Entry-Level Recruiting Experiences Small Bounce

We are now somewhere in the aftermath of "the Great Recession" and there are many signs that the legal economy is gaining strength. As is the case with other sectors, however, this nascent recovery has been something of a jobless one, with the legal sector continuing to experience a net loss of jobs in early 2011 according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nevertheless, after recruiting volumes by U.S. law firms on the campuses of U.S. law schools nose-dived to the lowest levels ever recorded in 2009, the late summer and early fall of 2010 saw a modest rebound in recruiting volumes, at least as compared to the historic lows of the previous year. While entry-level recruiting volumes have not returned to anything like the levels measured before the recession, the data provided by NALP members about fall 2010 recruiting reveal that most of the markers that measure the strength of the legal employment market for new lawyers, such as law firm recruiting levels for summer programs and summer program outcomes, rose slightly in 2010, a change in course following the general downward trend in recruiting volumes that was measured in 2008 and 2009.

The offer rate for entry-level associate positions rebounded just over eighteen points, to 87.4%, after plunging from 89.9% in 2008 to 69.3% in 2009. Not surprisingly, the acceptance rate for these summer offers fell slightly, from 84.5% to 82.7%, as students had incrementally more options on the table. The market for 3L law students looking for law firm work also rebounded slightly, 15% of the law firms surveyed reporting that they interviewed 3L students compared with a bare 3% in 2009 (this compares with 3L recruiting rates of 25% in 2008, 42% in 2007, and 53% in 2006). All of these 2010 numbers are increases over historic lows in 2009.

This small bounce in recruiting volume was also seen in the 2L market. Across employers of all sizes, the median number of offers extended bumped up to 9, from an all-time low of 7 in 2009 (this compares with medians of 10 in 2008 and 15 in 2007). Similarly, the percent of callback interviews resulting in offers for summer spots rose slightly to 40.6%, having fallen precipitously to 36.4% in 2009 after falling to 46.6% in 2008 from a figure that had hovered at or above 60% for the three previous years. Not surprisingly, the offer acceptance rate also fell slightly, to 40.4% from a historic high of 42.8% in 2009. The acceptance rate, however, remains near a historic high.

The one marker that fell in 2010 was the size of summer programs. After having been caught in the middle of the recession with larger summer programs than they would have liked, law firms in general brought in much smaller summer classes this time around, with the national average class size falling to 8 in 2010 from 12 in 2009 and average classes of 13 in 2008 and 2007. Average class size can be a misleading number, of course, as many law offices bring in summer classes that are very large, and others recruit far smaller classes, but the change in the size of the national average is a good measure of changes in class size generally. The median class size, a measure not as affected by the extremes, dropped to 4, after being at 6 for most years since 2001. These smaller summer classes are likely one reason that the offer rates coming out of them was as high as it was.

There remains, of course, tremendous variation in legal hiring, both by region and by individual employer, though these benchmark numbers continue to be a good gauge of the health of the entry-level employment market generally. While law firms continue to approach all hiring extremely cautiously, these numbers suggest that firms are returning to the entry-level hiring market with more confidence than exhibited in the depths of the recession.

A Retrospective on Recruiting

	SUMMER PROGRAMS				FALL RECRUITING OF 2Ls			
	Median Size	Average Size	% Receiving Offer	% Accepting Offer	Median # of Offers	Average # of Offers	% of Interviews Resulting in Offer	% of Offers Accepted
1995	8	11	84.3%	64.6%	14	30	55.7%	32.3%
1996	6	10	87.3	63.5	18	31	47.7	32.6
1997	8	12	88.2	60.1	24	40	52.3	30.0
1998	9	13	89.0	68.4	26	49	42.4	28.6
1999	8	13	88.9	65.2	21	41	63.8	29.0
2000	8.5	14	89.7	65.8	22	44	62.6	31.0
2001	6	12	84.2	72.8	11	26	51.4	34.9
2002	5	11	80.9	74.0	11	23	49.8	35.1
2003	5	10	87.0	77.0	11	29	52.9	31.4
2004	5	11	91.0	72.4	13	34	56.8	31.2
2005	6	12	90.6	73.0	16	37	59.6	30.3
2006	6	11	90.8	73.4	15	37	62.7	28.8
2007	6	13	92.8	76.8	15	39	60.0	29.1
2008	6	13	89.9	79.7	10	30	46.6	32.5
2009	6	12	69.3	84.5	7	16	36.4	42.8
2010	4	8	87.4	82.7	9	19	40.6	40.4

Introduction

Fall recruiting experiences are a topic of great importance both to law schools and to legal employers, particularly as activity in the employment market for entry-level and summer associates is affected by the economy as a whole. As a service to members and the legal profession, NALP reports annually on:

- the level of employer activity on campus,
- employer and school participation in job fairs, and
- outcomes of summer programs and of fall recruiting.

The first part of this report details recruitment activity on campus and at job fairs in fall 2010, providing comparisons with fall 2009 from the perspective of both schools and employers. The second part of the report provides information on the outcomes of 2010 summer programs and of fall 2010 recruiting for both second-year summer associates and entry-level associates. The last section reports on deferrals of class of 2010 graduates, drawing from information provided by both schools and employers. The findings in this report are based on law school responses to NALP's "Fall 2010 Survey of Law Schools on Fall Recruiting and Associate Deferrals" and on legal employer responses to the "2010 Survey of Legal Employers on Fall Recruiting and Associate Deferrals."

Note: As in prior years, this report does not document every aspect of recruiting nor include every category of hires. Hiring of current first-year (Class of 2013) students and current third-year (Class of 2011) students for summer 2011 associate positions is not included. Documentation of summer program outcomes includes only Class of 2011 graduates, and not any Class of 2010 graduates who participated in the summer 2009 program, or during the summer after graduation. Results of survey questions on lateral hiring are reported in the April 2011 *NALP Bulletin*.

Fall 2010 Recruiting Activity

■ Law School Perspective

A total of 119 law schools, about 60% of NALP's U.S. law school members, provided information on the number of employers participating in on-campus interviewing (OCI), the number of employers requesting resume collection, the number of job fairs or consortia in which the school participated, and the number of employers using video interviewing. Most were also able to provide comparable figures for fall 2009.

Because schools do not count employers on a uniform basis, only changes in employer counts were measured, and not absolute levels of activity. Job fair participation is measured both in terms of change and absolute levels.

- One-quarter of schools reported an increase of 5% or more in the number of employers on campus in fall 2010 compared with fall 2009. Nearly one-third reported steady numbers and 43% reported a decrease of 5% or more.
- Regional differences were evident, with schools in the Midwest most likely to report an increase of 5% or more. Schools in the West/Rocky Mountain region were most likely to report relatively steady numbers, and schools in the Southeast were most likely to report decreases. Further analyses by enrollment size show that the smallest schools diverged the most from the national average.
- About two-thirds of schools reported a decrease in the number of employers requesting resume collection. Most schools in the Northeast did so, as did 72% of small schools. Schools in the Mid-Atlantic and West/Rocky Mountain regions were most likely to report increases. The survey also asked for the number of employers requesting resume collection in 2010 who had been on campus in 2009. Comparing this with the number of employers on campus in 2009 provides a gauge of the shift. Overall, about 28% of employers who had been on campus in 2009 shifted to resume collection in 2010.
- An inquiry into the use of video interviewing revealed that 60% of schools did not use this technology in 2010. About 28% of schools reported using video interviews for 1 to 3 employers. Just a handful of schools used the technology more extensively.
- Over two-thirds of schools participated in five or more job fairs and over one-third participated in more than 10. Regional contrasts continue to be notable. Nearly all schools reporting from the Mid-Atlantic region participated in five or more job fairs, and 56% participated in more than ten job fairs. Among schools in the Southeast, by contrast, 36% participated in fewer than five job fairs. In the West/Rocky Mountain region that figure was 43%. As has been the case in prior years, just a few schools reported no job fair participation.
- About half of schools reported no change in job fair participation; this figure was highest among small schools and those in the West/Rocky Mountain region. Schools in the Southeast were most likely to have increased job fair participation.

Comparison of Fall 2010 and Fall 2009 Employer Activity, As Reported by Schools (percent or number of schools in each category)

	Total	NALP REGION					BY FALL 2010 JD ENROLLMENT			
		Northeast	Mid-Atlantic	Southeast	Midwest	West/RM	Fewer than 550	550-750	751-1,000	More than 1,000
Change in # of employers on campus:										
Decrease more than 10%	24.4%	28.6%	18.8%	39.4%	17.9%	9.6%	30.6%	22.6%	21.4%	20.8%
Decrease of 5-10%	18.5	19.0	18.8	21.2	21.4	9.5	13.9	19.4	21.4	20.8
Change of less than 5%	31.9	23.8	37.5	18.2	28.6	61.9	27.8	35.5	32.1	33.3
Increase of 5% or more	25.2	28.6	25.0	21.2	32.1	19.0	27.8	22.6	25.0	25.0
Number of schools reporting	119	21	16	33	28	21	36	31	28	24
Change in # of employers requesting resume collection:										
Decrease of 20% or more	29.8	36.8	26.7	36.4	18.5	30.0	42.9	26.7	22.2	22.7
Decrease of less than 20%	36.8	47.4	33.3	30.3	44.4	30.0	28.6	36.7	44.4	40.9
Increase	33.3	15.8	40.0	33.3	37.0	40.0	28.6	36.7	33.3	36.4
Number of schools reporting	114	19	15	33	27	20	35	30	27	22
Employers requesting resume collection who had previously been on campus, as percent of employers on campus in 2009	27.5	23.1	20.9	19.6	19.0	59.5	46.6	17.4	27.2	38.3

Job Fair Participation, Fall 2010, As Reported by Schools

(percent or number of schools in each category)

	Total	NALP REGION					BY FALL 2010 JD ENROLLMENT			
		Northeast	Mid-Atlantic	Southeast	Midwest	West/RM	Fewer than 550	550-750	751-1,000	More than 1,000
# of Job Fairs or Consortia										
Less than 5	30.8%	27.3%	6.3%	36.4%	32.0%	42.9%	48.6%	34.4%	7.4%	26.1%
5-10	35.0	27.3	37.5	30.3	40.0	42.9	40.0	25.0	37.0	39.1
More than 10	34.2	45.5	56.3	33.3	28.0	14.3	11.4	40.6	55.6	34.8
Number of schools reporting	117	22	16	33	25	21	35	32	27	23
Change in # of Job Fairs Compared with Fall 2009										
Decrease	21.2	19.0	37.5	21.9	17.4	14.3	20.6	16.7	26.9	21.7
No change	49.6	52.4	43.8	31.3	56.5	71.4	55.9	46.7	53.8	39.1
Increase	29.2	28.6	18.8	46.9	26.1	14.3	23.5	36.7	19.2	39.1
Number of schools reporting	113	21	16	32	23	21	34	30	26	23

■ Employer Perspective

A total of 260 law firm employers provided some information on recruiting activity. The majority of responses, about 70%, were from firms of more than 250 lawyers. Nationwide, the median number of schools at which employers recruited was 6. Just over one-third of employers each increased or maintained the number of schools visited, while 27% reported visiting fewer schools.

- Medians ranged from 4 at firms of 100 or fewer lawyers to 10 at firms of 251- 500 lawyers. It is also the case that for small offices, regardless of overall firm size, the median was 4 or fewer schools. It should be kept in mind, however, that firm or office size does not always correlate with the number of schools visited, because multi-office firms vary a great deal in how their OCI programs are structured. For example: In some firms, each office conducts its own visits, hence the number of schools visited by that office may be relatively few, even though the firm as a whole may visit many. Other firms split up the school visits, with each office responsible for visiting a few schools, but interviewing on behalf of multiple, or all, offices, again resulting in lower numbers per office. In other firms, all visits are done by one office, resulting in fairly large OCI numbers. All of these structures and more are present in the data reported in these tables, as is some composite firm-wide reporting, covering activity at all offices nationwide.
- Large firms in general and especially the larger offices were most likely to have increased the number of schools at which they interviewed. Offices in firms of 100 or fewer lawyers were much more likely to have maintained the number of schools visited — 67% compared with just 30% of offices in the largest firms.
- On a regional basis, the median number of schools ranged from 4 in the Southeast and West/Rocky Mountain regions to 8 in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions. Employers in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions were also most likely to interview at 9 or more schools. About 45% did so, a frequency more than twice that of employers in the Southeast and the West/Rocky Mountain regions. The percentage of offices increasing the number of schools visited was highest in the Northeast and West/Rocky Mountain regions. These same two regions had the smallest percentage of employers reporting visiting fewer schools.
- Regional averages are not necessarily indicative of activity on the part of employers in a given city within that region. For example, offices in New York and Dallas were more likely to have increased the number of schools visited than were offices in their respective regions as a whole; employers in Ohio visited more schools than average — a median of 12 compared to the regional median of 5.5. However, two-thirds of these employers also reported visiting fewer schools. Likewise, offices in New York and Philadelphia visited more schools than the regional median and were also more likely to have increased that number compared with their region as a whole.

Fall 2010 On-Campus Interviewing Activity and Comparisons with Fall 2009, As Reported by Employers — By Size

(in percentages except for medians)

	Number of Offices	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS VISITED IN 2010					# OF SCHOOLS VISITED COMPARED TO 2009		
		None*	1-3	4-8	9 or More	Median**	Decrease	No Change	Increase
Total — All Employers	**260**	**3.7%**	**25.6%**	**36.3%**	**34.4%**	**6.0**	**27.3%**	**37.4%**	**35.2%**
Firms of 100 or fewer lawyers	32	3.0	36.4	54.5	6.1	4.0	20.0	66.7	13.3
Offices of 26-50 lawyers	12	0.0	58.3	41.7	0.0	2.5	9.1	72.7	18.2
Offices of 51-100 lawyers	15	6.3	12.5	68.8	12.5	4.0	28.6	57.1	14.3
Firms of 101-250 lawyers	47	4.1	22.4	53.1	20.4	5.0	26.2	38.1	35.7
Offices of 51-100 lawyers	12	7.7	30.8	46.2	15.4	4.5	18.2	54.5	27.3
Offices of 101-250 lawyers	28	3.4	13.8	62.1	20.7	6.0	29.6	33.3	37.0
Firms of 251-500 lawyers	43	0.0	9.3	34.9	55.8	10.0	29.7	37.8	32.4
Offices of 51-100 lawyers	9	0.0	11.1	66.7	22.2	7.0	42.9	42.9	14.3
Offices of 101-250 lawyers	17	0.0	11.8	35.3	52.9	11.0	14.3	50.0	35.7
Offices of 251+ lawyers	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	12.5	50.0	25.0	25.0
Firms of 501 or more lawyers	138	4.8	29.0	26.9	39.3	6.0	28.8	29.7	41.5
Offices of 25 or fewer lawyers	13	13.3	66.7	13.3	6.7	2.0	22.2	55.6	22.2
Offices of 26-50 lawyers	25	10.7	50.0	32.1	7.1	3.0	47.4	31.6	21.1
Offices of 51-100	30	6.3	28.1	34.4	31.3	6.0	33.3	22.2	44.4
Offices of 101-250 lawyers	41	0.0	14.6	34.1	51.2	9.0	18.4	31.6	50.0
Offices of 251+ lawyers	20	0.0	5.0	15.0	80.0	15.5	27.8	22.2	50.0

This table includes offices/firms that reported visiting at least one school in 2009 or 2010. The number of offices reporting both 2009 and 2010 information for the comparative analyses is somewhat smaller than the number shown in the first column. Counts by office size within firm size do not add to the total count for the firm size because not all surveys included office size information, particularly if they indicated that they recruit for multiple offices.

* These employers did visit schools in 2009.

** Medians are calculated based on employers making visits in 2010.

Fall 2010 On-Campus Interviewing Activity and Comparisons with Fall 2009, As Reported by Employers — By NALP Region and City/State

(in percentages except for medians)

	Number of Offices	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS VISITED IN 2010					# OF SCHOOLS VISITED COMPARED TO 2009		
		None*	1-3	4-8	9 or More	Median**	Decrease	No Change	Increase
All Employers	**260**	**3.7%**	**25.6%**	**36.3%**	**34.4%**	**6.0**	**27.3%**	**37.4%**	**35.2%**
Northeast	34	0.0	17.6	38.2	44.1	8.0	22.6	38.7	38.7
Boston	7	0.0	28.6	28.6	42.9	6.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
New York City	20	0.0	5.0	35.0	60.0	11.0	16.7	33.3	50.0
Mid-Atlantic	44	2.2	15.6	35.6	46.7	8.0	27.0	40.5	32.4
Philadelphia	5	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	10.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Washington, DC/Northern VA area	26	0.0	7.7	46.2	46.2	8.0	30.4	39.1	30.4
Southeast	47	14.5	40.0	29.1	16.4	4.0	30.4	41.3	28.3
Atlanta	7	22.2	11.1	33.3	33.3	6.0	50.0	25.0	25.0
Dallas	6	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	2.5	0.0	50.0	50.0
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach	6	14.3	42.9	42.9	0.0	4.0	50.0	33.3	16.7
North Carolina	10	9.1	36.4	45.5	9.1	4.0	22.2	33.3	44.4
Midwest	52	0.0	17.3	50.0	32.7	5.5	32.6	37.0	30.4
Chicago	14	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	5.0	36.4	18.2	45.5
Michigan	7	0.0	0.0	57.1	42.9	8.0	50.0	16.7	33.3
Minneapolis	9	0.0	11.1	44.4	44.4	7.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
Missouri	5	0.0	20.0	40.0	40.0	4.0	0.0	80.0	20.0
Ohio	7	0.0	14.3	28.6	57.1	12.0	66.7	16.7	16.7
West/Rocky Mtn.	66	1.5	37.3	38.8	22.4	4.0	22.0	36.0	42.0
Los Angeles and Orange County	21	4.5	27.3	45.5	22.7	5.0	26.3	26.3	47.4
Portland	5	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	4.0	0.0	66.7	33.3
San Francisco	11	0.0	36.4	45.5	18.2	4.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
San Jose area	7	0.0	42.9	28.6	28.6	4.0	40.0	40.0	20.0
Seattle	8	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	2.0	28.6	42.9	28.6

This table includes offices/firms that reported visiting at least one school in 2009 or 2010. The number of offices reporting both 2009 and 2010 information for the comparative analyses is somewhat smaller than the number shown in the first column. Specific city information may include firms that recruit for additional offices in other cities, and/or a few offices in suburban locations. City figures generally do not include offices that submitted one composite survey to cover recruiting activity in multiple cities nationwide.

* These offices did visit schools in 2009.

** Medians are calculated based on schools making visits in 2010.

Almost one-third of responding employers participated in no job fairs, and 64% of employers participated in the same number of job fairs in 2009 and 2010.

- About 39% of firms of 100 or fewer lawyers did not participate in any job fairs. The majority of small offices, regardless of firm size, participated in fewer than two job fairs.
- Small firms and small offices generally participated in the same number of job fairs in 2009 and 2010. The largest offices were generally the most likely to have increased their participation in job fairs.
- On a regional basis, offices in the Northeast and Midwest were most likely to participate in job fairs, with about 80% doing so. About one-quarter of offices in these regions participated in three or more. Offices in the West/Rocky Mountain region were most likely to have not changed their participation, and offices in the Midwest were most likely to have increased their participation.
- Again, regional norms are not necessarily indicative of activity within a given market. For example, offices in North Carolina and Ohio were considerably more likely to not participate in job fairs compared with their respective regions as a whole.

Fall 2010 Job Fair Participation and Comparisons with Fall 2009, As Reported by Employers (in percentages)

	Number of Offices	NUMBER OF JOB FAIRS/CONSORTIA FALL 2010				COMPARED TO 2009 JOB FAIR PARTICIPATION		
		None	One	Two	Three or More	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same
Total — All Employers	**273**	**30.8%**	**26.0%**	**18.3%**	**24.9%**	**22.1%**	**14.0%**	**64.0%**
Firms of 100 or fewer lawyers	33	39.4	33.3	12.1	15.2	12.1	9.1	78.8
Offices of 26-50 lawyers	12	75.0	16.7	8.3	0.0	8.3	16.7	75.0
Offices of 51-100 lawyers	16	12.5	50.0	12.5	25.0	18.8	6.3	75.0
Firms of 101-250 lawyers	51	29.4	31.4	23.5	15.7	23.5	25.5	51.0
Offices of 51-100 lawyers	14	35.7	35.7	7.1	21.4	21.4	21.4	57.1
Offices of 101-250 lawyers	30	23.3	26.7	36.7	13.3	23.3	26.7	50.0
Firms of 251-500 lawyers	43	20.9	20.9	18.6	39.5	20.9	18.6	60.5
Offices of 51-100 lawyers	9	11.1	33.3	44.4	11.1	22.2	11.1	66.7
Offices of 101-250 lawyers	17	23.5	23.5	11.8	41.2	17.6	17.6	64.7
Offices of 251+ lawyers	8	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	37.5	25.0	37.5
Firms of 501 or more lawyers	146	32.2	24.0	17.8	26.0	24.1	9.7	66.2
Offices of 25 or fewer lawyers	15	93.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	93.3
Offices of 26-50 lawyers	28	42.9	39.3	14.3	3.6	25.0	3.6	71.4
Offices of 51-100	33	42.4	27.3	15.2	15.2	21.9	12.5	65.6
Offices of 101-250 lawyers	41	12.2	29.3	19.5	39.0	22.0	12.2	65.9
Offices of 251+ lawyers	20	0.0	5.0	40.0	55.0	45.0	10.0	45.0

Note: Figures based on employers who interviewed on campus or participated in job fairs, consortia or regional interview programs in either 2009 or 2010. Counts by office size within firm size do not add to the total count for the firm size because not all surveys included office size information, particularly if they indicated that participation was for multiple offices. The number of offices reporting both 2009 and 2010 information for the comparative analyses is somewhat smaller than the number shown in the first column.

Fall 2010 Job Fair Participation and Comparisons with Fall 2009, As Reported by Employers — By NALP Region and City/State (in percentages)

	Number of Offices	NUMBER OF JOB FAIRS/CONSORTIA FALL 2010				COMPARED TO 2009 JOB FAIR PARTICIPATION		
		None	One	Two	Three or More	Increased	Decreased	Stayed the Same
All Employers	**273**	**30.8%**	**26.0%**	**18.3%**	**24.9%**	**22.1%**	**14.0%**	**64.0%**
Northeast	34	20.6	35.3	17.6	26.5	15.2	21.2	63.6
Boston	7	14.3	42.9	14.3	28.6	42.9	0.0	57.1
New York City	20	20.0	25.0	20.0	35.0	10.5	31.6	57.9
Mid-Atlantic	46	39.1	15.2	15.2	30.4	19.6	17.4	63.0
Philadelphia	5	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	40.0
Washington, DC/Northern VA area	26	34.6	15.4	11.5	38.5	23.1	11.5	65.4
Southeast	55	41.8	27.3	12.7	18.2	21.8	16.4	61.8
Atlanta	9	11.1	33.3	22.2	33.3	44.4	22.2	33.3
Dallas	6	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	0.0	50.0	50.0
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach	7	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	42.9	0.0	57.1
North Carolina	11	54.5	36.4	0.0	9.1	27.3	0.0	72.7
Midwest	53	18.9	30.2	26.4	24.5	24.5	13.2	62.3
Chicago	14	0.0	35.7	42.9	21.4	42.9	7.1	50.0
Michigan	8	12.5	37.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	37.5	62.5
Minneapolis	9	11.1	22.2	22.2	44.4	44.4	0.0	55.6
Missouri	5	0.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	60.0
Ohio	7	42.9	0.0	42.9	14.3	14.3	28.6	57.1
West/Rocky Mtn.	67	37.3	29.9	19.4	13.4	20.9	9.0	70.1
Los Angeles and Orange County	22	40.9	31.8	9.1	18.2	18.2	9.1	72.7
Portland	5	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	40.0
San Francisco	11	27.3	36.4	18.2	18.2	27.3	9.1	63.6
San Jose area	7	42.9	14.3	42.9	0.0	14.3	14.3	71.4
Seattle	8	37.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	0.0	75.0

Note: Figures based on employers who interviewed on campus or participated in job fairs, consortia or regional interview programs in either 2009 or 2010. The number of offices reporting both 2009 and 2010 information for the comparative analyses is somewhat smaller than the number shown in the first column. Specific city information may include firms that recruit for additional offices in other cities, and/or a few offices in suburban locations. City figures generally do not include offices that submitted one composite survey to cover recruiting activity in multiple cities.

Summer Program Characteristics

Summer programs were typically 8 or 10 weeks long. Almost three-quarters of offices reported summer programs of either 8 or 10 weeks, although the lengths reported ranged from 4 to 14 weeks. About 62% of offices reported that their summer program in 2010 was two or more weeks shorter than in 2008. Among firms of 251-500 lawyers 72% did so.

- On a regional basis, 8-week programs are more common in the Southeast. On the other end of the spectrum, 12-week programs were most common in smaller firms and offices as well as in Boston and Michigan.
- Ten-week programs remained the norm in much of the Midwest.
- New information collected on the 2010 survey allowed for analysis on the presence or absence of summer programs in recent years. Overall, nearly three-quarters of employers held a summer program each summer from 2008 to 2010 and will do so again in 2011. This percentage is considerably lower in firms of 100 or fewer lawyers, in smaller offices, and in the Southeast and West/Rocky Mountain regions. Nearly 12% of offices did not hold a summer program in 2010 (after having a program in 2008 and 2009), but will have a program again in 2011. A small percentage of employers, about 5%, did not hold a summer program in 2010 (after having a program in 2008 and 2009) and will not have a program again in 2011.

Length of Summer 2010 Programs

	MOST COMMON PROGRAM LENGTHS AND % REPORTING EACH					RANGE OF LENGTHS REPORTED (WEEKS)		Average Length 2010	Average Length 2009	Average Length 2008	% of Offices Shortening Program*	Number of Offices**
	8 Weeks	9 Weeks	10 Weeks	11 Weeks	12 weeks	Minimum Length	Maximum Length					
Total — All Employers	**32.4%**	**7.1%**	**39.0%**	**5.0%**	**9.5%**	**4**	**14**	9.4	**9.7**	10.9	**62.3%**	**241**
By Number of Lawyers Firmwide												
100 or fewer	6.7	3.3	43.3	3.3	33.3	4	14	10.3	10.3	11.1	33.3	30
101-250	22.0	14.6	39.0	4.9	9.8	6	13	9.4	9.5	10.9	56.1	41
251-500	6.1	12.2	65.3	4.1	4.1	6	14	9.7	10.0	11.6	72.3	49
501+	52.9	3.3	27.3	5.8	5.8	5	13	8.9	9.6	10.7	67.3	121
By Number of Lawyers in Office												
25 or fewer	33.3	11.1	33.3	0.0	16.7	7	12	9.4	9.6	10.1	38.5	18
26-50	21.2	6.1	45.5	0.0	21.2	6	12	9.7	9.7	10.4	55.2	33
51-100	38.2	1.5	35.3	8.8	8.8	4	12	9.2	9.6	11.0	62.7	68
101-250	38.3	11.1	34.6	3.7	4.9	5	13	9.0	9.5	11.0	67.9	81
251+	19.2	7.7	50.0	11.5	7.7	8	13	9.9	10.5	11.8	69.2	26
By NALP Region and City/State												
Northeast	30.3	9.1	42.4	3.0	15.2	8	12	9.6	9.6	11.0	62.5	33
Boston area	33.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	8	12	9.7	9.8	9.9	50.0	6
New York City	30.0	10.0	45.0	5.0	10.0	8	12	9.6	9.7	11.5	75.0	20
Mid-Atlantic	37.5	7.5	40.0	7.5	5.0	8	14	9.5	9.8	10.9	60.0	40
Washington, DC/ Northern VA	30.8	7.7	38.5	11.5	7.7	8	14	9.7	10.4	11.6	69.2	26
Southeast	50.0	2.0	20.0	0.0	6.0	4	12	8.2	8.9	9.8	54.2	50
Atlanta	14.3	14.3	57.1	0	0.0	4	10	8.7	9.7	10.9	42.9	7
Dallas	42.9	0.0	28.6	0	0.0	6	10	8.1	9.3	8.9	42.9	7
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/ W. Palm Beach	57.1	0.0	28.6	0	14.3	8	12	9.1	9.3	10.9	71.4	7
North Carolina	62.5	0.0	12.5	0	0.0	6	10	7.8	8.1	10.1	71.4	8
Midwest	20.8	6.3	52.1	6.3	12.5	8	13	9.9	10.1	11.7	76.6	48
Chicago	80.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	8	11	8.4	9.6	11.5	90.0	10
Michigan	0.0	0.0	57.1	14.3	28.6	10	12	10.7	11.0	11.8	71.4	7
Minneapolis	0.0	0.0	88.9	0.0	11.1	10	12	10.2	9.8	11.4	75.0	9
Missouri	40.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	8	10	9.2	10.6	12.0	100.0	5
Ohio	0.0	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	10	11	10.1	10.1	11.9	85.7	7
West/Rocky Mountain	27.8	9.3	42.6	3.7	9.3	5	14	9.5	9.9	11.1	62.5	54
Los Angeles and Orange County	31.6	10.5	47.4	0.0	0.5	8	12	9.5	9.4	10.5	50.0	19
San Francisco	42.9	14.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	8	12	9.4	10.3	11.1	57.1	7
San Jose area	28.6	0.0	57.1	0.0	0.0	6	10	8.9	9.7	10.5	40.0	7
Seattle area	28.6	14.3	28.6	0.0	14.3	8	13	10.0	9.9	12.1	100.0	7

Specific city information may include offices in a few suburban locations. However, it generally does not include firms that submitted one survey for multiple offices nationwide. These firms are also excluded from regional analyses. However, information by region does include firms submitting a firm-wide form but whose offices are predominantly or wholly in that region.

* By two weeks or more in 2010 compared with 2008.

** This is the number of offices that reported a summer program in 2010. Averages for each year are based on offices reporting a program for that year. The number of offices on which the averages and the change figures are based thus vary from this number.

Summer Program Trends — 2008 – 2011

	% Holding Program in All Four Years	% Holding Program in All Years Except 2010	% Holding Program in 2008 and 2009 But Not in 2010 or 2011	Number of Offices Reporting
Overall	**73.1%**	**11.8%**	**4.6%**	**305**
By Number of Lawyers Firmwide				
100 or fewer	64.1	12.8	10.3	39
101-250	75.0	13.5	5.8	52
251-500	77.6	10.3	1.7	58
501+	73.1	11.5	3.9	156
By Number of Lawyers in Office				
25 or fewer	38.7	12.9	6.5	31
26-50	48.2	22.2	7.4	54
51-100	83.5	11.4	2.5	79
101-250	87.9	6.6	2.2	91
251+	89.3	7.1	0.0	28
By NALP Region and City/State				
Northeast	79.0	10.5	2.6	38
Boston	75.0	12.5	12.5	8
New York City	86.4	9.1	0.0	22
Mid-Atlantic	78.4	13.7	7.8	51
Philadelphia	33.3	50.0	16.7	6
Washington, DC/Northern VA	92.9	3.6	3.6	28
Southeast	65.2	10.6	6.1	66
Atlanta	70.0	20.0	10.0	10
Dallas	87.5	12.5	0.0	8
Houston	57.1	0.0	14.3	7
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach	55.6	11.1	0.0	9
North Carolina	54.6	9.1	0.0	11
Midwest	80.0	13.3	3.3	60
Chicago	78.6	21.4	0.0	14
Michigan	77.8	11.1	11.1	9
Minneapolis	72.7	9.1	9.1	11
Missouri	100.0	0.0	0.0	5
Ohio	77.8	11.1	0.0	9
West/Rocky Mountain	62.1	13.5	4.1	74
Los Angeles and Orange County	62.5	12.5	4.2	24
Portland, OR	66.7	33.3	0.0	6
San Francisco	70.0	10.0	0.0	10
San Jose area	66.7	11.1	0.0	9
Seattle	55.6	11.1	11.1	9

Note: Offices/firms included in this table held, or will hold, a summer program in at least one of the four years. This table shows percentages for the three most frequently reported combinations, which account for 90% of responses. This table includes both firmwide and office-specific reports. City information may include offices in adjacent areas. State information may include consolidated information reported by firms whose offices are primarily in that state. However, regional and city-specific figures generally do not include offices that reported one consolidated form to cover activity in offices nationwide.

Outcomes of Summer Programs and Fall Recruiting

A total of 242 employers reported information on the outcomes of their 2010 summer programs. Half of respondents represented firms of 501 or more lawyers. Because relatively few responses were from firms of 501-700 lawyers, that size category is not broken out separately this year. Firms of 100 or fewer lawyers represented about 12% of respondents. However, responses from those large firms were often from small offices of the firm. Just over one-third of respondents were from the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions combined. The Southeast and the Midwest each accounted for about one-fifth of respondents, and the West/Rocky Mountain for just over one-quarter of responses. Note that for firms submitting one survey to cover multiple, or all, offices, the information generally was not attributed to a city, and in some cases not even to a region if offices are nationwide.

■ Outcomes of Summer 2010 Programs

Responding employers reported a combined total of 1,881 individuals from the Class of 2011 participating in their 2010 summer programs, with an overall average class size of 8, and a median class size of 4. Distinguishing between firms that submitted a composite survey to cover activity in multiple, or all, offices from those that submitted a survey pertaining to that office only reveals that, on a per office basis, the median size was also 4, but the average size was 5. For firms reporting on a firm-wide basis, the median class size was 11, and ranged from 5 in the smallest firms to 27 in the largest firms. Just over 87% of participants received an offer for an associate position, up considerably from the 69% recorded for the summer 2009 program, and much more in line with offers rates documented in most, though not all, of the prior 15 years. Overall figures for 2010, those that are comparable to those compiled in prior years, show a considerable shrinkage in summer class sizes in 2010, with the median of 4 in 2010, the lowest since NALP began compiling these figures in 1993. The most comparable years were the recessionary period of the early 2000s. The fact that the offer rate recovered compared with 2009 must be viewed in the context of much smaller class sizes. Moreover, the acceptance rate remained high by historical standards.

- Measured in terms of either the average or the median, summer class sizes were largest

Outcome of Summer Programs

	Size of Program					
	Median	Average	% of Participants Receiving Offers	% of Offers Accepted	% of Accepted Offers with Deferred Start Date	Number of Offices
Total — All Employers	**4.0**	**8**	**87.4%**	**82.7%**	**12.2%**	**242**
Firmwide reports						
All firm-wide reports	11.0	17	86.4	83.7	11.5	48
By # of lawyers firmwide						
100 or fewer	5.0	4	55.6	90.0	0.0	5
101-250	4.5	5	67.2	83.7	0.0	12
251-500	12.0	14	90.2	82.8	0.7	14
501+	27.0	33	88.3	83.9	16.5	17
By NALP region						
Southeast	5.5	11	64.3	75.0	0.0	10
Midwest	7.0	7	82.2	74.7	0.0	14
Office-specific reports						
All office specific reports	4.0	5	88.2	82.0	12.8	194
By # of lawyers firmwide						
100 or fewer	2.0	3	65.2	81.4	5.7	25
101-250	5.0	5	80.3	81.8	20.0	29
251-500	4.0	6	80.9	77.0	0.0	35
501+	4.0	6	94.8	83.5	15.4	105
By # of lawyers in office						
25 or fewer	2.0	2	86.2	88.0	4.5	16
26-50	2.0	2	80.6	90.0	8.9	32
51-100	3.0	4	85.1	77.8	13.6	56
101-250	5.0	6	89.4	86.1	10.6	64
251+	14.5	16	96.4	77.9	12.1	20
By NALP region and city/state						
Northeast	5.0	8	93.0	83.6	16.2	30
Boston	3.0	7	95.1	84.6	21.2	6
New York City	8.0	10	95.9	83.5	16.1	18
Mid-Atlantic	5.0	6	82.9	70.4	2.1	37
Washington, DC/Northern VA	5.0	7	83.2	68.6	1.0	25
Southeast	2.5	5	86.8	79.5	6.6	40
Atlanta	7.0	6	95.6	81.4	0.0	7
Dallas	4.0	5	89.2	84.8	0.0	7
Houston	5.0	11	83.9	70.2	0.0	5
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/ W. Palm Beach	2.0	2	92.9	100.0	38.5	7
North Carolina	2.0	2	75.0	66.7	33.3	6
Midwest	5.0	6	89.4	87.6	13.6	35
Chicago	5.0	8	91.8	84.6	9.1	11
Minneapolis	4.5	6	86.4	94.7	30.6	8
West/Rocky Mountain	3.0	3	89.2	90.4	23.9	52
Los Angeles and Orange Co.	3.0	4	94.0	92.1	24.1	19
San Francisco	2.0	3	90.0	88.9	31.3	7
San Jose area	4.0	3	95.5	95.2	10.0	7
Seattle area	2.0	3	91.3	95.2	60.0	7

Note: Figures reflect participation by 1,881 students in the Class of 2011 during the summer of 2010. The number of employers reporting a summer program is shown in the last column. This table excludes survey respondents that did not host a summer program for 2Ls. However, it does include offices that that did not make any offers from the summer program or whose offer process was not complete as of December 30, 2010. Overall, firms reported that an offer decision had not been made for less than 2% of summer program participants. A few offices did not provide information on the number deferrals, but are included in the calculation of the percentage of accepted offers with a deferred start date reported. Average figures are rounded to the nearest whole number. Following the overall total shown in the first line, the table separates out surveys which reported information firm-wide, or for multiple offices, from those which reported office-specific information. Firm-wide information by region includes firms whose offices are predominantly or wholly in that region. However, office-specific information includes a few instances of firms with one small office in an adjacent suburban location or satellite location, and of multi-office nationwide firms consolidating two geographically adjacent offices onto one survey.

in the Northeast, and smallest in the West/Rocky Mountain region.

Some cities with relatively large firms, but certainly not all, had summer programs that on average were far larger than for their respective region as whole. Those that did include New York and Atlanta. Programs in Boston were smaller than the Northeast average. Programs in the West/Rocky Mountain region were quite consistently small and in line with the regional average.

- Average class sizes increased with firm size, whether looking at firm-wide reports or office-specific reports, as did offer rates. Offer rates were highest in the Northeast, and in New York and Boston, specifically, and lowest in the Southeast. However, a few areas outside the Northeast — Atlanta, Los Angeles/Orange County, and the San Jose area also had offer rates matching those of the New York firms. Acceptance rates were well over 80% in most cities. Relatively lower acceptance rates are noted for Washington, DC, Houston, and North Carolina.

Additional information requested on this year's survey revealed that an offer decision had not been made, for whatever reason, for fewer than 2% of summer program participants.

- About 12% of summer associates who accepted an offer are doing so with a start date deferred beyond December 1, 2011. This compares with a figure of 40% from the summer 2009 program. The considerably lower rate of deferrals reflects smaller classes, but it also reflects a shift on the part of some firms to a later start date for their entering associate classes. In fact, a quick polling of NALP members, conducted entirely separately from these two surveys, found that, while most are maintaining a fall start date, a sizable minority — about 12% — have set January as the start date for their entry-level associate class.

A different perspective on summer outcomes is provided by examining the distribution of acceptance rates for each of the offices reporting this information. This procedure, unlike that of the previous analysis, which is based on volumes, gives equal weight to each office. For example,

Acceptance Rates from Summer 2010 Program

(percent of offices in each range of acceptance rates)

	ACCEPTANCE RATES			Average Acceptance Rate	Number of Offices
	75% or Less	75.1 - 99.9%	100%		
Total — All Employers	**26.1%**	**22.6%**	**51.3%**	**82.9%**	**230**
By Number of Lawyers Firmwide					
100 or fewer	29.2	4.2	66.7	77.4	24
101-250	28.2	17.9	53.8	81.3	39
251-500	37.0	21.7	41.3	80.9	46
501+	20.7	28.1	51.2	85.2	121
By Number of Lawyers in Office					
25 or fewer	25.0	0.0	75.0	86.8	16
26-50	14.8	3.7	81.5	88.3	27
51-100	33.3	12.1	54.5	79.0	66
101-250	23.2	26.8	50.0	84.4	82
251+	26.9	61.5	11.5	81.5	26
By NALP Region and City/State					
Northeast	20.0	40.0	40.0	84.5	30
Boston area	20.0	20.0	60.0	85.8	5
New York City	20.0	55.0	25.0	82.3	20
Mid-Atlantic	36.8	21.1	42.1	74.6	38
Washington, DC/Northern VA	40.0	16.0	44.0	74.5	25
Southeast	31.3	14.6	54.2	79.2	48
Atlanta	33.3	50.0	16.7	70.5	6
Dallas	33.3	16.7	50.0	81.8	6
Houston	40.0	20.0	40.0	67.1	5
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/W. Palm Beach	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	7
North Carolina	50.0	0.0	50.0	65.6	8
Midwest	27.7	19.1	53.2	82.5	47
Chicago	18.2	18.2	63.6	89.4	11
Michigan	16.7	50.0	33.3	82.2	6
Minneapolis	25.0	12.5	62.5	83.3	8
Missouri	0.0	20.0	80.0	96.7	5
Ohio	71.4	28.6	0.0	61.6	7
West/Rocky Mountain	15.7	9.8	74.5	91.6	51
Los Angeles and Orange County	10.5	15.8	73.7	93.8	19
San Francisco	14.3	14.3	71.4	92.9	7
San Jose area	14.3	0.0	85.7	96.4	7
Seattle area	16.7	0.0	83.3	91.7	6

Note: This table excludes offices that did not make any offers to their summer associates or had not made any offers as of December 31, 2010. This table includes both firm-wide and office-specific reports. However, figures by region include firm-wide/multi-office reporting only if the firm is wholly or predominantly located in that region, and city-specific figures generally do not include offices in that city that submitted a composite survey for offices nationwide.

the acceptance rate for a small office has equal weight with that of a very large office. About 26% of offices reported acceptance rates of 75% or less; 23% reported acceptance rates between 75% and 99.9%; and 51% reported acceptance rates of 100%. The average acceptance rate was 83%. The smallest firms and the smallest offices were most likely to report a 100% acceptance rate.

- On a regional basis, offices in the West/Rocky Mountain region were most likely to report acceptance rates of 100%. Offices in the Mid-Atlantic region were most likely to have reported acceptance rates of 75% or less. It follows that the average acceptance rate was lowest there as well, about 75%. Most offices in Ohio reported acceptance rates of 75% or less. But in a number of markets, acceptance rates of 100% were the norm.

First-year Participation in Summer Programs

About 44% of the responding firms reported that their summer 2010 program included one or more first-year (Class of 2012) students.

- These firms collectively employed 228 first-years, with a median of 1 and an average of 2 for both firm-wide and office-specific reports. Measured by the median and the average, first-year presence was greatest in the Southeast and Midwest. In other areas, the typical number of first-years was one.
- Overall, 59% of these first-years received an offer to return for some or all of the summer 2011 program. This figure ranged from just over one-third to 75% depending on firm or office size. On a regional basis offer rates ranged from 44% in the West/Rocky Mountain region to 77% in the Mid-Atlantic region.

Presence of First-Years in Summer Programs

	NUMBER OF 1Ls		% Receiving Offers to Return Next Summer	Number of Offices
	Median	Average		
Total — All Employers	**1.0**	**2**	**58.8%**	**106**
Firm-wide reports				
All firm-wide reports	2.0	3	50.0	29
By # of lawyers firmwide				
101-250	1.0	3	65.0	7
251-500	2.0	3	42.9	9
501+	2.0	3	51.6	11
By NALP region				
Southeast	2.0	3	40.0	5
Midwest	2.0	3	51.4	11
Office-wide reports				
All office specific reports	1.0	2	63.7	77
By # of lawyers firmwide				
100 or fewer	1.5	2	66.7	10
101-250	1.0	2	37.5	15
251-500	1.0	2	75.0	17
501+	1.0	2	67.1	35
By # of lawyers in office				
26-50	1.0	1	42.9	11
51-100	2.0	2	63.9	19
101-250	1.0	2	59.3	29
251+	1.0	2	81.5	11
By NALP region and city				
Northeast	1.0	1	52.6	15
New York City	1.0	1	69.2	10
Mid-Atlantic	1.0	2	77.3	13
Washington, DC/Northern VA	1.0	2	80.0	7
Southeast	2.5	3	73.5	16
Midwest	2.0	2	60.6	15
Minneapolis	3.0	3	57.1	5
West/Rocky Mountain	1.0	1	43.5	18

Note: Figures reflect participation by 228 students in the Class of 2012 during the summer of 2010. The number of employers reporting that their summer program included 1Ls is shown in the last column. Average figures are rounded to the nearest whole number. Following the overall total shown in the first line, the table separates out surveys which reported information firm-wide, or for multiple offices, from those which reported office-specific information. Firm-wide information by region includes firms whose offices are predominantly or wholly in that region. However, office-specific information includes a few instances of firms with one small office in an adjacent suburban location or satellite location, and of multi-office nationwide firms consolidating two geographically adjacent offices onto one survey.

■ Hiring for Summer 2011

A total of 279 employers reported issuing a median of 29 and an average of 57 callback invitations each to second-year students, or a total of 15,325 callback invitations. Distinguishing between firms that submitted a composite survey to cover activity in multiple or all offices from those that submitted a survey pertaining to one office only reveals that, on a per office basis, the median was comparable, at 26, and that the average was 45. For firms reporting on a firm-wide basis, medians and averages ranged from 12 to well over 200, depending on firm size. The average and median numbers of invitations were highest by far in the Northeast, about twice as large as those for the region with the next largest numbers, the Mid-Atlantic region. Nationwide, 81% of these callback invitations were accepted. Acceptance rates were somewhat lower in the Northeast compared with other regions. The overall level of activity for 2010, figures which are comparable to those of prior years, show a slightly higher activity level compared to 2009, when the average and median number of callback invitations were 30 and 53, but still well below those in 2008 and 2007, with 2007 being the last year of a 6-year upward trend. Figures are based on offices that had interviewed at least one 2L, even if the process ended with no offers being made, or none had been made as of December 31, 2010.

- About 41% of callback interviews resulted in an offer, with a median and average of 9 and 19 offers, respectively. For offices reporting office-specific information, the median was similar, 8, and the average was 15. The overall median of 9 is up from the comparable figure of 7 in 2009, as is the offer rate, which was about 36% in 2009. Both figures however, remain off from those of the three years prior to 2008, when the offer rate was about 60% and the median number of offers was 15 or 16. Offer rates below 50% were last experienced in the fall of 2002, and prior to 2009 had only been as low as 47% since NALP began compiling these figures in 1993. The percentage of callback interviews resulting in an offer generally increased with firm size for individual offices. This percentage was also somewhat higher in the Southeast. On an individual office basis, employers in the Southeast and Midwest made the fewest offers, with medians of 4 and 5, respectively. This compares with a median of 18 and an average of 32 in the Northeast.
- Some cities and states departed from their regional norm with respect to offers made. For example, firms in Chicago and Houston reported relatively high offer rates compared to their regions as a whole, whereas the opposite was true in a number of cities including the Miami area, Michigan, and Missouri. Offer rates ranged from 32% in Michigan to almost 66% in Houston. Some of these differences of course result from differences in the firm sizes typical for these cities.
- Overall, about 40% of offers were accepted, down somewhat from 43% in 2009, but still much higher than figures which had ranged from 29% to 33% between 2002 and 2008. The acceptance rates of the last two years remain the highest since NALP began tracking these figures in 1993. A larger percentage of offers from offices in the Southeast were accepted — 51% — while acceptance rates were lower in the Northeast — about 33%. Acceptance rates were highest at firms of 100 or fewer lawyers and at offices of 25 or fewer lawyers.
- At the city and state level, acceptance rates were lowest at offices in Boston, New York, Chicago, and San Jose, where fewer than one-third of offers were accepted. Acceptance rates were highest in Michigan, Ohio, and Portland, at over 60%.

Outcomes of Callback Invitations to and Interviews of Class of 2012 Students for Summer 2011 Positions

	NUMBER OF CALLBACK INVITATIONS		% of Callback Invitations Accepted	% of Callback Interviews Resulting in Offer	NUMBER OF OFFERS EXTENDED		% of Offers Accepted	Number of Offices
	Median	Average			Median	Average		
Total — All Employers	**29.0**	**57**	**80.9%**	**40.6%**	**9.0**	19	**40.4%**	**279**
Firm-wide reports								
All firm-wide reports	52.5	121	82.0	38.7	17.0	38	43.1	45
By # of lawyers firmwide								
100 or fewer	12.0	12	85.7	47.6	5.0	4	81.0	5
101-250	31.0	31	86.5	34.6	9.0	10	54.5	13
251-500	73.0	85	81.4	37.6	22.0	26	50.5	11
501+	224.0	248	81.6	39.3	53.0	78	39.5	16
By NALP region								
Southeast	34.0	63	88.2	36.1	9.0	20	52.2	9
Midwest	23.0	34	87.8	38.3	8.0	12	53.5	11
Office-specific reports								
All office specific reports	26.0	45	80.4	41.5	8.0	15	39.1	234
By # of lawyers firmwide								
100 or fewer	10.0	15	87.7	29.6	3.0	4	66.4	29
101-250	28.0	37	85.8	34.1	9.5	11	39.7	34
251-500	22.5	47	79.2	39.2	8.0	15	41.4	43
501+	34.0	52	79.4	44.5	10.5	18	37.1	128
By # of lawyers in office								
25 or fewer	7.0	10	74.1	46.4	2.0	4	49.4	22
26-50	12.5	16	84.1	35.2	3.0	5	48.1	45
51-100	26.0	31	81.8	34.6	7.0	9	42.9	63
101-250	39.0	49	81.2	38.6	13.0	15	41.1	73
251+	135.0	153	78.0	49.2	61.0	59	33.6	24
By NALP region and city								
Northeast	82.0	113	74.2	40.7	18.0	32	32.8	33
Boston	48.0	69	86.1	44.7	12.0	26	31.9	7
New York City	99.0	146	72.0	40.1	29.5	42	32.3	20
Mid-Atlantic	40.0	57	78.7	41.7	12.5	19	39.9	44
Washington, DC/Northern VA	48.5	71	76.7	44.7	14.0	25	38.6	27
Southeast	14.0	22	87.9	47.2	4.0	9	50.6	47
Atlanta	19.0	30	88.6	43.3	6.0	12	58.7	9
Dallas	27.0	29	85.0	51.3	9.0	13	40.2	8
Houston	31.0	43	86.9	65.6	13.0	24	50.8	5
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/ W. Palm Beach	9.0	16	92.8	35.6	4.5	5	46.9	6
North Carolina	11.0	12	84.1	38.9	3.0	4	42.9	9
Midwest	24.5	35	88.8	41.8	5.0	13	40.7	47
Chicago	33.5	56	85.4	47.6	11.5	23	28.9	14
Michigan	25.0	28	90.0	31.7	4.0	8	65.0	5
Minneapolis	25.5	31	90.6	43.0	9.5	12	45.0	10
Missouri	36.0	38	93.2	35.6	10.0	13	46.0	5
Ohio	19.0	21	93.2	42.7	4.0	8	68.3	5
West/Rocky Mountain	22.5	27	83.0	39.0	7.0	9	39.2	63
Los Angeles and Orange Co.	28.0	35	81.7	39.2	10.0	11	33.2	21
Portland, OR area	10.0	10	92.3	33.3	3.0	3	62.5	5
San Francisco	24.0	30	85.9	38.7	7.0	10	39.4	10
San Jose area	30.5	37	76.5	37.5	10.0	11	30.2	9
Seattle area	15.0	20	87.6	40.8	3.0	7	44.9	7

Note: Figures for callback invitations and outcomes are based on 270 employers issuing a total of 15,325 callback invitations and do not include 9 offices that did not report the number of callbacks and interviews. Figures for offers and offer outcomes are based on 279 employers making a total of 5,172 offers. Median and average offer figures are based on all employers who interviewed at least one second-year student, even though a few ultimately made no offers as a result of callback invitations, or had not yet completed their second-year hiring as of December 30. The number of offices reporting interviewing second-year students is shown in the last column. Averages are rounded to the nearest whole number. Following the overall total shown in the first line, the table separates out surveys which reported information firm-wide, or for multiple offices, from those which reported office-specific information. Firm-wide information by region includes firms whose offices are predominantly or wholly in that region. However, office-specific information includes a few instances of firms with one small office in an adjacent suburban location or satellite location, and of multi-office nationwide firms consolidating two geographically adjacent offices onto one survey.

Grouping offices according to their individual acceptance rates, about 39% of offices reported acceptance rates of 40% or less; about 29% of offices reported acceptance rates between 40% and 60%; and 32% reported acceptance rates of more than 60%. The average acceptance rate was almost 53%.

- Small offices and firms more frequently reported acceptance rates in excess of 60%, as did offices in the Southeast. At the city and state level, average acceptance rates and the percent of offices reporting acceptance rates of more than 60% were highest in Atlanta and Portland. In contrast, over 70% of offices in New York and the San Jose area reported acceptance rates of 40% or less.

■ Third-Year Hiring

Hardly unexpected, third-year hiring remained severely constricted, with just 15% of offices reporting any activity at all, and with those that did typically making 1 or 2 offers. Because 40% of those offices that did interview 3Ls ultimately made no offers, the 290 accepted callback invitations resulted in only 110 offers. Most of those offers — 85% — were accepted.

Acceptance Rates for Summer 2011 Program

(percent of offices in each range of acceptance rates)

	ACCEPTANCE RATES			Average Acceptance Rate	Number of Offices
	40% or Less	40 - 60%	More than 60%		
Total — All Employers	**39.3%**	**29.1%**	**31.6%**	**52.7%**	**275**
By Number of Lawyers Firmwide					
100 or fewer	12.5	15.6	71.9	76.8	32
101-250	42.6	23.4	34.0	50.9	47
251-500	28.3	37.7	34.0	55.4	53
501+	48.3	30.8	21.0	46.9	143
By Number of Lawyers in Office					
25 or fewer	24.0	20.0	56.0	68.9	25
26-50	36.4	22.7	40.9	58.3	44
51-100	32.0	28.0	40.0	55.8	75
101-250	44.8	35.6	19.5	46.7	87
251+	63.0	25.9	11.1	38.3	27
By NALP Region and City/State					
Northeast	58.3	27.8	13.9	42.0	36
Boston area	57.1	42.9	0.0	31.2	7
New York City	76.2	19.0	4.8	35.8	21
Mid-Atlantic	42.6	31.9	25.5	51.9	47
Washington, DC/Northern VA	51.9	29.6	18.5	45.4	27
Southeast	25.5	29.1	45.5	58.9	55
Atlanta	11.1	22.2	66.7	65.6	9
Dallas	50.0	37.5	12.5	47.5	8
Houston	0.0	80.0	20.0	52.7	5
Miami/Ft. Lauderdale/W. Pa	28.6	28.6	42.9	63.1	7
North Carolina	45.5	9.1	45.5	56.5	11
Midwest	32.1	25.0	42.9	59.3	56
Chicago	57.1	14.3	28.6	45.2	14
Michigan	12.5	37.5	50.0	67.3	8
Minneapolis	50.0	10.0	40.0	59.3	10
Missouri	40.0	60.0	0.0	46.4	5
Ohio	11.1	44.4	44.4	61.9	9
West/Rocky Mountain	43.1	29.2	27.7	49.8	65
Los Angeles and Orange County	61.9	28.6	9.5	41.0	21
Portland	16.7	16.7	66.7	64.8	6
San Francisco	40.0	30.0	30.0	46.0	10
San Jose area	77.8	22.2	0.0	30.6	9
Seattle area	33.3	16.7	50.0	64.5	6

Note: This table excludes offices that interviewed but then did not make any offers for summer 2011, as well as offices that had not yet made offers as of December 31, 2010. This table includes both firm-wide and office-specific reports. However, figures by region include firm-wide/multi-office reporting only if the firm is wholly or predominantly located in that region, and city-specific figures generally do not include offices in that city that submitted a composite survey for offices nationwide.

Deferrals of Class of 2010 Associates

NALP's fall surveys to both schools and employers included questions to gauge the scope of deferrals of Class of 2010 graduates, activity during the deferral period, and the availability of stipends.

- About 60% of schools reported that at least one of their Class of 2010 graduates was deferred beyond December 1, 2010. Collectively schools reported 588 deferrals; the median and average numbers deferred were 4 and 13, respectively. By any measure, deferrals were most widespread at schools in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic regions. It should be noted, however, that many schools did not know if any of the class had been deferred, and of those who did know, not all could provide a number.
- For the most part, schools did not know about the activities of these deferred associates, with the activity of over 77% unknown. Most of those whose activity was known were or are working in some capacity.

Based on the employer survey, just over one-third of the 258 offices that had acceptances from their summer 2009 program deferred the start date for at least one individual beyond December 1, 2010. Collectively, based on all these offices (including those that did not defer any), just over half of 2009 summer associates who accepted their offer were deferred — a total of just over 800 deferrals. This figure includes voluntary deferrals. For those offices which did defer associates, the median number was 3 and the average was 9. Compared with summer 2008, when about half of summer associates accepting an offer were deferred, both the percentage of offices reporting deferrals and the number of deferrals from the summer 2009 program are lower. Based on these surveys and other NALP research on graduate employment, it is estimated that the number of deferrals for this class is roughly half of what it was for the Class of 2009, which is to say an estimated 1,600 to 1,800, compared with 3,400 to 3,700 estimated for the Class of 2009.

- Not surprisingly, deferrals were generally more likely at the largest firms. Deferral rates, measured as either the percent of offices deferring, or the percent of associates deferred, were lowest in small firms and in the Mid-Atlantic region and the Midwest. The median number of deferred associates ranged from 1 in the Southeast to 7 in the Northeast, figures that also reflect variations in typical summer program size.
- Just under one-third of deferred associates were working for pay or a stipend, although in the Northeast almost two-thirds were reported as working. The most common work setting was government, at 35%, followed closely by public interest organizations at 31%. In general, firms were less likely to track the activities of deferred associates, compared with deferrals from their summer 2008 class, and, as noted previously, some do not consider a January 2011 start date as a deferred start date.

Deferrals of Class of 2010 Graduates, As Reported by Law Schools

	Total	BY FALL 2010 JD ENROLLMENT				NALP REGION				
		Fewer than 550	550-750	751-1000	More than 1,000	Northeast	Mid-Atlantic	Southeast	Midwest	West/Rocky Mountain
% of schools reporting deferrals	59.8%	44.4%	69.6%	65.2%	64.3%	76.5%	90.9%	42.3%	44.4%	66.7%
Medians and averages:										
Median # deferred	4.0	1.5	3.0	5.0	25.0	14.5	5.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Average # deferred	12.8	2.1	5.4	17.1	43.3	29.0	6.0	3.4	3.3	15.3
Activity during deferral period:										
Working for pay or stipend	17.9	48.0	29.6	14.0	14.6	13.8	42.9	40.5	52.2	8.7
Volunteering	2.4	0.0	3.7	5.0	0.0	0.3	7.1	2.7	21.7	2.9
Continuing studies	0.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0
Neither working nor volunteering	2.4	12.0	8.6	1.8	0.0	0.9	7.1	5.4	0.0	4.3
Status is unknown	77.2	40.0	56.8	79.3	85.4	85.1	42.9	48.6	26.1	84.1
Number deferred	588	25	81	222	260	348	42	37	23	138

Note: Percent reporting deferrals based on 87 schools — an additional 33 schools chose the "don't know" option. Medians, averages and activity percentages based on 46 of the 52 schools reporting deferred graduates who were also able to report the number of deferred graduates, including those who reported only the total number deferred and did not report any activity breakdown.

- About 60% of employers deferring associates provided a stipend, and about 59% of those providing a stipend reported that it was unconditional. For those that did put conditions on the stipend, nearly all conditioned the stipend on taking a position with a public interest or government office.
- Almost two-thirds of employers anticipated that some or all of their deferred associates would start in the first quarter of 2011. However, almost one-third anticipated that some or all of their deferred associates would start in the third quarter of 2011. An inquiry about deferrals from the summer 2008 class (law school graduating class of 2009) revealed that only about 11% of those who were deferred ultimately never joined the firm. In some cases this occurred because offers had to be rescinded.

Deferrals of Summer 2009 Associates

	% of Offices Deferring	% of Class Deferred	Median Number Deferred	Average Number Deferred	THOSE WHO ARE DEFERRED ARE: % Working	% Not Working	% Status Unknown	FOR THOSE WORKING THE SETTING IS: % Public Interest	% Government	% Corporate Client	% Other	# of Offices Reporting
Total — All Employers	**35.5%**	**36.6%**	**3.0**	**9**	**30.6%**	**7.0%**	**61.2%**	**30.6%**	**35.1%**	**14.1%**	**20.2%**	**258**
By # of Lawyers Firmwide												
101-250	26.1	33.2	6.0	6	40.0	24.0	33.3	30.0	23.3	3.3	43.3	46
251-500	26.0	23.1	2.0	6	30.9	8.6	60.5	40.0	44.0	0.0	16.0	50
501+	47.6	41.2	2.0	11	29.5	4.9	64.4	29.8	36.1	17.8	16.2	136
By # of Lawyers in Office												
25 or fewer	33.3	39.5	2.0	3	6.7	40.0	53.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	16
26-50	28.6	18.2	1.0	1	50.0	41.7	8.3	0.0	16.7	33.3	50.0	37
51-100	30.6	22.4	2.0	3	30.9	29.4	39.7	23.8	28.6	4.8	42.9	73
101-250	32.1	20.2	4.0	4	45.7	18.1	32.8	26.4	24.5	9.4	39.6	87
251+	63.0	45.5	12.0	19	44.1	1.6	52.5	32.6	41.8	17.0	8.5	27
By NALP Region and City												
Northeast	41.9	45.4	7.0	17	64.7	2.3	29.0	33.6	37.8	17.5	11.2	33
Boston	83.3	78.3	7.0	9	57.4	2.1	40.4	33.3	33.3	3.7	29.6	7
New York City	35.0	41.3	8.0	25	67.1	2.3	26.0	33.6	38.8	20.7	6.9	21
Mid-Atlantic	26.2	18.5	2.0	4	34.9	9.3	55.8	40.0	40.0	13.3	6.7	45
Washington, DC/ Northern VA	30.4	22.2	3.0	5	22.9	11.4	65.7	37.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	24
Southeast	30.0	11.1	1.0	2	23.3	63.3	13.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	85.7	52
Midwest	27.8	35.2	6.0	9	31.8	9.1	58.3	31.0	21.4	7.1	40.5	55
Chicago	69.2	51.9	4.0	9	36.3	3.8	60.0	34.5	31.0	10.3	24.1	14
West/Rocky Mountain	47.3	29.4	2.0	3	31.9	21.7	46.4	18.2	59.1	9.1	13.6	57
Los Angeles and Orange County	44.4	30.9	2.0	3	24.0	24.0	52.0	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	19

Note: Number of offices is the number reporting acceptances from the summer 2009 program, including those who did not defer anyone from the summer 2009 program, or did not report if there were deferrals. Of these offices, those deferring associates collectively reported 811 deferrals. Only groupings with at least 5 offices reporting deferrals of summer 2009 associates are shown on the table. This table includes both firm-wide and office-specific reports. However, figures by region include firm-wide/multi-office reporting only if the firm is wholly or predominantly located in that region, and city-specific figures generally do not include offices in that city that submitted a composite survey for offices nationwide. Percentages for activity during the deferral period do not add to 100 because a small number of individuals reported as continuing studies are not shown in the table.

Finally, commentary provided both by schools and employers illustrates the variety of activities pursued by deferred graduates. These include:

- Academic settings and on-campus positions, such as university counsel, research assistant, teaching, and school clinical programs.
- Government settings such as public defenders' offices, city law departments, county attorney offices, district attorney offices, state's attorney offices, and the judiciary.
- Public interest and advocacy organizations including legal services, the Hague, the National Organization for Women, the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative, Eskimo Industries in Australia, Iraq and Afghanistan Vets of America, Congress-Bundestag Youth Exchange Program, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
- Association advocacy work.
- Assorted law firm work including contract work and temporary positions and solo practice.
- Business settings, including bar review, private equity, service/retail, and a family business.

Anticipated Start Dates for Deferred Class of 2010 Associates

	First Quarter 2011	Second Quarter 2011	Third Quarter 2011 or Later	Unknown
Total — All Employers	**61.4%**	**3.4%**	**30.7%**	**8.0%**
By # of Lawyers Firm-wide				
500 or fewer	71.4	3.6	17.9	14.3
501 +	56.7	3.3	36.7	5.0
By NALP Region/City				
Northeast	30.8	0.0	61.5	7.7
Mid-Atlantic	45.5	0.0	54.6	0.0
Southeast	80.0	0.0	0.0	13.3
Midwest	60.0	6.7	33.3	26.7
West/Rocky Mountain	61.5	7.7	26.9	0.0

Note: Overall percentages are based on 88 offices that reported deferring Class of 2010 associates. Percentages may add to more than 100 because more than one start date could be checked.

Stipend Provisions for Deferred Class of 2010 Associates

	% Providing Stipend	THE STIPEND WAS:	
		Unconditional	Conditional
Total — All Employers	**59.8%**	**58.8%**	**41.2%**
By Firm Size			
500 or fewer	71.4	90.0	10.0
501 +	54.2	38.7	61.3
By NALP Region/City			
Northeast	69.2	44.4	55.6
Mid-Atlantic	81.8	44.4	55.6
Southeast	46.7	71.4	28.6
Midwest	60.0	62.5	37.5
West/Rocky Mountain	53.9	57.1	42.9

Note: Of the offices reporting deferring start dates beyond December 1, 2010, 87 reported as to whether they provided or are providing a stipend, and 51 reported the details of the stipend. Of those who reported that the stipend was conditional, nearly all indicated that the stipend was conditional on taking a public interest position. A few of these respondents also indicated that the stipend was conditional on either a public interest or other position.