

February 5, 2016

TO: Fred Thrasher, NALP Deputy Director, Anna Whitener, NALP Board Liaison to the Experienced Professionals Section

FROM: Katherine White, Experienced Professionals Section Chair

Re: NALP Experienced Professionals Section Board Report

The Experienced Professionals Section will be led by the following Work Group Vice Chairs in 2015/16:

<b>Work Groups and Vice Chairs</b>
<b>Annual Education Conference Planning/Bulletin Article Planning</b> <u>Vice Chairs:</u> Jennifer Guirl, Bryan Cave; Linda Kressh, UCLA; Michele Ward, Winston Strawn
<b>Experienced Professionals and Newer Professionals Collaboration</b> <u>Vice Chairs:</u> Norma Cirincione, Cleary Gottlieb; Lee Anne Masetti-Martin, Morrison Foerster
<b>Managing Your Own Professional Development</b> <u>Vice Chairs:</u> Cindy Hasson, Paul Hastings; Brad Sprayberry, Gunster; Wendy Siegel, NYU

**Quarterly Conference Calls:**

The third EP Section conference call of the 2015-2016 year was held on Tuesday, January 26, 2016.

**Work Group Reports:** There were no work group reports on this call. However, the Experienced Professionals and Newer Professionals Collaboration Work Group has been continuing to provide speakers and ideas to the Newer Professionals Section for their “Ask the Expert” webinars. This has been a very successful collaboration for the Section.

**Ideas Discussed on Quarterly Call:**

A. Innovating Talent Work Group Report

We started the call with a report from Georgia Emery Gray, who is a member of the Innovation Talent Work Group. Dyana Barninger who chairs this group for NALP, could not be on the call, so Georgia filled in. She gave a terrific report, and led a robust discussion. Georgia started by discussing one of the group’s charges, which was to research what other professional services organizations do to recruit. She noted that for one thing, corporations and consulting firms who hire MBAs and others, don’t have the same timing challenges that legal employers and law schools face. Here are some challenges our industry faces:

1. Corporations and consulting firms are not burdened by our industry’s compression issues. We basically have a four week window for recruiting, which stretches our

resources and is dictated by the market. They actually do have a shorter time frame but are not as burdened because they have longer runways of time to make contact with the students.

2. Since law firms (and law schools) are lawyers are inherently risk averse, it is hard to implement any changes to the current process. She further notes that she thinks it's fair to say that there is risk adversity and entrenchment which makes it hard to innovate, generally, and especially under our current scheme. The current system in our industry does not provide enough time for mutual assessment of candidates, or for the candidates, of the offers they receive.
3. Are industry guidelines holding us back? What do other industries do?

Georgia described recruiting in the corporate/consulting world as follows, and suggested there are things we can learn from how this other industry handles the recruiting process:

1. These employers develop relationships with potential candidates early on – often from the first semester of their business school programs. They hold job fairs and events for the students.
2. The employers utilize technology to a much larger extent than we do in our industry. Employers bring I pads and lap tops with them to events, and encourage students to complete profiles on the company websites, so the companies can stay in touch with the students. They also often invite students to participate in case studies and other work-related projects, so the companies can get a sense of the student's work product, even before they are hired.
3. The employers utilize assessment tools more broadly than we do in our industry, and have found that by standardizing the way they evaluate candidates, they make better hiring decisions. This includes, for example, a two day interview process and pairing candidates with "buddies" who introduce them to staff members and give candidates a fuller view of the company. The result of this is lower attrition rates than we do in our industry.
4. Grades do not carry the same amount of weight as they do in the law firm hiring world, in fact, at most corporations they are not considered.
5. The recruiting function and staffing for recruiting is much larger in these institutions, and recruiters play a more active role in the process. For example, some on campus recruiters visit schools twice a week at certain times of the year. Recruiters also often screen candidates during the first phase of the interview process.
6. On the business school side, the work group found that the career services staff were more involved throughout the year, than the law school career services staff members are.
7. Finally, there are no regulatory guidelines for these employers. Each school has their own policies and guidelines about interview dates.

Georgia noted that the full report will be published before the conference in Boston. There will also be a session at the conference to discuss their findings.

Members asked several questions about the findings. First, it was asked if professionals who participate in the recruiting process receive credit for the time they spend. Georgia noted that it is often almost competitive to get involved in recruiting, because it is so highly regarded. Some organizations give bonuses for recruiting. There is a lot of pride

and a high level of engagement in the recruiting efforts of the companies.

Another member asked what we might take away from this information. How can we adapt what we do? Georgia suggested several thoughts:

- Legal employers should embrace technology more in the recruiting process, since this is so important to the millennial generation.
- Legal employers might think creatively about offering writing competitions or other kinds of programs that would give law students the opportunity to submit work product as part of the recruiting process.
- Legal employers and law schools should start to think about ways to engage students earlier in their law school careers, in the process of learning about legal employment opportunities.

#### B. Board Report

Anna Whitener gave a brief report, since there had not been a Board meeting our last call.

Anna reported that NALP has a balanced budget of 3.9 million for FY 2016.

- She mentioned the NALP Foundation changes.
- Anna also talked about the Best Practices Guide for Law Schools update.
- She reported that the 14 day reaffirmation period has been approved by the Board to be implemented.
- Finally, she reported the Recruiting Summit was to take place in New York later that week, and the deadline for the Newer Professionals Conference in Baltimore was coming up.

C. Discussion: How Can We Improve Connections with Smaller Offices? Firms discussed the issue of recruiting for smaller offices. It was suggested firms reach out to law schools in the geographic areas of these offices, and in the larger cities where they recruit, to discuss these challenges with the law school career services staff members. Law schools are eager to help students and employers connect, and will for example, send invitations for firms to students from specific geographic locations about receptions or to do resume collects. Many schools also prepare regional resume books they are happy to share with firms.

D. Discussion: Should Legal Employers Connect with Students on LinkedIn? One member said she invites students to follow her firm on LinkedIn, so they can learn about new developments, and see what the firms are doing. Another member said she uses LinkedIn to follow up on students, when she doesn't yet have a resume. Yet another member said he uses LinkedIn to connect with candidates. And notes in callbacks if students comment on things the firm has posted on LinkedIn. This can help differentiate a candidate – if he or she takes the time to follow their firm.

E. Discussion: How Can Legal Recruiting Professionals Get Firms to Increase 1L Hiring? The group talked about 1L hiring, and how hard it is to get students to return, after a 1L summer. Some firms touted hiring 1Ls, because they spread the good word about the firm, when they return to campus. It was noted that the firms' own stats on success with 1L hiring would be considered, and factor in to the decision by partners.

F. Discussion: Are JD/MBA Students Advised by Business Schools to Work for a Corporation During their Second Year Summer? Evidently some firms on the West Coast

have seen a trend with joint degree students being advised to work for a corporation during their 2L summer. This is not that common, but it was the consensus of the group that these students should get a law firm job, if that is where they want to work, for their 2L summer, or their 3LE summer.

This was a lively and robust conversation. Thanks to all of the EP members who participated.