counted the highest status faculty member in the program (over all courses reported for the program). Forty-eight (44%) of the programs have a tenured member of the faculty as the highest status member teaching in the externship program; nine (9%) have a tenure-track faculty member as the highest status person teaching in the program. Therefore, fifty-seven (55%) of the schools have a tenured or tenure track faculty

⁸¹See, Stacy L. Brustin & David F. Chavkin, *Testing the Grades: Evaluating Grading Models in Clinical Legal Education*, 3 CLIN. L. REV. 299, 300-306 (1997) (reporting on an informal survey of clinical teachers regarding their experiences with and views on grading in clinical courses) and Nancy H. Kaufman, *A Survey of Law School Grading Practices*, 44 J. LEGAL EDUC. 415, 417 (1994) (Table I reports data from Professor Kaufman's survey of law school grading practices and shows among 99 reporting schools clinical courses (excluding simulations and externships) were graded like seminars thirty-seven percent (37%) of the time (N=3); offered either for a grade or pass/fail nineteen percent (19%) of the time (N=19); offered solely as pass/fail thirty-nine percent (39%) of the time; and offered for no credit one percent (1%) of the time (N=1). The survey reported responses from only twelve schools with respect to externships. One school graded externships like other courses in the curriculum, while eleven awarded grades on a pass/fail basis.

member teaching at least one of the externship courses in the school's program.

TABLE XIV
FACULTY STATUS

Survey	Tenure	Tenure-Track	Clinical Tenure	Clinical Tenure-Track	Long-term K	Short-term K	Other
2002-03 (N=106 schools)	48(45%)	9(9%)			21(20%)	14(13%)	11(10%)
1986* Judicial (N=143 courses)	34%		0%		2.1%	13.5%	50.4%
Non-judicial (N=289 courses)	49.5%		0%		1.8%	7.1%	41.8%
Liemer†	74(53%)		13(9%)		53(38%)		
Clinical‡ Section	31.3%	11.6%	4.1%	.8%	26.1%	15.9%	9.9%

*These percentages represent the tenure status of all faculty involved in the judicial and non-judicial externship courses.

† Professor Liemer's tabulations are available in "Who Votes at Law School Faculty Meetings in the United States?" (2005) and may be accessed on the Association of Legal Writing Directors website, <http://www.alwd.org/>. These numbers indicate that there is at least one clinician at seventy-four schools who is tenured or on the tenure track.

‡From a compilation prepared by Professor David Santacrose (Michigan) from data self-reported by clinicians to the Directory of Clinical Teachers https://cgi2.www.law.umich.edu/_GCLE/index.asp. This data represents status reports from forty-five percent of the clinicians in the database with three or more years of teaching experience.

We have no comparison data since the Seibel & Morton survey did not ask for information about faculty status. There is not any comprehensive data on the status of clinical faculty in American law schools generally. Professor Sue Liemer has collected some information on clinical faculty status as part of her review of which schools permit clinical faculty, legal writing faculty, and librarians to vote at law school faculty meetings. Her chart has data for 140 schools. Of these, at least one clinician is tenured or on the tenure track at seventy-four schools (53%). At thirteen schools at least one clinician has clinical tenure or is on the clinical tenure track. At fifty-three schools clinicians are on some form of long-term or short-term contract.⁸² It appears from our data and that collected by Professor Liemer that tenure is available to externship faculty at the same rate as it is for clinical faculty in general.

Administrative support

Our survey asked about administrative support for the externship program. We wanted to know the type and amount of administrative support the externship program is given. We obtained data on the availability of administrative support from eighty-three of the 108 programs represented in the sample. Thirty-four programs (41%) report having a staff coordinator; thirty-two (39%) have a secretary (at least part time); and nine programs (11%) have some other staff available to support the externship program.

⁸²Susan P. Liemer, *Who Votes at Law School Faculty Meetings in the United States?* (2005)(chart on file with author Ogilvy). Another compilation was prepared by Professor David Santacroce from data self-reported to the Directory of Clinical Teachers. Forty-five percent of clinicians in the database with three or more years of teaching experience reported employment status as follows: tenured (31.3%); tenure track (11.6%); clinical tenure (4.1%); clinical tenure track (.8%); long-term contract (26.1%); short-term contract (15.9%); and other (9.9%) (on file with author Ogilvy).

TABLE XV
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT OF EXTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

(N=80 schools reporting some administrative support)*	Staff Coordinator	Administrative Assistant	Secretary	Other
2002-03	34	34	34	9

*Of the 80 schools reporting at least one administrative support person (regardless of percentage of time devoted to externships), 56 reported in only one category and 24 reported in more than one category of administrative support.

Because we cannot correlate the data on administrative support with program size and complexity, we cannot suggest whether the amount of administrative support reported is appropriate. However, comments from externship faculty and administrators at teaching conferences suggests that a number of them believe that the level of administrative support at their schools is not sufficient. More investigation of this question is certainly warranted.

Evaluation of Placements

Finally, we tried to identify how programs evaluate the placements at which students extern. Of the 271 courses in our sample, we have data on 266 with respect to how placements are evaluated. The survey asked whether the programs used site visits, student evaluations, or some other method of evaluation. 247 of the courses (93%) employ student evaluations of the placement; 161 (61%) report using site visits; and 125 (47%) report using other evaluation methods. Most commonly, the other methods of evaluation included using student journals, individual and class discussions, and informal contacts with fieldwork supervisors. Many courses use multiple methods for evaluating placements: 150 (56%) use both student evaluations and site visits; 62 (23%) use student evaluations, site visits, and other methods together; 119 (41%) use student evaluations and other methods together; and 70 (26%) use site visits and other

methods together.

TABLE XVI
EVALUATION OF PLACEMENTS

Methods Used (N=266 courses)	Number of courses (percentage)
Student Evaluations	247 (93%)
Site Visit	161 (61%)
Other	125 (47%)
Student Evaluation & Site Visit	150 (56%)
Student Evaluation, Site Visit, & Other	62 (23%)
Student Evaluation & Other	119 (41%)
Site Visit & Other	70 (26%)

We were surprised at the large number of courses reporting the use of site visits as a means of evaluating placements, so we analyzed the data more finely. We examined the use of site visits as a placement evaluation method by looking at the practice in different categories of credit awards, 1 - 4, 5 - 6, 7 - 10, and 11 - 15. There is some overlap in the data because, as noted above, some courses permit students to earn credits over more than one category. We found in courses awarding 1- 3 credits (N=176), site visits were used in 100 courses (57%); in courses awarding 1 - 4 credits (N=217), site visits were used in 132 courses (61%); in courses awarding 5 - 6 credits (N=68), site visits were used in 38 courses (56%); in the 7 - 10 credits category (N=32), 16 courses (46%); and in the 11 - 15 credits category (N=25), 15 courses (60%). We also examined the use of site visits in courses that we could identify as awarding credits only within one of the credit categories we created for this analysis. Using this method, we found that 121 courses award only 1 - 3 credits and of these, 60 or fifty percent (50%), use

site visits to evaluate placements. One hundred and seventy-three courses award only 1 - 4 credits and of these, seventy-one (71), or forty-one percent (41%), use site visits to evaluate placements. Twenty courses award only 5 - 6 credits and of these, ten, or fifty percent (50%), use site visits. Five courses award only 7 - 10 credits and of these, three, or sixty percent (60%), use site visits. And sixteen courses award 11 - 15 credits and of these, six, or thirty-eight percent (38%), use site visits.

The appropriate frequency and nature of site visits as a tool for the evaluation of placements is a subject worthy of its own article. There is little agreement among externship faculty as to the need or efficacy of site visits and even less written about site visits,⁸³ despite the importance that the ABA accreditors apparently place on them.⁸⁴ We can say with some

⁸³See e.g., William Wesley Patton, *Externship Site Inspections: Fitting Well-Rounded Programs into the Four Corners of the ABA Guidelines*, 3 CLIN. L. REV. 471 (1997) and J.P. Ogilvy, *Guidelines with Commentary for the Evaluation of Legal Externship Programs*, 38 GONZAGA L. REV. 155, 177-78 (2002/03).

⁸⁴The 1986 version of Interpretation 2 of Standard 306 did not explicitly mention site visits as a factor that the ABA would use in evaluating field placement programs, see AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND INTERPRETATIONS, Interpretation 2-306 (1988). The 1993 version added “visits to field placements,” as a factor that the law school and Accreditation Committee of the ABA should use to evaluate field placement programs. Interpretation 2 of Standard 306, subsection (e)(3) provided, *inter alia*, “[a]n on-site visit by full-time faculty during the course of each field placement is preferred.” In addition, subsection (h) provided that “[i]n those field placement programs that award academic credit in excess of six credit hours per semester . . . (3) The school shall ensure that there is careful and persistent full-time faculty monitoring of the academic achievement of each student. This shall include and on-site visit in each field placement by full-time faculty in the course of the field placements. The school shall document this monitoring” (emphasis supplied). AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND INTERPRETATIONS, Interpretation 2-306 (1995). The 2003 version modulated the site visit requirement somewhat. Subsection (e)(10) require that the field placement program be periodically reviewed and that one factor utilized shall be “the visits to field placements or other comparable communication among faculty, students and field instructors” (emphasis supplied). However, subsection (f)(3) provided that “[p]eriodic on-site visits by a faculty member are preferred,” and “[i]f the field placement program awards academic credit of more than six credits per academic term, on on-

confidence that a number of schools were out of compliance with the requirement for site-visits, in effect when the survey was conducted, for courses offered for more than six academic credits. But the data certainly raises more questions than it answers. Do faculty and administrators of programs offering less than seven academic credits (now less than four) for fieldwork perceive a significant benefit given the time and resources devoted to site visits or do the programs conduct site visits primarily because of the stated preference for them in Standard 305? What is the relationship between the use of site visits as an evaluative tool and the size of the program, i.e., number of students served and number of discrete placements used. Are site visits likely to be thought of as less onerous for smaller programs or limited placement programs? What resources are devoted to site visits? What benefits are achieved by the use of site visits? How frequently is a placement visited? Will the 2005 version of Standard 305 increase or decrease the use of site visits or will schools devise reasonable “equivalents,” that require less time and fewer resources to administer?

Conclusion

We have learned a great deal by doing this survey. It has reinforced our appreciation of the great diversity of field placement programs within American law schools. As this article goes to press, data is being extracted from a new, web-based instrument. From the new instrument we hope, *inter alia*, to identify information relevant to the manner in which externship programs are

site visits by a faculty member is required each academic term the program is offered” (emphasis supplied). SECTION OF LEGAL EDUC. AND ADMISSIONS TO THE BAR, AMERICAN BAR ASS’N, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS, Standard 305 (2003). The current Standard 305 extends the requirement for “periodic on-site visits or their equivalent by a faculty member if the field program awards four or more academic credits (or equivalent) for fieldwork in any academic term or if on-site visits or their equivalent are otherwise necessary and appropriate” (emphasis supplied). AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF LAW SCHOOLS AND ASSOCIATED INTERPRETATIONS (2005).

complying or intend to comply with newly drafted (2006) ABA accreditation standards relating to field placement programs, including how programs identify “a demonstrated relationship between [a clear statement of the] goals and methods to the program in operation,”⁸⁵ evaluate “each student’s academic performance involving both a faculty member and the field placement supervisor,”⁸⁶ select, train, evaluate and communicate “with field placement supervisors,”⁸⁷ and conduct “periodic on-site visits or their equivalent . . . if the field placement program awards four or more academic credits (or equivalent) for fieldwork.”⁸⁸ By collecting, analyzing, and sharing information relating to program design, pedagogy, and adherence to accreditation standards, we can improve the design, delivery, and political standing of field placement programs within the schools and within the ABA. In addition, just as the survey that is the foundation for this article has captured concrete historical data on the nature and extent of externships in legal education for the years 2002-2003, continuing the collection and dissemination of data on externship programs will benefit future historians of legal education.

⁸⁵ABA, Standards for the Approval of Law Schools, section 305(e)(1) (August 2004).

⁸⁶ABA, Standards for the Approval of Law Schools, section 305(e)(3) (August 2004).

⁸⁷ABA, Standards for the Approval of Law Schools, section 305(e)(4) (August 2004).

⁸⁸ABA, Standards for the Approval of Law Schools, section 305(e)(5) (August 2004).

Glossary

Course A course is a discrete curricular offering for which a law student may earn credits toward graduation.

Extern/Externship An extern is a student who is earning course credit for performing tasks in a supervised learning experience of limited duration in which a student takes on a responsible role in a setting outside the traditional law school environment, an externship. Depending on the restrictions on placements imposed by the sponsoring law school, the setting may be a law office, a government office, a judicial chambers, a non-governmental organization, or a private/public, for-profit business. The externship may last for a year, a semester, or less. Ideally an externship should include a process of engagement, learning, and reflection. Engagement encompasses the process of assigning work to the extern, supervision of the extern's work, provision of an appropriate work environment, orienting the extern to the workplace, evaluation and feedback, and reporting to the law school by the placement.

Faculty Supervisor The faculty supervisor is the full- or part-time member of the law school faculty responsible for communicating with the extern and the extern's fieldwork supervisor about the student's externship and for guiding the extern's reflection on the student's experiences at the externship.

Field Placement See externship.

Fieldwork Supervisor The fieldwork supervisor is the individual at the externship (field placement) responsible for making assignments to the extern, guiding the work of the extern, and providing feedback and evaluation to the extern.

Intern/Internship See Extern/Externship.

Mentee See Extern. Some programs use the terms Mentee and Mentor for extern and fieldwork

supervisor.

Mentor See Mentee.

Mentorship See Extern/Externship.

Placement See Extern/Externship.

Program The externship program is made up of all the discrete externship courses offered by a law school.

LEGAL EXTERNSHIP BIBLIOGRAPHY
A selected bibliography of books and articles relating to the
design, critique, and pedagogy of legal externships
(as of December 2007)

- Stephen R. Alton, *Mandatory Prelicensure Legal Internship: A Renewed Plea for Its Implementation in Light of the MacCrate Report*, 2 Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev. 115 (1995).
- Alexis Anderson, Arlene Kanter & Cindy Slane, *Ethics in Externships: Confidentiality, Conflicts, and Competence Issues in the Field and in the Classroom*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 473 (2004).
- Alice Alexander & Jeffrey Smith, *A Practical Guide to Cooperative Supervision for Law Students and Legal Employers*, 29 Law Office Econ. & Mgmt. 207 (1998).
- James H. Backman, *Practical Examples for Establishing an Externships Program Available to Every Student*, 14 Clin. L. Rev. 1 (2007).
- Gregory Baker & Jennifer Zawid, *The Birth of a Therapeutic Courts Externship Program: Hard Labor but Worth the Effort*, 17 St. Thomas L. Rev. 711 (2005).
- Joseph A. Barrette, *Self-Awareness: The Missing Piece of the Experiential Learning Puzzle*, 5 T. M. Cooley J. Prac. & Clin. L. 1 (2002).
- Cynthia Batt & Harriet N. Katz, *Confronting Students: Evaluation in the Process of Mentoring Student Professional Development*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 581 (2004).
- Paul Bergman, *The Consumer Protection Clinic at UCLA School of Law*, 29 J. Legal Educ. 352 (1978).
- Barbara A. Blanco & Sande L. Buhai, *Externship Field Supervision: Effective Techniques for Training Supervisors and Students*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 611 (2004).
- Kate E. Bloch, *Subjective Lawyering and Other Clinical Extern Paradigms*, 3 Clin. L. Rev. 259 (1997).
- James J. Broshahan, *Are practitioners the best teachers?* 3 Learning and the Law 40 (1976).
- Kathleen Connolly Butler, *SharedResponsibility: the Duty to Legal Externs*, 106 W. Va. L. Rev. 51 (2003).
- Stacy Caplow, *From Courtroom to Classroom: Creating an Academic Component to Enhance the Skills and Values Learned in a Student Judicial Clerkship Clinic*, 75 Neb. L. Rev. 872 (1996).
- Joanne Carter, *Mixed Emotions: A Law Student's Perceptions While Working at a Public Defender's Office*, 2 T. M. Cooley J. Prac. & Clin. L. 329 (1998).
- A. James Casdner, *Are law professors right for the job?* 3 Learning and the Law 36 (1976).
- Gerard J. Clark, *Supervising Judicial Interns: A Primer*, 36 Suffolk U. L. Rev. 681 (2003).
- Rebecca A. Cochran, *Judicial Externships: The Clinic Inside the Courthouse*, 3d ed. (LexisNexis 2005).

Liz Ryan Cole, *Training the Mentor: Improving the Ability of Legal Experts to Teach Students and New Lawyers*, 19 N.M. L. Rev. 163 (1989).

Liz Ryan Cole, *Lessons from a Semester in Practice*, 1 Clin. L. Rev. 173 (1994).

Robert Condlin, *Learning from Colleagues: A Case Study in the Relationship Between "Academic" and "Ecological" Clinical Legal Education*, 3 Clin. L. Rev. 337 (1997).

Robert Condlin, *"Tastes Great, Less Filling": The Law School Clinic and Political Critique*, 35 J. Legal Educ. 45 (1986).

Leslie Larkin Cooney, *Heart and Soul: A New Rhythm for Clinical Externships*, 17 St. Thomas L. Rev. 407 (2005).

Cooperative Learning Education at Northeastern University, 3 J. Contemp. L. 210 (1977).

Larry Cunningham, *The Use of "Boot Camps" and Orientation Periods in Externships and Clinics: Lessons Learned from a Prosecution Clinic*, 74 Miss. L.J. 983 (2005).

Greg Dantzman, *My Externship Experience at the Public Defender's Office in Ann Arbor*, 2 T. M. Cooley J. Prac. & Clin. L. 337 (1998).

Erica M. Eisinger, *The Externship Class Requirement: An Idea Whose Time Has Passed*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 659 (2004).

Robinson O. Everett, *The Duke Law School Legal Internship Project*, 18 J. Legal Educ. 185 (1965).

Mary Jo Eyster, *Designing and Teaching the large Externship Clinic*, 5 Clin. L. Rev. 347 (1999).

Bernadette T. Feeley, *Examining the Use of For-Profit Placements in Law School Externship Programs*, 14 Clin. L. Rev. 37 (2007).

Norman Fell, *Development of a Criminal Law Clinic: A Blended Approach*, 44 Clev. St. L. Rev. 275 (1996).

Anahid Gharakhanian, *ABA Standard 305's "Guided Reflections": A Perfect Fit for Guided Fieldwork*, 14 Clin. L. Rev. 61 (2007).

Daniel J. Givelber, Brook J. Baker, John McDevitt & Robin Miliano, *Learning Through Work: An Empirical Study of Legal Externship*, 45 J. Legal Educ. 1 (1995).

Kenny Hegland, *Condlin's Critique of Conventional Clinics: The Case of the Missing Case*, 36 J. Legal Educ. 427 (1986).

Lawrence K. Hellman, *The Effect of Law Office Work on the Formation of Law Student's Professional Values: Observation, Explanation, Optimization*, 4 Geo. J. Legal Ethics 537 (1991).

Peter Jaszi, Ann Shalleck, Marlana Valdez & Susan Carle, *Experience as Text: The History of Externship Pedagogy at the Washington College of Law, American University*, 5 Clin. L. Rev. 403 (1999).

Peter A. Joy, *Evolution of ABA Standards Relating to Externships: Steps in the Right Direction?*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 681 (2004).

Judicial Clerkships: A Symposium on the Institution, 26 Vand. L. Rev. 1123 (1973).

Harriet N. Katz, *Using Faculty Tutorials to Foster Externship Students' Critical Reflection*, 5 Clin. L. Rev. 437 (1999).

Harriet N. Katz, *Personal Journals in Law School Externship Programs: Improving Pedagogy*, 1 T. M. Cooley J. Prac. & Clin. L. 7 (1997).

Neil Kibble, *Reflection and Supervision in Clinical Legal Education: Do Work Placements have a Role in Clinical Legal Education*, 5 Int'l J. Legal Prof. 83 (1998).

Minna J. Kotkin, *Reconsidering Role Assumption in Clinical Education*, 19 N.M. L. Rev. 185 (1989).

Arthur LaFrance, *Clinical Education: To Turn Ideals Into Effective Vision*, 44 S. Cal. L. Rev. 624 (1971).

Legal Externships, 6 J. Legal Educ. 504 (1953-1954) (Panel discussion held at Boston, MA, on Aug. 23, 1953, during the 5th Annual Meeting of the American Law Student Association. Participating were Professor William Kelly Joyce (Moderator), Judge Mark E. Lefever, Professor Lawrence N. Park, and Dean E. Blythe Stason).

Lisa G. Lerman, *Professional and Ethical Issues in Legal Externships: Fostering Commitment to Public Service*, 67 Fordham L. Rev. 2295 (1999).

Mary A. Lynch, *Designing a Hybrid Domestic Violence Prosecution Clinic*, 74 Miss. L.J. 1177 (2005).

Stephen T. Maher, *The Praise of Folly: A Defense of Practice Supervision in Clinical Legal Education*, 69 Neb. L. Rev. 537 (1990).

Stephen T. Maher, *Clinical Legal Education in the Age of Unreason*, 40 Buff. L. Rev. 809 (1992).

Meryl Markowitz, *My Experience at the Eaton County Prosecution Office*, 2 T. M. Cooley J. Prac. & Clin. L. 343 (1998).

Harold a. McDougall, *Lawyering and Public Policy*, 38 J. Legal Educ. 369 (1988).

Elliott S. Milstein, *Clinical Legal Education in the United States: In-house Clinics, Externships, and Simulations*, 51 J. Legal Educ. 375 (2001).

James E. Moliterno, *On the Future of Integration Between Skills and Ethics Teaching: Clinical Legal Education in the Year 2010*, 46 J. Legal Educ. 1 (1996).

Jean Montoya, *The University of San Diego Criminal Clinic: It's all in the Mix*, 74 Miss. L.J. 1021 (2005).

Linda H. Morton, Janet Weinstein & Mark Weinstein, *Not Quite Grown Up: The Difficulty of Applying an Adult Education Model to Legal Externs*, 5 Clin. L. Rev. 469 (1999).

Linda H. Morton, *Creating a Classroom Component for Field Placement Programs: Enhancing Clinical Goals With Feminist Pedagogy*, 45 Me. L. Rev. 19 (1993).

Janet Motley, *Self-Directed Learning and the Out-of-House Placement*, 19 N.M. L. Rev. 211 (1989).

J. P. OGILVY, LEAH WORTHAM & LISA G. LERMAN, *LEARNING FROM PRACTICE: A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TEXT FOR LEGAL EXTERNS* (Thomson/West 2007).

J. P. Ogilvy, *Introduction to the Symposium on Externships²: Learning from Practice*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 469 (2004).

J. P. Ogilvy, *Guidelines and Commentary for the Evaluation of Legal Externship Programs*, 38 Gonzaga L. Rev. 155 (2002-2003).

J. P. Ogilvy, *Introduction to the Symposium on Developments in Legal Externship Pedagogy*, 5 Clin. L. Rev. 337 (1999).

J. P. Ogilvy, Leah Wortham & Lisa G. Lerman, *Learning from Practice: A Professional Development Text for Legal Externs*, 2d ed (Thomson/West 2007).

William W. Patton, *Law Schools' Duty to Train Children's Advocates: Blueprint for an Inexpensive Experientially Based Juvenile Justice Course*, 45 Juv. & Fam. Ct. J. 3 (1994).

William Wesley Patton, *Externship Site Inspections: Fitting Well-Rounded Programs into the Four Corners of the ABA Guidelines*, 3 Clin. L. Rev. 471 (1997).

William P. Quigley, *Reflections from the Journals of Prosecution Clinic Students*, 74 Miss. L.J. 1147 (2005).

Allen Redlich, *Perceptions of a Clinical Program*, 44 S. Cal. L. Rev. 574 (1971).

Henry Rose, *Legal Externships: Can They Be Valuable Clinical Experiences for Law Students*, 12 Nova L. Rev. 95 (1987).

Sacks, Howard R., *Student Fieldwork as a Technique in Educating Students in Professional Responsibility*, 20 J. Legal Educ. 291 (1968).

Robert F. Seibel & Linda H. Morton, *Field Placement Programs: Practices, Problems and Possibilities*, 2 Clin. L. Rev. 413 (1996).

Marshall S. Shapo, *An Internship Seminar for Law Students: A Test of Theory, A Critique of Practice*, 46 Tex. L. Rev. 479 (1967-1968).

Roy D. Simon, Jr. & Tom Leahy, *Clinical Programs that Allow Both Compensation and Credit: A Model Program for Law Schools*, 61 Wash. U. L.Q. 1015 (1983-1984).

Hans P. Sinha, *Prosecutorial Externship Programs: Past, Present and Future*, 74 Miss. L.J. 1297 (2005).

Louis J. Sirico, Jr., *Judging: A Book for Student Clerks* (LexisNexis 2003).

Linda F. Smith, *Why Clinical Programs Should embrace Civic Engagements, Service Learning and Community Based Research*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 723 (2004).

Linda F. Smith, *Designing an Extern Program: Or As You Sow, So Shall You Reap*, 5 Clin. L. Rev. 427 (1999).

Linda F. Smith, *The Judicial Clinic: Theory and Method in a Live Laboratory of Law*, 1993 Utah L. Rev. 429 (1993).

Mark Spiegel, *Theory and Practice in Legal Education: An Essay on Clinical Education*, 34 UCLA L. Rev. 577 (1987).

Marc Stickgold, *Exploring the Invisible Curriculum: Clinical Field Work in American Law Schools*, 19 N.M. L. Rev. 287 (1989).

Nina W. Tarr, *Current Issues in Clinical Legal Education*, 37 How. L. J. 31 (1993).

Margaret A. (Peggy) Tonan, *Beauty and the Beast—Hybrid Prosecution Externships in a Non-Urban Setting*, 74 Miss. L.J. 1043 (2005).

Leah Wortham, *The Lawyering Process: My Thanks for the Book and the Movie*, 10 Clin. L. Rev. 399 (2003).

Carolyn R. Young & Barbara A. Blanco, *What Students Don't Know Will Hurt Them: A Frank View from the Field on How to Better Prepare Our Clinic and Externship Students*, 14 Clin. L. Rev. 105 (2007).