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Executive Summary

Legal Education – Courses and Preparation

* The law school courses that best prepared respondents for law school are Legal Research & Writing, an Internship or Externship, and Civil Procedure. (See Table 5 on Page 4)

* About four-fifths (79%) of all respondents report there are experiences, skills or knowledge they lacked as a new lawyer. That percentage increases to 88% when only considering respondents who graduated within the last five years. (See Tables 6 and 6a on Pages 4-5)

* The two most frequently mentioned experiences, skills or knowledge that respondents believe they might have lacked as a new lawyer are practical skills or experience and the business aspects of a law practice. (See Table 6c on Page 6)

* When asked if there was a particular class or experience that respondents felt should have been offered to them while in law school but was not, the most frequently mentioned responses are practical courses/experience and an Internship. (See Table 7b on Page 7)

* Just over two-thirds of all respondents report that, upon law school graduation, they were prepared for practical ethical dilemmas (69%), collaborative work (68%) and interpersonal skills (68%). (See Table 8 on Page 7)

* Two-thirds (67%) of all respondents report that, upon law school graduation, they were unprepared for law office management components involved in the practice of law. Around half of all respondents report they were unprepared for financial matters (52%) and work alternatives (48%). (See Table 8 on Page 7)

* Over four-fifths (81%) of all respondents rate the case method technique as being an effective law school education technique. Between 60% and 68% rate experiential learning, the Socratic Method and collaborative learning as being effective. (See Table 9 on Page 8)

* Over four-fifths of respondents agreed that the United States legal education system needs to undergo significant changes to better prepare future lawyers for the changing employment landscape and legal profession (82%) and that a mentorship program would have significantly helped their overall law school experience (81%). (See Table 10 on Page 9)
* About three-quarters (73%) of respondents believe that Liberalization of business structures and disruptive technologies are set to bring greater change in law over the next two decades than we have seen in the last two centuries. *(See Table 10 on Page 9)*

* Slightly over three-fifths of respondents believe their law school education adequately prepared them for the practice of law (62%) and that their law school professors had significant practice experience in the area of law they instructed (61%). *(See Table 10 on Page 9)*

* About two-fifths (41%) of respondents believe that Florida law schools effectively prepare today’s graduates for the competent, ethical and professional practice of law. *(See Table 10 on Page 9)*

**Legal Education – Online Law Curricula**

* Half (50%) of all respondents believe that no law school curricula should be taken online, while 37% believe that up to one-quarter of law school curricula should be permitted to be taken online. Only 13% believe that more than one-quarter of the curricula should be permitted to be taken online. *(See Table 11 on Page 11)*

* The most frequently mentioned subjects that are good candidates for online learning are Legal Research & Writing, Civil Procedure and Contracts. The most frequently mentioned subjects that respondents believe would not be beneficial to students if taught online are “all courses”, followed by Torts. *(See Tables 12 and 13 on Pages 12-13)*

**Legal Education – Future of the Third Year of Law School**

* 57% of all respondents, and 70% of respondents who graduated within the last five years, believe some changes are needed to the third year of law school, compared to 16% of all respondents, and 12% of respondents who graduated within the last five years, who believe the third year structure is working well. *(See Tables 14 and 14a on Page 13)*

* There is a correlation in that the more recent the law school graduation of respondents, the more likely they are to believe some changes are needed to the third year of law school. *(See Table 14a on Page 13)*

* An overwhelming majority who believe changes are needed to the third year of law school listed the need for practical experience programs, an Internship/Externship program, and a Residency program through this open-ended question. *(See Table 14c on Page 15 and Pages 121-133 located in Appendix A)*
Legal Education – Undergraduate Level/College

* About two-thirds (65%) of all respondents believe that none of the required legal education could be provided during the last year of college. For those that do believe courses could be provided in college, Legal Research & Writing, Basic/first year courses and Constitutional Law were most frequently mentioned. (See Tables 15 and 15b on Pages 15-16)

* Writing skills was reported with the most frequency as being a skill most necessary for an undergraduate to develop to be successful in law school. Reading comprehension and critical thinking were also mentioned with frequency. (See Table 16 on Page 16)

* Advice about loan complications/personal finances and being certain that law is a career that you want to pursue are the most frequently mentioned advice tips that respondents would provide to college students who are considering going to law school. (See Table 17 on Page 17)

* Geographic location, academic reputation and ABA accreditation are the most frequently mentioned responses pertaining to the reasons that respondents chose a specific law school to attend. For those who graduated within the last 5 years, the most frequently mentioned reasons are geographic location, ability to get into the law school, and ABA accreditation. (See Tables 18 and 18a on Pages 17-18)

Legal Education – Improving the Law School Structure or Process

* By a significant margin, the most frequently mentioned suggestion to improve the law school structure or legal education process is to add a practical experience component or an Internship/mentorship program. (See Table 21 on Page 21 and Pages 222-256 located in Appendix A)
Bar Admissions – Paralegal Services/Use of Nonlawyers

* More than half (56%) of all respondents do not believe regulated paralegals should be allowed to deliver legal services directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer. (See Table 24 on Page 23)

* Assistance in the preparation of forms and legal documents, assistance in real estate matters, and basic/routine matters are the three most frequently mentioned legal services that respondents feel could be delivered by a regulated paralegal directly to the lawyer’s client, under the supervision of the lawyer. (See Table 24b on Page 25)

* Nearly two-thirds (64%) of all respondents believe that Florida should not consider authorization of trained, regulated nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of law outside the supervision of a lawyer, compared to nearly one-fifth (19%) who believe that Florida should consider such a program. (See Table 27 on Page 27)

Bar Admissions – Admission on Motion/Reciprocity

* By a three to one ratio (66% important to 22% unimportant), respondents feel that it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity. A higher percentage (73%) of respondents under the age of 50 believe that it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity. (See Tables 31 and 31a on Page 31)

* Nearly three-quarters (72%) of all respondents who graduated from law school within the last ten years and nearly two-thirds (63%) of respondents who graduated from law school over 10 years ago feel it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity. (See Table 31b on Page 32)

* Over three-quarters (77%) of all respondents favor a rule change that would allow them to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state, compared to 11% who oppose that type of rule change. (See Table 32 on Page 33)

* A very large majority (88%) of respondents who graduated within the past five years favor a rule change that would allow them to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state, compared to only 6% who oppose that type of rule change. (See Table 32b on Page 34)

* Just over three-fifths (61%) of all respondents favor a rule change that would allow a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements), compared to three-tenths (30%) who oppose that type of rule change. (See Table 33 on Page 35)
Almost two-thirds (64%) of all respondents report they are in favor of allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida, compared to 21% who are opposed. (See Table 34 on Page 37)

**Bar Admissions – Uniform Bar Examination**

Just over half (51%) of all respondents favor Florida adopting the Uniform Bar Examination, compared to slightly over one-quarter (26%) who oppose it. (See Table 37 on Page 40)

**Bar Admissions – Alternative Business Structures**

Over three-fifths (62%) of all respondents report that The Florida Bar's current ethics rules prohibiting any degree of nonlawyer ownership and participation in law firm profits do not prevent them from operating in a way they would like, compared to 9% who believe the rules do prevent them from operating the way they would like. (See Table 39 on Page 42)

Nearly two-thirds (65%) of all respondents report that Florida Bar members should not be permitted to share fees with nonlawyers, compared to 18% who believe they should be permitted to share fees. (See Table 40 on Page 44)

Two-thirds (67%) of all respondents believe some degree of nonlawyer ownership of a law firm should not be permitted, compared to 17% who believe it should be permitted. (See Table 41 on Page 45)

Only 14% of all respondents report that changing the ethics rules to allow for some degree of nonlawyer ownership would affect their clients. Of those respondents who reported some type of impact on clients, the majority of those believed it would be negative impact. (See Tables 42 and 42a on Page 47)

Two-fifths (40%) of all respondents report that their professional judgment could be affected by sharing fees with a nonlawyer, compared to just over one-third (34%) who believe their judgment would not be affected. (See Table 43 on Page 47)

Over three-fifths (63%) of all respondents believe participation in law firm profits by nonlawyers should not be permitted, compared to one-fifth (20%) who believe it should be permitted. (See Table 44 on Page 49)

Only 15% of all respondents believe that allowing for sharing of law firm profits would affect their clients. Of those respondents who reported some type of impact on clients, the majority of those believed it would be negative impact. (See Tables 45 and 45a on Page 50)
Less than one-fifth (18%) of all respondents report that allowing for some degree of nonlawyer ownership would hinder their legal practice or law firm, compared to 9% who report that it would benefit their legal practice or law firm. The remaining 73% of respondents report that it would have no impact on their practice or that the situation is not applicable to them. *(See Table 46 on Page 51)*

Only 5% of respondents believe that there are client services that Florida lawyers and law firms should be permitted to offer, but are currently not permitted to offer due to the restrictions on sharing fees with nonlawyers. The majority (68%) of respondents have no opinion on this topic. *(See Table 47 on Page 51)*

Only 13% of all respondents indicate they would have nonlawyer partners in their firm or legal office if they were permitted to do so. For those who would like to have nonlawyer partners, accountants were most frequently mentioned. *(See Tables 50 and 51 on Pages 53 and 55)*
Florida Bar Vision 2016 Commission Survey

A link to an electronic survey was e-mailed on October 1, 2014 to a random sample of 3,122 members of The Florida Bar. The sample was cross-checked against Bar membership records data and no demographic category differed by more than 1%. By the October 12, 2014 cut-off date, 1,148 completed surveys were received for a response rate of 37%, which is excellent for a survey of such significant length. The margin of error is plus or minus 3% at the 95% level of confidence.

In reporting the results, all percentages were rounded to the nearest whole percent (example 34.5% equals 35%). For this reason, totals may vary from 99 to 101 percent. Note that several questions are "multiple response questions." This means that respondents were encouraged to check all responses which apply to a given situation. Thus, multiple response questions will not total 100 percent.

SECTION I: LEGAL EDUCATION

1. What is your legal occupation or classification?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vision 2016 Commission Survey Percent</th>
<th>2013 Membership Opinion Survey Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sole practitioner</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner/shareholder</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner with 1 or more associates</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing partner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other private practitioner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government attorney</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government attorney</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government attorney</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate counsel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal aid/legal service</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Legal occupation data for this survey is very similar to the results of the 2013 Florida Bar Membership Opinion Survey.

* The most frequently mentioned occupations or classifications under the “Other” category are “of counsel”, “retired”/”semi-retired” and “unemployed”/”not currently practicing”.
2. **What is the total number of attorneys employed in the firm or legal workplace where you primarily practice?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vision 2016 Commission Survey Percent</th>
<th>2013 Membership Opinion Survey Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One attorney</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 attorneys</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 attorneys</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 attorneys</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 attorneys</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Size of firm data for this survey is nearly identical to the results of The Florida Bar’s 2013 Membership Opinion Survey. Over two-thirds (68%) of respondents, both in this survey and in the Bar’s most recent Membership Opinion Survey, are employed in firms or legal offices of 10 attorneys or less.

3. **In general, do you feel that the legal profession, as a career, is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vision 2016 Commission Survey Percent</th>
<th>2013 Membership Opinion Survey Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becoming more desirable</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming somewhat more desirable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staying about the same</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming somewhat less desirable</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming much less desirable</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Desirability of the legal profession as a career data for this survey is nearly identical to the results of The Florida Bar’s 2013 Membership Opinion Survey. Over three-quarters (78%) of respondents, both in this survey and in the Bar’s most recent Membership Opinion Survey, believe that the legal profession, as a career, is becoming less desirable, compared to only 4% who believe it is becoming more desirable.
4. All things considered, how do you feel about your legal career at this time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over three-quarters (77%) of all respondents report that they are satisfied with their legal career at this time.

4a. All things considered, how do you feel about your legal career at this time?  
– BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL AND GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current legal career level of satisfaction ranges from 64% satisfied (for those who graduated from law school within the last five years) to 80% satisfied (for those who graduated from law school over 10 years ago).

GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unsatisfied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Males have a slightly higher level of satisfaction with their legal careers than females (78% to 73% satisfied).
5. Thinking back, what course or experience in law school best prepared you for your future as a lawyer?

A total of 1,377 courses or experiences were provided by respondents. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the nine most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 60-75 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research &amp; Writing/Legal Research/Legal Writing</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship/Externship</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics/Clinical Courses</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Advocacy</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Practice</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moot Court</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Again, thinking back to when you entered the legal profession, were there any experiences, skills or knowledge that you believe you might have lacked as a new lawyer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t recall</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About four-fifths (79%) of all respondents report there are experiences, skills or knowledge they lacked as a new lawyer, compared to 12% who report they did not lack those experiences, skills or knowledge.
6a. Again, thinking back to when you entered the legal profession, were there any experiences, skills or knowledge that you believe you might have lacked as a new lawyer? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t recall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A large majority (88%) of respondents who report graduating from law school within the last 5 years report that there are experiences, skills or knowledge that they believe they lacked as a new lawyer. Over three-quarters (78%) of respondents who graduated from law school over 10 years ago report the same.

6b. Again, thinking back to when you entered the legal profession, were there any experiences, skills or knowledge that you believe you might have lacked as a new lawyer? – BY AGE GROUP and TYPE OF PRACTICE

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under years of age</th>
<th>36 to 49 years of age</th>
<th>50 to 65 years of age</th>
<th>Over 65 years of age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Recall</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t recall</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About four-fifths of each age and type of practice group (77% to 83%) report that there are experiences, skills or knowledge that they believe they lacked as a new lawyer.
6c. Again, thinking back to when you entered the legal profession, were there any experiences, skills or knowledge that you believe you might have lacked as a new lawyer? If “Yes”, please explain:

A total of 910 experiences, skills or knowledge that respondents believe they might have lacked as new lawyers were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the four most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 76-92 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical skills or experience</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business aspects of a law practice</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t know how to practice law</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing/dealing with clients</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Was there a particular class or experience that you feel should have been offered to you while you were in law school but was not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t recall</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over half (54%) of all respondents report there was a particular class or experience that they felt should have been offered to them while they were in law school but was not.

7a. Was there a particular class or experience that you feel should have been offered to you while you were in law school but was not? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t recall</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Around half (49% to 56%) of all three groups listed above report there was a particular class or experience that they felt should have been offered to them while they were in law school.
7b. **Was there a particular class or experience that you feel should have been offered to you while you were in law school but was not? If “Yes,” please explain:**

A total of 408 classes or experiences were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the four most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 93-100 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical courses/experience</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business skills/training</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office management</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **How do you rate your level of preparedness upon law school graduation for each of the various components involved in the practice of law?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Prepared Percent</th>
<th>Neutral Percent</th>
<th>Unprepared Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical ethical dilemmas</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative work</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping skills</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial matters</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work alternatives</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Just over two-thirds of all respondents report that, upon law school graduation, they were prepared for practical ethical dilemmas (69%), collaborative work (68%) and interpersonal skills (68%).

* Two-thirds (67%) of all respondents report that, upon law school graduation, they were unprepared for law office management components involved in the practice of law. Around half of all respondents report they were unprepared for financial matters (52%) and work alternatives (48%).
8a. How do you rate your level of preparedness upon law school graduation for each of the various components involved in the practice of law? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Prepared</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Prepared</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practical ethical dilemmas</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative work</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping skills</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial matters</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work alternatives</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law office management</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Recent law school graduates (within the last 5 years) report being more prepared than the other two groups on all nine components of the practice of law listed above.

9. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the following law school education techniques?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Effective Percent</th>
<th>Neutral Percent</th>
<th>Ineffective Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case method</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socratic Method</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over four-fifths (81%) of all respondents rate the case method technique as being an effective law school education technique. Between 60% and 68% rate the other three listed techniques as being effective.

* Almost one-quarter (24%) of respondents rate the Socratic Method as being ineffective.
9a. How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the following law school education techniques? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Effective Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Effective Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Effective Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case method</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socratic Method</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative learning</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A higher percentage of respondents who graduated over ten years ago rate the case method technique as being effective, while a higher percentage of respondents who graduated within the last five years rate the experiential learning method as being effective.

10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree Percent</th>
<th>Neutral Percent</th>
<th>Disagree Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The U.S. legal education system needs to undergo significant changes to better prepare future lawyers for the changing employment landscape and legal profession.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mentorship program would have significantly helped your overall law school experience.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberalization of business structures and disruptive technologies are set to bring greater change in law over the next two decades than we have seen in the last two centuries.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your law school education adequately prepared you for the practice of law.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally, your law school professors had significant practice experience in the area of law they instructed.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida law schools effectively prepare today’s graduates for the competent, ethical and professional practice of law.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

10a. The U.S. legal education system needs to undergo significant changes to better prepare future attorneys for the changing employment landscape and legal profession. – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Within Last 5 Years</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 6 to 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated More Than 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10b. A mentorship program would have significantly helped your overall law school experience. – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Within Last 5 Years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 6 to 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated More Than 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10c. Liberalization of business structures and disruptive technologies are set to bring greater change in law over the next two decades than we have seen in the last two centuries. – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Within Last 5 Years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 6 to 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated More Than 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10d. Your law school education adequately prepared you for the practice of law. – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Within Last 5 Years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 6 to 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated More Than 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10e. Generally, your law school professors had significant practice experience in the area of law they instructed. – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Within Last 5 Years</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 6 to 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated More Than 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10f. Florida law schools effectively prepare today’s graduates for the competent, ethical and professional practice of law. – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduated Within Last 5 Years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated 6 to 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated More Than 10 Years Ago</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What is the optimum percent of law school curricula that should be permitted to be taken online for a law school student to achieve the fullest level of an overall educational experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None should be taken online</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 25%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26% to 50%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% to 75%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% to 99%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Half (50%) of all respondents believe that no law school curricula should be taken online, while 37% believe that up to one-quarter of law school curricula should be permitted to be taken online. Only 13% believe that more than one-quarter of the curricula should be permitted to be taken online.
11a. What is the optimum percent of law school curricula that should be permitted to be taken online for a law school student to achieve the fullest level of an overall educational experience? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None should be taken online</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 25%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 50%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 to 99%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About half (49% to 53%) of all three groups listed above believe that no law school curricula should be allowed to be taken online.

12. Please list any subjects you believe are good candidates for online learning:

A total of 738 subjects that are believed to be good candidates for online learning were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the seven most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 101-112 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research &amp; Writing</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Please list any subjects that you believe would not be beneficial to students if taught online:

A total of 960 subjects that would not be beneficial to students if taught online and various other comments were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the seven most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 113-120 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All courses (do not believe any subjects should be taken online)</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial Advocacy</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What are your thoughts about the future of the third year of law school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe some changes are needed</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe it is working well</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nearly three-fifths (57%) believe some changes are needed to the third year of law school, compared to 16% who believe it is working well.

14a. What are your thoughts about the future of the third year of law school? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I believe some changes are needed</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe it is working well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The more recent the law school graduation of a respondent, the more likely they are to believe some changes are needed to the third year of law school.
14b. What are your thoughts about the future of the third year of law school? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP AND TYPE OF PRACTICE

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes are needed</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is working well</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes are needed</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is working well</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over two-thirds (70%) of respondents 35 years of age or younger believe that changes are needed to the third year of law school, compared to over one-third (38%) of respondents over 65 years of age who feel the same.

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes are needed</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is working well</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14c. If you believe changes are needed, please describe:

A total of 509 comments or suggestions were provided about the future of the third year of law school. Each response was reviewed and categorized.

The table below displays how one category featured an overwhelming majority of responses (380 out of 509). To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 121-133 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish practical experience/Internship/Externship</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Responses Combined</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Do you feel any of the required legal education could be provided in the last year of college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About two-thirds (65%) of all respondents believe that none of the required legal education could be provided during the last year of college.

15a. Do you feel any of the required legal education could be provided in the last year of college? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About two-thirds (63% to 67%) of each group listed above believes that none of the required legal education could be provided during the last year of college.
15b. If “Yes”, which course(s)?

A total of 437 courses that respondents believe could be provided in the last year of college were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the seven most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 134-142 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Research &amp; Writing</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic/first year courses</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Law</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torts</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Procedure</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What skills do you feel are most necessary for an undergraduate to develop to be successful in law school?

A total of 1,630 skills that are most necessary for an undergraduate to develop to be successful in law school were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the ten most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 143-150 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical skills</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication/discipline</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study skills</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic/logical reasoning</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skills</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. **What advice would you provide to college students who are considering going to law school?**

A total of 893 respondents provided advice to college students who would be considering going to law school. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the four most frequently mentioned categories. **To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 151-208 located in Appendix A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loan complications/financial advice</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be certain this is what you want to do</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take certain undergrad courses/have certain major</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t go to law school</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Below are various reasons for choosing a law school. Please check all of the ones that had a significant role in the selection of the law school you attended: (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE QUESTION)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA accreditation</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get into that school</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future employment opportunities</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/atmosphere</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial assistance</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News &amp; World Report rankings</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only law school I received an offer from</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent requests/recommendation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for social activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The most frequently selected reasons for choosing a law school are geographic location (72%), academic reputation (65%) and ABA accreditation (60%). The most frequently mentioned response under the “Other” is “evening program” or “night school”.*
18a. **Below are various reasons for choosing a law school. Please check all of the ones that had a significant role in the selection of the law school you attended:** – **BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL** (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA accreditation</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get into that school</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future employment opportunities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/atmosphere</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial assistance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News &amp; World Report rankings</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent requests/recommendation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only law school I received an offer from</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for social activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The three most frequently mentioned responses for respondents who graduated from law school within the last five years are geographic location (69%), ability to get into that law school (62%), and ABA accreditation (60%).

* The three most frequently mentioned responses for respondents who graduated over ten years ago are geographic location (72%), academic reputation (68%), and ABA accreditation (60%).
18b. Below are various reasons for choosing a law school. Please check all of the ones that had a significant role in the selection of the law school you attended: – BY GENDER AND REGION (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY)

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA accreditation</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get into that school</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future employment opportunities</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/atmosphere</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial assistance</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News &amp; World Report rankings</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent requests/recommendation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only law school I received an offer from</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for social activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA accreditation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to get into that school</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future employment opportunities</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus/atmosphere</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial assistance</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. News &amp; World Report rankings</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent requests/recommendation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only law school I received an offer from</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation for social activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. **When did you graduate from law school?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the last three years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5 years ago</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years ago</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 years ago</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The majority (72%) of respondents graduated from law school over 10 years ago, while almost one-fifth (18%) of respondents graduated within the last five years.

20. **Besides law school, have you had other professional schooling (graduate level courses for another field)?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nearly one-quarter (24%) of respondents have had additional professional schooling (graduate level courses from another field).

20a. **Besides law school, have you had other professional schooling (graduate level courses for another field)? – BY YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A slightly higher percentage of those respondents who graduated more than 10 years ago have had additional professional schooling (graduate level courses for another field).
20b. If “Yes”, please indicate in what area and whether there was anything from that learning experience that you feel could be applied to the structure of legal education to make the learning experience for future law school students more effective:

A total of 202 respondents listed areas of professional schooling they received for another field. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the five most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 209-221 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate programs/classes</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLM</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Please provide any suggestions or ideas that you may have in relation to improving the law school structure or legal education process:

A total of 386 respondents provided suggestions or ideas in relation to improving the law school structure or legal education process. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the three most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 222-256 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add practical experience/Internship/mentorship program</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce number of lawyers or law schools/improve job market</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce cost</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION II: BAR ADMISSIONS

22. To what degree are you aware of the Florida Registered Paralegal Program? (To see the FRP webpage, click here).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am well aware of it</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am somewhat aware of it</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had no previous knowledge of it</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over three-fifths (63%) of all respondents have at least some awareness of the Florida Registered Paralegal Program, with 15% being well aware and 48% being somewhat aware of it.

22a. To what degree are you aware of the Florida Registered Paralegal Program? – BY AGE GROUP AND TYPE OF PRACTICE

### AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am well aware of it</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am somewhat aware of it</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had no previous knowledge of it</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* There is a correlation between age and level of awareness of the Florida Registered Paralegal Program.

### TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am well aware of it</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am somewhat aware of it</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had no previous knowledge of it</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Respondents in private practice have a higher level of awareness of the Florida Registered Paralegal Program.
23. **Does your firm or legal office employ paralegals?** (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE QUESTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – firm/office employs paralegals</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – firm/office employs Florida Registered Paralegals</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nearly half (49%) of all respondents report that their firm or legal office employs paralegals, with nearly one-quarter (23%) reporting that their firm or legal office employs Florida Registered Paralegals.

23a. **Does your firm or legal office employ paralegals? – BY TYPE OF PRACTICE** (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE QUESTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – firm/office employs paralegals</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – firm/office employs FRPs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. **Do you think regulated paralegals should be allowed to deliver legal services directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* More than half (56%) of all respondents do not believe regulated paralegals should be allowed to deliver legal services directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer.
24a. Do you think regulated paralegals should be allowed to deliver legal services directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer? – By gender, age group, type of practice and region of primary practice

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Type of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region of Primary Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24b. Do you think regulated paralegals should be allowed to deliver legal services directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer?

A total of 207 legal services that regulated paralegals might be allowed to deliver directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer were provided. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the ten most frequently mentioned categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in preparation of forms/legal documents</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in real estate matters</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic/routine matters</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview clients</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft pleadings</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorce/dissolution of marriage matters</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic wills</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery matters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probate matters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assistance in the preparation of forms and legal documents, assistance in real estate matters, and basic/routine matters are the three most frequently mentioned legal services that respondents feel could be delivered directly to the lawyer’s client under the supervision of the lawyer.

25. How strongly do you agree or disagree that the legal needs of Florida’s citizens are currently being met?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over two-fifths (44%) of all respondents agree that the legal needs of Florida’s citizens are currently being met, compared to 37% who disagree.
25a. How strongly do you agree or disagree that the legal needs of Florida’s citizens are currently being met? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A higher percentage of male (48%) and private practice (49%) attorneys agree that the legal needs of Florida citizens are currently being met. A higher percentage of female (40%) and government practice (43%) attorneys disagree that the legal needs of citizens are being met.*
26. Do you think the medical profession has a good framework for using paraprofessionals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of those respondents who have an opinion, by a 2 to 1 margin (36% to 18%), they believe the medical profession has a good framework for using paraprofessionals.

26a. Do you think the medical profession has a good framework for using paraprofessionals? – BY TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentages across type of practice categories are almost identical regarding whether the medical profession has a good framework for using paraprofessionals.

27. Several states have either approved or are considering authorization of trained, regulated, nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of the law outside of the supervision of a lawyer. Do you believe Florida should consider such a program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nearly two-thirds (64%) of all respondents believe that Florida should not consider authorization of trained, regulated nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of law outside the supervision of a lawyer, compared to nearly one-fifth (19%) who believe that Florida should consider such a program.
27a. Several states have either approved or are considering authorization of trained, regulated, nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of the law outside of the supervision of a lawyer. Do you believe Florida should consider such a program? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27b. Several states have either approved or are considering authorization of trained, regulated, nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of the law outside of the supervision of a lawyer. Do you believe Florida should consider such a program? If “Yes” or “No”, please explain:

A total of 285 respondents provided reasons why they believe Florida should or should not consider authorization of trained, regulated, nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of the law outside of the supervision of a lawyer. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 257-278 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments in opposition to Florida considering such a program</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favor of Florida considering such a program</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Do you handle dissolution of marriage matters in your practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and I primarily use an hourly rate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and I primarily use a flat fee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and I primarily use some other type of billing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of those respondents who do report handling dissolution of marriage matters in their daily practice, the majority use an hourly rate.

* The median hourly rate reported is $300, while the median flat fee reported is $1,500 (SEE TABLE 29 ON NEXT PAGE).
29. If you do handle dissolutions of marriage in your practice, what is your typical charge for a flat fee or hourly rate?

a. Flat Fee (Typical Fee for a Basic Dissolution)

(TOP THREE MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED RESPONSES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median flat fee = $1,500
Range = $300 to $5,000

b. Hourly Rate (Typical Fee for a Basic Dissolution)

(TOP THREE MOST FREQUENTLY MENTIONED RESPONSES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$350</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median hourly rate = $300
Range = $225 to $850

30. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding nonlawyer licensing and authorization for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission:

A total of 195 respondents provided comments, suggestions or feedback regarding nonlawyer licensing and authorization. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 279-297 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments opposed to nonlawyer licensing and authorization</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favor of nonlawyer licensing and authorization</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. Admission on motion (sometimes known as reciprocity) allows a member of one state bar to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar exam if the member meets the other qualifications (like character and fitness requirements, for example) set by the second state. Today, over 40 states have some form of reciprocity. Florida does not.

Please rate how important you feel it is for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither important nor unimportant</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important at all</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* By a three to one ratio (66% important to 22% unimportant), respondents feel that it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity.

31a. Please rate how important you feel it is for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity: –

BY GENDER AND AGE GROUP

GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A higher percentage of respondents under the age of 50 believe that it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity.
31b. Please rate how important you feel it is for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity: –
BY TYPE OF PRACTICE, REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE AND YEARS SINCE
GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PRACTICE</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YRS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A significantly higher percentage of respondents from the Southeast Region (Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach counties) feel it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity.

* Nearly three-quarters (72%) of all respondents who graduated from law school within the last ten years and nearly two-thirds (63%) of respondents who graduated from law school over 10 years ago feel it is important for Florida to adopt some form of reciprocity.
32. Do you favor or oppose a rule change that would allow you to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly favor</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat favor</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither favor nor oppose</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over three-quarters (77%) of all respondents favor a rule change that would allow them to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state, compared to 11% who oppose that type of rule change.

32a. Do you favor or oppose a rule change that would allow you to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state? – BY GENDER AND AGE GROUP

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A large majority (87%) of respondents 35 years of age or under are in favor of a rule change that would allow them to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar exam (but meeting other requirements) in that state.
32b. Do you favor or oppose a rule change that would allow you to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state? – BY TYPE OF PRACTICE, REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE AND YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF PRACTICE</th>
<th>Private Practice</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE</th>
<th>North Region</th>
<th>Central/SW Region</th>
<th>Southeast Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* At least three-quarters (75% to 82%) of respondents in each type of practice and region group above are in favor of a rule change that would allow them to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar exam (but meeting other requirements) in that state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YRS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A very large majority (88%) of respondents who graduated within the past five years favor a rule change that would allow them to become a member of another state bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements) in that state. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of respondents who graduated over 10 years ago also favor such a rule change.
33. Do you favor or oppose allowing a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly favor</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat favor</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither favor nor oppose</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Just over three-fifths (61%) of all respondents favor a rule change that would allow a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements), compared to three-tenths (30%) who oppose that type of rule change.

33a. Do you favor or oppose allowing a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements)? – BY GENDER AND AGE GROUP

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* About two-thirds (65%) of respondents under 50 years of age favor a rule change that would allow a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements).
33b. Do you favor or oppose allowing a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements)? – BY TYPE OF PRACTICE, REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE AND YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YRS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over two-thirds (68%) of respondents from the Southeast Region favor allowing a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements).

* Around three-fifths (57% to 63%) of all other groups listed above favor allowing a member from another state bar to become a member of The Florida Bar without taking the bar examination (but meeting other requirements).
34. **Do you favor or oppose allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly favor</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat favor</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither favor nor oppose</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Almost two-thirds (64%) of all respondents report they are in favor of allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida, compared to 21% who are opposed.

34a. **Do you favor or oppose allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP AND TYPE OF PRACTICE**

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34b. Do you favor or oppose allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida – BY REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE AND YEARS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YRS SINCE GRADUATED FROM LAW SCHOOL</th>
<th>Graduated Within Last 5 Yrs Percent</th>
<th>Graduated 6 to 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
<th>Graduated Over 10 Yrs Ago Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Around two-thirds (62% to 68%) of each group listed above favors allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida.

34c. If in favor or opposition to admission on motion in Florida, please briefly explain:

A total of 232 respondents provided a response as to why they either favor or oppose allowing some form of admission on motion in Florida. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 298-318 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favor of allowing admission on motion in Florida</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments opposed to admission on motion in Florida</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Are you a member of another state bar (in addition to your Florida Bar membership)? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don’t have a professional need for another state bar</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I do not want to take another bar exam</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it is too expensive</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, it is too time consuming</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35a. If “Yes”, please list all state bars in which you are a member:

A total of 283 responses were provided by respondents who report that they have membership in other state bars, in addition to their Florida Bar membership. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the six most frequently mentioned categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding admission on motion/reciprocity for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission:

A total of 155 comments, suggestions or general feedback were provided regarding admission on motion/reciprocity. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 319-331 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favor of admission on motion/reciprocity in Florida</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments opposed to admission on motion/reciprocity in Florida</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37. The Uniform Bar Examination (UBE) is prepared and coordinated by the National Conference of Bar Examiners to test knowledge and skills that every lawyer should be able to demonstrate prior to becoming licensed to practice law.

It is composed of the Multistate Essay Examination (MEE), two Multistate Performance Test (MPT) tasks, and the Multistate Bar Examination (MBE).

It is uniformly administered, graded, and scored by user jurisdictions and results in a portable score that may be transferred for a limited time period to another UBE jurisdiction without re-taking the bar examination. Jurisdictions that use the UBE continue to decide who may sit for the bar exam, who will be admitted to practice, determine underlying educational requirements, and make all character and fitness decisions.

Jurisdictions that adopt the UBE may require candidates to also complete a jurisdiction-specific educational component and/or pass a test on jurisdiction-specific law in addition to passing the UBE.

Some advantages of having a uniform bar exam might be that it alleviates expense of a bar exam in a second jurisdiction; eliminates duplication of effort; reduces delay in gaining admission to a second jurisdiction; recognizes the effects of globalization and the need to cross state lines; moves the country towards a uniform bar examination; and the current bar admission procedures become less restricted.

Some disadvantages of having a uniform bar exam might be that there are already too many lawyers in Florida; all lawyers should take the Florida bar examination; Florida could lose control of the subjects tested by the exam; there are distinctions between Florida law and general law; and an ability to test on Florida specific components could be lost.

After considering all of the above, to what degree do you favor or oppose Florida adopting the Uniform Bar Examination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly favor</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat favor</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither favor nor oppose</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat oppose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Just over half (51%) of all respondents favor Florida adopting the Uniform Bar Examination, compared to slightly over one-quarter (26%) who oppose it.
37a. To what degree do you favor or oppose Florida adopting the Uniform Bar Examination? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region</th>
<th>Central/SW Region</th>
<th>Southeast Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oppose</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
37b. **If in favor or opposition to, please briefly explain:**

A total of 173 respondents provided reasons as to whether they are in favor of, or in opposition to, Florida adopting the Uniform Bar Examination. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. **To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 332-345 located in Appendix A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favor of the Uniform Bar Exam</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments opposed to the Uniform Bar Exam</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. **Please list any additional comments, suggestions or feedback regarding the Uniform Bar Exam:**

A total of 54 respondents provided comments, suggestions or feedback regarding the Uniform Bar Exam. The table below lists the three most frequently mentioned categories. **To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 346-350 located in Appendix A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments in favor of the Uniform Bar Exam</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments opposed to the Uniform Bar Exam</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral/Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. **Some countries, as well as the United States District of Columbia, have relaxed their rules restricting nonlawyer ownership, partnership or participation in the delivery of legal services and now allow for some form of an “alternative business structure” for the provision of legal services. This could allow for fee-sharing and profit-sharing with nonlawyers. Do The Florida Bar's current ethics rules prohibiting any degree of nonlawyer ownership and participation in law firm profits prevent you from operating in a way you would like?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over three-fifths (62%) of all respondents report that The Florida Bar's current ethics rules prohibiting any degree of nonlawyer ownership and participation in law firm profits
do not prevent them from operating in a way they would like, compared to 9% who believe the rules do prevent them from operating the way they would like.

39a. Do The Florida Bar's current ethics rules prohibiting any degree of nonlawyer ownership and participation in law firm profits prevent you from operating in a way you would like? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
39b. If “Yes”, please explain:

A total of 52 respondents provided reasons for why they believe The Florida Bar’s current ethics rules prohibiting any degree of nonlawyer ownership and participation in law firm profits prevent them from operating in a way they would like. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 351-355 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Comments</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments with Example(s) Listed</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Should Florida Bar members be permitted to share fees with nonlawyers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nearly two-thirds (65%) of all respondents report that Florida Bar members should not be permitted to share fees with nonlawyers, compared to 18% who believe they should be permitted to share fees.

40a. Should Florida Bar members be permitted to share fees with nonlawyers? – BY GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40b. Should Florida Bar members be permitted to share fees with nonlawyers? – BY AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region</th>
<th>Central/SW Region</th>
<th>Southeast Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Do you believe some degree of nonlawyer ownership of a law firm should be permitted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two-thirds (67%) of all respondents believe some degree of nonlawyer ownership of a law firm should not be permitted, compared to 17% who believe it should be permitted.
41a. Do you believe some degree of nonlawyer ownership of a law firm should be permitted? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP AND TYPE OF PRACTICE

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. Would changing the ethics rules to allow for some degree of nonlawyer ownership affect your clients?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only 14% of all respondents report that changing the ethics rules to allow for some degree of nonlawyer ownership would affect their clients.

42a. If yes, please describe how your clients might be affected:

A total of 78 respondents provided reasons for how changing the ethics rules to allow for some degree of nonlawyer ownership might affect their clients. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 356-361 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact on clients/the profession</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on clients/the profession</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

43. Do you feel your professional judgment could be affected in any way by sharing fees with a nonlawyer?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two-fifths (40%) of all respondents report that their professional judgment could be affected by sharing fees with a nonlawyer, compared to just over one-third (34%) who believe their judgment would not be affected.
43a. Do you feel your professional judgment could be affected in any way by sharing fees with a nonlawyer? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/not applicable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44. Should participation in law firm profits by nonlawyers be permitted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over three-fifths (63%) of all respondents believe participation in law firm profits by nonlawyers should not be permitted, compared to one-fifth (20%) who believe it should be permitted.

44a. Should participation in law firm profits by nonlawyers be permitted? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP AND TYPE OF PRACTICE

**GENDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AGE GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TYPE OF PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44b. **Should participation in law firm profits by nonlawyers be permitted? – BY REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. **Would allowing for sharing of law firm profits affect your clients?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only 15% of all respondents believe that allowing for sharing of law firm profits would affect their clients.

45a. **If yes, please describe how your clients might be affected:**

A total of 65 respondents provided reasons as to how their clients might be affected if sharing of law firm profits were permitted. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 362-367 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact on clients/the profession</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on clients/the profession</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
46. How would allowing for some degree of nonlawyer ownership either benefit or hinder your legal practice or law firm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It would have no impact on my legal practice</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or law firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would hinder my legal practice or law firm</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would benefit my legal practice or law firm</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Less than one-fifth (18%) of all respondents report that allowing for some degree of nonlawyer ownership would hinder their legal practice or law firm, compared to 9% who report that it would benefit their legal practice or law firm.

46a. If you feel it would either benefit or hinder your firm, please briefly explain:

A total of 115 respondents provided reasons how allowing for some degree of nonlawyer ownership either would benefit or hinder their legal practice or law firm. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the two most frequently mentioned categories. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 368-377 located in Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hinder practice/firm</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit practice/firm</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Are there client services that Florida lawyers and law firms should be permitted to offer, but are currently not permitted to offer due to the restrictions on sharing fees with nonlawyers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only 5% of respondents believe that there are client services that Florida lawyers and law firms should be permitted to offer, but are currently not permitted to offer due to the restrictions on sharing fees with nonlawyers. The majority (68%) of respondents have no opinion on this topic.
47a. **If “Yes”, please specify:**

A total of 44 respondents provided client services that Florida lawyers and law firms should be permitted to offer, but are currently not permitted to offer due to the restrictions on sharing fees with nonlawyers. Each response was reviewed and categorized. The table below lists the four most frequently mentioned categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business consulting</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial advising</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. **Do you feel that maintaining the present restrictions contained in Florida’s ethics rules impede Florida lawyers and law firms from participating on a level playing field in a global legal services marketplace that includes the increased use of one or more forms of alternative business structures?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No opinion</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only 14% of respondents believe that maintaining the present restrictions contained in Florida’s ethics rules impede Florida lawyers and law firms from participating on a level playing field in a global legal services marketplace that includes the increased use of one or more forms of alternative business structures.

48a. **Do you feel that maintaining the present restrictions contained in Florida’s ethics rules impede Florida lawyers and law firms from participating on a level playing field in a global legal services marketplace that includes the increased use of one or more forms of alternative business structures? If “Yes”, please specify:**

A total of 32 respondents provided comments or examples as to lawyers and law firms participating in a global legal services marketplace that includes increased use of one or more forms of alternative business structures. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 378-380 located in Appendix A.
49. What types of non-lawyer service providers (other than administrative assistants, paralegals, receptionists and support staff) currently assist you in serving your clients? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE QUESTION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Specialist</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator/Arbitrator</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Appraiser</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist/Psychologist</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Personnel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbyist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Analyst</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Over one-third (34%) of all respondents report an accountant currently assists them in serving their clients, while one-quarter (25%) report an information technology specialist assists.

* Three-tenths (30%) of all respondents report that none of the above mentioned non-lawyer service providers assist them in serving their clients.

* The most frequently mentioned responses under the “Other” category are expert witnesses, investigators and financial advisors/planners. To view a complete listing of all responses provided under the “Other” category of this question, please see Pages 381-382 located in Appendix A.

50. If you were permitted to have nonlawyer partners in your firm or legal office, would you do so?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only 13% of all respondents indicate they would have nonlawyer partners in their firm or legal office if they were permitted to do so.
50a. If you were permitted to have nonlawyer partners in your firm or legal office, would you do so? – BY GENDER, AGE GROUP, TYPE OF PRACTICE AND REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

### GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male Percent</th>
<th>Female Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGE GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>35 or under yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>36 to 49 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>50 to 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
<th>Over 65 yrs of age Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TYPE OF PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Private Practice Percent</th>
<th>Gov’t. Practice Percent</th>
<th>Other Legal Practice Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REGION OF PRIMARY PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>North Region Percent</th>
<th>Central/SW Region Percent</th>
<th>Southeast Region Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/no opinion</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
51. If yes, what types of nonlawyer partners would you hire? (SELECT ALL THAT APPLY) (MULTIPLE RESPONSE QUESTION)

(THE TABLE BELOW ONLY INCLUDES THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO INDICATED THEY WOULD HAVE NONLAWYER PARTNERS IN THEIR FIRM OR LEGAL OFFICE IF PERMITTED TO DO SO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>(n=146)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator/Arbitrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobbyist</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist/Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Analyst</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The most frequently mentioned responses under the “Other” category are marketing professionals, business consultants and investment consultants. To view a complete listing of all responses provided under the “Other” category of this question, please see Pages 383-384 located in Appendix A.

52. Please check how strongly you agree or disagree that the following restrictions should apply to nonlawyer ownership or participation in a law firm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Agree Percent</th>
<th>Neutral Percent</th>
<th>Disagree Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All persons having managerial authority or hold a financial interest</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or hold a financial interest must abide by the Rules of Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lawyers who have a financial interest or managerial authority in the</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization undertake to be responsible for the nonlawyer participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the same extent as if nonlawyer participants were lawyers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The sole purpose of the organization is to provide legal services to</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clients.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding alternative business structures, nonlawyer ownership, or nonlawyer participation in law firms for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission:

A total of 53 respondents provided comments, suggestions or feedback regarding alternative business structures, nonlawyer ownership, or nonlawyer participation in law firms for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission. Each response was reviewed and categorized. To view a complete listing of all responses to this question, please see Pages 387-392 located in Appendix A.

54. In what COUNTY do you primarily practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Vision Survey Percent</th>
<th>2014 Actual Bar In-state Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alachua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeSoto</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagler</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadsden</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilchrist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glades</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Vision Survey Percent</th>
<th>2014 Actual Bar In-state Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hendry</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernando</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>&lt;0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manatee</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami-Dade</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okaloosa</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okeechobee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osceola</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johns</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lucie</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarasota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumter</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwanee</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Vision Survey Percent</th>
<th>Actual Bar Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volusia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakulla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. **What is your gender?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Vision Survey Percent</th>
<th>Actual Bar Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. **What is your age group?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 years of age or younger</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 49 years of age</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 65 years of age</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65 years of age</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

57. **How many years have you been a member of The Florida Bar?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 years</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 years</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A:

RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS
5. Thinking back, what course or experience in law school best prepared you for your future as a lawyer? (1,377 Total Courses/Experiences)

* Legal Writing/Legal Research & Writing. (142 Responses)
* Internship/Externship. (134 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (111 Responses)
* Evidence. (88 Responses)
* Trial Advocacy. (82 Responses)
* Clinics/Clinical Courses. (82 Responses)
* Trial Practice. (65 Responses)
* Contracts. (62 Responses)
* Moot Court. (59 Responses)
* Practical skills classes. (38 Responses)
* Litigation Skills. (27 Responses)
* Torts. (24 Responses)
* Mock Trial. (23 Responses)
* Property Law. (22 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (17 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (16 Responses)
* Criminal Law. (12 Responses)
* Tax Law. (12 Responses)
* Law Review. (11 Responses)
* Pre-trial practice courses. (11 Responses)
* Basic courses/curriculum. (10 Responses)
* Real Estate. (9 Responses)
* Negotiations. (8 Responses)
* Ethics. (7 Responses)
* Socratic Method. (7 Responses)
* Business Organizations. (6 Responses)
* Client Counseling. (6 Responses)
* Family Law. (6 Responses)
* Professional Responsibility. (6 Responses)
* Appellate Advocacy. (5 Responses)
* Client Interviewing. (5 Responses)
* Accounting. (4 Responses)
* Administrative Law. (4 Responses)
* Corporate Law. (4 Responses)
* Estate Planning and Trusts. (4 Responses)
* Law Office Management. (4 Responses)
* Wills, Trust and Estates. (4 Responses)
* Arbitration. (3 Responses)
* Bankruptcy. (3 Responses)
* Commercial Sales and Transactions. (3 Responses)
* Electives. (3 Responses)
* Probate. (3 Responses)
* Alternative Dispute Resolution. (2 Responses)
* Appellate Practice. (2 Responses)
* Elder Law. (2 Responses)
* Federal Courts. (2 Responses)
* Federal Income Tax. (2 Responses)
* Mediation. (2 Responses)
* Medical Malpractice. (2 Responses)
* Motions/Depositions. (2 Responses)
* Securities. (2 Responses)
* The CLI Program. (2 Responses)
* 14th Amendment.
* A class entitled "The Querulous Client."
* A course where we walked through an asset purchase from start to finish.
* A pre-trial litigation class that simulated a case from initial evaluation all the way up to trial, with a focus on pre-trial practice.
* A seminar course in conflict of laws that required students to argue opposing sides of cases and judge the dispute.
* A seminar on estate planning where we drafted a sample will and trust and prepared a sample federal estate tax return.
* A skills course called "Pretrial Civil Litigation," taught by a partner in a prominent law firm. (I attended law school at the Univ. of Oklahoma).
* Actually, it was a comment one of my professors said. "Do not be afraid to call another attorney for help." Asking an attorney with more experience in an area of law will save your client money and you time by heading you in the right direction from the beginning.
* Actually, law school was very inadequate as far as preparing me for the practicalities of being a lawyer.
* Actually, very little. I tripped over a few books about growing and running a practice that were far better than learning the law. I think we are really not doing a great job preparing young people for careers as lawyers.
* All. Learning a basic understanding of legal concepts was vital to a student such as me who had no background in the law, no family members who were lawyers, etc. A good grounding in legal concepts was vital.
* All course work in my field of specialization.
* All of them. Law school helps to change the way people think and increases critical thinking and reading comprehension, but any functional skills I only learned by practicing.
* All substantive law classes.
Although law school was an enjoyable experience for me as a whole, I cannot pinpoint a single course that prepared me for the practice of law. Instead, law school sharpened my analytical skills, which was crucial for my development as an attorney.

Analyzing case law.

Any course in which public speaking, such as in front of the class, was at a premium.

Any courses that simulated real experiences such as Trial Advocacy, contract drafting classes, and classes where we had simulated negotiations (in my case it was a collective bargaining class).

Appellate review because if you know the issues at appeal, it makes you better on the line.

As a 41 year member of the Bar, the only thing that law school provided me was the concept of analysis.

As a transactional attorney, I felt that law school is only geared for litigators. I wish there were more business oriented classes which addressed practical situations in the business world.

As a whole, they all prepared me with a foundation to properly think through a case, although I would have preferred courses in the business of the law and how to run and manage a law firm and clients.

As I am not a practicing attorney, but the courses I found most helpful were those in which I had really good professors who were actually interested in teaching.

As I was told by my teachers in law school, they were teaching the process of learning the law, not learning to practice. This was a true and helpful statement, as the process of learning how to practice is the never ending process.

At my law school in the 80's, we had a couple of courses that prepared us for something other than theory. We interviewed "clients", prepared interrogatories, prepared for trial, interviewed witnesses and proposed questions to be asked, as well as drafted motions and orders. We prepared for objections, etc. In real life, I used one of the "how to" books for trial which I got in law school. It is the only law book I bothered to keep.

Attended law school evenings (1972-1976). School was excellent with many courses taught by the judiciary or the Clerk of Court. First two years included all required courses. Full year (2 semesters) on Contracts, Torts, Constitutional Law, Federal Court Practice Rules and Procedure, Evidence, Equity, State Court Practice, Rules and Procedure, Wills and Trusts and Real Estate. Any new lawyer needs a good working knowledge of all these skills. 90% of clients’ issues will involve these areas of the law and, without the ability to understand and apply this knowledge to the issue at hand, results in bad advice to clients and bad or unnecessary litigation filed which is bad for the legal profession and a waste of valuable judicial resources.
* Attending night school and being forced to juggle time, a new home and marriage, and study.

* Attorney's Title Insurance Fund seminar.

* Being a certified legal intern at two different state attorney's offices.

* Being a law clerk and obtaining practical hands on experience. While critical thinking is necessary, little is taught in law school about the application of the practice

* Being able to have legal reasoning.

* Being challenged by professors.

* Being required to think and listen.

* Being required to think independently and understand the issues involved in each situational setting.

* Best preparation was not a particular course, but rather a particular professor. The one I have in mind was very good at challenging answers to his questions. He had an ability to force me to focus on answers. If answers were not thoughtful and analytical he would continue asking questions until ultimately it would force a ridiculous response. I also was careful in responding so as to avoid the ultimate embarrassment of a ridiculous answer.

* Business Planning. This was a course that included formation of entities, some basic Tax and some basic Securities Law. There are concepts from that course on which I still rely, 37 years later.

* Case analysis.

* Classes were too theoretical.

* Commercial Law.

* Conflict of Laws.

* Courses that focused on the area of law in which I now practice.

* Cramming, going forward with the test, and forgetting it all afterwards. That's what many lawyers do in each case or trial.

* Criminal Orientation.

* Criminal Pre-Trial Practice.

* Critical thinking and analysis.

* Drafting courses.
* Each and every clinical "real life experience prepared me for my career as a lawyer. Excellent professors who challenged me and gave me the opportunity to expand my critical thinking skills also were an excellent preparation.

* Each class taught me the underlying concepts for the area being taught, however, it was the overall experience of each class that helped develop what I call the ability to think like a lawyer; to use analytical reasoning to consider all of the facts and possible outcomes, obvious and not so obvious and to think inside the box and outside the box. That is why I feel extremely prepared in trial. I do not have to stick to the script.

* Employment Law.

* Engaging professors that not only taught the law, but also connected my class experience to the actual practice of law and how to use those principles with professionalism to help those in need. Also, if not as important, was my work at the Public Defender's office during law school.

* Every course contributed to preparing me for my future legal career.

* Federal Civil Procedure.

* Fiduciary Administration.

* Final exams. They are very similar to a final ruling in a trial or appeal. You essentially have one chance to make your case.

* Finance.

* Florida Practice.

* From an actual do the work prospective, practicum courses with adjunct faculty practicing in the field they were teaching were the best preparation. From a theory prospective, the best courses were Business Organizations and Secured Transactions. Best experiences were the Moot Court competitions, both Appellate and Trial.

* Fundamental Lawyering Skills.

* General preparation for classes.

* Generally all the courses I took that required exam essay writing. My practice (prior to my taking some time off to raise my children) was writing intensive and I feel that many of my classes assisted with sharpening my writing skills.

* Getting a degree.

* Getting an overview of different types of law, so nothing in particular.

* Hard work and intellectual challenge.
Holding down a job while going to law school.

I always found that courses taught by adjunct professors who had active legal practices were very valuable. I intended on going into Transactional/Real Estate practice, and I will always remember the adjunct professor in my Real Estate Development class who would advise on certain real world scenarios and advise "This is where you're going to make money (i.e. title insurance)", or "You need to be careful here, this is where someone is going to sue you if the deal goes bad."

I am not sure that law school prepared me for the practice of law. Most of what I learned came to me from mentors, attorney supervisors and work experience after I graduated.

I attended law school in the late 50's and early 60's, where many of the professors were former judges, of the trial courts as well as the Supreme Court of more than the State of Florida. Professors were also active practicing lawyer experts in their field, as well as young legal eagles. Use of the Blue Book hand written testing methods helped. Students must think and be able to write clearly and be understood. Neither students nor lawyers should be required as a condition of being admitted to a law school, nor to The Florida Bar, be required to be tested nor file pleadings electronically. Skilled in the use of a computer, in my opinion, does not assist one to think like a lawyer. Law schools, the Bar and the court system should be about the law and the public that need and use the law and the reasonable use thereof. Law schools should first provide for the public both the poor, uneducated, as well as all others of the public at a reasonable cost and expense rather than Government workers or other advice to non people-people problems. Law students should first and primarily be required to master legal courses required to assist lawyers in the needs of people-people, people-governmental and/or people-corporate legal needs, activities and other legal needs and problems.

I attended UF. We had a variety of visiting professors, who were most memorable. Some of the best were Former Dean from the University of Mississippi Law School Constitutional Law and the visiting professor studying at Oxford Estate & Trusts who had a photographic memory.

I believe that law school was a process that helped me learn to think in a specific manner. No one class prepared me for being an attorney. My best experience was as a CLI as a state prosecutor.

I can't think of any. Law school was a joke as it had NO bearing on the reality of being a lawyer.

I did not practice law until many years (20) or so after graduating. Upon graduation I did not feel confident to practice on my own. I did not think I learned relevant practice information and needed to work for someone rather than on my own.

I did sports during law school, and I think that helped me to better manage time, work as a team, to compartmentalize study from personal life, and to be healthier so I have lower medical costs over my life.
* I don't think any of the courses themselves prepare you to be a lawyer; they just teach the basics of the law.

* I don't think law school did a great job. Only by "hands on" practicing law, did I become actually prepared.

* I don't think law school related too much to the actual practice of law other than teaching research and writing.

* I don't think one course of activity was more important that other.

* I graduated in the 1960s; theory only. I didn't know where the courthouse was or how to try a case. No practical experience at all. It's much better in that regard today, but we did learn how to research by book, which is not useful today.

* I had a real good ethics professor. He made some good points that I have held on to.

* I have practiced 30+ years as a CPA and retired 5 years ago, the last 23 years as a partner. Law school helped develop my organizational skills and my ability to recognize issues.

* I majored in Criminal Justice. The entire curriculum was very valuable. I also served on the Student Attorney General's staff, prosecuting and defending allegations of Honor Code violations.

* I really can't point to one particular course. Law school doesn't seem like it's really designed to teach substantive, useful law. I can honestly say I learned more about law studying for the bar exam than I learned in my three years of law school.

* I think my legal education as a whole prepared me for being a lawyer. I do not think the substance of each class had relevance with my current practice but the training of preparing for each class, spotting the issues, analyzing the issues and coming to your desired conclusion were techniques that I brought to my practice.

* I think that mandatory legal aid internships should be required and the service offering should be expanded to beyond indigent cases to better season graduates to the issues and options available pursuing a legal career.

* I think that the curriculum at large prepared me for my future as an attorney. The fundamental classes gave me an understanding as an attorney. The courses in my 3rd year and those taught by the practitioners helped prepare me for the legal profession and the practical aspects of the law.

* I took a course in Law School which was about an attorney as counselor and that was the best course which had some application to the practice of law.

* I was a naval officer during the Vietnam War when I decided to go to law school. None of my family or friends had been lawyers, but I had been the legal officer, in additional to my regular duties, on my destroyer and found it very interesting. My professors inspired me and made me want to be a lawyer. I had no idea what field of practice would be right
for me so I spent 10 years as a trial lawyer with a general practice from criminal defense, family law, and personal injury to real estate. I discovered the field I preferred was representing Real Estate developers, which I have done for over 30 years.

* I went to law school from 1980 to 1983. The methods used back then prepared me for the surprises that occur in court or to otherwise be able to think on my feet.

* I worked in a law firm my 2nd and 3rd years of law school. I was able to see how theory was practiced.

* I worked part-time for an attorney my 3rd year. Also, I had a number of classes taught by people who were still in private practice or recently retired, and in one case a sitting federal appellate judge.

* I worked/clerked my second and third years. This provided valuable practical experience.

* I'm not sure a particular course helped prepare me for the future, but the work ethic required to succeed in law school helped prepare me for the future. I also think that clerking in the summer was an extremely valuable experience. Law schools like to push their study abroad programs, but experience in a law firm for 2-3 months is much more valuable.

* Immigration law and immigration clinic; international trade law course and seminar.

* Impossible to limit the answer to one course or experience. It is a comprehensive education, all aspects are important.

* Improving my ability to think analytically.

* In general, the courses in law school circa 1974-77 were not relevant to the actual practice of law for me. I practiced in a large firm in the corporate/securities department and later as a bank attorney.

* Inspiration gained from my professors and fellow students.

* International Business Transactions.

* Land Use Law.

* Law school does a terrible job of preparing law students to practice law.

* Law school is very inefficient and provided very little help in preparing me for my future as a lawyer.

* Law school may train you to think like a lawyer, but it does not prepare you to be a lawyer. Only experience, your own or that of others, does that.

* Learning to work hard and being able to always do what is in the interest of my clients.
Learning with other really smart, really driven students. So many courses were important-
Federal Courts and the Federal System, Secured Transactions, Debtors' Rights and
Creditors' Remedies, Contracts. But being there with all those smart people, learning and
getting to know them. I am particularly happy that I NEVER had a clinical law course.

Legal Method and Jurisprudence, which emphasized how to approach and analyze issues
outside the strictures of so-called black letter law.

Legal Process. It was a class which helped parse out the meaning behind the specific
language chosen when laws are written. It definitely helped me think about why certain
words were chosen, and what they mean when attempting to interpret and apply the law.

Legislation.

Logic and thinking. Every class consisted of these elements to some degree, but there was
no effort to link the elements of a legal problem to the necessity of utilizing logic and
reasoning to define the matter. The Legal Research and Writing classes provided the best
effort at combining the abstract with the concrete. Learning black letter law in Contracts
was necessary; however there was no course on applying that law to abstract principals.
As a student it would have been helpful to investigate "why" a principal was created by a
court so that the logic could be applied elsewhere.

Meeting ad hoc professors and fellow students that I have encountered in my legal career
and getting exposed to practice management concepts.

Meeting future colleagues.

More practical courses, like how to file pleadings, how to deal with the Clerk of the
Court, how to deal with opposing counsel.

Most of them.

Most people couldn't have predicted the number of new law schools and the vast
oversupply they created. Likewise, the outsourcing of legal services offshore is
staggering. The Bar is absolutely worthless as far as keeping the unauthorized practice of
law from occurring.

Motions & Depositions provided the most preparation for actual practice.

My law school had a cooperative work experience program in the form of a law office
that represented low income clients. This experience was invaluable.

My LLM in Taxation.

My property professor, while teaching property, taught problem solving skills. I took the
problem solving skills and apply them in my daily practice.

My research classes which introduced me to researching cases via the computer.
* My three legal clinics, my summer jobs, and honestly, my high school job at K-Mart.

* My work as an Assistant U.S. Attorney best prepared me for trial practice. My law school Constitutional Law professor was most influential in teaching me how to think like an attorney.

* No one course best prepared me for my future as a lawyer. I feel all of the basic first and second year courses combined gave me the experience I needed to become a good lawyer. Perhaps law school could be shortened to a 2 year program with a required internship to better prepare students for the real life practice of law, but the first two years create a critical mass of understanding of various aspects of law and procedure that are necessary to make a student ready to become a future lawyer.

* No one course. It was the overall experience of working very hard and learning to think in legal terms. In the old days, the Socratic Method also helped.

* No particular classes were helpful. The best aspect was the training involved in thinking like a lawyer.

* No particular course but essay type exams helped make you think through your response in more detail and use more levels of thought.

* No particular course or experience best prepared me but the overall law school experience was helpful.

* No particular course or experience.

* No single course, but the process helped to make me think in new ways about things.

* No specific courses, however the entire experience prepared me to practice.

* None of it, frankly, although, from what I understand, they have started to hire more professors with actual practice experience and have started offering more practical skills classes.

* None of them really. They were totally lacking in practical "how to" knowledge.

* None. The legal job market is changing much quicker than the curriculum. I went immediately into corporate in-house practice, and nothing in law school prepares an attorney to work in-house. A significant portion of my colleagues have experienced the same lack of preparation for their careers.

* Not any one specifically: rather the thought process to analyze issues presented in every course and to look at the issue from more than one side.

* Nothing in law school prepared me for the practice of law, litigation and trial.

* Nothing. I went to Florida A&M College of Law and it was a terrible experience which had more of a detrimental affect than it did to help prepare me for my career. However, if
was to choose one thing that may have helped prepare me than I will have to say Evidence. I work in foreclosure and you really need to know evidence.

* Nothing. Law school gave me the basic information, but it did not prepare me for the shock of dealing with judges, the system and people in general.

* Obviously, legal education is the key to law school, however, I believe an emphasis on the actual practice and practicalities of the legal profession would benefit law students.

* Oral arguments.

* Other than granting me a degree, my law school had little relevance to the practice of law.

* Pleadings and discovery.

* Preparation for the real world.

* Pretrial Litigation Drafting. This should be a requirement; all future attorneys need to know how to draft basic pleadings. Interning prepared me for practice probably more than law school did. Law school teaches you to THINK like a lawyer but doesn't teach you how to practice. I wish there was more hands on/actual practice of law training in law school.

* Pre-trial litigation was a good course and is worth mentioning here.

* Pre-trial practice was the best class because I used the skills immediately, and working in the courthouse as an intern was the best experience because it made me feel comfortable in the courthouse.

* Probably none. There were few, if any, clinical courses when I went to school, and PR class was strictly rules based, rather than a discussion of professionalism, client relationships, law office management, and the other things that one needs to know in the real world.

* Probably social interaction with the professors, i.e. "war stories". Best remembered is Hugh Sowards' comment "If the client flies first class, you fly first class. If the client flies coach, you fly coach." Not sure how that applies to the era of private jets, but the point remains the same.

* Probably the Lawyering Skills and Values; however, it was a very weak attempt to introduce students to Legal Writing. The curriculum was just too spread out. I wish I had taken Civil Pretrial Practice.

* Procedure based classes, e.g., conflict of laws, federal jurisdiction, and complex litigation. As a litigator who practices primarily in federal court, the concepts discussed in these classes are the ones I refer to the most.

* Professors made a big impact.
* Putting in the hours.
* Remedies.
* Sales.
* SAO internship.
* Secured transactions.
* Selling condominiums to work my way through helped me to learn hard work and how to work a jury.
* Serving on the honor court.
* Socratic Method where we were all shaking in our boots and had to make quick decisions regarding how we would back up our arguments. The fear in the room was an important tool in honing skills. Also, the professor, although scary, was extremely ethical and would lead us down dubious paths where we would have to find ethical, but creative, ways to travel. On opening day, 35 years ago our dean told us while sitting in an auditorium to look to our left and our right, that one of would not be there next semester. She was right. This was not a scare tactic. It was a reality of a good law school that understood not every good student was cut out to be a lawyer; it also took character and spirit.
* Statutory interpretation.
* Stetson Trial Team. No question.
* Taking a class my final year of law school that allowed us to represent clients charged with crimes.
* Taking every course I could on legal analysis and writing. That led to my career, and it's both fulfilling and economically rewarding.
* Teach thinking and improvise.
* The act of studying, the long times it took to prepare for class are similar to preparing for hearings etc.
* The basic legal education over 30 years ago plus a litigation skills course.
* The best preparation is being provided the practical experience of seeing an actual transaction or matter from the perspective of "how" it gets accomplished as much as why it is legally appropriate.
* The classes that dealt with specific areas of the law as they exposed you to issues and new thinking about the law and how we have to work with it to solve our problems. I think it helped me to view each client as a person with a problem who has come to me to
help him reach a solution it is almost like a puzzle that you have to solve and overcome traps along the way that would take you off course.

* The competition to remain in school led to the ability to deal with the stresses of the profession.

* The core courses.

* The course Legislation and Regulation.

* The electives. The instructors for the electives tended to take a much more practical approach to what to do with the materials learned.

* The entire first year "core" course load. After that, there were only a few courses that translated into practical application and few really stand out, with the possible exception of a few Tax-related courses.

* The experience by far that prepared me for my future as a lawyer was something I took the initiative to do on my own and did regularly over about a 7 year period: I went to courthouses in several different towns and observed courtroom proceedings.

* The experiences in law school were limited in terms of preparing a student to become a lawyer.

* The first year of law school was the most important since it taught me how to think like an attorney. After that, law school was a waste of time except for the clinical programs.

* The immersion into the necessity of critical thinking best prepared me for my future as a lawyer.

* The law school experience: (1) Socratic Method and; (2) Legal Research; emphasized the importance of clear, logical thought and hard work and attention to detail. These are qualities that help in being an effective attorney. However, none of the course work in law school prepared me specifically for work as an attorney in private practice law firm.

* The Legal Skills and Values classes.

* The Litigation Skills program.

* The LL.M. program in Real Property Development at the University of Miami's law school. This experience was very practical and hands on focusing not only on the legal aspects of Real Estate development but on the business and financial aspects as well.

* The one experience that had the most impact was when a professor told me that in order to be a better lawyer than any of my opponents, beyond being well prepared, was to know the rules of procedure and evidence better than them. He was right!

* The pressure and multitasking.
* The research hours required in the Law Library were the most constructive experience preparing me to be a lawyer.

* The tremendous amount of reading required in law school prepared me for the large amount of reading and reviewing I have to perform on a daily basis. The best experience in law school was interning for the Public Defender's office and a Circuit Court Judge. Both of those experiences helped me prepare for what I encounter in practice more than any course I completed.

* The trial prep seminar given by Roy Black at the University of Miami was the most helpful.

* The whole experience of law school itself, as well as the appreciation for the law itself that was taught to me.

* There was no course (save perhaps research) which prepared me for practice.

* There was nothing I learned in law school that had anything to do with the law I practiced.

* Thinking like a lawyer.

* Though I enjoyed attending the University of Florida College of Law, I can honestly say that my legal education did NOT prepare me to practice law. They only teach you in law school the theoretical science; the applied science is something you learn "hands-on" in the so-called real world. It was quite frustrating for me to learn the practice of law. For instance, I had no idea how to even prepare or file a lawsuit for weeks following my graduation from law school! That alone has stayed with me ever since.

* Transactional Drafting.

* Very little from my education is relevant to real world jobs, but the training and education as a whole was useful in providing a methodology for thinking. Corporate policies and procedures, management in general – more of the bigger picture type courses and information would have been extremely useful. Very few attorneys litigate cases. Helping us all learn negotiation strategies, how to achieve the best outcomes where there are multiple stakeholders with divergent priorities would have been very useful.

* Very little in law school prepared me for my future legal practice. Law school should be changed to a 1 or 2 year course of study, with 1 year mandatory apprenticeship (like the old days).

* Virtually none. Much of the education (when I went to law school) was focused on preparing students to take the bar exam and theory as opposed to the practical aspects of being an attorney.

* Volunteer/legal aid experience.

* Volunteering for an organization that provides legal services to indigent clients.
* We had a class called lawyering where we had to write motions, research briefs and give oral arguments. Also, my work on my student journal was incredibly helpful.

* We had a course called lawyering process. The course was a yearlong Legal Research and Writing course that divided our first year students into "firms". It centered around a lawsuit between clients of the firms and walked us step by step through an initial consultation, research, contact with opposing party and counsel, initiating a lawsuit (summons and complaint), counter-claims, motions, hearings, and post decision activity which culminated in an appeal and timed oral arguments at the end of the year. Along the way we drafted letters, pleadings, conducted depositions, etc.

* While theoretical and not practically oriented, it taught me legal principles that I have had the opportunity to use in practice, such as the minimum contacts test.

* Within the confines of school, special in-depth projects, such as research papers, in areas of particular interest are the most memorable academic experiences.

* Working at a title insurance company while in law school.

* Working at the public defender's office and having good professors which taught the courses in ways that connected the subject matter to the actual practice of law.

* Working in a law firm while attending law school at night.

* Working in law enforcement while attending law school. The course work at Miami was quite complete.

* Working long hours and constantly being stressed out.

* Working part-time at a Civil law firm.

* Working with attorneys outside of law school. Law school didn't help much.
6. Again, thinking back to when you entered the legal profession, were there any experiences, skills or knowledge that you believe you might have lacked as a new lawyer? If “Yes”, please explain:

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

* Internship/Externship. (13 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (11 Responses)
* Trial Advocacy. (11 Responses)
* Legal Research & Writing. (10 Responses)
* Practical courses/experience. (10 Responses)
* Property. (5 Responses)
* Business Management Skills. (4 Responses)
* Contract Law. (4 Responses)
* Trial Practice. (4 Responses)
* Evidence. (3 Responses)
* Mock Trial. (3 Responses)
* Moot Court. (3 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (2 Responses)
* Criminal Law. (2 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (2 Responses)
* Family Law. (2 Responses)
* Skills related courses. (2 Responses)
* A reality check on the job market.
* Advocacy; public speaking.
* All procedural aspects from filing notices to introducing exhibits on the record in depositions. Understanding of litigation strategy.
* An understanding of how the mechanics of the system works. The steps from filing a complaint, motion practice, more of the interim steps that occur. Law School focuses on big motions for summary judgments and appellate briefs, as opposed to the bulk of the type of motions/documents lawyers actually create.

* Appellate Advocacy (basic and advanced).

* As a new attorney, there were numerous skills/knowledge I lacked about the day to day practice of law. However, I feel this is how it is in every profession when a person is new. The key is whether you had the skills to learn what you needed to know. I had those skills and therefore feel I was able to progress in my legal career.

* As an associate entering litigation, preparation for daily litigation activities and knowledge of the FRCP was lacking.

* Collective Bargaining.

* Corporate finance and the basics of in-house practice.

* Court room decorum, etiquette and managing clients.

* Ethics.

* Every course contributed to preparing me for my future legal career. The internship that I participated in gave me a great advantage.

* Federal Courts.

* Federal Income Tax.

* Finance.

* How to actually "practice law".

* How to bill, interact with clients.

* How to interact with other attorneys, how to begin the process of a lawsuit, how to file papers, how to negotiate.

* I believe it was the professors that influenced and prepared me the most.

* I could have used more experience in conducting discovery and in evaluating the value of cases.

* I had limited trial court experience in law school by choice and then found myself in court on a daily basis as a trial attorney because that's where the job opportunities were.

* I had no idea how to actually practice law. Law Schools should do away with the third year of study and either put students into a sort of apprenticeship program, or they should
require simulation classes that would take a student through the life of a case (i.e., motion to dismiss, answer, motion practice, discovery, MSJ, pre-trial motions, trial, appeal) I would have been infinitely more prepared for the actual of practice of law, had this been part of the curriculum.

* I had worked in the legal field for 4 years prior to law school and throughout the law school process. I was prepared for the profession in an attorney capacity from work experience, but not so much from the classes.

* I started out practicing in the Criminal Law area, even though I had no prior experience in that field. As a new attorney, I lacked familiarity with the day-to-day procedures of handling a case, as well as the case law generally applied in many of the cases. My first couple of years were very much a "learn-as-you-go" experience.

* I'm not certain how else to describe this, but I think law school did not confer enough knowledge about the 'nuts and bolts' of law practice. I feel like I would get a better start as an apprentice to an experienced attorney.

* Incorporating the practice of law with the business of law.

* It would have been very helpful to learn the general logistics of how to file documents with the Court, schedule hearings, etc.

* Law practice management.

* Law review and summer clerkships.

* Law school teaches general concepts. As a new lawyer, you lack knowledge and skills in too many areas, but only practicing law you will obtain that necessary knowledge and skills.

* Law school teaches you almost nothing about the day to day practice of law. I had no idea how to handle clients, investigate evidence, file and serve motions, and prepare orders. Even clinics and internships kept me insulated from the real world, and failed to teach me the nuts and bolts of the legal industry.

* Law school teaches you nothing about how to act as a lawyer. This has obviously always been the system. I had the pleasure of working with law students from Europe and South America, and their systems employ an apprenticeship-type method. I am not sure that it is necessary for implementation of such a formalized system, but many students are placed as a disadvantage coming out of law school depending on the willingness of the law firm's or their supervising partner's willingness and ability to teach them how to practice law day in and day out.

* Law students do not leave law school understanding procedure until they actually practice procedure.

* Learning about what practice is all about.
* Legal aid clinic.
* Litigation experience, motion practice, attorney conduct during interactions with opposing senior counsel, and law firm dynamics generally.
* Litigation skills.
* Medical Malpractice.
* Motions & Depositions.
* No, but that is only because I had already worked through a clinical program and externships- I came into the legal profession with experience filing pleadings, conducting a trial, and doing extensive research, etc. But if I had not had an opportunity to work via these programs I would not have any experience on the day to day of filings, conducting trials, or the general environment of a law firm.
* Not enough experience, skill, or knowledge doing everyday things. For example, which table to sit at when arguing a motion or how to communicate with a potential client, etc.
* Of course, as a new lawyer, I lacked the experience, skills, and knowledge that can only be gained from time spent as an attorney.
* Oral advocacy skills need improvement. Also, law school did not provide much practical experience.
* Participation in the Children's Advocacy Clinic.
* Practical knowledge and skills.
* Pretrial Litigation Drafting. This should be a requirement; all future attorneys need to know how to draft basic pleadings. Interning prepared me for practice probably more than law school did. Law school teaches you to THINK like a lawyer but doesn't teach you how to practice. I wish there was more hands on/actual practice of law training in law school.
* Pre-trial Practice.
* The basic operational duties of trust accounting and procedures to file documents with the court.
* The course Legislation and Regulation.
* The how of the job, rather than the theory.
* The process of the court system (what an attorney is supposed to do in court).
* There are some things that you can only learn through experience. I took a pre-trial litigation practice course, but even it could not prepare me for the entire minutia of
proceeding to trial. I can't explain it with any specificity, but I wish I had come in with a little more practical experience on drafting discovery, reviewing discovery, etc.

* Time management/organizational skills.
* Torts.
* Understanding practically how to manage a case/caseload. I received little to no education on how to actually be a lawyer- only how to think like a lawyer- until I began actively pursuing practical experience, advocacy teams, and internships. This should be a requirement in law school.
* We are taught theory in law school so transitioning to real life application took time.
* While clinical experience helped immensely, there were still every day aspects of the job that I was lacking, like knowing how to file things, communicating with clients, writing e-mails to clients, etc.
* Wills, Trusts and Estates.
* Working with attorneys outside of law school. Law school didn't help much.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

* Practical skills or experience. (139 Responses)
* The business aspects of a law practice. (71 Responses)
* Didn’t know how to practice law. (48 Responses)
* Interviewing/dealing with clients. (46 Responses)
* Drafting documents/pleadings. (40 Responses)
* Navigating Courts/Courtroom experience. (36 Responses)
* Internship. (32 Responses)
* Law Office Management. (27 Responses)
* Trial experience. (26 Responses)
* My knowledge and experience came afterwards- while practicing. (23 Responses)
* Billing. (21 Responses)
Mentorship. (13 Responses)

Deposition skills. (12 Responses)

How to conduct discovery. (12 Responses)

Litigation skills. (12 Responses)

Negotiation. (9 Responses)

Public speaking. (9 Responses)

Finance. (8 Responses)

Contracts. (8 Responses)

Technology/computer skills. (7 Responses)

Dealing with judges. (6 Responses)

Civil Procedure. (5 Responses)

Evidence. (5 Responses)

Procedural rules. (5 Responses)

1) I lacked an understanding of how to take a case from start/intake through to trial and everything in between. I quickly learned it, and it was one of the most important things I learned because I have used that understanding in both my Criminal and Civil practice. However, this very basic idea (which is important for a trial lawyer) is never really touched upon in law school, even in trial prep classes (which seem to focus more on the theatrics of openings/closings/cross, rather than how to prepare to make sure that your opening, closing, and cross are superb). And, even in the clinics, most cases were already opened and pending cases so we didn't have to learn what to do once the case is started. That being said, most of what I'm talking about can only be gained through real world experience.

2) Though law school, Legal Research and Writing courses taught us how to draft legal memorandum, motions, briefs, etc., there are other essential skills, such as drafting a contract, a non-compete agreement, or even wills, that are never really taught in law school. This leaves most prepared to write motions and memorandum, but unprepared to do what most people want their attorney to do- draft a legal document for them.

A clinical program should be mandatory and taught by local lawyers that have actually practiced and not those educated idiots that are too often law school professors (if they got thrown out and had to proactive they would get real thin - real fast).

A general lack of Florida law and rules. It took me some time to really learn the distinctions.
* A true mentor.
* Ability to advise others.
* Ability to deconstruct and analyze case and determine most likely outcome from onset of case and experience in engaging in discovery practice, particularly depositions.
* Ability to handle stress.
* Ability to think of the practical effects of issues that arose rather than just simply focusing on the strict letter of the law.
* Actually handling a case from start (interviewing client to final judgment) to finish.
* Advocacy opportunities were very limited when I was attending law school.
* All I knew was theory with no real world experience to tie the theory to.
* Although I was told, I did not remotely understand that outcomes are greatly influenced by knowing your judge in at least two ways: 1) Knowing the judge's biases and history on legal issues; 2) The judge's bias toward or against certain attorneys. I also did not remotely understand how much attorneys and parties mislead, both affirmatively and by omission, other parties and judges. Finally, I did not understand how often some judges do not follow the law, a problem which is often a variation of knowing your judge above.
* Although I worked as a paralegal prior to becoming a newly minted lawyer, I still lacked a lot of the experience and seasoning that comes with time.
* Among the problems were: how to analyze problems and find solutions; how do you make money; how to find clients; how do you do marketing; and do we really help people?
* An overview of what we were supposed to accomplish, and procedurally how to accomplish it. Law school was theoretical only, not practical. As with most new attorneys, working paralegals have far more knowledge than newer attorneys. Professionalism was not emphasized, but just given cursory attention. This is why we have many unpleasant areas of the State in which to practice, because winning is everything, at any cost.
* An understanding of billing and hours in the real world as opposed to the class room.
* Any knowledge of what a lawyer actually does. I had a lot of book knowledge, but nothing practical.
* Any knowledge or skills to practice as a lawyer!
* Applied exercises.
Arguing motions; preparing and responding to discovery.

As a litigator, it was difficult to see how the different phases of litigation fit together. Until you've seen a lawsuit from start to finish, it's hard to know the importance of discovery, motion practice, etc.

As a new lawyer I lacked pretty much all experience, skills and knowledge, which is par for the course. I always tell new lawyers that as a new lawyer, no less than the court clerks or judicial assistants and probably less than our paralegals or legal assistants. I tell young lawyers that we should keep that in mind, and not be afraid to ask questions and admit that you don't know something (but you can learn).

As a new lawyer, I did not have the knowledge of how the actual practice of law functioned. I depended upon experienced lawyers to mentor me.

As a new lawyer, I lacked practical skills, like how to run a law firm, trust accounts, and basic courtroom skills- like presenting a simple motion before a judge. Also, I lacked practical ethical skills, i.e., typical pitfalls that attorneys are faced with.

Aside from the standard things like the real world - academia dichotomy, I did not know or realize so many people fib. Mislead, etc. under oath and that "the system" rarely punishes them notwithstanding this usually constitutes perjury. This concept offered by well seasoned practitioners is that if judges/"the system" nailed every perjurer, nothing else would get done- was hard to grasp and accept myself, and once I was able to eliminate my own unrealistic expectation, I still had to explain it to clients who, like me, thought the system was "fair" and "just" ... "it's the best system we have" I say. The phenomena of lying cops and public officials seems to be at an all-time high, and they are becoming very skilled, convincing liars to the extent it affects your case and you must advise your clients that even if they are telling the truth, innocent, and want their day in court, the opponents are such well-practiced liars they appear to be truthful and are able to persuade juries who also have no idea how much lying goes on. I wish I would have learned this in law school- the reality of practicing in the court system.

At the time I entered the legal profession 24 years ago, there were no mentors. I lacked any real comprehension of how to handle clients and balance the legal and administrative aspects of practicing law.

Attention to detail.

Basic information like you must call the judge's office to set a hearing they do not do that for you.

Basic trust accounting knowledge. Fortunately I started out with a fine large law firm where I could learn this. Many young lawyers do not do this.

Basically everything.

Because I decided to practice Immigration Law, I was less prepared because my law school, in spite of clinics, offered only one course in Immigration Law.
Because I was educated in the early 90's, I missed the technology trend, which included Excel and PowerPoint, etc. - so that was all learned on the job. We were taught nothing about marketing or branding ourselves as lawyers. We were taught nothing about building and starting a business. We needed a Tax course and Labor & Employment Law course not just in theory, but in practice and for small to mid-sized business, since, in fact, most lawyers work in smaller firms.

Being able to organize and think clearly.

Billing, running a legal office, working with clients in a Civil setting, not criminal (law school pushes litigation and Criminal Law), working with partners, owners.

Brief writing and editing were not truly covered in law school. Negotiation skills for settlements were lacking as a new lawyer.

Confidence, self-esteem, money & experience.

Courses on how private attorneys can practically handle client cases from intake to appeal and collection of a judgment.

Day to day knowledge of preparing complaints, motions, discovery.

Did not get the "big picture" or have the experience needed to become a successful lawyer off the bat.

Even though I participated in the legal clinic, it wasn't until after actually practicing for several months that I had any practical understanding of procedure.

Everything it takes to be a good lawyer besides academics; experience.

Everything was new and, as a solo practitioner, there was no one to monitor what I was doing. Simple things that most lawyers are taught, but a senior counsel did not exist. Fortunately, I joined a helpful bar association - Fla. NELA that was incredibly helpful.

Expectations as to what a new associate should and should not do/know. Nothing saying here is in-house and how it works, legal aid, law firm, etc.

Experience working in a law firm.

General skills associated with the practice of law in an office environment. These may more relate to paralegal and secretarial functions which should have been included in the law school training. One must know what the supervised are supposed to be doing.

Generally, with few exceptions, young lawyers don't comprehend the big picture and have the skills to perform the requisite analysis to handle anything beyond relatively simple matters. It takes time to develop those skills.

How to analyze real issues (not law school hypothetical situations).
* How to find a position.

* How to handle opposing counsel when they refused to cooperate or respond.

* How to handle the pressure that comes with practicing law.

* How to handle your student loan debt.

* How to look at big pictures- what does the client really want as opposed to what they are saying? What is the best strategy for the company as a whole on a long-term basis rather than merely addressing the immediate situation being presented?

* How to practice law in a way that took into account the business realities of operating such an office that allowed for "making a living."

* How to work with a partner.

* I am a board certified Real Estate lawyer but the Real Property class that I took in law school had nothing to do with the practice of Real Estate law on the outside. I had no experience with closings or title insurance or Real Estate litigation, all of which became so important when I decided to become a Real Estate lawyer. Law schools were lacking so much in that area.

* I attended a national law school. It did not want to waste time teaching us the procedures followed in local courts. Thus, when I got to Florida, I had to learn those procedures. However, the firm I started with made a point of teaching those things in-house.

* I believe that law school does not adequately prepare students for the actual practice of law, and focuses a bit too much on the theory/study of law. Most graduates will be practicing lawyers and not legal scholars or theorists.

* I certainly did not start out as capable a lawyer as I am today. But that capability comes from experience, not from the "lack" of any particular skill. If I felt unsure about some part of Civil Procedure, I researched thoroughly and found the answer. As a new lawyer, I definitely lacked the judgment that comes from experience. Fortunately, I had mentors in our law firm who helped me learn to think things through and to act deliberately rather than reflexively.

* I couldn't possibly have known what the practice was like.

* I didn't have knowledge of workplace culture and a perspective on the overall legal field. I knew predominantly solos, because the local bar association, whose meetings I went to while I was a student, was mostly solos. I had almost no contacts in government law, none in big law, and none doing in house counsel work. I also had no contacts of people with law degrees not working in law.

* I didn't know that court costs could be sent to collections court or reduced to a Civil Judgment, and that reducing the costs to a Civil Judgment would lead to a license suspension (or that it was called a D6), or that falling behind on collections court
payments would result in a writ of bodily attachment that would land a client in jail until
the purge amount was paid or the client attended a hearing to come up with a new
payment plan. So, yes, we have debtor's prison, it just lasts for a week or less, except in
the unfortunate circumstance where someone is being arrested on the writ and gets
arrested for a new charge at the same time, like resisting officer, possession of a
controlled substance, carrying a concealed weapon, possession of firearm by felon, etc.

* I do not believe I was completely prepared to represent people in court before a judge or
jury. I did not think law school at the time really cared about preparing students to
practice law, but was more concerned with teaching big concepts and preparing students
to take the bar exam.

* I feel like it took me awhile to see the big picture of how the three branches work, case
law in relation to statutes or rules. I'm not sure why it was overwhelming to learn in law
school, but I did not understand it until I practiced for awhile.

* I feel that the Socratic Method used in law school was not effective. I also feel that law
school favored the teaching of legal theory while lacking practical application.

* I had a clear understanding of discovery and motion practice because of the legal intern
program. The students today do not have that, and do not seem to have any grasp on "the
business" of practicing law. They seem to feel entitled to a $100,000 salary when they
pass the Bar.

* I had all the requisite skills, but they were very underdeveloped.

* I had clerked with three different law firms before I graduated, which assisted in the
transition.

* I had little or no knowledge about how things actually worked in real life as opposed to
merely an academic understanding of the law. We were not taught how to deal with real
people in a real setting.

* I had little to no training on how to draft motions and propose orders. Text books are
useless for these, or how to pick a jury. And worse, are the graduates I've dealt with who
graduated in the mid-late 90's and after. They can't reason, they have no clue how to do
legal research or writing, they expect others to do their work for them, and they show
little regard for the value of experience, yet expect higher wages than experienced
attorneys, but they have no clue how to do the work.

* I had never actually had face to face contact with a client. I worked in a law firm for a
while, but as a law clerk doing research. I did not even have client contact in my first job
until I had been there 6 months or so.

* I had no experience of any kind in simple accounting methodology. I took none in
undergraduate school and, in my opinion, this was a deficiency in my overall education.
If I had it to do over again, I would take some accounting in college. It would have served
me well in my career and in administering a law office.
I had no formal training in the negotiating skills, and I had few opportunities to draft Contracts and similar documents.

I had no idea how the system worked.

I had very little notion of cross examination and very little skill at jury selection.

I had worked in law firms for many years prior to attending law school. I had performed every job in an office from a courier running errands to a law clerk drafting complex pleadings. I frankly did not enjoy law school. However, the greatest skill which I believe is not well taught in law school is how to think and write rhetorically (the other is how to argue without becoming combative). Now, I had taken rhetoric classes, so while this was not my weakness, it is one I generally see. My actual experience made me far more useful than the typical first year associate. The only way to replicate that is, and since law school is already a trade school, mandate law clerk experience in firms, courts, or even law school projects, to enable them to better understand what the actual practice of law entails. They need to understand how important it is to work well with others, and to see the day-in and day-out of the profession.

I knew theory but not how to make a living trying cases.

I lacked the social skills necessary to develop a well paying practice. Joining Civil clubs and every other entity which gives you access to people. I did not become a joiner until I had more than ten years of practice.

I needed the skill of being assertive and asking a lot of questions. Due to my personality and the natural fear of being seen as dumb, I did not inject myself into interactions with my fellow lawyers to get enough information or access to resources so that I could be somewhat confident when I entered the courtroom or encountered new legal issues.

I really had no idea of how to intake a client, initiate a case and really manage work flow of a case. If you have never done it, it's difficult to know the steps, particularly in dealing with case filing, service and basic procedural steps.

I remember how relieved I felt after graduating from law school and passing the state bar. But after practicing for several months the weight of taking on client's legal problems and associated problems became apparent and I realized that actually representing clients and having them rely on you for their income, custody and their freedom was a tremendous responsibility. I think it would be very helpful for law students to hear from clients and practicing attorneys in different types of law settings.

I should have learned to be a stronger legal researcher.

I teach as an adjunct in the paralegal studies program at our local college. The nuts and bolts approach to real life situations and how you handle clients. Files and cases make many of the paralegals graduating with a 2 year degree, much better prepared to handle the first day of work in a law office. If you do not teach where to look for the online site
to form a corporation in Florida, you look pretty dumb, regardless of how knowledgeable you may be in corporate law.

* I think law school changed my thought process. Reviewing cases and briefing them to define facts and spot issues really changed the way I think through things.

* I thought the access to the legal system was something everybody can have. I thought the Courts were interested in administering justice; turns out they were more concerned with closing cases in order to comply with administrative orders, showing a total disregard of the proper judicial procedure. I thought Judges were held to a higher standard, only to be confronted with the reality of Judges arrested for smoking pot, drunk driving, sleeping with prosecutors, appointed by the government without any consideration for their qualities or skills, only because they were influential people. I guess I had a very naive approach or lack of proper knowledge as to how things really work in the legal arena.

* I took Wills and Trusts but had no conception as to how to open an estate or act as legal representative of the estate.

* I was 25 when graduating - what did I know about life? Who was I to give advice to people who were divorcing when I had not yet gotten married, nor did I have advice regarding custody matters or the experience needed in order to advise business owners how to handle their debt issues. Now, when I look back, I have to laugh at myself. I was admitted in 1978, to give you an idea. It was a time when firms were phasing out the concept of the young lawyer carrying the older lawyer's briefcase and listening, absorbing, and learning. The new era of electronics via computer came into play, as did advertising. Anyway, my point is, I did not have life's experiences upon which to draw so that my role was as much as a "counselor" as an attorney.

* I was not prepared for the reality of the mercurial dispensation of "justice" that, it turns out, is somewhat whimsical.

* I was trained by good attorneys, and sometimes trial by fire (literally), which did help me to be unafraid of my inexperience.

* I wish I had had a greater understanding and appreciation for how vicious the legal system is and how it destroys families and communities.

* I wish I had studied science more, as many of my cases involve forensic science.

* I wish I would have had more experience with negotiation.

* I worked as a private law clerk. I think that experience was valuable. I recommend more time in the practice before licensing.

* I would have appreciated more of a rounded practical education, with access to different legal.

* In law school, you are taught to view County and Circuit Courts as if they are an Appellate Court. Attorneys should be better trained; that is not the case.
* In so many ways, we are counselors and that aspect has been forgotten. Law school was more like learning to be an engineer in that we were provided a limited toolbox and when we saw a problem we were limited to just the tools in the box. Over time one discovers that the legal "toolbox" provides very limited solutions. Knowing what motivates a client, or an opposing party is just as important as writing a complaint. Being creative in finding solutions was not taught. Ours is a profession taught as a technical job, when it is actually an art. This is a profession, not a job.

* It was all wonderfully esoteric. The problem was no one explained how to deal with the clerk's office, process servers, judicial assistants, etc.

* It would have been helpful to have had more knowledge about career options, trajectories, etc.

* Knowledge about filing a suit.

* Knowledge of landlord/tenant law and procedure. Knowledge about auxiliary services such as process servers, court reporters, finding experts.

* Knowledge of the "nuts and bolts" of how to do things. Without a supportive employer and knowledgeable support staff and clerk's office personnel, I would not have been prepared to accomplish the practical aspects of the job.

* Lack of confidence and inability to speak up to sufficiently represent my client, which I think was a byproduct of lack of confidence in my skills.


* Law school does not prepare one to practice law. Civil Procedure is a totally abstract course, especially when taken during the first year of law school. It is a course that would be much more productive if taken during first semester of third year, or when one has already had clerking experience and seen just how the procedural rules apply in the everyday practice of law.

* Law school really is not what prepared me. It was clerking for 3 years while in law school that provided that.

* Law school teaches well how to think about the law. Law school teaches virtually nothing about how to practice law. Apprenticeship has been abandoned in favor of purely academic training. That is a huge mistake and has led to a market flooded with lawyers but diluted of capable lawyers. A 25 year-old kid with a JD and a Bar ticket can hang out a shingle. But (s)he is not ready to practice law.

* Law school was a horrible experience. Professors with zero experience in the "real world" required us to read cases that have little to no relevancy (on a practical level) in daily life. We should have been taught to read modern cases, not just seminal cases from 150 years ago.
Life experience/maturity that is only gained with the passage of time. The nuts and bolts of litigating, i.e., who, what, where and why of the in/outs of court practice.

Local rules and procedure related to actual practice.

My first job was with NASA and I did not keep time. I was given an assignment and worked until it was completed and I had done all that I thought needed to be done. In private practice, it was a shock to understand that you had to consider the value of the case before you determined what work was acceptable to complete your task.

My school didn't focus on internships/pro bono work so when I entered the workforce after graduating early with no extracurriculars. I could not find a job.

No idea how to manage my workload. This was 1978, before computers, and it was hard to keep track of due dates and how to manage my cases.

No one coming out of law school knows how to be a lawyer. Law school prepares you to debate the law on an academic level, but it doesn't teach you how to try or defend a client. It doesn't teach you how to take a deposition of a recalcitrant witness. It doesn't teach you much of anything related to the day to day life of a lawyer. You can read and analyze the law. That is about it.

Nuts and bolts, e.g., exactly how to prepare a last will & testament.

Obviously, knowledge. I had no legal training, and needed to learn to "think like a lawyer". I do think my interpersonal skills helped me network and build a practice.

Organizational skills for developing cases.

Other than the business planning course, there was no practical experience, clinic or course available to a lawyer who wanted to be a transactional lawyer. We learned about the Rule Against Perpetuities, but not how to handle our own house closing, or how to review a set of condominium documents or a lease for an apartment. There were clinics and internships for those who wanted to pursue a career in litigation, but nothing for those of us who were going to do general business law.

Real world ethical issues. More was ridiculous when I was admitted. It had nothing to do with the actual practice of law and the real world issues that arose. I would have also liked more information on how law firms operated. Career guidance was nonexistent.

Reality that not all lawyers follow the rules like they should.

Self confidence in advocacy, but then there were not that many women in law school and the assumption was corporate or probate work.

Street smarts. There are too many ivory tower attorneys today. After several years of old time investigators leading me around and showing me the ropes, I could always win against an ivy tower attorney. Any smart person can tackle book learning. There is no substitute for combat experience.
The adversarial nature of the relationship with the client; attorneys who raise issues that should not work but do; juries that are incompetent; judges who grant foreclosures when no mortgage or note is introduced in evidence; and appellate courts who uphold such foreclosures, etc.

The experience to know that arguments were not personal attacks against me or my client. In hindsight, I was probably too naive a few times and too aggressive other times.

The Florida Bar should institute an "articled clerk" program along the lines of the British system for training lawyers to practice after law school.

The importance of making decisions, which provide cost effective and practical guidance to clients.

The truth. The law is not about justice; it’s all about the money and politics.

There should have been a class in "copy-machine operation," (now almost obsolete) as well as how to actually operate a practice. I totally had to learn it all as I went along. There was "criminal clinic" and a "civil clinic," where you could get more "practical experience," but the classes were very limited & hard to get into. Fortunately, I'd worked my way through undergrad as a waitress, so I had no problem talking to victims and then clients. Classes on those types of things would have been far more practical than some of the other things we were required to take.

There were several mixed messages about how much to push forward on issues in the courtroom. Several times, I was told to handle things in a manner for my client's interest. I know realize that it is disrespectful and undermines not only the judge but the entire justice system. I hope that seasoned lawyers need to attend live professionalism courses.

Too many to list.

Typing.

Understanding of trusts/estate planning; sales and client/other business-related skills.

Understanding the role a lawyer plays when wearing the different hats. A healthy fear of the Bar. Understanding unreasonable Bar attitudes.

Understanding the way trust accounts are to be handled.

Understanding what trial judges want as opposed to what appellate judges want.

Upon graduation, I lacked an awareness of the different personalities that drives individuals, how to be prepared for their dark sides and how to use the productive side of those personalities. And these included judges and other lawyers, not just clients.

Very little litigation experience; unfamiliar with how juries really worked and that judges were not as fair and unbiased as taught in law school.
* We had no experience in how to find and network with clients, nor did we have any idea how to balance the interruptions of the work day with the requirement to bill 40 hours of our time each week in six-minute increments. That was a difficult transition, but, thankfully, one that I no longer have to deal with, being in-house counsel.

* We never had a course where the professor said: "a prospective client walks into your office, he is upset because his neighbor is building an addition that will block his view; or he is upset because his son was just arrested; or he needs advice on drawing a Real Estate contract, etc. What do you do??" Of course, this was 40 years ago and legal education may have changed. But my experience is that today's young lawyers also lack this practical understanding of the scenarios lawyers face and how to deal with them. Also, we were never taught how to talk to a client. Too often, especially with new lawyers, I will hear the lawyer ask a question such as: "Subsequent to the occurrence complained of herein...?" What? Lawyers must learn to speak like real, everyday people when dealing with the vast majority of clients, and juries.

* We should have been required to spend half a year if not a full course year actually working with other lawyers in order to graduate.

* Yes, not in terms of "lack," but in terms of wanting to have more experience in to feel comfortable. Even with all my courses in research and writing, you can always have more research and writing skills.
7. Was there a particular class or experience that you feel should have been offered to you while you were in law school but was not? If “Yes,” please explain:

Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less

* Practical experience. (14 Responses)
* Required internship. (14 Responses)
* Business concepts and management. (6 Responses)
* Basic skills/Lawyer 101. (5 Responses)
* Law Office Management. (5 Responses)
* Time management. (4 Responses)
* Trial Practice. (4 Responses)
* Clinics. (2 Responses)
* Courtroom experience/skills. (2 Responses)
* A course for students interested in becoming solo practitioners. Although I don't believe that all students should go directly into opening their own firm immediately after law school, I do believe that unless a "residency" program is set up (similar to other professional programs), that law schools should provide students with the tools to branch out on their own after law school. Also, ideally, I believe every law student should be required to take a pre-trial or trial skills course in their first or second semester. I took one as an elective in a later semester, but I believe that if it was required, similar to how Legal Writing and the mock oral argument was required, that students who believe they have no interest in trial work may realize that they enjoy or have a knack for it and pursue internships/additional courses that further develop those interests. It would also be helpful for those interested in beginning their own firms after graduation.
* A course on professionalism, as well as career development.
* A Florida specific Criminal Law course that could discuss both how to defend a client and how to prosecute a case.
* A more practical version of criminal procedure, or some sort of Criminal Law practice course, or even a public defender specific course or clinic.
* A more practical, hands on approach to litigation, similar to the clinics but using hypothetical cases where the students can participate in all aspects of the litigation (instead of gaining experience as a clerk and allowing them to enter the field with unable to put their education or first year role into any context).
* A night program.
* Accounting for lawyers, and more business law courses.
* Additional Legal Research and Writing.
* As someone who works in litigation, the only courses that seem to have had a direct relationship to what I do on a daily basis were Torts and Florida Civil Practice. It's hard to envision how such a class might work, but it could be beneficial to offer a course called "Litigation" with the goal of teaching students what they will encounter on a daily bases working up cases.
* Avoiding law school loans which you will never pay off on lawyer salaries.
* Classes on drafting and reviewing contracts. Programs to teach various aspects of a corporate transaction and how to manage them.
* Client relations class; drafting reports to clients; class on billing.
* Elder Law.
* Experience in a variety of legal settings and networking. There is not enough focus on alternative careers as the job market for young attorneys is scarce.
* Florida Procedure should be required.
* How to write a motion at the trial court level, how to serve a party, what an NPNP is.
* I always hoped to take Disability Law but it was never offered at the right time for my schedule. I would have also benefitted from a course on legal technology. I also feel that instruction on statutory construction and interpretation was lacking.
* I believe that almost all classes are offered, but many of the most valuable ones, i.e., Legal Drafting, Legal Research, etc., had very small class sizes and were taught by adjuncts. I believe it would be helpful to have more such classes and to ensure that high quality instructors are teaching them.
* I believe the third year should be abandoned entirely. It is a great expense with only minor return.
* I didn't need another class, but more assistance in the bar application process would have been helpful.
* I think one class devoted strictly to motion practice would have been phenomenal because it would have covered the vast majority of what I do every day.
* I would require a class on some sort of compliance due diligence on the things you must do as a lawyer to comply with the bar requirements, how to set up a trust account, all the basics of getting started and staying compliant and out of trouble.
* It was offered, but only once per year. I wish Federal Courts had been offered each semester.

* Litigation courses that heavily emphasize discovery, deposition, mediation, legal research and trial procedure.

* Many more classes that were more specific, but then that would be a waste of time and would be better appropriate in building expertise during my legal career.

* Modern Technology in the Legal Field. My clients text me all the time and I have issues with e-filing sometimes. This would have been helpful to have had a basic prep of before hitting the real world running.

* Moot Court.

* Mostly an experience that I felt was lacking. I never really felt that I was being treated as a typical student, and I felt that a few members of my school administration did not want me to succeed; I even felt that there was a deliberate attempt to cause great difficulty for me. In spite of how I felt at the time, I always assumed that the administrators involved were just making the best decisions that they could with the information they had in the context of their own experiences. The lack of a typical experience has not made me bitter, nor do I harbor ill will, or anger; the experience made me a stronger individual and makes my story all the more compelling. It also made me a better record-keeper. I have reconciled my ambivalence through faith and attribute a spiritual significance to that portion of my journey. I am sure it is only beginning, and as human beings we are all pretty much the same. I suppose this answer is long-winded enough, but it is not often that I find an opportunity to reflect on that experience, perhaps my general answer is also off-point with what the question is truly asking. If that is the case, then nothing was missing and I feel that my faculty and classmates allowed me to develop in one of the most rigorous academic and professional environments of which I have been a part.

* My career services department was really terrible and did absolutely nothing to help me. I was glad I already had job hunting skills, but I think most of the reason why so many of my classmates were unemployed was because they had no guidance on how to find a job and market themselves.

* No, however Trial Advocacy could have delved more into the litigation practices that matter most. Very few cases go to trial, and very few young attorneys get to chair the cases that make it there. Trial Advocacy could have focused more on discovery process, mediation, settlement negotiation and basic motion practice.

* Public speaking in the legal profession i.e., speaking in front of judges. It would also be helpful to learn more about courtroom procedure i.e., the technical parts of the profession such as filing documents and types of pleadings and motions.

* Some sort of training in dealing with stress.

* Taking depositions – fact witnesses, corporate representatives and experts.
* The school should require a class on trust accounting and on filing procedure because not all new lawyers will have paralegals to file the documents for them.

* The third year of law school should have been solely a work study program.

* The whole Legal Writing, Appellate Advocacy, legal drafting classes need to be more practical and less fluff. These are so important but, unfortunately, at my school, our professor for these (who was the head of the writing dept.) didn't even show up to most of our classes. Almost all of our classes in November were "cancelled so we could work on our briefs." What a joke, especially considering I was paying thousands of dollars for that class and basically told to teach myself.

* There should be a class that teaches basic Civil litigation skills (i.e., drafting discovery requests, preparing litigation reports for clients, etc.).

* There should be an e-filing component in Legal Writing and Research.

* Very few classes were taught on how to be an effective associate or low-level attorney. Everyone leaves law school thinking the legal working world is something that it very much is not.

* Visits to actual courtrooms for first appearances, motion calendar etc.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

* More practical courses and experience. *(61 Responses)*

* Law office management. *(40 Responses)*

* Business skills and training. *(39 Responses)*

* Internship. *(34 Responses)*

* Dealing with clients. *(13 Responses)*

* Trial skills. *(11 Responses)*

* Additional/Advanced Research & Writing. *(10 Responses)*

* Court Process. *(9 Responses)*

* Clinics. *(7 Responses)*

* Accounting. *(6 Responses)*

* Billing. *(6 Responses)*
* Computer/new technology. (**6 Responses**)

* Deposition Skills. (**4 Responses**)

* Mentoring. (**4 Responses**)

* Discovery. (**3 Responses**)

* Negotiating. (**3 Responses**)

* A basic litigation practice course, not trial practice and not Civil Procedure, but a blending of the two to give practical exposure to litigation.

* A class devoted to developing analytical ability. I find that lacking in a lot of recent graduates. A class devoted to practical professionalism. Many attorneys don't understand how to be professional while still zealously representing a client.

* A class on insurance.

* A course where a Judge and some local attorneys teach law students how to act in the court room, what to do and not to do, how to effectively argue your position. It would also be helpful to shadow a local attorney or Judge to see what a day is like in the practice of law. With the ever changing technology, more classes regarding technology and discovery would be helpful.

* A critical legal course.

* A really good Real Estate class. Theory and history of the law is important but to become proficient in any phase of law, you also need practical education if not actual experience as a law student in real life.

* A truthful and sincere introduction as to the reality of the legal field in Florida. I guess law professors who for the most part do not practice law, have decided to be exclusively part of the abstract academic world, because they can't stand what is really going on out there. It is just by exception that some law professors are practitioners; some law professors don't even have a license to practice in Florida. Yes, the academic part is very important, but do you know how many times, when asked in law courses as to how a specific institution works in Florida the standard answer or excuse students heard is "Oh, I don't know, I don't have a Florida Bar license." The reality of economics in the legal field should be taught. There are more than 100,000 Florida Bar members and the reality is that most attorneys are trapped between the law schools that can impose whatever student fees they want to charge and the federal government that provide loans without even questioning the student fees charged by law schools. Of course the attorney is the one that has to repay the student loans, mostly in excess of $100,000.00. How is that you can work on public services helping your community and expect to have a decent life? How can the Attorney General's Office, the SAO, and the PDO pay a brand new lawyer $39,000.00 for a yearly salary? The simple question is why is that Law Schools charge that much? The answer is because the government allows it. Limit the amount you can
get from the federal government, which will drive the student fees down immediately. Don't continue screwing the life of a person interested in becoming a lawyer.

* An elective course in Construction Law.

* Basic mental health course discussing personality traits, how to deal with each, and how to spot and successfully deal with common mental health issues.

* Bridging the gap between law school and the actual practice of law.

* Briefing and arguing motions. I had one teacher, in evidence, who went through the exercise of making the arguments on both sides of an evidence issue as we discussed a particular situation or fact pattern. But other teachers just taught the law as a series of hornbook rules. A valuable law school experience would be having students argue the issues live and in class as the concepts are taught.

* Civil Motion Practice.

* Constitutional Law.

* Course on the practicing law portion of the Rules of Judicial Administration.

* English. Surprised how many lawyers don't know how to write proper English.

* Every class after the first year was unnecessary as law school is a waste of money and time. People should clerk with a lawyer and then pass the bar exam. There is no reason to have three years of law school.

* Florida Administrative Procedures Act.

* Honest assessment of what the practice was truly going to be.

* How to classes in corporate, probate, etc.

* How to deal with unprofessional attorneys.

* How to read and understand financial statements or otherwise how to use complex mathematics or statistics for various purposes relating to complex litigation.

* How to settle a case; negotiation.

* How to survive ethically in a dog-eat-dog society that sanctions advertising at its worse.

* I always thought there should be a course in the social dynamics of a law firm or other organization of lawyers. Over time, I have come to learn that there are great parallels between law firms and fraternities. Unfortunately, I also was never in a fraternity. The point is that I believe it is much easier for a SOCIALLY adept person to succeed as a lawyer in a firm or other organization than someone technically adept, no matter how good they are.
I feel more emphasis should have been placed on Legal Research, not Legal Writing, but Legal Research.

I think overall law school does a poor job of preparing one to be a lawyer.

I wish that some type of international law/relations/diplomacy had been required, rather than just offered as an elective class. This desire has grown over the years, and due to the increasingly interconnected globe.

I'd like to have heard a little more from good ethical attorneys about how honest work will pay off in the end. Fortunately, my father taught me this. Not the profession.

Law school does not provide people skills.

Law schools should offer a course that reviews the various civil and criminal jobs available to attorneys, including private and government practices. The course should explore real pros and cons to each job and provide examples of common career paths in each field.

Life management, coping with stress.

Many new attorneys have no idea about the foundational business principals underlying a successful practice. There should be a mandated course to this end.

Moot court should be encouraged more.

More choices in various specialties (non-required courses).

More emphasis on actual real life motion practice.

More guidance counseling to help steer the minority students and/or those with a different cultural background. I am a woman whose father is a judge and was raised in the legal field, but (again) in a school with a 60 percent flunk out rate where there were few women students or role models in a culture of supporting failure rather than success. While that is an era of the 70s and 80s, I would not doubt we still have these issues today. Guidance help would assist in identifying these issues.

More job interview experience.

Negotiating, how to do a deal, representing a buyer vs. a seller, and other similar practical courses. I know that these types of courses are now offered as I see them through my kids’ curriculum at law school.

No, but I think the wills and trusts workshop should have been mandatory. All lawyers need to know how to draft wills and trusts. I regret not taking that class to this day.

Presently, there should be more required courses.

Pro bono at a legal clinic should be a requirement for graduation.
* Professionalism! Not just Ethics.
* Professors that taught "thinking" as opposed to learning a particular subject.
* Rainmaking.
* Rather than focusing on the concepts of Civil Procedure, it would have been better if they offered it with the actualities of drafting or inputting into legal computer programs.
* State procedure.
* Stetson, at the time, did not offer computerized research. They thought it was a fad.
* Tax procedure. I was interested in Federal Income Taxation and my law school gave classes on Tax theory but felt it was beneath them to teach us procedure.
* The savvy students knew precisely which course to take in preparation for the bar exam, which is the only thing that counts.
* There should be a basic psychology class with respect to dealing with clients.
* There should be a class on basic Real Estate transactions, including forming entities to acquire Real Estate and understanding of basis title and survey issues and the use of title insurance. And it should include basic Tax considerations, such as rollover of gain on sale of principal residence, exemption on sale of residence for seniors and when to use 1031 Exchanges. Other classes or concepts to be included in an advance Real Estate transactions class: (i) forming condominiums: residential, commercial and office; (ii) land use considerations, including environmental concerns; (iii) buying and leasing commercial Real Estate; (iv) forming entities for business purposes, including concepts for shareholders', partnership and limited liability company agreements.
* There should be drafting courses offered or required for non-litigation practice. There should be more focus on written communications with clients, supervising attorneys, and opposing counsel (whether in letter or email format, including memos of law). Also, the Appellate Brief/Appellate oral argument, which I believe is a requirement of all R&W II courses, should be optional. Most lawyers will never write a brief in their entire practice.
* They should have you deal with other people’s problems all day long for a semester and see if you still are interested.
* Yes, I would have liked to do a case study where you see a lawsuit from complaint to final judgment and you represent one side all the way through conclusion of the case. Also, I think some education on post-judgment enforcement and collection would have been beneficial.
12. Please list any subjects you believe are good candidates for online learning:

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

* Legal Research & Writing. (26 Responses)
* Ethics/Professionalism. (11 Responses)
* Contracts. (7 Responses)
* Property. (7 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (6 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (6 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (5 Responses)
* Torts. (5 Responses)
* Bar Exam Prep Classes. (4 Responses)
* Evidence. (4 Responses)
* Any elective course. (2 Responses)
* Law Office Management. (2 Responses)
* A lot of drafting classes make good candidate for distance education.
* Agency Law, Commercial Papers.
* All required courses. Class size is too large for case study and the Socratic Method to be effective. Lectures could be recorded and would be more effective because students could re-wind and pause at their convenience, rather than being seen as an interruption. This would allow time for reflecting, looking something up (in a text or online source), taking a mental or bathroom break, or clarifying something that was not heard - all without missing lecture time.
* All the 1L classes.
* All, except externships.
* Courses in substantive law can generally be learned from books, or online. Classes regarding procedure are probably a little trickier. In my opinion, any classes regarding the actual practice of law should be in person, without exception.
* E-discovery courses.
* Family Law.
* Florida Rules of Practice and Procedure.
* I believe very few law school classes should be online.
* I do not believe any law school courses should be taken online.
* I do not believe online learning is effective.
* I don't believe that law schools should offer online learning.
* I don't really have a strong opinion to promote any particular subject for online learning. Maybe if there was a class that better prepared persons to deal with the significant increase in online resources that claim to not need a licensed attorney, that could be helpful to understand what is out there.
* I think many courses could benefit from a partial online option with limited courses in the classroom. These would be externships, legal research, the coursework portion of legal aid, ethics, professional responsibility, etc.
* I think online classes should be the exception, not the norm.
* I think that most of them are, from strictly the reading/lecture standpoint. However, I have seen good online courses and bad ones. It is important that the subject matter be presented in a manner that will keep attention and will clearly demonstrate its worth.
* I think the classroom experience with its interaction between professor and student was an important part of my learning, so I can't think of any of my classes that would give better results if taught online.
* I think writing courses would be very well served online, especially with "track changes" writing assignments. The instructor could leave comments in electronically submitted documents, and have an hour or so on a particular day of the week to address any comments or concerns of the students based on the instructor's written comments, which the students have had time to appreciate and try to decipher.
* I took Food & Agricultural Law online. I think online classes are good for these niche topics, but core curricula should not be taught online and must be taught in a classroom.
* International Law.
* Most online classes are a joke.
* My Property professor conducted his exam remotely, via computer, and included elements of surprise and drafting under time pressure. That's the experience most similar to what I do in my career, and should be emulated.
Niche industries or specialties may be better suited to learn the substantive law online (specifically statutory based legal issues).

None. Certain students may have the capacity for self-direction, but I can conceive of no good justification for encouraging online learning. First, there is no need to make law school easier or more convenient. Florida has plenty of lawyers, many of whom have trouble finding good jobs in law. Second, encouraging online learning will only increase the profits for schools at the expense of the profession. Since only self-directed students can really succeed in online classes, the same goals could be satisfied equally as well by simply opening up the bar exam to non-law school graduates. Or create some other kind of assessment.

None. Class participation, communication, and the open exchange of thoughts and ideas are key components.

None. I am strongly against the cheapening of a law degree by allowing "University of Phoenix" style classes and/or degrees. In my ten-year experience in management (prior to returning to law school) the competency level of graduates from these "online colleges" and "universities" is drastically lower when compared to graduates of traditional "brick and mortar" universities and colleges.

None. I didn't attend law school in Florida. In general, with exception of Miami, FSU, UF, and FAMU, and possibly Stetson, I find that candidates from the other Florida law schools to be woefully unprepared, lack the skills to practice law, and are typically the lawyers that end up as solo practitioners with a largely unethical practice. I am deeply saddened that we continue to allow these schools to open in Florida, flood the legal market with poorly trained "lawyers," and continue to dampen the public's perception of what a lawyer is and should be. Allowing courses online would only worsen this.

None. This is a ridiculous idea. The practice of law is not done through the Internet.

None; the best part of law school is getting to know your classmates. The practice of law requires good networking skills which begin in law school.

One of the difficulties with the legal profession is that it is not really one field. It is many different fields with a general background. It seems to me that someone who is destined to become a personal injury attorney could do just fine learning certain aspects of business law online. But that same person should probably learn Torts law in person. The reverse could be said for someone destined to be a corporate transactional attorney.

Perhaps online courses can be offered for students to audit so that they can acquire additional education but not receive academic credit for enrolling online. Or perhaps online courses can be offered in addition to in-class subjects for a pseudo certificate program. For example, if a student is interested in taking courses that are not offered regularly due to the schedule/availability of the professor, they can take an online course and receive a certificate of completion (pass/fail) but not academic credit.

Skills courses like interviewing and counseling and alternative dispute resolution.
* Some experiential courses, such as Law Without Walls at the University of Miami.
* Substantive courses.
* Tax.
* Technology and finance courses only.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

* Legal Research & Writing. (80 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (57 Responses)
* Contracts. (40 Responses)
* Tax Law/Taxation. (32 Responses)
* Torts. (29 Responses)
* Criminal Law. (26 Responses)
* Evidence. (26 Responses)
* Property. (24 Responses)
* Real Estate/Real Property. (22 Responses)
* Ethics/Professional Responsibility. (21 Responses)
* Technology/computer skills. (19 Responses)
* Wills, Estates and Trust Law. (18 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (16 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (15 Responses)
* Basic classes. (10 Responses)
* Law Office Management. (9 Responses)
* Uniform Commercial Code (UCC). (9 Responses)
* Bankruptcy. (8 Responses)
* Business. (8 Responses)
* Document preparation. (7 Responses)
* All. (6 Responses)
* Electives. (5 Responses)
* Accounting for lawyers. (4 Responses)
* Administrative Law. (4 Responses)
* Probate Law. (4 Responses)
* Rules of Procedure. (4 Responses)
* Secured Transactions. (4 Responses)
* Substantive law courses. (4 Responses)
* E-Filing. (3 Responses)
* Black letter law. (2 Responses)
* Insurance Law. (2 Responses)
* Intellectual Property. (2 Responses)
* Legal technology classes. (2 Responses)
* Trusts. (2 Responses)
* Absolutely none! Training for a law career is not just about reading and memorizing material!

Absolutely none. The practice of law demands the ability to observe how other attorneys react and think. One of the many skills learned in law school is the ability to think on your feet, to state your position and argue it effectively and quickly. Even when you are not the student being questioned in a classroom, you learn from watching how other students handle that pressure. That skill is learned in every class, repeatedly, not simply in Trial Advocacy classes. The exposure to observing that process cannot be over-estimated.

* Accounting and the Law.

* Any lecture hall classes. All my 1L classes, except Legal Writing, were huge lecture hall classes. Socratic Method just means don't say anything substantive if I was called on. It's a joke. There is pretty much no classroom interaction in the core 1L classes. All those could go online.
Any rote learning process would work. Rules of procedure come to mind. Writing classes could be submitted online. However, no subject matter can be taught online without intensive interaction of a moderator to help the student exam the subject. Online material may work, but the average law school professor does not have the skill set to pull it off. I have created online classes for contractor continuing education and I have also taught at the university level. Online and virtual classes are MUCH more time consuming and difficult to create effectively. For an in-person class it generally takes 3 hours of prep for every one hour of class. Online and virtual take five hours because the nuance of personal communication is lost. I believe many new lawyers are robots now and it takes about 2 years to bring them around. Virtual classes are not a solution to law school problems.

Any subjects on law having to do with the history of that kind of law.

Anything taught in law school could be taught online, but the experience would not be the same.

Commercial Law.

Core courses, but not the practical ones involving skill development.

Developing critical thinking skills includes listening and evaluation and not just doing your own thing. Making it easier will not make better educated or prepared lawyers, only more tech savvy and isolated lawyers.

Disability (ADA).

Do not believe that online or part-time learning are good fits for legal training? Lawyers in training should be fully engaged, in person, interacting with professors, practitioners, judges, clients, and other students. A full contact holistic approach with practical applications should be the norm, not sitting in a room looking at a screen.

Domestic Relations.

Elective and upper-level courses, such as environmental law or other specialties for which law schools offer certificate programs. I also believe that LLMs can be offered wholly online, as at that point a student has completed his/her basic legal training.

Employment Law.

Equitable Remedies.

Family Law.

Federal Tax.

General Legal History.

Historical subjects, regulatory-type subjects and foundational subjects.
Honestly, I thought about this one. Is there something that would/could be good? Civil Procedure, to some extent, you could memorize the rules but the whole point of law school was applying facts to situations which is not done well on-line. Just because it is easier to move people through a system, or cheaper, does not mean it is best. How a school can defraud you out of your tuition money. Even in a paper practice, a lawyer must have an in depth understanding of people, more importantly of our Civilization. Technology has robbed our society of this important aspect. There is no substitute for face to face learning, and there is no justifiable reason to not provide it to students.

How to do online research with WestLaw, Lexis and the like. No substantive courses should be taught online. Prospective lawyers need to be in a room with other prospective lawyers in order properly to learn legal concepts and how to think like a lawyer.

How to draft and deal with emails. Other than that, none-students need to interact live. They have poor communications, social and inter-personal skills.

How to read and understand financial documents.

I am not a proponent of online training. There is no interpersonal interaction; and despite technological advances, online training presents a myriad of issues, most notably honesty on the part of the student.

I believe all of the "required" courses such as evidence, property, etc. could be effectively taught online.

I do not believe any subjects would be a good candidate. Too much would be sacrificed from the interactive work in and out of law school classes that helps in making one "think like a lawyer."

I do not believe online classes as a rule are appropriate for law school.

I don't believe that online teaching of the law is a good option.

I don't think any subject should be completely taken online. I believe some course material in most courses can be read and studied online, but I believe all courses should have some classroom interaction with a professor and students.

I don't think online courses are ideal, but at the same time, students might find it useful to be exposed to various technological platforms.

I don't think there are any entire courses that should be taught online only, but I think some portions of many courses could be done online. For example, some 2nd or 3rd year courses could allow for some of the denser technical work to be done online but there should be required in-person classes as well.

I graduated in 1976, so my experience with online learning is limited to CLE classes. I have not found any major difference between most classes taught online and those taught in the classroom.
I see more and more undergraduate courses taught online by non-profit state schools. That leads me to believe the effectiveness of these courses has been thoroughly vetted. However, I graduated from law school in 1995. I don't remember whether there was a course that lent itself to online learning. I can only say that a big part of law school experience is networking and hearing the opinions and arguments of others. I would hate to lose that.

I think every subject area has the potential opportunity for online learning mostly because it's dealing with substantive matters. If you check into Practical Law, the publication, it provides a pretty good example of the capability of online law systems to enable active practical learning and law tools to help young lawyers learn the "how-to's" of law. I also think there are a variety of paralegal classes that would help young lawyers productively function in any internship or their first year of work. While it's great to know about law, it's much better if you can actually do legal stuff that provides actual value to clients, employers and the community.

I think that law school classes should be in person. You would miss out on too much by not having the experiences that only a true classroom setting can provide.

I think that younger students would be more adept at this, because it is the only world they know.

I think the Socratic Method was priceless and I do not envision online classes at the law school level.

I think very little should be offered online because of the potential for fraud. The whole point is to learn and from what I have seen in young attorneys as well as the ones in my generation, there is a heavy leaning toward whatever will get them by regardless of the ethics.

I was in law school 40 years ago. My opinion on this issue is not valid in that I have never taken an online courses, thus I do not know how effective they are.

I would not solely have people learn through online classes, however, because there is tremendous value in the in-class experience of learning through the Socratic Method, interacting with one’s peers (in study groups etc.), and having direct, live interactions with one's professors. The value of these classes is not in understanding specific areas of law that most lawyers do not use during their careers, but rather in *how* to learn and *how* to think like a lawyer, logically and with critical thinking applied to every situation. I would be concerned that these core traits would be lost if all classes were taught online.

I would prefer to see components of courses taught online than entire course.

I wouldn't break this up by subjects. I suspect that a portion of any subject could be taught by online learning. It would be the black letter law in any subject matter areas- the seminal cases. However, that's just a starting point. Any further discussion (i.e., about the application of the case, and comparing and contrasting the case with other authority)
would, I think, need to be done in a more interactive setting, or at least it would be more invigorating in a live setting. That's also the setting that would mostly closely duplicate the give and take, back and forth of lawyering in real life. Not having attended law school via online learning, I'm not sure whether that's possible in an online learning setting.

* If any area is to be taught online, then it should be limited to subjects involving the study and interpretation of case law in areas of practice. Since my personal belief is that this should be only a small part of a legal education, very little, if any, of this should be done online.

* If I were to suggest a class that could be taken online, probably whatever Legal Research and Writing is being taught nowadays. In the dark ages, we had to use books such as digests. Now that research is online anyway it would probably be an easy course to be presented that way.

* If there were a supplementary course solely on using online sources, it could be successfully taught online, but having taught online courses, I don't think they can adequately teach necessary skills like lawyer-client interaction and verbal argument or conveyance of information.

* If they ever allow online law school, it will water down the already tarnished prestige of the degree, but, if it becomes a business necessity, then the only online courses should be those directly related to technology: billing, office management, Microsoft certifications, online marketing and the ethics related to it.

* Immigration.

* Initial law school curricula should be taken in class with attendance required and with an experienced in field professor.

* International Law.

* It depends on how the online learning is structured; is the course being streamed live and everyone is logged in via Skype or a Google+ hangout or something similar? If questions can be asked by a student so that the professor can see the person asking and hear the question and ask a question in return if the student's question is unclear, I think all the basic courses would be fine to be taken online, though I would hope that the exams were taken in a classroom versus online. If it were that a student watched the professor's lecture but could not ask questions, or the student went to a website where assignments were posted and questions posted for the students to answer, then the list of courses I would find acceptable online would shrink. If the subject were Legal Research (not writing as well), any online format would be fine if it only focused on using online services, not actual books in the library. The Legal Writing portion would need more of a Skype style of teaching.

* It really depends. Any course can be taught well online to learn facts, case law, general theories, etc. Any course benefits from in person teaching if there are meaningful interactions between the studies and learning is carried out in an interactive way. For
example, it is easy to learn the rules of evidence through an online course. But you are only going to learn how to effectively utilize them through a mock trial or mock deposition type situation involving multiple students/professors. The above concepts can be applied to any course. It is easy to learn Real Estate law and procedures online. To effectively negotiate a difficult commercial transaction involving governmental permits, business tradeoffs, competing corporate goals, etc., it is more effective to conduct mock negotiations, attend actual governmental board planning meetings to learn what they are like and to conduct a complicated mock closing with issues arising at the table.

* Labor and Employment Law.
* Legal Jurisprudence.
* Legal Theory.
* Lien Law.
* Local rules and state laws for students who will not be practicing in the jurisdiction they go to law school in.
* Most courses in law school are not designed to effectively train or teach a student if taken online. Live class attendance, class participation and discussion aid greatly in the learning process for the difficult topics covered in law school.
* Municipal Corporations.
* Negotiable Instruments.
* No first year courses.
* No one subject should be dedicated to online learning. However, all first year subjects could benefit from up to 10% online learning.
* Non-core classes or electives.
* None, as I believe class room attendance is an integral part of the experience. This prepares the student better for interpersonal interaction, preparedness, the appropriateness of personal appearance, showing up on time, and the formalities of our profession.
* None. I don't believe online classes for law school would be effective in any manner.
* None. If it can be learned online, then it's not worth taking the class. Learn it for the bar exam. I understand "online" to be self taught from course materials that the professor puts online- with little interaction with the professor or classmates. By contrast an internet assisted class where students and professors participate in a virtual classroom that emulates physical classroom instruction could be quite beneficial, in particular, for comparative law or international law classes with students from other countries.
None. One of the problems in the profession is the lack of interpersonal skills exhibited by attorneys.

None. Online learning for a degree program is a scam. The school has no idea who is on the other end of the computer.

None. The discipline needed to attend class, in person, everyday, to be on time. To work within a large group, and with distractions. To be called upon, and even embarrassed openly by the professor. These are all experiences which mature the individual. When you are in practice you will not be able to attend court on your personal schedule, but will be subject to the rules of the court and judge. The freedom given by online learning is not helpful to the rigidity you will face in practice.

None. The law school classroom experience is critical to a legal education.

None. The learning comes from the personal interaction between the students and the professor.

None. The practice of law is about practical experience which you cannot get from your love seat. Though some of the current methods do not fully prepare lawyers, I believe that online education would result in even worse preparation.

None. The Socratic and critical thinking portion of law school is vital.

None. We don't need to cheapen the title by allowing online degree mills to churn out more JDs.

None. You learn from classroom discussion and others.

Oil and Gas Law.

Online classes can still have posting requirements to foster discussion but it is not a replacement for the live classroom discussion via the Socratic Method, and certainly cannot take the place of the bonding that occurs between classmates as they learn each other's quirks and areas of practice interest.

Online courses, by their nature, tend to have limited opportunity for interaction and discussion. The law is generally not a series of black and white answers but rather a continuum of various shades of gray depending on circumstances. Students need to challenge and be challenged on their analysis of issues in the classroom. Unless the online course provides for interaction with the faculty and other students, I would limit the courses to programs that are relatively routine and there are few courses that fall within this scope.

Online learning has its place but not in law school! No lawyer works in isolation; there’s the client, the opposing counsel, etc. There is no opportunity for meaningful interaction available with online learning- it offers a quick fix re: financial issues, but also provides an opportunity for student to take the easy shortcut way! Also, online courses are rife
with opportunities for cheating and there is absolutely no place for that in any law school curricula-we have ethical obligations!

* Online learning should never, ever be allowed. It can never substitute for the live classroom or thinking on your feet in public. You are trying to allow more people into the law schools so that you can make more loans that is why you want online learning. You are destroying the practice and lowering standards.

* Perhaps some of the more specialized courses apart from the "core" courses typically taken the first year of law school.

* Post JD courses in pursuit of an advanced law degree.

* Practical type courses that involve real-life examples, writing, procedural examinations and case management. No casebook or typical exam.

* Pretrial Practice, workshops.

* Selected topics in various areas of the law (that would normally be taught as electives or seminars in the 3rd year).

* Sports Law.

* Statutory courses.

* The class part of clinic classes.

* The only classes that I think could not be taught online are the clinical courses that require the student to attend the class, such as litigation skills and negotiation skills class.

* There are none. Online learning should not be allowed and cheapens the quality of education and the value of the degree. And I'm a 38 year old technophile.

* Things you would assign to your secretary or paralegal.

* Third year courses (specialized courses like entertainment law, appellate law, etc).

* This is not trade school. Don't go there.

* To me, the issue is the quality of the teacher. If the course has a great teacher, that should be offered online as opposed to multiple classes with average teachers.

* While online education reaches a much greater audience, the practice of law requires personal interaction which cannot be replicated or simulated online.
13. Please list any subjects that you believe would not be beneficial to students if taught online:

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

* All/Do not believe any classes should be taken online. (29 Responses)
* Trial Advocacy. (19 Responses)
* Torts. (11 Responses)
* First year classes. (9 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (8 Responses)
* Evidence. (8 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (7 Responses)
* Contracts. (7 Responses)
* Legal Research & Writing. (6 Responses)
* Criminal Law. (5 Responses)
* Property. (5 Responses)
* Ethics. (4 Responses)
* Mediation/Arbitration. (4 Responses)
* Appellate Advocacy. (3 Responses)
* Any practical courses or seminar courses. (2 Responses)
* Core curriculum, especially first year courses. (2 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (2 Responses)
* All - class participation, communication, and the open exchange of thoughts and ideas are key.
* All of them. You cannot learn collaboration and ethics online and alone. I am rather upset we are even considering this.
* All subjects except for Legal Research.
* All. This is based on the interactive and discussion part of the classroom. Even through live web-cams, one cannot experience the same sensation as disagreeing with someone in person, face-to-face.

* Any course discussing case law. There really needs to be an interactive process because that's what happens in practice.

* Any of them. Legal concepts cannot be adequately taught or learned online. You need that face to face contact with your professor and your peers.

* Any practical course; any first year substantive course.

* Anything that requires live, in-person interaction.

* Anything where discussion and thought are encouraged, which would include any upper level writing course.

* Bar-tested subjects.

* Basic first year courses should be taken in person and students subjected to being challenged and responding in open class.

* Black letter law classes.

* Doctrinal courses and Bar tested areas.

* Externships.

* Family Law.

* I do not think that any classes are more beneficial to take online as oppose to in class. It is important to have the live interaction with other minds. In the class you hear so many different opinions, point of view, and analysis. Whether they are wrong or right it is important to hear the difference and to be able to react. I enjoyed online classes in undergrad but I think in law school it is more important to be able to be in a class room setting where you have to be prepared for a discussion.

* I think all law school classes should be in person as students are never fully paying attention online. It is easy to take short cuts via online classes.

* I would not recommend online for any substantive and essential legal course like Torts or Criminal Law.

* Ideally, I do not believe any subjects should be taught online. Torts, Criminal Law, Constitutional Law, and Property are all understood on a deeper level when fleshed out through thought provoking conversation and debate with professors and fellow students.

* Interviewing and counseling, internships, etc.
* It really depends on what part of the legal profession someone is going to enter.
* Legal and Case Methods.
* Motions & Depositions.
* Pre-trial Practice.
* Real property.
* Substantive subjects that require discussion and development of issues.
* The first-year classroom experience is important. After that a combination of online/work-study/apprenticeship (or almost anything) would be better than the current ABA mandated model.
* The traditional classes with the case-based focus would not do well online, nor would smaller seminars with a more intimate focus.
* There is no substitution for the hands-on component of being physically present to engage with a professor and/or practitioner as relates to the subject matter.
* There should not be online learning in law school.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

* All/Do not believe any courses should be taken online. (160 Responses)
* Torts. (58 Responses)
* Contracts. (53 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (49 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (45 Responses)
* Trial Practice. (45 Responses)
* Evidence. (40 Responses)
* Ethics/Professionalism. (33 Responses)
* Legal Research and Writing. (33 Responses)
* Criminal Law. (32 Responses)
* Trial Advocacy. (32 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (27 Responses)
* 1L courses. (17 Responses)
* Appellate Advocacy. (12 Responses)
* Tax. (11 Responses)
* Real Estate. (10 Responses)
* Will, Trusts and Estates. (10 Responses)
* Core classes. (9 Responses)
* Property. (9 Responses)
* Family Law. (6 Responses)
* Mediation/Arbitration. (5 Responses)
* Moot Court. (6 Responses)
* Practical courses. (5 Responses)
* Clinical courses. (4 Responses)
* Corporate. (4 Responses)
* Litigation Skills. (4 Responses)
* Mock Trials. (4 Responses)
* Negotiation. (4 Responses)
* Substantive classes. (4 Responses)
* Oral Arguments. (3 Responses)
* UCC. (3 Responses)
* Administrative Law. (2 Responses)
* Admiralty. (2 Responses)
* Law Office Management. (2 Responses)

* All clinics and all other courses designed to familiarize the student with how to interact with the court system, colleagues and clients. Those should be hands-on.
* All courses tested on the multi and state Bar Exams.
* All if the Socratic Method is to be used.

* Any classes that are smaller should not ever be moved online. Most business that comes into a law firm is through referrals and contacts. I have two advanced degrees. My law degree was all in person, and I also have a Master’s that was all online. In law school, with in person classes, I at least can go to a networking event and see familiar faces. The way law school classes are taught is not conducive to meeting classmates, but it does put people together in the same space, and then student groups can have activities and you can meet people if you want to be social. For my all-online Master’s, my fellow classmates are creeped out if I happen to be at a conference and passing through their city and want to meet up for coffee. In an online class, you cannot make the same connections. Student groups also can't exist in this environment. They may exist on paper, but everything fizzes and there aren't socials or speaker series or anything like that. This is not to be cold and calculating about networking. Instead, online classes are very isolated. It's not a good lifestyle as a student, and it means that at graduation you have no contacts that care to meet up with you for coffee.

* Any law school course! Part of the growth I experienced in my thinking was due to sitting in a class with 100 other students and seeing how their minds processed problems differently. I'm not sure an online course could offer that.

* Any subject can generally be taught online but there should still be collaborative effort via Skype, Blackboard, and other interactive technology.

* Any subject capable of being taught online does not merit being part of a doctoral program.

* Any subject that lends itself to Socratic Method with heavy case analysis. Tax classes as well because of the complexity of the subject.

* Anything that necessitates reasoning and the ability to communicate effectively. For some reason, the majority of twenty-somethings have weak interpersonal skills and cannot seem to follow a thought process different from their own. I think this has contributed greatly to the appalling behavior displayed by the majority of practitioners.

* Anything to do with litigation or drafting.

* Canon Law.

* Case Study.

* Class work with an educator: any legal classes relevant to actual practice rather than core classes.

* Classes involving case studies and courses where open discussion is needed.

* Client counseling, negotiation, trial skills and dependency and delinquency.

* Dealing with clients.
Discussion groups.

Do not have any confidence in online classes.

Don't think law courses should be taught online. The U.S. law schools are a business that keeps growing, but the marketplace keeps shrinking. Law firms hire fewer attorneys to work longer hours for less money and benefits. Laypersons handle more legal matters online without retaining attorneys; e.g. filing their own trademark applications. Large corporate clients want attorneys to delegate document review to businesses that charge very low rates, thereby preventing the attorneys handling the matter from properly evaluating the evidence. They also question any time spent on Legal Research, expecting attorneys to know the case law as if the law is static. Attorneys are pressured to keep billing unreasonably low to not alienate large clients, but at the same time are expected to bill 2400 net billable hours at firms that race to the bottom to cut rates and cut time billed.

Even classes on procedure require significant interaction, debate and analysis that cannot be delivered effectively through an online course. A cursory review might lead one to believe that memorization of rules is all that is needed in those types of classes, but real experience indicates that everything is subject to interpretation which requires strategy, skill and persuasion even in routine procedural matters.

Everything. I have participated in online meetings in large groups and it is futile to try to ask a question or get an answer.

Experiential learning.

Going to class, taking notes and asking questions is the best way to learn.

Government.

I am not a believer in the value of on-line study generally, particularly not at the professional schools level. MBA's on line to me are worthless, in part because there is no collaboration or other interaction.

I am strongly opposed to online courses for law school. There is no viable way to replicate the dynamic of collaborative learning and practical skills necessary for a successful legal career through isolated distance learning.

I believe that courtroom skills are better taught with some one-on-one feedback.

I believe there should be mandatory skills and practical courses that are taught in person and not online.

I think legal learning should all be in person. The concepts are difficult and talking them through helps work them out.

I think that future lawyers should spend time with their professors and other future lawyers, face-to-face. I feel that online learning is anonymous and cold, designed only to convey facts and not nuances, which are best learned in discussion with others.
If the Elements class (Legal Reasoning) continues to be a part of the curriculum, then I do not think that Elements would be nearly as effective taught online. Classes that rely on collaboration among students may also not be beneficial to students if taught online.

If you are a profession dealing with people, then you need to be in a classroom dealing with people.

Interviewing; Counseling.

Jury Selection; Comparative Laws.

No real and lasting learning occurs with online courses. The more we rely on these courses to educate our future students, the more we are letting budget constraints reduce the effectiveness of our educational institutions. If you do not have time to attend class and the institution accommodates that, how shocked will you be when he court requires your appearance? Awful idea for legal education.

No substantive course work should be online. Even extroverted, technology savvy, geniuses should be taught to work with other people. You cannot learn to work with and for people in a cubicle with a laptop!

Payment Systems.

Philosophy of law.

Practice areas of law content critically necessary for developing as an effective, ethical and professional attorney.

Since my school used the Socratic Method, it would be virtually impossible to transfer this technique to online. This method did teach me how to think outside the box, which has been very beneficial for my law career as an appellate lawyer. It also forces the student to be very prepared and not simply "wing it." Since such critical classroom courses as ethics are apparently not impacting lawyers thus far, putting these online would simply dilute the effect further.

Smaller classes with interactive learning.

Smaller workshops requiring collaboration.

Specifically, the practice of law demands the ability to observe how other attorneys react and think. One of the many skills learned in law school is the ability to think on your feet, to state your position and argue it effectively and quickly. Even when you are not the student being questioned in a classroom, you learn from watching how other students handle that pressure. That skill is learned in every class, repeatedly, not simply in trial advocacy classes. The exposure to observing that process cannot be over-estimated.

The financial world.
* The interaction between students and professor is integral to the development of future attorneys.

* The law is the interaction of people to solve problems. This is usually done though negotiations in an adverse setting. Online classes reduce the students’ interactions with professors and fellow students, thus reducing their ability to deal with these problems in a calm logical manor with clear communication of their position.

* The practical aspects of law and client interaction, courtroom interaction- absolutely need to be in-person. But even then, if practicing lawyers were to coach students through practical problems in real time such as through GoTo Meeting, etc. you could selectively use technology pretty effectively.

* The whole law school experience would be lost. More people would leave law school thinking they can sit behind a computer, launch nasty emails and not answer their phone.

* Theory and Environmental Law.

* Two areas must be done in person to have any effect on a student's development into a fledgling attorney: 1) Any course that involves practical skills that an attorney will have to use "on the street", such as advocacy, research and writing, and clinical experiences. 2) Courses such as ethics and in the constitutional and democratic underpinnings of our legal system. Personal mentoring and group discussions must be utilized in order to develop an understanding of right and wrong, as well as the necessary tolerance of opinions needed to make a democracy function.

* Virtually all subjects because online courses deprive a law student of critical interactive, spontaneous classroom discussion and interaction with the professor and fellow students. A lawyer must be able to think quickly and be exposed to differing opinions and be able to react to them intelligently.

* While the future is electronic communications, the ability to present ourselves professionally and persuasively is still mandatory in the legal profession. This experience is gained through the face to face classroom challenge; not an electronic course. That being said, professionalism in emails needs to be taught.
14. What are your thoughts about the future of the third year of law school? If you believe changes are needed, please describe:

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

* Require practical experience/Internships/Externships/Residency. *(86 Responses)*

* A fourth year should be added, that is 100% practical experience, sponsored by an employer that commits to hire the participant upon successful completion of the 4th year program.

* Allow limited, supervised practice by 3rd year students.

* Allow some classes to be online, require externship for all third year students whether in government or private practice.

* As discussed above, the third year of law school should be spent interning somewhere that can prepare you for the changing legal profession.

* As I said before, there are things only experience can bring. Therefore, I'm not sure any changes can be made to make it more effective. But, to the extent 3Ls can be placed in positions to gain experience, I think it would be beneficial.

* Based solely on the greater supply of new attorneys and lower average new attorney salary, I believe lawyers should be allowed to sit for the bar exam upon completion of the second year of law school. Third and/or fourth year should involve some sort of classification that allows meaningful mentorship and practice-based knowledge, but also gainful employment as a licensed attorney.

* By my third year, I was only taking electives just to get credit. It wasn't necessarily in subjects I care about, just took them to meet my requirements. My internship that year provided me with more education and preparation than the courses did.

* I am mixed. In some ways, I feel the third year, compared to the first two, was an utter waste of my time and money. On the other hand, I feel that legal education needs to become far more practical. It should involve more legal drafting (particularly Motions to Dismiss, Motions for Summary Judgment, and other legal memoranda), and the practical training to put those documents into context. I believe the first year I should have been learning to think and analyze case law (as I did); the second year I should have been applying those skills in hypothetical scenarios to put gain understanding of procedure and strategy and the third year should have been practicing with a mentor and gaining real world experience.

* I believe experiential learning should be a part of every law student's education. My classmates that did not partake in that experience, and people I interact with from other
law schools that do not offer any opportunities, have had significant difficulty adjusting to the professionalism requirements of the legal career.

* I believe it should include a formal mentorship/apprenticeship.

* I felt as if my third year of school was a waste in the sense that I had taken all of my necessary courses and was required to take elective courses, which were not beneficial in my legal career.

* I would welcome a third year where students can work more and prepare better for the transition to full-time employment.

* If law school is going to remain a three-year program then students should be going to class and having on-the-job training as well.

* If the third year is retained, it should be used either as (1) a full-time internship to provide actual work experience prior to graduation or (2) to allow a student to obtain a "certificate" or "concentration" in a particular area of law that he or she has an interest such as Health Law, Bankruptcy, Civil Litigation, etc.

* If the third year of law school is kept, which I feel is superfluous in its current format, then I suggest that all courses are rotating mandatory externships or trial and pre-trial, preparation instead of mandatory classroom classes.

* It might have helped me if the third year was more practice-centric with possibly meaningful practical experience under supervision of a practicing, experienced attorney. If that does not fit into the curriculum, it might help if law schools could facilitate a fourth year during which new attorneys would be paired with experienced attorneys for practical experience. My school made clinic experience available, but it consumed semester credits that I wanted to use for courses because I think the courses are primarily important.

* It would be beneficial for attorneys preparing to enter a profession and guild to, much like medical residents, embark upon some form of clinical or practical apprenticeship in order to gain the skills essential to practicing, 85% of which exist outside the context of case law and theoretical discussion. I think it's important to pair doctrine, theory and information with practical application.

* It's a complete waste of time.

* It's almost useless. It should be abandoned in favor of an earlier entrance to practice or perhaps preparation for the bar examination (which, however, also has little bearing on the practice of law).

* It's useless to sit in a classroom for the third year of law school. Only two years are necessary in order to take the subjects on the Bar and any desired electives. Third year students should be heavily encouraged, or obligated, to obtain practical experience in a variety of forms (law firm, judicial clerkships, legal consulting firms, NGOs or other organizations working on law and policy, etc.) In this regard, we are in general behind
our European lawyer counterparts, which largely are either required or encouraged to obtain practical experience as a part of the law degree.

* Law school should be 3 years, but let me be clear: two of the six semesters (and summers too) should be spent doing full time internships and only one semester should be spent learning contracts, property and miscellaneous 1L classes. One semester should go to Bar preparation. The final two semesters should be completely free to the student to select their specialty. Undergrad should be cut to three years and law school to two years plus one full year of internships before any diploma is awarded. Loans should be discouraged, and that way from 24 to 30, people might actually have a realistic chance at paying off their student debt so that they can buy houses at age 30 rather than becoming wage slaves for life.

* Law schools want to keep the third year in order to generate more revenue from students. I believe that year could focus on experiential learning and mentoring outside the classroom, and students should pay very little for oversight from the school to ensure that they are receiving adequate skill development. As it exists at most schools, if students participate in an externship for credit, the school still charges them full price and does virtually nothing. This hardly seems fair, particularly given current student debt levels.

* My school was preparing me for the bar exam in its 3rd year which I think is very important. Not all schools work directly with the student in preparation for the bar.

* My second and third year were when I actually got to take classes with teachers who cared about teaching. Law school doesn't necessarily need to be shorter, but the first year needs to be reevaluated. It's so mired in "tradition" that it doesn't function usefully. I learned more from taking Barbri than I did from any of my first year classes.

* No changes needed. In fact, another year of law school may be in order.

* The first year is a waste of time and money; recorded lectures would be more effective. Find the best, most engaging professor and record them delivering the most engaging lecture on the subject. In a live lecture, questions are discouraged (as a practical matter) during class because if 1/10 of students have a 2 minute question in a class of 300 you just burned one hour. Class size is too large for the case study and Socratic Method to be effective. Recorded lectures would be more effective because students could re-wind and pause at their convenience, rather than being seen as an interruption. This would allow time for reflecting, looking something up (in a text or online source), taking a mental or bathroom break, or clarifying something that was not heard - all without missing lecture time. A live lecture at a fixed time by an average professor who doesn't have time to answer questions, then, is less effective than a recorded lecture by an excellent professor that can be accessed at will. So let the students learn at home, on their own time, and come to class to work through hypotheticals and problem sets under the guidance of a professor.

* The incorporation of a required law office management course or a required school-approved internship/residency program with specific practical standards that must be met to ensure that students are prepared to enter the legal world after graduation.
The shift of "skills" based training, as I indicated above, is flawed in my opinion. Traditional liberal arts education, as it is currently being taught, is necessary. The problem now is that so few law students actually become litigators in big firms where the "skills" taught at law school are necessary.

The third year feels more like a malaise than anything. Mostly, you bide your time and accrue tuition charges until you graduate.

The third year of law school should be focused on preparing students for the Bar and their future employment. The third year curriculum should have offerings that focus on the transition from academia to the working world.

The third year should be a blend of bar-preparation and, practical coursework or allowing the student to represent indigent clients pro-bono. This way the student will have an opportunity to gain some familiarity with bar tested subjects that she may not have had exposure to, and he will be able to gain practical experience that will prepare him to be an attorney. The opportunity and gift of representation of an indigent client should be available to any third year student.

Third year seems almost unnecessary. Essentially, all of the required classes are completed (or substantially completed) after two years. Third year is nothing more than electives. It can be useful if one knows which specific concentration he/she wishes to practice and can take those classes.

Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago

Need Practical experience/Internship/Externship/Residency programs. (294 Responses)

Get rid of it. (6 Responses)

A fourth year should be added to the JD program. In the past it was understood that, although while not formally "required", one had to practice law under the supervision of a mentor because a newly admitted member of the Bar simply did not have the skills to practice law without supervision and without continued learning. Today, however, in part because we are producing too many lawyers, those who cannot readily find employment "hang their own shingle" and simple do not know what they do not know. They either fail, and in the process harm the entire profession, or end up stuck at a low level practice for their entire career. A surgeon cannot graduate medical school and do brain surgery; yet a law student technically can graduate law school and do a capital murder trial. While I do not know of any newly admitted members first chairing a capital murder trial, I have seen several newly admitted members who have never even watched a jury trial from beginning to end first chair a jury trial with no second chair, no mentor and no advice. In our profession, while reckless, such action is not prohibited. Largely, because our profession has long been one that observes time-honored traditions, we have not historically seen wide-scale ramifications. However, with an economy that continues to
slow and law schools that continue to annually pump out a large number of graduates we are seeing more and more departure from the principles that have protected our profession. We need to: 1) Add a fourth year to the JD program to address practice issues, i.e. an externship; or 2) Require two years experience before one can be a "full bar member" (like a CPA); or 3) restrict certain tasks until there is an additional test or practical experience.

* A third year is absolutely necessary. The vast amount of material which a future lawyer must learn is such that it cannot possibly be properly digested in two years. Most law students do not know the area of the law they will go into (although they may know the area they wish to go into). But most students are not editors of the law review at an Ivy League law school, and do not have their pick of areas they will work in. A broad knowledge of the law is therefore very important. It also helps one to learn how to think and argue like a lawyer.

* Advocacy mentorship including interviewing clients, examination of witnesses, presentation of evidence including marking exhibits and foundation of items of evidence.

* Based on conversations with current law students, it appears some positive changes have already been made. There are significant clinics and internships available for students, which facilitate students' practical legal experience. However, I strongly urge that law schools provide a way for students to incorporate ethics on a more practical basis. Additionally, civility continues to be sadly lacking in the legal profession.

* Better sense of the career.

* Business training, law office management training.

* Change needs to be made in the culture of the adversary process. It is still too much about fear and ego gratification. Alternative behaviors and motivations need to be presented at the law school level.

* Fewer substantive courses because by then students know the fundamentals; instead more offerings pertaining to actual practice and to use of a legal education other than actual practice of law. One exception regarding fewer substantive courses might be to offer courses in specialized areas of law for those students who are committed to practicing in a specialty, for example, taxation or property or bankruptcy. Many students, however, are not able to predict the area in which they will eventually wind up due to unforeseen economic or personal events so specialization may not be worthwhile for a majority.

* First, close all the law schools. Then allow no more people to take the Bar for 10 years. Next, enforce as mandatory a monthly annuity program for all lawyers from the first day. Many of my friends are still forced to practice well into their 70's because they never had a savings program that was mandatory, or mandatory dues like the unions that went into a pension which would supplement their social security. Every other job has pensions, annuities, etc. I know each one could do it voluntarily, but they never do. It's either that big house, or fancy car, or very much lately, a divorce after a long term marriage which is disastrous especially late in life. Please do something to cut down on the number of
lawyers, resulting in bloodthirsty competition, cutting of fees, false guarantees, etc. Young lawyers can't get a job out of school or open their own offices without the internship we used to get from older lawyers we worked and learned from, which results in many bad practices.

* Focus on business concepts and legal skills necessary for employment under the new legal practice model.

* Focus on the nuts and bolts of practicing law. Learn how to handle a wide variety of cases and offer a course in law firm management.

* Have more opportunities to work at law firms, governmental agencies, legal clinics, etc. to get some real world experience.

* I actually think it should be extended to two years so four years total for law school, but that you have to work at least 20 hours a week in a mentorship or internship program for the last two years. The law student would be required to take two classes a semester for the last two years. Online classes at that time should be fine.

* I believe a fourth year of residency should be required, similar to doctors.

* I believe more emphasis should be placed on law office operations i.e., trust accounting, client communications and management.

* I believe the third year could be eliminated.

* I believe third year ought to spend more time in independent research and writing and less time in lecture halls.

* I do not believe that we can produce competent lawyers in two years as has been suggested. There is simply too much material that should be covered in law school for a two year course of study. Perhaps there should be real world clinical requirements for all law grades in the last year of study akin to the practical rotations that fourth year medical students are required to complete before eligibility for terminal degree.

* I don't know if it is purposeful, but law schools seem to try and destroy students the first and second year and reward students who "made" it the third year. That is not representative of life. If it is going to be a three year course, let the students determine their own curriculum. If it is going to be a two year course, then let the students know what they are "in-for."

* I felt my full third year was not needed. I was able to get the subjects I needed to take the Bar by the end of my second year as I recall. The third year would be good for obtaining practical experience.

* I graduated law school in 2004. The third year was most beneficial because it allowed me to take classes that I was not particularly interested in, but by doing so gave me a more well-rounded legal education. In addition, I had the opportunity to take advantage of the
law clinic at the school to get more practical experience. I don't think it should be used to take bar prep courses for credit as I have noticed some school are doing more recently.

* I know that I had two options in my third year, and I chose a seminar class where a paper of significant length was required (no final exam, just the paper). I don't understand the point of that. It held no real world application. I would much rather see real world writing than a seminar class. For example, if there were a criminal law class involving real world writing, there would be a series of papers, not one large one. One might be a motion to suppress or a motion to dismiss, one could be a writ, and one could be an appeal, and all of it would revolve around a real case and the students would receive the discovery and/or transcripts in the case to use to write the various motions, writs, appeals, etc.

* I like the idea of a mentoring program but would encourage it during the summers rather than in lieu of a third year. I favor a required mentoring program for students that exposes them for a period of time to transactional work and then a period of time to trial work. I would like to see collaboration between law schools and private transactional attorneys/companies/local governments for transactional work and between law schools and the trial lawyers/court system/states attorney/public defender for trial work. Mentoring requires a serious commitment from the practicing attorney, a commitment not often valued by today's employers who focus on billable hours and productivity. The Florida Bar could encourage mentoring by recognizing pro bono hours for the mentor. Alternatively, consider structuring a shadowing program and requires the law student to observe xx hours of practicing lawyers and interviewing such lawyers.

* I participated in an international moot court competition my last year of law school and it was the highlight of my law school experience. I wish more students would have the opportunity to participate in internships, trial prep classes or other clinics that would help them practice their advocacy skills.

* I strongly believe that most students are not equipped with the coping, interpersonal, and time management skills needed to make the practice of law a life-long career. Burnout and substance abuse is a problem in the profession, and there needs to be some third year law school courses that equip students to handle the real-world pressures they will face.

* I strongly disagree with the notion that the third year can be eliminated. The market demands today require that law school be made more rigorous, not less. I do think that more attention should be given in the third year to practical aspects to better prepare new lawyers in making the transition from school to practice. But we are finding recent grads to be less rigorous in their analytical skills such as knowing how to read and interpret a reported decision.

* I think it needs to be expanded to provide for more mentoring of law students and to the extent that law schools are in smaller communities there need to be expansion programs that get law students into larger legal communities where there are more mentoring opportunities.

* I think it would be helpful if the third year focused more on developing well-rounded people who can cope with the pressures of the practice of law. Perhaps seminars that
would address the financial problems that new lawyers face, as well as coping mechanisms for dealing with stress, would be helpful. In addition, I think that more attention be devoted to ethics and professionalism. However, I graduated from law school many years ago (1982) and I am sure that there have been positive changes since that time. In addition, I think that in every year of law school, not just the third year, the students should practice effective written and oral communication.

* I think there should be a 4th year or at least 3 years and an extra semester where the student apprentices but gets paid either way, whether a full year or a semester. There are so many areas of law that require/demand at least one semester of basic knowledge for every student before graduation because without a basic level of knowledge. Students/future lawyers don't even know what they don't know; they are ignorant of all the many legal aspects affecting their cases and cannot possibly serve their client's needs properly, fully, effectively without knowing basic information about all the various fields of law so they can recognize all the legal aspects applicable or affecting their cases. You don't know what you don't know.

* I think we need to teach Law Students that the Legal Profession should be higher than it is, not a money making business but a profession with a higher purpose.

* I went to school in Georgia and they allowed the Bar to be taken prior to the end of 3rd year. That resulted in a mass exodus of students after they took the bar. Not much learning, except in electives that were of interest.

* I would like to see more on-the-job training and practical application of the knowledge and skills acquired in law school. I have a son who is in his second year of medical school and another who is pre-med. I've found that the "new" format for Florida medical schools works, as the med students are actually required to work in hospitals and free clinics under the supervision of practicing physicians while still in their first year, and are required to participate in externships sponsored by the medical school after their second year, with rotations starting in year three. They're also being taught the practical aspects of patient consultation, time management, technological application, as well as social responsibility. By the time they graduate, they're prepared for practice.

* If a law student knows the primary area of law in which he or she intends to seek employment (or go into private practice), it would be exceptionally valuable to actually apprentice [at least in part] working in that environment, and devoting an appreciation for the nature of what will be commencing a sustained career. It would enable the neophyte to more easily pivot if the presumed choice is less likely to be personally fulfilling and might not ultimately be professionally satisfying.

* It should be on the job training where you get school credit prior to becoming a barred attorney.

* It should be one half courses and one half internship.

* It would have been better to have been allowed to work full time in a law firm in order to prepare me for the practice of law.
It's almost inherently useless. There were no classes I took that I couldn't have taken in my second year. I was busy trying to work and run a law review; classes were things that filled time.

Law school needs to be harder to get into and the first place to start would be literacy. I know what you are doing: try to get rid of the third year so it will 1) be easier and 2) so the big firms can have free labor. However, if you do this there will be no jobs for graduates and the degree will no longer truly be a doctorate.

Law school needs to better prepare students for the practice of law. Simply teaching students to "think like an attorney" is insufficient. Perhaps students should focus their education during the third year of law school and the teaching should be more geared toward preparing students for the actual practice of law.

Law school should be more difficult and it should be much harder to get into. The bar exam should also be much more difficult.

Law students need to take classes in areas of the law that they will likely be practicing. Professors/law schools offer classes that have limited or no practical value for law students. I think the third year could be eliminated, but I am in favor of keeping the third year if that year is filled with more practical experience. Many clients are now unwilling to pay for first year practicing attorneys. This problem could potentially be lessened if first year attorneys had more experience in law school in the setting of their future employment.

Make it harder.

Mentors and trial work.

Mentorship would be a good idea for the 3rd year - like a mini residency. I believe the medical profession does better job preparing their professionals for the workforce than the legal profession does.

Mentorship, preparation for practice in the real world, some form of apprenticeship. I have always found it curious that plumbers, electricians, masons, accountants, doctors and other trades and professions require an apprenticeship and demonstrated skills and competence before being foist upon the public yet a law school graduate by dint of passing the bar exam is legally deemed competent to handle a complex personal injury claim, capital criminal matter or a multi-million dollar estate plan. Only that graduate's good judgment or good fortune in joining an established firm stands between him and potential disaster for the client.

More "inside the court" material. Many of the lawyers I know had tough times their first year.

More emphasis on technology and office management.

More emphasis on the practice and professionalism. Attitudes of young attorneys seem to lack the true meaning of the practice of law (all about $$ and nothing else).
- More focused elective requirement.
- More information about what will be required to be a successful law firm employee. Practical ethics instruction is needed as well as law practice workshops taught by actual trial lawyers and practicing attorneys.
- More instructions on the nuts and bolts of the actual practice of law.
- More interaction with courtroom experience. Mentoring may also help.
- More technology application. Adding experiences in the business end of law practice. Community outreach, pro bono activities.
- Must be taught how the first two years apply to the outside world of actually practicing law. Law school teaches the law and how to distinguish the law but does not teach anything about practicing the law.
- My third year of law school was a complete waste. I was working almost full time and learned so much more from that experience! School was just same old/same old and contributed nothing at that point to my education as an attorney.
- My third year of law school was the best out of all three. I finally got to focus my studies to my exclusive interests, the classes were smaller, professors more accessible. What's not to like?
- My third year was just like my second, except different subject areas. I was tired of that routine by third year. I think some sort of one on one apprenticeship would have been more useful.
- My third year was very repetitive to what I had already learned from course materials so the third year could have been better spent preparing for the Bar and taking courses that would assist in the transition from student to lawyer.
- Need to create a "Legal Residency" program with three 4-month rotations: 1) Criminal Law - SAO or PD; 2) Civil Litigation to include Business litigation and/or Transactional work; 3) Pro Bono Clinic rotation.
- Opportunities to learn about different positions in the legal field as not everyone yearns to be a litigator.
- Overall I had an excellent experience in the 3rd year of law school, getting to focus on legal areas I wanted to practice in and leaving behind the courses I knew would not come into my practice life. Our school had perhaps and over-emphasis on bar passage in this last year. Again, my feeling is the onus should be on the student to work out how best to prepare for the bar, and seek courses and other things that will help this process.
- Peer screening before Bar admission stricter standards for criminal and social behavior history.
* Please, it is common knowledge that the third year is a waste. Students are made to take classes on subject area that they have no interest in and will never practice, i.e., Federal Tax Law. To develop a good lawyer, the courses should be focused on their interests not some antiquated curriculum from 150 years ago or some ivy league school. The right answer is to have professional educators, and not lawyers, teach the law. Leave teaching of how to apply the knowledge to active lawyers in the community.

* Potential specialty for a trial lawyer, much like English barrister solicitor distinctions. Include a year or two working for the Clerk and Judge where the employer (Judge/Clerk) responsible for some or all of decision as to whether designation as a trial lawyer is appropriate.

* Practice tips.

* Practicum, Ethical Problem Solving and Law Office Management.

* Real life and practical illustrations and presentations, even trial monitoring with input from the lawyers involved at the end (when willing).

* Require that the law be taught and the Law be taught in the class room with attendance required by both the students and Prof. The student cost in tuition must be lowered to a reasonable sum. Not by reduction in curricula or removing the third year or relying on Federal/local tuition grants/loans.

* Should have a fourth year which is an apprenticeship where students are only practicing under supervision.

* Students need to be better prepared to face the many challenges that lie ahead, from gaining employment to the overall expectations of those wanting to practice in what is a competitive profession.

* Students should be focusing more on what they plan on doing when they graduate and taking courses specifically designed to assist the transition.

* The above referenced practical considerations of the practice of law, whether it trust account management, professionalism, general business advice coupled with how to draft a proper motion, hearing notice, order etc.

* The best idea is to get rid of it. If we can't get rid of it, make it into required courses on the preparation for the practice of law.

* The old adage that the first year they scare you to death, the second year they work you to death, and the third year they bore you to death was true in my experience. I think the third year should be more practical in nature. There should be more instruction on the actual practice of law. Less theory, more practice. There should be classes on filing technology, maintaining form files, how to do things on a practical level, and more role playing like trial practice. For transactional training, there should be negotiations classes, drafting classes, training on things like working in track changes or some of the collaborative programs available for group drafting. There should also be training about
office management as more and more students are going out on their own right out of school because firm jobs are harder to come by. There should also be more training on professionalism. As the Bar has gotten larger, the number of lawyers who act professionally has gotten smaller. There should be a greater emphasis on ethics as well.

* The students should be learning how to run a business and how to manage a law firm.

* The third year of law school should be devoted primarily to psychology, business, and finance. There should be a required one year full-time internship after law school.

* The third year should not be eliminated, but we need think about bridging the gap between legal education and the legal profession. With less and less mentoring, law schools need to do all they can to prepare students, which may involve changing the third year of law school. I do not have any concrete ideas, but law school administrators and professors need to be willing to have the discussion, be willing to make change, and be willing to try new things.

* There needs to be a program to provide some grounding so that new lawyers understand the day-to-day activities and are prepared to accord themselves with standards for professional conduct once they are part of the Bar.

* There needs to be more real world experiences and course that provide stronger writing skills and drafting techniques. There also needs to be an understanding of the business of law.

* There needs to be some form of introduction to the realities of practice whether it be transactional or litigation. Students should attend a real estate closing, a probate hearing, some type of litigation, should be addressed by other transactional attorneys perhaps by web cam to view consultations, meetings and the like that illustrate actual practice.

* Third year law students should be exposed to real cases and should be arguing and briefing motions and attending evidentiary hearings. If they are not interested in litigation, they should be exposed to real life Real Estate closings, transactions, etc.

* Third year of law school is a complete waste of time. If anything, it should be used for clinical work or some "out of class" instruction. It is only a money grab for law schools. That is one of the reasons why many people chose an MBA two year track over a JD three year track.

* Third year of law school worked very well for me, for two reasons. First, it was an opportunity to take more specialized senior level courses in subject matter areas I was considering for a career. Also, I had the opportunity to work in addition to going to school. In fact, I had a part-time job with a law firm, and I also did a judicial externship. Both gave me real-life skills that allowed me to transition very well to my life as a first-year attorney the following year. That having been said, (a) it's been 25 years since I was in first year, and (b) I don't know what other ideas are out there, so although it worked very well for me, I'd be willing to listen to suggestions for changes.
* Third year students should have to take some mandatory classes that will help you pass the Bar and prepare them for real life legal practice. Taking whatever you want is not always the best option, especially if you are unsure or change your mind about what area you will practice in.

* Too many are being churned out by too many law schools.

* We need to do a better job mentoring 3Ls on business development, marketing, and mentoring.

* We should consider requiring the equivalent of "medical residencies" (law school designed programs that will allow the students to rotate through the different types of practice). For example, the work has been done generally and the ground work already set in the criminal and civil arenas with the internships via Legal Clinics and State Attorney, Public Defender and Government Agencies. There are law schools in Florida and outside (Ohio and New York) that provide experience in representing or assisting corporate start-ups or working in the corporate world. Perhaps a centralized state-wide matching of internship opportunities developing specialized areas of practice. Stakeholders who have a volume of cases in a significantly specialized area of practice may join an assist with providing training an internship program where specific training is provided (perhaps via internet since it could be offered state-wide) then the students would do their "residence" or internship in a variety of areas. Some of the core areas for the "residencies" might include criminal, civil, appellate, corporate (would include workers' comp. and labor law). A second corporate track that would include securities, commercial transactions, real estate, and construction law. Another "residence" might deal with personal injury claims. In short, the Sections of The Florida Bar and the areas of Board Certification would provide an excellent guide for demarcation of the "residencies."

* Work with real people and real cases. Use the third year as kind of a transition from the academic world to the real world.

* Would be nice to have a course like public defender in the business arena.
15. Do you feel any of the required legal education could be provided in the last year of college? If “Yes”, which course(s)?

Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less

* Legal Writing and Research. (19 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (10 Responses)
* Any of the first year curriculum. (6 Responses)
* Constitutional Law. (6 Responses)
* Professional Responsibility. (6 Responses)
* Contracts. (5 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (5 Responses)
* Torts. (4 Responses)
* Property. (3 Responses)
* Ethics. (2 Responses)

* A course that teaches students the basics skills of being a lawyer/law student such as how to brief a case, outline, write a memo, etc.
* A public speaking class.
* All core bar exam subjects. Even if it is a very basic teaching of it I think that would be extremely helpful.
* Any and all.

* Any of the typical first year courses, provided they were taught at the appropriate academic level to prepare college seniors for the rigors of law school. It would be beneficial, as it may serve to screen out would-be law students who may not understand what they are getting themselves into.

* Applicable skills in the courtroom.

* Are you suggesting that certain 1L courses be offered as electives at the undergraduate level? Or that someone interested in law would be locked into picking a major in undergrad. that included the 1L course, or else face a disadvantage when they arrived at law school (as compared to, say, a biology or engineering or accounting major, whose
major almost certainly would not add 1L classes, particularly if the school did not have an associated law school).

* Bar preparation.
* Basics classes typically taught 1st semester.
* Criminal Law.
* Cursory examinations of the first-year law school core course load are probably all that could and should be provided in an undergraduate environment.
* Evidence.
* Having prerequisites would preclude excellent candidates from applying.
* I believe all legal classes could be provided in college for academic and general knowledge purposes. However, without the framework of a legal institution and goal of professionalization, they would be hard to "package" into an applicable professional education.
* I could have learned all I needed to learn to practice law in college.
* I did not know I wanted to be a lawyer until 2 years after college.
* I do not feel anything of the current required legal education should be provided after the first three semesters. After the first three semesters, then all classes should be externships or trial and pretrial preparation.
* I feel that clinical experience should be required in the last year.
* I think a joint program where you do 3 years of college and 3 years of law school would be helpful. College did not prepare me for law school.
* I, for one, had no idea I would become an attorney in college. I do not see any advantage to providing a further hurdle to admission for people joining the profession after having worked. Frankly, those attorneys who have worked in other fields before attending law school seem, in my opinion, better prepared for some of the practical aspects of practicing law.
* It could be useful to learn procedural based courses first, while in college, so that upon entering law school, the substantive courses would make more sense. It is difficult to understand the substantive issues in cases when procedural questions are mixed in, but the procedural courses typically deal only with procedure.
* Law Firm Management/Business Administration.
* More specific skills courses.
* Need more internship opportunities & mentoring.

* Not that I was prompted to do so, but I will explain my "no" answer. Allowing students to take law school credit courses in college would encourage students to go directly from undergraduate studies to law school. Based upon my limited exposure to law students, it seems that students benefit from some period of time working or other activity between undergrad and law school.

* Perhaps the types of courses normally taken in the second year, such as Family Law, Elder Law, Health Law and something that gives an overview of a particular area in order to help students decide their interests.

* Several of the basic practice courses should be required for the final year of law school, such as, basic discovery, basic federal practice, etc.

* Statutory interpretation.

* Substantive classes need to teach certain problem solving and analytical thinking methods. Undergraduate colleges do not teach critical thinking/problem solving/analytical thinking. They give you a bunch of information to memorize for an exam without teaching you how to think.

* Substantive courses could be taught in college, but until you are immersed in legal education and your brain is 'trained' to 'think like a lawyer,' this type of education could be detrimental too early.

* There is no need, in my opinion, to make it easier to become a lawyer.

* These days, fewer than half of students tend to go to law school right after college.

* Yes. Not a single college student in the USA should graduate without knowing at the very least the basics of their constitutional rights.

Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago

* Basic courses/first year courses. (41 Responses)

* Legal Research & Writing. (39 Responses)

* Constitutional Law. (34 Responses)

* Contracts. (27 Responses)

* Ethics. (25 Responses)

* Torts. (20 Responses)
* Business Law/Business Management. (16 Responses)
* Property. (15 Responses)
* Civil Procedure. (14 Responses)
* Criminal Procedure. (12 Responses)
* Criminal Law. (10 Responses)
* Law office management. (5 Responses)
* Tax. (5 Responses)
* Law office management and interpersonal skills. (2 Responses)
* More electives. (2 Responses)
* Public Speaking. (2 Responses)
* A realistic orientation into the legal field with appropriate expectations of the positions that can be obtained as a career.
* Accounting.
* Actually, the answer is that I am not sure about that. If the idea is to reduce law school to two years and to include some of the material in the last year of college at the expense of providing any practical training, then my answer is no. But, if you could do some of the general stuff like Criminal Law, Torts, or other first year classes, excluding Civil Procedure, which I think is too important to be taught in an undergraduate setting, in the fourth year of college and then provide practical training in the second year of law school, I would be all for it.
* Although I would not be in favor of granting law school credit, I suppose Constitutional Law would be a strong candidate for upper class undergraduates. It would have to be a rigorous course equivalent to what is presented in law school.
* Any course if the instruction is good enough.
* Any of the courses could be taught in the last year prior to graduation. I would add material, whether in the last year or otherwise, on the issues I referenced above: Material on how much and frequently knowing your judge may affect the case; how often attorneys and parties mislead (or lie); how often some judges do not follow the law; and the psychology of influence.
* Anything, other than the basic foundations of law, such as Legal Research & Writing; Constitution Law; Contract Law; Evidence Law; etc.
Anything, really. There are many existing courses which do provide legal knowledge. Most of the colleges have a paralegal program that includes legal courses. I taught UCC and securities law to accounting students, business law to business students, negotiation strategies to business students, etc. Any of these would be appropriate for students intending to become lawyers. I also made my business students visit at least one courtroom for at least an hour during the semester. It was enlightening to them and made many of them realize that becoming an attorney or a judge was not out of reach for them and that it was a goal they should consider.

- Black letter law courses.
- Broad exposure class to introduce more in depth the various legal professions.
- But some undergraduate courses are helpful in preparing for law school (e.g., philosophy).
- Combination of class work + practical experience could work for some.
- Comparative Law.
- Digital Technology.
- Foundational.
- Hard to imagine how that would work in practice.
- History.

I do not believe we should confuse graduate education with undergraduate education. There has been a trend to lower the age at which complex ideas are discussed. This trend is currently occurring in both primary and secondary education. The issue that I see is that students increasingly lack the basic knowledge and skills necessary to engage in "deep" thought or discussion on more complex topics. As a result, increasingly I see young individuals including young attorneys who are very knowledgeable on specific subjects but lack broad knowledge of a field. This creates a serious deficit in their ability to think objectively and to engage in serious analytical thought because there is no context for the information.

- I don't think that is practical. Undergraduate students have required courses that they are trying to complete. Also, the undergraduate environment is totally different.

- I think the first year of law school as an immersive experience into the law is effective and should be retained.

- I think the issue is not so much the course but the quality of the college where the course is studied.

- I think the law school curriculum in its entirety should be similar to a giant 3 year CLE course of basic, intermediate, advanced & practical classes/subjects.
I took a fantastic Civil Liberties course in college. It was superior to many of my law school classes as it covered very interesting and relevant material and required a great deal of writing.

International Law.

Internships, clerkships and the like. Would be nice if there was a way to monitor one's work in a clerkship or internship.

Introduction to law practice where it will provide an overview of typical career demands, skill sets, costs, etc. This would be helpful to those who decide to go to law school and may justifiably deter some from entering law school and even graduate, only to find it is not for them and not what was expected.

It depends upon your major.

It seems that students today are not as educated in terms of civic education and critical thinking. Undergraduate education should include a requirement for learning about the government, our constitution, and responsible citizenship. The US Constitution is the bedrock of our legal system yet many of today's students arrive at law school without a good understanding of how it affects our lives and how important it is to the law itself. Also skills that are missing include: the ability to engage in critical thinking, reading, writing, and interpersonal communication skills.

It would be good to show students what they are getting into.

It's good that law school does not have prerequisites. If it did, then you would only serve to add work to people coming from non-traditional backgrounds. For example, if someone did not plan to go to law school, then went later, then that person would have to get admitted to an undergrad and take some classes before doing law school. That's an extra year and a hurdle specifically for students with more life experience and maybe a better perspective on their goals for the degree. Meanwhile, as it currently is, undergrads who know they want to do law school can get the undergrad degree in 3 years, because if they don't have to worry about prerequisites that's doable. I know you are thinking that law school tuition is high, but also undergrad tuition has gone up so much in the last decade. Even in state schools, that undergrad tuition is high. It's better to leave the law school entry requirements as-is, so as to allow an undergrad prospective law student to not have hoops to jump through and so to be able to graduate undergrad in 3 years.

Just clinical work or work in a law firm which would allow students to realize what is for them and not for them. A lot of it will be based on the lifestyle. You might want to practice in a law firm but after four months of 80 hour weeks, you might decide to go into the government or chose another area of the country or career track. There is absolutely nothing in law school that prepares you for life as a lawyer in the real world. That is why most lawyers are miserable. The rates for suicide, alcoholism, depression and divorce rate for lawyers are above the national average and this is for a professional degree that people sacrifice a lot of time, energy and money for. Plus, most students have no idea the amount of financial burden they are taking on with all of their student loans until after
they graduate and they have to work as a law firm slave just to pay back their loans. They also need to close the bottom third of law schools. There are just too many lawyers in the world.

* Land use.

* Law school is most effective as an immersion program. The education of law involves a radical change in how to think and process information. Taking a singular class cannot prepare a student for that necessary change.

* Law schools should require work experience before admission.

* Lawyers need more training not less!

* Legal Research Courses not requiring legal analysis.

* More technical courses in areas of law that one anticipates practicing.

* Most substantive higher level practice-specific courses tend to be taught by experienced adjunct professors who have practical knowledge [not just book-smarts]. The benefit from learning from them can be invaluable.

* No because law school should teach ALL law related courses. Other areas of knowledge and skill should be learned or mastered before entering law school. Four-year undergraduate degree should NOT be a PRE-LAW education.

* No core course should, but any course could.

* No, let youngsters enjoy their last year of college before facing the drudgery of law school.

* No. Law school is a method of thinking on a level much different than the intellect required to receive a college degree. They are two different things. What are you doing - looking for teaching jobs for all the unemployed lawyers out there?

* Not many undergraduate institutions have a Pre-Law as a major. I knew I was going to law school so I majored in Political Science, which is not at all helpful. Looking back, I should have majored in English. I recommend, at a minimum, a writing course, an analysis course, and a course on the Socratic Method at the under-graduate level.

* Not really, as pre-law doesn't really exist. By way of example, I was an English/Business Co-Major.

* Not the required basics, more like a practicum where you experience true days as a lawyer before signing up for law school.

* Oil and gas.
* Other nations allow you to go to law school from high school and make a longer term instead of having separate undergrad and law school requirements. That makes more sense, especially financially.

* Our country's history and the role of the law and lawyers in its founding.

* Pleading and Practice.

* Procedural law requirements.

* Procedure.

* Really anything you can teach to law students, you can also teach to college students. But if the student is still stimulated by college, and still excited by what the student is learning, it seems a loss to cut that off early. On the other hand, starting law school courses a year earlier would save money.

* Require trial practice and/or clinic experience.

* Some basic overview of the U.S. legal system.

* Students should not be forced to be pre-law.

* Substantive law.

* Sure, lots of classes. But that's a bad idea. I received my undergrad in engineering. If I took law classes as electives I could not have graduated in 4 years.

* Technology.

* The "book learning" courses in academic areas of law.

* The essentials taught in the first two years enable one to choose the area in which you want to practice

* The more advanced Tax classes and electives are difficult to pick up on one's own, such as antitrust.

* There is no reason for someone to be taking law school classes in college.

* There should be a requirement for logic, ethics and interpersonal communication as a prerequisite for any law school. Much as there are specific requirements for STEM professions, there must be basic requirement for law. Classical logic and reasoning is missing from current graduates. They know "what" but they have no idea "why." I ask a simple question of new lawyers, "Do you believe laws we have are black and white?" Any new lawyer that answers "yes" has no business being a lawyer and is lacking in the fundamental skill of reasoning. If you (the reader) answered "yes" unconsciously as you read this, then I propose that you never sat through a legal philosophy class either.
* Third year internship program.
* Trial Advocacy.
* Trial preparation and skills.
* While there are certainly courses that could be offered, I don't think the system should be "fast-tracked" any further than it already is. A lot of legal concepts are based on life experiences. We need new lawyers to have some life experience outside the classroom.
* Wills and Trust Workshop and Florida Constitutional Law.
* Yes, but why?
16. What skills do you feel are most necessary for an undergraduate to develop to be successful in law school?

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

- Writing skills. (81 Responses)
- Reading comprehension. (48 Responses)
- Time management. (32 Responses)
- Critical thinking. (23 Responses)
- Analytical skills. (14 Responses)
- Study skills. (13 Responses)
- Public speaking. (12 Responses)
- Dedication/discipline. (10 Responses)
- Research skills. (10 Responses)
- Communication skills. (9 Responses)
- Logic/logical reasoning. (7 Responses)
- Business. (5 Responses)
- Confidence. (3 Responses)
- Organization. (3 Responses)
- Multi-tasking. (2 Responses)
- Networking skills. (2 Responses)
- Philosophy. (2 Responses)
- Public debate. (2 Responses)
- Stress management. (2 Responses)
- Ability to analyze related texts.
* Ability to focus on the material and keep up with the assignments.
* Accounting.
* Business experience and life experience. A minimum of five years of work experience before entering law school.
* Collaborative skills.
* First, the ability to put their nose to the grind stone. As a predicate matter, they have to have the analytic abilities, but I believe that undergraduate education is far too late a time to develop those. Second, they need to further develop their writing (undergraduate education is, again, not the place for basic writing). Third, they need to develop their study skills and class-taking abilities. The third piece is really only necessary to the extent that law school is required. Given how much I learned on the job, it's not clear to me that anything beyond the first year and a bar preparation course really have anything to do with learning to be a lawyer. It seems to me that these further years, if they have any utility at all, are more networking than anything else.
* For the typical attorney, a good liberal arts education will provide students with the tools they need to be successful in law school. Pre-law specific majors tend to omit skills that could be useful but don't initially appear to be related.
* Hard to tell because everyone is different.
* How to read case law!
* How to take essay exams.
* How to think!
* I do believe writing is important, but (in my opinion) that is something that is easier harnessed and refined than some other skills.
* Independent learner.
* Learning how to focus on the important aspects of assignments and not minuscule details.
* Listening skills!
* Open mindedness.
* Political science.
* Political theory.
* Precision of language.
* Professionalism.
* Self awareness.
* Social skills.
* Sociology.
* Structure of the court system.

* Take good notes, read all the materials, attend all classes and have a good memory.
* The will to be there and actually want to practice law. Law schools should actively discourage students from selecting a legal education simply because they are unsure of what to do following the completion of their undergraduate studies.
* They need to be able to read and outline effectively. If you outline when you read for the first time, you will not have to reread later, wasting valuable time. Also students need to come up with a system of organization and time management. Once these basic skills are mastered, the student will save much time and effort preparing for exams and will have a useful set of materials to look back upon later. Not only do I think that these skills must be learned and mastered to achieve success in law school, but these are also the set of skills that employers desire.
* Truthfully? Thick skin and the drive to succeed, even if that is at the expense of your classmates. Being able to read quickly and absorb on the first read is essential. Organizational skills.
* Understanding that they should not attend law school.
* Understanding the writing styles of each professor for exam purposes.
* Who cares? The correct question is what skills are most necessary for an undergraduate to develop to be a successful lawyer. And then ask the same question of law school students. If the answer isn't the same, then law school is broken. That is, if the skill set to be successful in law school (which you should pursue in undergrad) is different than the skill set to be successful in law (which you should pursue in law school), then law school is probably not preparing you for law. In case you are wondering, law school is not preparing anyone for the practice of law. Both undergrads and law school students should focus on being popular (this skill set makes it easier to get students and teachers to help you in both levels of education and makes it easier to get clients, potential clients, employers, employees, and colleagues to help you out in your career) and on working hard and consistently (hard workers get farther in law than smart people).
Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago

* Writing skills. (383 Responses)
* Reading comprehension. (127 Responses)
* Critical thinking. (117 Responses)
* Analytical skills. (98 Responses)
* Time management. (68 Responses)
* Logic/logical reasoning. (54 Responses)
* Dedication/discipline. (52 Responses)
* Research skills. (50 Responses)
* Study skills. (49 Responses)
* Public speaking. (44 Responses)
* Communication skills. (42 Responses)
* Interpersonal skills. (30 Responses)
* Business skills. (24 Responses)
* Computer/technology skills. (17 Responses)
* Ethics. (14 Responses)
* Finance/accounting. (11 Responses)
* Organizational skills. (11 Responses)
* History. (10 Responses)
* English language skills. (9 Responses)
* Philosophy. (9 Responses)
* Stress management. (9 Responses)
* Collaboration. (8 Responses)
* Debate/arguing. (7 Responses)
* Broad based education. (5 Responses)

* Confidence. (5 Responses)

* Networking. (5 Responses)

* Speed reading. (5 Responses)

* Advocacy skills. (4 Responses)

* Common sense. (4 Responses)

* Courses in government/knowledge of government. (4 Responses)

* Psychology. (4 Responses)

* Statistics. (4 Responses)

* A broad understanding of multiple fields not connected to the law.

* A considered approach to virtually everything.

* A good liberal arts foundation including: Language skills; writing skills; a solid knowledge of our history (and a working knowledge of world history); literature and at least one Florida relevant language (Spanish or French). Too many of our graduates are Master’s of sports information and techniques but have inadequate writing skills and a woefully inadequate education when it comes to even American and English literature. Also, they tend to have only the most basic handle on American history (essential to understanding the context of most of our laws) and almost no awareness of world history.

* A person who wants to do well in law school needs to know how to answer the questions on a law school final exam. I am talking about method, not content.

* A real major, not a "soft" major like Political Science.

* A tough skin.

* A wide knowledge of people and what makes a civilization work, in particular, our American society. A good solid liberal arts education which gives one this knowledge while teaching critical thinking is still the best preparation for a legal career.

* Algebra.

* Arguing cases, drafting pleadings, drafting Contracts apart from the actual case law governing the area of practice. Just nuts and bolt of putting it on paper and arguing a side of a case.

* Balancing life/family and law school.
Bar preparedness.

Being able to analyze historical change, i.e.: my background is in archaeology and history. I have prepared some of my strongest arguments in tracking how interpretation of legal matters have progressed/changed over time.

Biology.

Classroom participation and accountability.

Collaborative mediation, arbitration and running a law office.

Criminal justice.

Debt management.

Experience in the Socratic Method of teaching.

Generally, the deductive reasoning process prevalent in mathematics appears to help in the law school educational protocol, if it is based on the case or Socratic Method. Being able to read and retain the content is extremely important, and may be an educational requirement that is disappearing in the instant electronic communication age. It would also be helpful to be able to spell and put together intelligent phrases based upon fact and not opinion.

Get a job in a law office or volunteer. Students need to know the basics so they aren't totally unprepared for class.

How to handle professors that like to bully students.

How to think like a lawyer. How to "parrot" the law professor's ideas.

Human resources and behavior.

Humanities.

I believe that law school is a unique experience in and of itself. A solid undergraduate program in any number of disciplines can prepare an undergraduate for law school. When I was an undergraduate, I was disappointed in the fact there was no "pre-law" program of any sort. That may have changed. "Pre-med" does it quite well. Public speaking, debate, writing skills: these areas could be developed in a pre-law environment.

I can't put my finger on any one particular skill per se. Elements of claims, rules of procedure, the names of seminal cases, IRAC method and even the ability to write different types of legal documents can be taught. I think that what must be developed as an undergraduate falls more in the category of personal traits. The undergraduate must learn to be academically rigorous and intellectually honest, in other words, being eager to advance the strengths of one's argument, but also be willing to admit and confront the weaknesses. The undergraduate must also come prepared with a great work ethic.
I don't think there is any particular skill you can learn in undergrad to be successful in law school. You need to be organized, which is not really a teachable skill. You need to get over the fear of maybe being wrong when you answer a question in a classroom full of people. You need to be able to deal with the ultra competitive people who are looking to knock you down in order to get ahead. Reading and retaining what was read, as well as understanding it is also a necessity. It either clicks for you and you understand it, or it doesn't (and if it doesn't, that is usually because the person went to law school because that's what their parents wanted). Other things should have been taught prior to entering college, such as how to spell and how to read critically.

I found the biggest aspect of Law School was twofold. It allowed me to mature and I was able to meet fellow students who had burning desire to be a lawyer, which pushed me.

I was lucky; I was already a professional when I went to law school. I found that the grading curves and competitive environment needs to be addressed if we want to encourage our young to act in such a manner. The dog eat dog mentality law school promotes does not properly address the ways to cope in an adversarial, while practicing with dignity and respect. I found it incredibly sad that after I had taken the oath of an attorney they had to change it to include treating other lawyers with respect in all communications. This is something that should be inherit in our profession, but is anathema to the law school mantra of the survival of the fittest, rather than survival of all who are fit. With a mandatory year of internship and mentoring by the best of the best, hopefully this can be resolved.

Ideally, that depends upon the type of law practice that the individual wants to pursue. The corporate transactional lawyer should have a solid background in finance. The family law attorney may want to have a background in accounting and counseling. The local government lawyer may want to have a background in planning and land use. The patent attorney must have a background in engineering, of course. Rather than offering a "pre-law" undergraduate degree, it seems more logical to me that the "pre-law" class becomes a part of each of the undergraduate studies.

Introduction to legal terminology.

Learning human nature, perhaps as a waiter or salesman.

Minimize advocacy, maximize understanding constitutional principles. An arguer is a loudmouth, not a fine lawyer skill.

Not a "skill" per se, but I would highly discourage (and would not admit to a graduate program, if I were king for a day) students rolling straight from college to law school. The perpetual student who's never had a practical, "real" job is not an ideal candidate.

Not enough room to write. 90% of what we need to teach young lawyers is less about the "law" and more about the business of law. I think understanding how your personality should drive your preferences in the practice would be better.
* Overall exposure to the different legal career options so that upon entrance the student can focus on a certain discipline.

* Religion.

* Rote memorization.

* Scientific methodology.

* Sorry to the world, but I think that the “No Child Left Behind” generation is hitting law schools. “No Child Left Behind” didn't teach writing. It just taught to multiple choice tests - facts, not how to structure thoughts. It has already caused issues for colleges these past few years because of the students needing remedial writing instruction. And colleges have not necessarily succeeded in teaching those skills. I think it will cause fundamental challenges for law schools when they get this crowd. Legal Research and Writing will assume more skills coming in than what the public grade schools have prepared.

* Substantive degrees rather than Political Science or English.

* Surviving a competitive environment.

* Third year internship program.

* To not be materialistic or succumb to being a crook.

* Typing.

* Understanding that grades will not determine "success" as a lawyer; finding balance.
17. What advice would you provide to college students who are considering going to law school?

Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less

Loan Complications/Financial Advice – 43 Responses

* A law degree is not a "safe" option. IF you study the risks of employment and the binomial wage curve for lawyers, and STILL want to go to law school, then get any engineering degree or business degree so you can practice types of law that actually make money. Not the pie in the sky save the whales stuff, where there is one job and 1,000 graduates and it pays $30,000 a year.

* A legal education creates an almost insurmountable amount of debt without offering a great deal of job security. For example, it took me 6 months to find a job after I took the bar, which is not uncommon.

* Be acutely aware and familiar with the loan contracts and economic effect of the debt burden on their ability to achieve other goals, such as marriage, purchase of a house, etc.

* Consider the financial aspects.

* Consider the financial ramifications.

* Consider your true desires for law school. If you are in it for just the money, it might not be the best profession for you to be in. Also, consider the financial ramifications of attending law school if you would be required to take out student loans. Many of my colleagues took out student loans, only to become six figures in debt after graduation and getting a job that paid significantly less than expected.

* Do not get a loan. You will never be able to pay it back or live life freely without debt.

* Do not go to school with the sole intention to make money. Be prepared to have rough years initially making money and getting the right job.

* Don't assume that you will get out and immediately make a lot of money. This seems to be a common misconception.

* Don't do it if you have to take on significant debt. You will probably regret law school and being a lawyer (I have yet to find a lawyer in private practice that actually enjoys being a lawyer). If you have significant debt, you will be locked in because you have to make $2000+ every month just to cover your loans, no matter what. It will cripple you from starting a small business or changing careers.

* Don't go unless it's free.
* Don't take out student loans to go to law school.

* Don't, unless you don't have to accrue much extra debt.

* Ensure that you truly want a JD as law school can be extremely expensive and the salary you'll likely receive when you graduate may now be as high as you would hope.

* Find ways to save up and reduce or eliminate the amount of money you have to take out in loans.

* Focus on scholarships and public schools to limit financial obligations and student loans. The student loans are not worth it and you will never pay them off if you go to a private school.

* Get a scholarship or attend a state institution (paying "in-state" tuition).

* Get a scholarship or go into another field first, then go to law school later in life. Do not dig yourself into $150K of undergrad debt followed by $100K (or more) of law school debt.

* Get a scholarship. Student debt is running out of control.

* I would advise an aspiring law school student, especially if they have already existing debt, to consider the financial implications of continuing your education at that time. That's not saying never go; rather, I'm only suggesting you consider what your debt obligations will look like in 3 1/2 years in comparison to what you could expect to make (i.e., the average salary of an attorney in Florida).

* I would urge them to try to obtain scholarships. The exorbitant cost of law school is something I seriously underestimated.

* If you can't get into a quality state school, don't go the expensive private route in hopes of finding a job. The risk is not worth the reward.

* If you have to pay for it don't go. If you are going to go, attend the best school you can receive a significant scholarship from, even if you are admitted to a "higher" ranked school.

* It is too expensive and not worth the payout.

* Law school costs a lot of money and there are not that many jobs. Do not go into the profession because you think you will make a lot of money. You may, but make sure it is what you want.

* Make sure that you have a plan because it is too expensive. If you are unable to find adequate work, your student loans will be a very large burden. In any event, they are a burden even with a job.
* Make sure to know that law school could be very expensive and student loans could be very hard to deal with afterwards.

* Make sure you are fully aware of the financial consequences if you are taking out student loans.

* Make sure you can afford it.

* Many people choose law because they do not know what else to do after undergraduate school. They should think long and hard before taking on close to $200,000 in loans.

* Only do it if your debt will be less than $50k.

* Really make sure it is what you want to do (because of loan debt issues) and go to law school in the area you want to eventually practice in.

* Reconsider because the cost for a legal education is not worth the return (as a lot of law firms are not willing to hire right out of law school unless you are at the top of your class).

* Seriously consider your options, the cost of law school and the cost of the student loans you'll be taking out, and weigh them against the current job availability and salary levels of attorneys in the job market today.

* Simulate your debt load by saving the approximate amount each month that you will be paying in loans.

* Think very hard and wisely. The cost is outrageous compared to the starting salary of the majority of first time employment opportunities and that is if you are lucky enough to be able to get a job upon graduation and passing the bar.

* To beware of the financial implications of attending private schools and the typical salary range for graduates.

* Unless you are able to afford law school, I would strongly advise that you consider the serious long term debt that is inevitable.

* Unless you are in the top five percent, and in some cases even if so, the benefits of law school are not worth the financial risk if you have to take out student loans.

* Unless you get into a top 20, have a scholarship that pays for most of it, or 100% have a job waiting for you at the end. DO NOT DO IT. It's not worth the debt and the horrible people you meet. I was one of the few lucky ones that didn't graduate top third in my class but still found an actual lawyering job, but I do have $165,000 dollars in debt that I'll probably have until I die.

* Unless you have a full scholarship, are inherently wealthy, or are alright with being crushed by over $100k in student debt, then do not go. Law school is not a 3 year commitment, but rather a 13 to 27 year commitment due to the repayment of all the debt.
that a student incurs. As a practical matter, a starting associate (or "fellow" as these firms are now calling it to pay even less) is $30k-$60k a year. After taxes, that new lawyer is taking home very little money. After a $700-$1200 a month student loan payment, paying rent (which is usually $1000+, depending on location), vehicle payments, insurance payments, etc., you are living paycheck to paycheck usually on a deficit.

* Weigh very carefully all the pros and cons especially the actual costs of law school. Go into law school with passion. Do not go to law school with the idea that you will be a rich attorney the day you get out of law school.

* You will be saddled with debt (or you will pay an outrageous out of pocket amount for in Florida tuition).

**Be Certain This is What You Want to Do – 37 Responses**

* Ask yourself why do you want to go to law school? Unless the answer is "I love the law," then think twice about your decision.

* Consider your level of commitment to the profession - it's a long and costly experience if you're not seriously considering a legal career.

* Do it if you are truly interested in the law, not because of money.

* Do not attend law school until you are absolutely certain that you want to be a lawyer.

* Do not do it for the money, do not choose a school based solely on the US News ranks. In my experience, happy lawyers are those that enjoy the practice of law, i.e., the intellectual pursuit of it all because the day to day responsibilities and stress of being a lawyer are often less glamorous that recent college graduates imagine. Be sure it is what you want to do.

* Do not go unless you are 100% certain that is what you want to do.

* Don’t go. Unless you love it and then it’s worth it.

* Don't go to law school simply because you don't know what else to do. Go to law school if you want to practice law or acquire a law degree for a different career. Take courses that will help you learn how to run a business.

* I tell them if they are sure they know they want to be a lawyer, major in philosophy. The philosophy undergrads tended to do better as a group in my law school. Also, make sure it is what you really want to do before law school, because law school is not the place to explore your potential desire to practice law.

* I would advise them to make sure it is something they really want because jobs are not easy to find and the starting pay is not enough relative to the cost of the law school investment. It is a fulfilling career but it is not for the faint of heart and they must be
prepared for the stress of lawyering. If they are going into law solely because they think they will make more money they will be disappointed so they should only go to law school if they like studying the law and helping people with their legal problems.

* I would take as many undergraduate courses with a focus on law in order to ensure that you are actually interested enough in law before you completely immerse yourself into that field.

* If possible, speak with law students and professors about their experiences. Also, consider whether you are willing to put in the time, not only in law school, but in a professional career that will often require you to work long hours.

* If you have the interest, drive and stamina for law school, go for it. Whether you pursue the practice of law or not, a law school education is invaluable and readily applicable to a myriad of professions.

* Know and understand why you wish to become an attorney.

* Make sure being an attorney is something you really want to do rather than a fallback option.

* Make sure it is really what you want to do. The law field is not a huge money maker like lay people think; it takes a while to get to that point, if ever. Talk to several lawyers before making your choice. You should also chose a major that you can fall back on if you end up not liking it (marketing, business, finance, and accounting).

* Make sure it is something you want to do, and carefully consider the costs of attending same.

* Make sure it is what they really want to do because it can be quite difficult sometimes.

* Make sure it's what you are really passionate about. If you are not dedicated, the stress and downfalls of the profession will not be worth it.

* Make sure that they really want to practice law before starting law school.

* Make sure that this is really your passion. Don't go because someone else wants you to.

* Make sure that you really want to be there. Don’t just go because you don't know what else you'd like to do.

* Make sure they really know what they're getting into and that it is something they actually want to do.

* Make sure you have a love for the law and a passion to help people/society.

* Make sure you want it for the right reasons.
* Not to take it lightly. Consider why you want to do it, compare it with other careers they are interested in.

* Only attend law school if you want to be a lawyer. There is a route to any other profession that does not involve law school, and if you need the degree, you can always go back later.

* Only go if you love the law. A passion for law makes the greatest attorney; a disdain for law will only grow worse with time. Whatever feelings you have about practicing as an attorney will only be emphasized as your career grows.

* Only go to law school if you are absolutely, 100% positive that there is no other career path that you wish to pursue. If you are even slightly interested in something else, do not go to law school.

* Only move forward with law school if you are willing to dedicate yourself and put law school first.

* Really look into the profession and make sure that it is what you want.

* Really research the practice of law and what you want to do with your law degree. It is a stressful job and a lot of work and I have found that most are very unhappy with their job. It is important to find out if it’s really what you want before you get started.

* Reconsider and make sure they really want to be a lawyer.

* Research well and make sure this is the career for you - the market is entirely over saturated due to too many law schools, so don't expect a big paycheck out of the gates. Make sure law is your passion. Without passion, you will not be a successful lawyer.

* Take a comparable course in undergrad to see if law school really is for you.

* Talk to multiple lawyers about the profession before applying and make sure it is something you might actually want to do with your life.

* Think hard if you really want to pursue a legal career, which is demanding and time consuming. Unless you are truly committed, consider other professions.

**Work Experience/Internship First – 27 Responses**

* Do an internship and make sure the law is what you want to do.

* Do an internship first to see what an attorney really does.

* Do your best to get exposure to working in a law firm or legal aid clinic either as an employee or intern.
Don't do it right after undergrad unless you plan to be in top 10% of your class and have demonstrated that type of academic success. Get some practical job experience first. Be sure you are interested in practicing law, not just putting off adulthood!

Don't go straight from college to law school. Take three years and work in a profession similar to the area you wish to practice.

Get some work experience in the field you studied before going to law school.

I think everyone should take at least a year or two off before law school, if not more time. This will allow them to determine whether law school is really what they want to do and/or do interesting things with their lives before starting a career.

I usually tell students to think twice before attending law school.

I would recommend some prior work experience. I would also recommend prior work experience more generally to allow them to mature into a professional, which is something that should occur before law school. Third, I would recommend that they be prepared to consider law school to be a grueling three year interview and screening process because that's what it really is - a marker on the road to getting your resume in the door with a decent employer.

If possible, work in a profession that interests you for a year before law school in order to get professional experience that could benefit you during and after law school in addition to the legal knowledge and experience you will receive during law school.

If the student places no priority on debt, then I would advise the student to take seriously the core courses and then complete externships and trial and pretrial preparation without any focus on the other courses. If someone wants to focus in a particular topic, like family or environmental law, then to go to LLM because certificates at the JD level are not as important as knowing how to write and handle court, which are taught in trial and pre-trial preparation. The person should take externships to help them have a better understanding of how a type of office/area of law operates and what are the daily demands of that type of legal practice.

Intern at a law firm. The smaller firms will give you more experience and the bigger firms will give you more prestige. Both will be beneficial.

Network. Find a legal job or an internship while you are in college. Get as much real life experience you can get so when you are able to select your elective classes in your 2nd and 3rd year you will be able to pick the classes that will be the most beneficial to your career.

Pick a specialty or two and get experience through an internship/externship. Begin networking early to help find a job upon graduation.

Suggest you talk with counsel in the venue you intend to practice. Do a whole lot of internships.
* Take a year off between college to work and travel. Work in a law office before you go.
* Take the time to work and gain real life experiences before going to law school this will help you tremendously in law school.
* Take time off first.
* They have to be committed to the profession since the market is so competitive right now. They should volunteer with Legal Services.
* Think very, very carefully about it. Don't go right into law school out of college. Work first.
* Try out a summer internship at either the Office of the Public Defender or the State Attorney, or otherwise entangle yourself in a legal setting amidst working professionals. Learn the inner workings of the system, the frustrations, and the triumphs. Use this time not only to volunteer your time but also gain sight into whether you want to become a member of the field. This could provide firsthand knowledge and connections, and allow college students to determine whether or not he/she should spend the 3 years immersed in legal education, not to mention the price of tuition to take part in the practice of law.
* Work as a paralegal for at least a year first.
* Work before going to law school.
* Work first in order to make sure that you actually want to go to law school.
* Work for a few years in the real world first; you gain maturity and judgment and have a less naive world view.
* Work in a particular field that interests you before you attend law school. You may find out that it is really boring or doesn't interest when you start. Or it may provide you with the skills that an employer will want to see and set you above you law school classmates when you are competing for the same job.
* Work or volunteer for a long enough period to develop practical skills and knowledge.

**Be Prepared to Work/Study Hard – 14 Responses**

* Although you are smart enough to get through undergraduate school without needing to study much, go the extra mile and study to earn excellent marks. Developing such study habits will prepare you for the work load that comes with being a first year law student.
* Be mindful that it is nothing like college.
* Be prepared to really commit to law school and treat it as a full time job.
* Be prepared to work quite hard.
* Don't stress too much. If your methods of studying have worked don't completely revamp them but just step them up a little.
* Get ready to work hard and be aware of what options are after law school.
* Get the hornbooks for the 1L courses and prime yourself for the topics. Learn how to study for long periods with few breaks.
* I always teach them my briefing method and advise them to talk with their professors and go to class! Study hard.
* Is this what you really want to do? If so, be ready to work harder than you ever have.
* Learn the system.
* Learn time management and handling large volumes of reading and note taking.
* Stay strong until the end. Perseverance is the key to success.
* The advice that I would provide to college students who are considering going to law school is to expose themselves to the various avenues in the practice of law. Then set goals that will help them pursue their defined avenue.
* Treat it like a full-time job. Go to as many networking events as possible and make and maintain connections.

**Take Certain Undergrad Courses/Have Certain Major – 13 Responses**

* Figure out what you want to do before you start law school, tailor your curriculum to that goal, and start your job search immediately.
* I would advise them to major in whatever they wished, just as long as they were developing research, writing and reading skills.
* I would encourage students to seek less traditional "law" majors, particularly if that student has an interest in a certain area (Ex: Chemistry vs. Criminal Justice major). Instead, seek to develop a well-founded knowledge in a certain subject area. Law school teaches one how to be a lawyer, but developing an expertise in an area will make that student more marketable in the long room and open doors that otherwise might not be available for the more "traditional" student.
* I would tell college students to take courses while in college that will help prepare them for law school.
Major in English, minor in Philosophy and take legal courses for your electives.

Read every example and explanation and or hornbook for each of the first year courses. For two reasons: (1) most law school concepts are foreign, having even a basic familiarity with the terms and concepts gives a leg up and; (2) to test the strength of their "interest" in law.

Study in an undergraduate field that will hone the skills listed above, or study in a law-related undergraduate field.

Take a major which will get you the best GPA and which you enjoy.

Take as many creative writing classes as you can to help your writing skills. Take as much mathematics as you can to assist your problem-solving. I am a tad biased; I was mathematics minor.

Take classes that require a lot of reading and writing, and logical thinking like math and science courses. No need to take political science if they have no interest, take courses they are interested in to increase their GPA.

Take courses or classes in improving your study skills. Become accustomed to un-learning and re-learning concepts.

Take courses that make you read.

Try to take as many of the legal courses available in your undergrad institution. For example if there are any paralegal studies programs or political science take advantage.

Don't Go to Law School – 10 Responses

Don't do it. (6 Responses)

As long as Florida has a dozen or more law schools and approximately three thousand graduates taking The Florida Bar Exam each year, I will not advise college students to attend law school and will do my best to warn them away from doing so.

Frankly: don't go! As it stands, law school is an abysmal investment. The vast majority of students considering law school see it as the only option to make something of their liberal arts degrees. Many of them believe that a law degree will give them options. In fact, it restricts their future employment options, as most traditional employers seem hesitant to hire lawyers for non-law roles. Those students get stuck under-employed in jobs they hate with mountains of debt. On top of all that, the legal industry doesn't have many good jobs available and even students who truly want to be lawyers are struggling to find the jobs they want.

Go to medical school instead.
Know that it's not as glamorous as it once was. You get out of law school with tons of debt, jobs are hard to come by, and they don't pay as great as they once did. You will likely say you want to do it to change the world and you care about the legal system. I think most lawyers went in with that attitude, but when you get out, you've got to pay your bills, and the idealistic side of the legal realm has to take a back seat.

**Saturated Job Market – 10 Responses**

A law school degree is unlikely to help you get any other kind of job. You can find anecdotal examples of people who did something other than be a lawyer with a J.D. - but that does not negate the general trend. And those people probably would have got exactly where they ended up if they had pursued the appropriate degree (MBA, marketing, etc.) instead of a J.D. There is only one job that requires a J.D. and that is a lawyer. Second, don't confuse the parts of law you like with what you actually want to do. If you love trial work and trial team, don't become a lawyer. 96% of cases settle and trial prep is nothing like trial. The most active and senior private litigators will rarely try more than two cases in a year. If you love IP work, remember that you won't get an IP job unless you live in D.C., Atlanta, Chicago, New York, or California. The market is oversaturated and everyone in your graduating class (and other graduating classes from other schools/states) will be applying for a job at the same time. Plus, you'll be competing with laterals from the last year or two. So you will take whatever job you can get. It probably won't be what you wanted unless you are in the top 10% of your class (and even then, it's not a sure thing). And for the most part, you'll be locked in to whatever your first job is. Because you probably won't be in a financial position to leave for a while and everyone will tell you no employer wants to see a job hopper. And, after two years, doing "X" law, you may be hesitant to start over in "Y" law. And you will have to start over - financially and otherwise. Because your labor-employment experience isn't useful to an IP firm. So why would they pay you like a third year lawyer? And what do you know about IP?

Also, the job market in the legal field is becoming increasingly difficult.

Be aware that the legal job market is completely and utterly saturated, and in reality, if you're not graduating from a T14, it's generally not worth going to law school unless you plan to practice in the city or town in which the law school is located. Prospective law students must also be aware of in which field of law the demand for legal practitioners is the highest to lowest (i.e. high demand for mortgage foreclosure attorneys in Florida, low demand for international human rights lawyers.) This sounds obvious. It's not. Too many of my peers (and I went to two law schools; went to one school for 1L year and transferred to a better school for 2L and 3L) had ambitions and expectations of becoming United Nations legal officers or big law corporate attorneys. This is statistically unrealistic, and prospective law students deserve to know the realities in the form of statistical evidence. In other words, it is misleading to NOT provide statistics on the percentage of the class that will in all likelihood become personal injury or DUI defense attorneys.

Beware of the job prospects upon graduating and the oversaturation of the profession.
* Do not feed into the sales pitch that there is a lot you can do with a law degree. There is a lot you can do without one. The cost/benefit ratio and the job opportunities are not present at a level that should attract individuals not interested in litigating. There are generally not positions with entities such as the SEC, FINRA or in corporations as counsel for first year students. The idea that there are "transactional" and "litigation" tracts are deceiving. Certainly there are a number of attorneys that do not litigate, but there are few opportunities for them to be hired as an attorney right out of school. Additionally, I would advise to plan for job placement sooner. Seek admission to summer programs, as this is the only way most large firms hire new graduates. If you wait until you pass the Bar to get a job, be prepared to work in a practice area such as insurance defense, PIP, personal injury, Family Law, foreclosure, or bankruptcy.

* Do you have a lawyer job lined up? Are you OK making far less then you could in other fields? If so, continue to consider law school.

* Don't do it. The job prospects are terrible.

* Don't go. Career prospects are dismal in Florida.

* Make sure you're sure you want to do it, because you will have a lot of debt and there are not many jobs. The legal community is currently saturated with attorneys.

* The landscape is changing. The six figure salaries upon graduating are not guaranteed. It is an over saturated market. There are already too many lawyers.

**Improve Reading/Writing/Various Skills – 9 Responses**

* All prospective students should look to improve or practice their reading comprehension skills.

* I would encourage the aspiring student to begin working on time management and organization skills now so as to be ahead of the curve when law school begins. Among other things, treating school like your job (even if you don't have to, given your intellect) goes a long way towards preparing for law school.

* Improve your writing skills.

* Learn how to write a proper legal paper.

* Learn to write clearly and concisely! Do not major in creative writing and English. Major in journalism so you can learn how to explain difficult concepts in laymen's terms.

* Major in English literature. Take public speaking classes.

* Study analytics and practice persuasive writing.

* Take as many writing courses as possible.
* Time management and reading.

**Shadow Attorney – 7 Responses**

* A year working in a law firm, or even shadowing an attorney for a month or two, would be extremely beneficial to finding that out.

* I would recommend that they shadow an attorney before actually beginning law school. I work at a law school and meet with several students who find mid-way through their law school career that they don't enjoy law and may not have the skill set to be a successful lawyer.

* Shadow a lawyer, it is not like television.

* Shadow an attorney to be sure they would be happy performing those tasks every day.

* To intern with a practitioner, or even just to shadow a practitioner for a short period of time, to determine whether the time, effort and student loan debt are worth the expenditure on the profession. If not genuinely convinced of a satisfaction in pursuing this profession, it might be wise to contemplate less costly alternatives.

* Try to shadow an attorney before applying so that you can understand the intricacies involved in practicing law (frequent late nights most if not every day, lack of family time, likely to work weekends) as it may not be what you imagined a legal career to be.

* You should talk to/interview as many people you can who have received their law degree and how they've used it. I'm still coming across ways that would have been nice to know about in law school so I could have taken the appropriate classes or training to prepare me.

**LSAT Related – 5 Responses**

* I would encourage the aspiring student to invest in an LSAT prep program (not simply a book) I still have no clue what the LSAT has to do with law school or legal acumen, but it matters a lot and is important for that reason alone. Last, I would encourage the aspiring to read law school prep books. They're a great source to begin to understand legal thought and what is expected of law students.

* If you do not do well on the LSAT, take it as a sign to consider a different profession that may suit you better.

* Make good grades and do well on the LSAT.

* Practice hard for the LSAT.
Practice the LSAT early, take full practice tests under testing conditions, and when you begin law school take any subjects that will be tested on your state bar.

**Consider Where to Go – 4 Responses**

* Forget about the promise of scholarships. Go to the best ranked school you can get into. The name recognition will take you farther than a first-year scholarship at a fourth-tier school.
* I advise them to go to the best and cheapest school.
* I would encourage the aspiring student to carefully consider where they go to school. It should not matter where you go, but it does and it's something some find out the hard way (I know from personal experience).
* Major in whatever you have a passion for because you do not need a specialized or specific undergraduate degree to be successful in law school or to have a successful law degree.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

**Be Certain This is What You Want to Do – 98 Responses**

* Only go if you really want to be a lawyer. *(6 Responses)*
* Don’t – unless it is your passion/calling. *(4 Responses)*
* Keep an open mind. *(2 Responses)*
* Are you going to law school because if sounds prestigious or is it a profession you want to work in? Make sure going for the right reasons as it is very expensive endeavor and earning potential not significant if not in top of your class compared to debt you will owe.
* Are you sure?
* Be certain because what was once a profession has been degraded. The law schools are too many; it is now big business with fewer opportunities and a significant expense with long term ramifications and huge debt.
* Be certain that they are not relying on the law school education solely to earn a living
* Be sure it is what you want to do.
Be sure that you actually want to practice law. Spend some time in a law firm or legal environment and ask questions of practicing lawyers. If you don't want to practice law do not go to law school.

Be sure that you want to be in the service industry.

Be sure. It can be a tough path, but can also be rewarding.

Choose another profession unless you are thick skinned and are driven to work hard. Being a lawyer is not a 9 to 5 job.

Decide what your professional goals are. Do you need a law degree to achieve those goals? What is it you want to do as a lawyer and how likely are you to achieve that level of practice?

Develop a business plan, which will force one to face harsh realities of what is expected from the student and from the legal profession. Unless that person can establish a true business plan with deliverables, marketing and a functional spreadsheet, the student should re-examine why he or she wants or believes he or she wants to attend law school. Since Florida has allowed numerous unranked law schools into the State, these students need to understand that the practice has changed forever as there are no barriers of entry. Therefore, marketing is of the utmost consideration. The law schools then need to teach these business realities to avoid a disconnect.

Do not consider attending law school for the assumed income or prestige. Consider attending law school if you love to learn, love to be challenged, and love to provide a service to others.

Do not consider it unless it has been your life's dream to practice law. I would warn them that the financial rewards may be disappointing and that there is an extremely high level of competition due to an oversaturation of law schools. I would encourage them to seek a different profession if they have any doubt about their desire to be a lawyer.

Do not go into the profession either as a default profession or with the thought of making a lot of money. Go into the profession only after considering whether you are willing to weather the storm of numerous rejections from law firms and government agencies as the job market is so tight. Also realize that you may have to start in a position in an area of law you never much cared for or even contemplated. Fully realize that litigation is pitiless, thankless and does not provide the rewards glamorized in TV, novels, and movies. Also, realize that law firms are not democracies, nor clubs, and that vested and equity partners are looking out primarily for their own interests and those of clients and not those of associates. It is the nature of the beast.

Do not go to law school for the purpose of becoming a better business person. Do it if you intend to practice and grow the profession.

Do not go to law school just because you don't know what you want to do after college.

5. Do not go to law school just because you could not get into medical school.
Don’t do it unless you are highly motivated.

Don’t go unless you are truly interested in the law; don't go just to put off entry into the "real world."

Don't do it for money or prestige. If you want to be a lawyer to help people and earn a decent living, do it. Think about practicing in small community.

Don't go because you're not sure what you want to do; only go if you are sure you want to become an attorney.

Don't go to law school as the next step in finding yourself. Go with a purpose that you want to learn to be a crusader for your future clients.

Don't go to law school because you think you'll become rich. Go to law school if you have a passion for helping others and resolving problems. Find a job you love once you graduate. Work-life balance is very important. Otherwise, you may find yourself very unhappy.

Don't go to law school unless you know what you want to do with the degree and have a plan to achieve it.

Don't go unless you really, really, want to be a lawyer. Law school sucks and it is such a miserable experience. Unless you really want to practice law, don't go. Find some other profession.

Don't go, unless you know exactly why you are going and what you want to do with your law degree. It is a highly competitive and stressful career.

Don't unless you are called deeply to enter the profession from a desire to help your fellow humans. Forget the money. If you are good at the practice it will come.

Enjoy what you do; otherwise you will be miserable for the next 40 years.

Going to law school is something you should only do if you are truly interested in the practice of law and enjoy research, writing, persuasive argumentation, and advocacy.

I tell them that they should only go to law school if they really, really want to be a lawyer (in whatever shape and form that takes) I tell them that there are way too many lawyers out there, and that this is way too demanding a profession for someone who's undecided. I loved law school, and I have enjoyed every single day of my profession. I remember being in law school, and waiting for my first semester marks, and thinking that I wanted to be a lawyer more than I wanted to breathe. I hope for the same for the young lawyers.

I would advise them that they must really, really want to be lawyers in order to make the process – including paying for law school – worthwhile.

If you aren't passionate about some area or aspect of the law or at a minimum intrigued by something in the law, then law school might not be for you; clients need lawyers with
a genuine interest or love of the law, not someone who is merely doing a job that seems prestigious.

* If you don't have a passion for it, don't do it, as it requires a lot of work, and the financial return should never be your motivation. Whatever you do for work, you'll be doing it for a very long time, so you have to feel passionate about it.

* Is this what you really want to do?

* It is a great, yet competitive, career choice. Therefore, you need to be somewhat passionate about it. You will be working with people so you need to hone your interpersonal skills.

* Just be sure that is what you want to do.

* Know what is motivating you to go to law school and determine what your life mission is. If the answer to that can be advanced by law school, then do it.

* Make certain that law is what YOU want to do.

* Make sure being a lawyer is really what you want to do, because the time and money put into law school is large (but worth it if you enjoy the career).

* Make sure it is something you are prepared to do and are prepared to dedicate the necessary time.

* Make sure it's something you want to do because it's an expensive decision.

* Make sure that is really what you want to do. Research this career path well before you commit.

* Make sure that is what you really want to do.

* Make sure that is what you want to do before undertaking a commitment for 3 years and thereafter.

* Make sure that this is an area you would like to actually practice, rather than just go because it is something that you think might be good to have under your belt or a segway into a different profession.

* Make sure that you are going to law school for the right reasons and have an understanding of the time commitment, stress, pressures, etc. that come with the profession.

* Make sure the law is the profession you want to pursue.

* Make sure you are doing it because you think you want to be a lawyer and not just by default.
* Make sure you are pursuing it for the right reasons; so many do not. You have to not only be detail oriented; you have to enjoy getting to the details.

* Make sure you are truly interested in learning the law and being a lawyer.

* Make sure you have the passion to practice law, disseminate legal advice, or even use that education for other endeavors, and not just attend because you cannot figure out what other vocation to pursue.

* Make sure you understand what the practice of law is really like.

* Only if you have no ambivalence.

* Person should be absolutely sure law school and therefore law practice is what they want to do because there are many, many days that the practice of law can be boring, stressful, unrewarding, and a grind.

* Pick an area you are truly interested in, not simply one that will maximize income.

* Realize much of society now does not hold attorneys in high regard. Realize the profession you will be entering is an important one. Truly ponder whether you wish to spend your working life helping others, or will you be entering the profession solely in the pursuit of a large paycheck. If it's the latter for you, don't bother.

* Reconsider and learn more about a career in law before committing.

* Reconsider your options. If you're going to law school because you can't think of anything better to do than the legal profession is not for you.

* Seriously consider whether want to practice law, or whether you want a law degree because it will assist you with other career goals. I would suggest the opportunity to practice law is becoming much more limited, and job and career satisfaction is becoming increasingly unlikely.

* Seriously think about the reasons why you are interested in pursuing a legal degree.

* Still a useful area of knowledge, but consider non-law firm employment options.

* They need to make sure they go to a good school. It's sad to watch young lawyers in the courtroom today compared to what they were 30 years ago. A young person today should only go into law if they are doing it out of a love for the law, if they truly want to make it their life's vocation and treat it as a profession. They should love it so much that they are willing to make all of the sacrifices and not make a lot of money. Atticus Finch didn't make much money, but he is what the American legal system is all about.

* They should not go unless they want to practice law or practice in a related field.

* Think about what kind of law you want to practice and identify your expectations for your practice. If you cannot picture either of those, then really think more before deciding
on going to law school. If you can picture those, talk to others who have the practice you want and see how realistic your goal is before making the final decision to go to law school.

* Think about why you want to be a lawyer and make sure you are being realistic about what it is like, and what your duty to your client demands, to live as a lawyer in the area of practice you are considering.

* Think about why you want to go and what you want to get form the process.

* Think long and hard about how you want to spend your life. Most attorneys involved in litigation are seeing and dealing with people at the worst times of their lives. Are you prepared to handle that day in and day out? Are you prepared to deal with opposing counsel, who may have no interest in resolving the case on the merits? Do you like lawyers enough to want to spend almost every waking minute with them, between work, networking, marketing, Bar functions, and similar activities? How well do you respond to the irrational and impractical demands of your superiors? If the answer is "not well," then you should find another career. At one time, being a lawyer was about helping people at the worst times of their lives. Now, your job will be to make the worst times of many peoples' lives worse. Can you do that and still sleep at night? If not, you find another career.

* Think long and hard about it and accept the proposition that for many years after you begin practicing you may be making not much more than a lower middle class salary and be prepared for that. You should plan to make not much and hope that you will be fortunate to make much more.

* Think long and hard about it and consider possible niche practices such as Patent, Trademark and Tax.

* Think long and hard about it. If you don't have any prior experience in the practice of law, you should at the very least intern with a law firm or several before going to law school.

* Think long and hard about that choice.

* Think long and hard about what you are looking to do as a lawyer and seek out those practicing in that area of law and talk to them.

* Think long and hard, and don't make law school a fall back for failure to find a career path in college. Many believe a law degree is automatic ticket for higher wages, which we know is not the case. To be successful (and not just monetarily), it will take hard work. Know that a career in law can be taxing on your own mental health, and can strain relationships.

* Think twice and go for the right reasons – and that is that you want a career in the law.

* Think twice. Future lies for those with prior work or business experience.
* Think twice; do it only if you are following your heart and have a true passion for many aspects of the law.

* Think very carefully because the field in Florida is hugely over-saturated. Think about other alternatives to practice. Take the focus off of money and destroying the other side. Hope that The Florida Bar does something to curtail the clownish advertising that makes the profession look money-grubbing and causes further deterioration of the image the public has of lawyers.

* To really think the decision over to determine if it's is worth going into a great amount of debt to enter a marketplace where there is a glut of attorneys.

* Try to talk to practicing lawyers about what a lawyer actually does on an average day, and think hard about whether that is really what you want to do. Don't buy into the myth that many law schools sell about a law degree opening doors to all kinds of potential, different careers. A law degree opens doors to being a lawyer.

* Unless you have always wanted to practice law, you might need to consider alternative careers.

* Use caution. Enter only after a sound business plan for the legal education and securing a legal job that suits your personality is in place. Unless you are fully prepared to be an entrepreneur, you have no business in law school! The idea that a law firm, OR State Attorney or Public Defender will scoop you up and train you and mentor you and keep you in the firm for any length of time happens to only a teeny, tiny portion of students (under 5%).

* What other interests do you have? What would you do if law school doesn't work out? Travel extensively before you make this commitment, move out of your comfort zone and limited social circle: your friends aren't all going to go to law school: be your own person. If this is someone else's dream, find your own. Talk to lawyers, volunteer or work in a law office. Also, ask yourself: Why do you want to go to law school?

* You better really want to do it and don't do it just because you haven't found a good job.

* You can attend law school regardless of your undergraduate major. With so many areas of the law one particular undergraduate major is not required. Prepare yourself for a career that you will enjoy in case you end up not going to law school or attendance at law school has to be delayed.

* You need to be committed; this is not a career for those who could not think of something better to do.

* You need to have core strengths and have a plan for improving on your weaknesses before law school. Try to get as much life experience as possible. Know how you will finance your degree.

* You really have to want to do this in order to come into our profession.
Loan Complications/Financial Advice – 97 Responses

* Don’t – too costly. (3 Responses)

* Ask yourself why you want to be a lawyer. If the answer is money, consider medical school, dental school or pharmacy school.

* At this time, I could not advise college students to go to law school. The expense is too much and like taking out a home mortgage. The return on the investment is too little unless you are the top of the class. I have two sons and have discouraged them from going to law school and have encouraged them to seek other professions.

* Attend a public law school or a private law school awarding substantial scholarship support. The overwhelming debt will otherwise haunt you forever.

* Avoid student loans. They can destroy the rest of your life.

* Be careful about student loans.

* Be cautious before committing to student loans if that is the only way you are able to attend law school. Unless you graduate in the top 10 percent of your class, the chances of obtaining a high-paying position are quite remote and you may find yourself forced to take a position that will make paying back the student loans quite difficult.

* Be prepared for a huge financial burden/loan that will follow you for years and years. Lawyers aren’t as sacred as they used to be. Look at the median salaries of attorneys, not the average salary.

* Be prepared for the law school loan debt. I graduated undergrad with no debt and then ran up $150k in loans for law school that will take 30 years (as a government employee) to pay them back.

* Be very wary about incurring large student loan debt.

* Better understand the compensation most lawyers receive. We work harder than many other professionals for less income. You may be able to achieve your career goals without going to law school

* Carefully evaluate loans and expected loan debt, and fully understand that "average" salaries are not what you should base your decision to take on significant loan debt. Try to gain experience working at a law firm in an capacity (a file clerk for example) to see if law is really what you want to do because once you borrow 6 figures of student loans, it is nearly impossible to change careers if you’re not happy.

* Compare the cost of going to law school with what you expect to do after law school.
Consider law school only if you truly love the law and are unconcerned about your future salary. If you're doing it to get rich, you're going to be sorely disappointed, and you're doing it for the wrong reasons.

Consider the amount of debt you will incur and be sure it is worth it.

Consider the debt you'll take on in order to earn a degree.

Consider the law as a profession and not simply as a way to earn money.

Consider your student loan debt very carefully and avoid bottom tier law schools.

Do it because you are passionate about the law, not because you think you are going to get rich.

Do not borrow money to attend.

Do not enter the profession in order to make a lot of money. If you are interested in learning a lot of substantive law and how to think like a lawyer proceed.

Do not expect that you will get rich quick.

Do not go if you have to incur significant debt to do so.

Do not go if you think you will be rich because you are a lawyer.

Do not go to law school if your only goal is to make money.

Do not go to law school unless you can pay for it without any student loans! This topic has been thoroughly discussed, but schools are financing their other academic programs on the backs of law students.

Do not unless you can gain admission to the best law schools and expect to excel. Otherwise, the "cost" of law school is just too great if you are going to rely on student loans.

Do your homework. Compare the most common starting salary to the amount of debt that you will incur to get your law degree.

Don't go to a private law school unless you are wealthy or someone else is paying for it; you don't want to be stuck with tremendous financial obligations that you struggle to pay.

Don't assume that you will have a successful career financially. Go to law school if you have a passion for the law or serving the underserved and are willing to forego the big bucks.

Don't become a lawyer if you are expecting a large income and a normal work week.
* Don't do it just for the money, because that may not be there. If you have a passion for practicing law, being a lawyer, or some other profession that would flow from a law degree, I would do it but carefully consider the financial and opportunity costs.

* Don't do it. Law school is expensive and time-consuming. The financial benefits usually do not outweigh the debt incurred. Even if the college student will not need student loans, most lawyers are not wealthy. Many cannot find jobs after graduation. Also, law school becomes the center of your world for three years. Those three years could be better spent with family, attending to your own personal growth, and earning a living, possibly even in a more lucrative profession. Unless the law is your passion and your only career-related passion, I would recommend not going.

* Don't expect to graduate and make big bucks, plan on working your way up the ladder.

* Don't go if you are only going because you think you will earn a lot of money as an attorney.

* Don't go if your motive is just to become rich. The legal profession has changed and there is no guarantee of financial success. Only enter law school if your goal is to enter and preserve a time-honored profession that is noble and vital to our freedoms.

* Don't go into debt to pay for law school.

* Don't go to law school but if you want to go, don't go into it for the money.

* Don't go to law school to make money. Go to law school because you are genuinely interested in the law and helping others. You will likely not become rich practicing law so you need to enjoy your job.

* Don't go unless you can afford it without taking out massive student loans.

* Don't learn law in order to earn a good income. Some lawyers get rich, but most don't, and plenty struggle. Way too many lawyers hate what they do.

* Don't take out student loans.

* Don't think a law degree equates to riches.

* Don't unless you have a real interest in the law, public service, and justice. Don't unless you have the financial means other than by borrowing. Don't if all you see is a well paying job when you get out and don't care about anything else except the money.

* Don't. Unless you have wealthy parents, you will be saddled with six figure student loan debt until just about retirement age. You won't be able to help your own kids with college costs because you will still be trying to dig yourself out of debt when your kids are 18. Decent, high paying law jobs are few and far between and getting scarcer by the day. It's simply not worth it to gamble your financial future.
* First, obtain all information available about the average salary of a lawyer in your state. I cannot tell you how many wasted law degrees are out there. Folks just decide I am not going to work this hard for just this much money. Not a problem, but students just need to know at the outset. Maybe send an outline with the law school admission package.

* Get a practical legal education which emphasizes things that real attorneys do every day. The other thing would be that there are so many attorneys that if one's only opportunity to get into and complete law school involves the acquisition of a burdensome debt, the person should consider another field.

* Give careful consideration to the fact that it is not all about making money, but about making a difference in the lives of one's clients while maintaining a balance in life.

* Go to the cheapest law school you can find.

* Have a trust fund.

* Honestly, at this point, I tell most people it is not worth the cost. If “daddy” is very well connected and you can get into a top notch school and money is no object, it will probably pay off for you and it does not matter anyway. Otherwise it is just far too expensive for the real world jobs that are available as you will never pay off the student loans and be able to afford a home, family and to support a practice at the same time. I do encourage people (primarily women) who have been a paralegal or otherwise worked in a firm for awhile and have some real world experience to consider law school on a part time basis and take a few years to get through it but to pay for it as they go (or see if their employers will pay at least a portion of the cost) I would have made quite a bit more money if I had not become a lawyer and did not practice as a lawyer. But the 3 years spent in law school were also very valuable to me in terms of learning to think like a lawyer which is a skill that can be utilized well in many different ways. it is just now, an extremely expensive skill to obtain.

* I always tell prospective law students to really consider the "business of obtaining a law degree"- i.e., the cost of tuition versus the reality of obtaining gainful and meaningful employment.

* I would advise against incurring large amounts of debt. I also would point out to them the absolute necessity for cultivating the ability to attract clients if one is in private legal practice.

* I would ask why they want to attend law school. If the answer is that they want to make a lot of money, I would dissuade them and steer them to the investment banking area. I would advise a student that the practice of law is an honorable profession and that he or she should be prepared to uphold the high ethics expected of all lawyers. I would also tell the student that the practice of law is not easy.

* I would tell them to look at how many hours they want to work and how much they expect to be paid. Then advise them what hours it really takes to make a decent salary now. To run the financial simulator (student loan, basic rent/utility/groceries) to see how
much they must make out of law school to survive and then what they equates into for a job.

* If student loans will be necessary, to do research on the costs and repayment structure of student loans, and to very seriously, methodically consider the costs vs. benefits, and the likelihood of being able to promptly, if ever, pay off student loans. The research should include the actual monthly loan payment compared to likely starting salaries.

* If their motivation is only to earn more income than they might in some other field, forget law. They should want to serve their fellow humans; earnings should be secondary.

* If they want to just hang out their own shingle, I would tell them to reconsider. There are a lot of starving lawyers out there.

* If you are doing it for future income, think again. Student loans will have you making a payment similar to a house payment for 20 years.

* If you cannot go without borrowing money, don't go.

* If you have to borrow more than $25k, don't go. If you have to borrow more than $25k to go to a school that is not in the first tier, consider using that money for lottery tickets instead. Law school was interesting, and the practice of law can be a great job, but all things considered it just does not make financial sense for most people.

* If you need an income, do not go to law school and borrow a truck load of money to pay for it. Analyze how you might make a living and how your skill set might work in another profession all together, and then review the average wages. Then review the same about authentic data for lawyers. Then, average the costs and overhead and insurance expense of being a lawyer.

* If you're not comfortable being burdened without outstanding amounts of debt, law school is not the proper place for you.

* It gets old very fast. It takes an inordinate amount of time to build a practice on your own and because there are so many attorneys out there, it is hard to find a job with a good firm so the pay is always going to be lower than you were once led to believe. Then there is the cost of education. There are so many law schools out there and they don't really teach. You read and learn on your own. No one is paying a huge amount to get that diploma. That debt can last a long, long time. So my advice is that unless you want to work your rear end of for pennies, especially for the first five years and then give up your weekends for the rest of your career, forget going to law school and find another profession like in IT or the medical field (though not necessarily an MD because we are being flooded with them also) or in management.

* It is very hard to justify the costs of law school (especially if loans are needed to complete college and law school) versus realistic income expectations. Unless someone has their heart set on becoming an attorney, it just does not make sense to me for someone to spend the time and especially the money to go to law school. I have been a practicing attorney for almost 30 years. When I graduated from law school, I owed
$15,000.00 in student loans. My monthly payment was under $200.00, which was equivalent to a car payment. This was realistic for me and everyone else in my class. Within ten years of my graduating, I was hiring young attorneys to work for my firm, paying them about $40,000.00 per year. I could not figure out how they could afford to live, since they told me that they owed about $100,000.00 in student loans. My understanding is that today, law students are graduating over $200,000.00 in debt. Average starting salaries (other than at the top firms) are not that much more than $40,000.00 per year. It is unfair for us to be recommending the legal profession, when young lawyers, on average, will not be able to afford much more than simply paying back their loans for several years.

* Law school is a huge sacrifice of time and money. Unless your parents are rich you will be going into massive debt to obtain your legal education. Be 100% sure that this is the road you want to be on. Also be aware that it can take years if not decades to recoup the investment that you made in your education. If you are going into law for the money than you are not going into it for the right reasons and there are lots of other careers that can earn you more money with less education. Also, don’t be in such a hurry to graduate that you do not enjoy the law school experience more. Law school is hard but it’s also fun and you should take all the opportunities you can to get the most out of it as possible.

* Law school is too expensive, and student loan debt can hobble you. Attempt to work during school and pay as you go.

* Law school is very expensive and the job market is diminishing. Think long and hard about this choice and ultimate career plan. The cost and time investment may not justify the returns.

* Lawyers are not always rich, and most graduates do not earn six-figure salaries right out of law school (or for quite some time, for that matter) Make good choices as to what law school you attend, particularly concerning the financial obligations you will be assuming to attend that law school. Do not assume massive student loan debt if you can help it because it will affect your choices for decades. Work hard, find a practice area you enjoy, and know that if you do the practice of law can be very rewarding.

* Make sure that this is the career for them. Get the best bang for your buck, be careful with student loans.

* Make sure you are going for the right reasons and not because you want to be rich!

* Make sure you are not making the decision because you think it will provide more money in the future.

* Might not be worth the financial investment.

* My first advice is to select another profession. Due to over-crowding and increased educational expenses, the legal profession is not economically viable to most students. Unless one has $200,000 to $500,000 to spend on an education it is not feasible. Student loan interest simply makes becoming a lawyer a losing economic proposition. The
average cost of a private legal education, when interest is added, cannot be recovered over the average legal career. Many of the newly admitted bar members have more than $250,000 in debt. With interest ticking on that amount, they cannot make it. Many of the newly admitted members I have interviewed recently have required $60,000 starting salary because they cannot pay their loans and live with a lesser salary. However, their market value has no relationship to their debt. Simply put, in my part of the state the market rate for a new lawyer with no experience is $45,000 to $50,000. Perhaps in Miami or Tampa the market may be higher, but so is the cost of living. Moreover, the integrity within and respect for our profession is in sharp decline. This is, again, due to over-crowding and lack of mentoring.

* Only attend because you want to be a lawyer (or need legal training for the work you wish to do after graduation) and not for any perceived stature or financial benefits. They need to understand the time and lifestyle commitment associated with a successful practice.

* Pursue the law as a passion, not for the potential income.

* Realize much of society now does not hold attorneys in high regard. Realize the profession you will be entering is an important one. Truly ponder whether you wish to spend your working life helping others, or will you be entering the profession solely in the pursuit of a large paycheck. If the latter, then don't bother.

* Really consider the financial consequences (e.g. debt) of going to law school, especially in the event the practice of law turns out not to be what they expected.

* Research the job markets and pay scales in desired local markets. Compare tuition rates at public and private schools. Compare the ROI and demand for other areas of interest, e.g. engineering and medicine.

* Seriously consider whether they are likely to be able to obtain employment in the type of legal work in which they are interested and, if so, whether that will enable them to live the lifestyle they desire considering (i) the amount of debt they will have a result of going to law school and (ii) the amount of billable and marketing work that will be required of them if they are to be successful.

* Strongly consider other professions. The amount of time and money expended on a legal education is not really worth it. It's not worth it to borrow $150,000 or more to become a lawyer. No realistic chance of paying their money back in a 20 year time period.

* That a law degree is not a destination but an entry requirement and that there are many things you can do with one, but it is no longer a guarantee of riches.

* The college student should be realistic about job prospects and financial compensation, and then decide whether the time and money that will be invested in law school will be worth it.

* The legal profession is not a guaranteed ticket to a big salary. There is a misconception that all lawyers make a lot of money, and that simply is not true. To be successful, you
must put forth your absolute best effort. Make sure you choose a practice area that truly interests you. If you don't, you will be very unhappy and will burn out.

* Their goal is to be a good lawyer, not to make money.

* They need to reassess their basis for wanting to practice law. It is not for everyone. People naturally assume that if they become lawyers they will become rich, and powerful. That is not the case for everyone.

* They should understand that, in the current environment, they should not expect the law to be an avenue for substantial financial gain.

* Think long and hard before taking on the loans.

* Think twice about it due to the heavy debt burden. If they have a scholarship or a full ride, law school is a good option. If they have will be borrowing the full amount, I don't believe it is a good option.

* To think hard about considering a career where he/she can provide for his family without incurring in a massive debt that most attorneys will carry for the next 20 years of their live, affecting them as to mortgage options, places to live, schools for their kids, etc.

* Try to do it with as little debt as possible and don't sell out, your reputation is gold.

* Weigh the costs and all alternatives.

* While earning a living is important, financial reward is not a good reason to attend law school.

* You might end up hating it with a ton of debt.

* You will be paying off student debt for the rest of your life. You should speak to a parent or a financial counselor about the amount of debt you will incur and how long it will take to repay.

Take Certain Undergrad Courses/Have Certain Major – 78 Responses

* Major in what you like in college and do well. (2 Responses)

* Additionally, while there will always be a need for attorneys in private practice, it is honestly not a lifestyle that I think is conducive to personal growth. There are many alternative careers available to someone with a law degree, and from that perspective law school may be worth the investment. If the student was set on attending law school, I would suggest that the student seek out additional courses that could prepare him or her to understand the actual practicalities of being a lawyer and contributing to a practice.
* Business majors do well in law school.

* Choose a major based on what interests you. Don't major in "pre-law" unless you want to. Focus instead on getting good grades.

* College students who wish to go to law school should major in English (or take additional writing courses).

* Complete a broad liberal arts curriculum. Achieve distinction on scholarship as an undergraduate.

* Concentrate a significant portion of your undergraduate courses in marketing and finance.

* Consider an undergraduate program in journalism.

* Consider getting a simultaneous MBA.

* Depends on the planned law practice, but reading and writing and business classes of all types seem generally the most beneficial.

* Develop expertise in something other than law. Take courses in bookkeeping, accounting, and finance.

* Do not take legal studies in undergraduate. Rather take political science, business, psychology, etc. Learn to think analytically. Take some logic courses Learn to interact with people face to face- develop your people skills Learn technology but do not rely on it

* Don't major in political science or criminal justice. There are not enough opportunities to develop critical thinking skills in those majors. Take courses which introduce some business law concepts. Take courses in accounting and finance - understand how money is counted. Take higher level math courses - students really need to know more than basic algebra. Take a logic course and a statistics course - they help introduce analytical reasoning skills.

* English and Business courses.

* Excel and develop a passion for English, logic, public speaking and writing courses, speed reading courses.

* Find a niche area you can specialize in before law school.

* Focus on and excel in the chosen undergraduate study that's of primary interest (e.g., science, art, math, social studies) and also take electives that hone the attributes of a lawyer.

* Get a good, well-rounded education. Take a course in public speaking, drama, basic accounting, and philosophy.
* Go for it. Take debate, take public speaking, and take writing classes.
* Have a business background. This is real work, not for idealists.
* Have a liberal arts background but also take computer engineering and/or computer science classes.
* I always suggest going to trade school first so they have a profession that makes money even in a rocky economic climate. That way if "this law thing" doesn't work out, they can make a healthy income in some kind of trade.
* I often tell them not to. Get technological certifications first and then law if they still feel compelled.
* I would give them the same advice my dad gave me (who had also attended law school and is a successful businessman. Law school is an excellent education. It will teach you how to think and evaluate, and open doors into a variety of opportunities. Law practice is only one area, but lawyers contribute significantly in the business, government and education fields. Don't feel like a literal preparation such as a pre-law program is the only way to go. Choose undergraduate disciplines that focus on thinking and analysis.
* I would stress business and finance classes over other classes.
* I would urge them to obtain the most diverse and liberal undergraduate education they can.
* If they have any interest in a commercial/business practice, make sure to take some business courses as well (such as business management); business acumen is necessary and often overlooked in law school. A lawyer needs to understand business implications/realities in order to effectively counsel/represent businesses.
* If you have an idea for what area of law you want to practice in, try and make sure your undergraduate classes give you a strong base for that area because you are not going to gain any specialized knowledge in particular fields in law school.
* If you intend to practice on your own or own your own firm one day, take business classes, business law classes and classes that involve history of the U.S. and the legal system/political system.
* Learn some accounting, bookkeeping, and, most of all, computer and tech skills.
* Look for diverse learning methods; interactive and speaking learning environments will help.
* Look for every opportunity to research and write; take classes that make you think and present information both in writing and orally; take classes that cause you to test your beliefs. Even if you are a business major, look for smaller classes with opportunity to interact with classmates and the professor.
Major in business or economics and go for an MBA rather than law school. A successful businessman can always hire lawyers and truly successful businessmen end upon knowing more about the law that affects their field than most lawyers.

Major in business.

Major in or take classes that force you to write frequently and under time constraints.

Make sure college major hones writing, analytical, and debate skills.

My advice would be to engage in some mentoring and sales/marketing courses. Most students don't grasp how marketing and business development is a necessary part of a legal practice until it's too late.

Of course, if the question is "How do I get in?" get the best grades you can get in the most challenging courses you can take at whatever school you are attending, and be active in SOMETHING while in school, whether it is research, student politics, intercollegiate or intramural athletics.

Select a major/minor that will assist you in reading comprehension and writing.

Take a speed reading course and keep up with that skill.

Take a wide variety of subjects to prepare and take a wide variety of law classes in law school; you will not be able to predict the areas that you will actually end up practicing in for the most part.

Take accounting courses. Understand that the practice is very demanding of your time If you like problem solving, it is a good area to study.

Take as many courses (or major or master in) speech communication, argument and debate, rhetorical theory, psychology, etc.

Take as many courses on writing, philosophy, logic, and read comprehension.

Take as many courses that have practical application as you can.

Take as many Math, History (United States and world), English, Literature and Science undergraduate classes as possible. Law Schools should give enhanced grade credit for such classes over the "candy class courses".

Take as many speech, writing and law classes as you can whether on line or in the classroom to make sure that you are making the right decision as law school is extremely expensive.

Take Business and Marketing courses, critical thinking courses, and all the writing courses you can.

Take Business courses: Accounting, Business Relations, Contract Law, etc.
* Take classes requiring you to read and write a lot, because it will give you a leg up in law school. Anything that can increase your critical thinking skills is also helpful. Give yourself as well-rounded an education as possible, and try to give yourself leadership opportunities inside and outside the classroom (i.e., extracurricular activities) to prepare you for life as a lawyer.

* Take classes that help to develop and hone a thought process as well as classes that help to develop methodical thought.

* Take classes where you are challenged to think and express yourself orally and in writing.

* Take comprehensive English courses; take two years of Spanish; take one year of accounting.

* Take computer and business courses. Do volunteer work with non-profits or legal aid groups. Build your resume by your involvement in the community.

* Take courses in finance, learn to type, and learn your way around a computer if they don't already know. Take courses outside your major, such as computer programming so when you feel trapped in your profession you have another skill. Take debate, you'll learn there a lot to help you in your first year, and if your college has pre-law, take legal research and writing to start to hone your craft.

* Take courses that improve analytical and critical reading, writing and thinking, as well as research skills.

* Take courses that introduce them to the many relationships between people and businesses. Take finance, business management courses or contract courses.

* Take courses that require analysis of information such math; economics; psychology and sociology, as well as business courses to understand financial statements and accounting.

* Take courses that require clear writing.

* Take courses that require the development of writing skills. Also, take courses that develop analysis, logic, reasoning and decision-making. Take at least a few business courses - economics, finance and accounting.

* Take less history and more math, science or even philosophy classes. Learn how to problem solve and not just accumulate information.

* Take liberal arts courses.

* Take lots of courses concerning creative and proper writing and other communication skills, such as public speaking.
* Take many courses that require you to read, write and think critically. Also, work at an attorney’s office or the state attorney/PD’s office. It may even be more beneficial for them to do a paralegal certificate program while in college.

* Take more hardcore science classes and less political science!

* Take research and writing classes as well as logic classes. If you are not successful with these types of classes, then practicing law may not be for you. I’ve always felt that my ability to write well and to analyze issues has distinguished my work from that of my peers.

* Take some basic business courses and courses that require writing in order to have some basis skills which will be further developed in law school. If the student knows which area of the law in which they want to practice, they should load up on undergraduate courses that will compliment those areas of law.

* Take some business courses in undergrad because practicing law is also a business and they do not teach you that in law school. Consider going to school in the city you will practice in because you will meet many people in law school that could become excellent business contacts and referral sources in the future. I would also tell them to shadow an attorney before considering going to law school because life as a lawyer is not what you see on TV.

* Take some business courses to include banking and economics, take some courses in logic and/or mathematics and take courses in literature, writing and speech.

* Take some courses in areas in which you do not expect to practice as it will better prepare you for an unknown future.

* Take some pre-law classes to get a better idea of what will be expected during the 1st year.

* Take writing and English classes in addition to government and political science.

* Take writing-oriented coursework very seriously and spending time learning how to diagram and understand decisional case law.

* These are your must-have classes: US History (2); World History (2); Ancient History (1); Logic; Philosophy (2); Art History; Sociology; Ethics (general and of science); English (literature and writing); any language; any music; Speech (composition and speaking); any Math; any Technology class. After this, you are on your own, choose what you fancy. The idea is you must be a well-rounded, thinking and creative individual. Is the exception patent law? I do not think so. They need a background in technology, but that changes so quickly that what they learn today is out of date in three years or less. They need to know WHY, more than WHAT. That is the problem with online learning - no why, but lots of what because that is easier to teach. It takes smart teachers to crank out smart students.
* Try to obtain a broad education with course work in English writing, business writing or such. Take some basic courses in accounting and finance.

* Try to take a law class while you're still in college and see if you love it.

* Undergraduate degree should be in a fallback position should law school not work out or the degree should be complimentary to the desired legal practice i.e., nursing if you want to be a malpractice or personal injury attorney.

---

**Don’t Go to Law School – 72 Responses**

* Don't do it. *(41 Responses)*

* Become an engineer instead. *(5 Responses)*

* Think twice about it. *(5 Responses)*

* Go to Medical School instead. *(3 Responses)*

* Do not go. It seems like the legal profession has no united public relations to counter the anti-lawyer attitudes of the public. I believe the negative public perception of the legal profession has directly or indirectly led to so-called tort reform over the years, which has led to evisceration of statutes/law rather than reform. Practically, this has led to fewer jobs for more attorneys (since additional law schools have opened since I graduated).

* Don't do it. The actual practice of law is completely different from most people's expectations. It is a meaner, more desperate field today than when I started.

* Don't go. With respect to our state bar, I believe the Bar has done a very poor job of protecting the right of attorneys to practice law, of defending our reputations as lawyers by constantly publicizing rule violations, by permitting the mass expansion of law schools and law school class sizes, and failing to aggressively confront the unlicensed practice of law. My opinion may change if we can figure out a way to convince state bar associations that their primary purpose is to support attorneys by providing meaningful assistance instead of defaulting to "did you read the rules" in response to every question from practitioners, defending wages by opposing mass expansion of law schools and law school class sizes, and aggressively defending the profession against unlicensed practitioners.

* Don't. Technology is killing the profession. Advertising is denigrating the profession. Stress is killing the lawyers. The bar associations are ignoring their members by not urging criminal prosecution of those who are not authorized to practice law, but are doing so.
* Don't. That's the advice I've given any that asked me. If they insist they will, then my advice is never work for a government agency, and if you must, work for the federal system.

* Go into another profession and make enough money to hire a lawyer, if you need one.

* I tell them not to go as it is not worth all the struggles they will encounter from a mental standpoint.

* I would strongly recommend against a college student attending law school.

* I wouldn't advise anyone to go to law school. The profession is no longer honorable as attorneys no longer represent their clients, but themselves. Personal injury attorneys are ruining the practice of law. One piece of advice, practice what you are interested in i.e., Aviation or Environmental Law. Have a passion for a topic of law and practice it, instead of becoming a personal injury attorney as many do/default.

* I've been a prominent litigator & trial lawyer in 2 states for 35 years. I've worked for myself as a sole practitioner and I've worked for firms among the largest in the nation. I hated every minute of law school, hated having to take the bar exam 3 times in each state before passing it, had only marginal success in my career and was overwhelmed my entire career until my heart attack last year by crushing, relentless stress, pressure, toxic, angry, bitter, unappreciative, confrontational lawyers, adjusters, judges, clients and witnesses. The profession exacts demands unlike any other and takes its toll on the lives of the lawyer and his/her family. In my 35 year career, I have never been sued for legal malpractice and have never had a disciplinary problem in either of the 2 states in which I'm admitted. I'm proud of that and it's not been easy when so many in our profession are corrupt, unethical & dishonest, whether for money or power. There are far many other easier and less stressful ways to make far more money. My advice to college students considering going to law school is: don't do it. But at the end of the day, I don't regret my decision to become a lawyer for 1 second. I have loved my career, loved being a lawyer, would like to feel that I have contributed something and am most proud of my accomplishments.

* Not to. Actually, get an MBA. Law school is not a great education today. Helps you think critically, but not creatively. Legal Zoom has done $100M and a profit of $12M. Seriously more revenue than most law firms combined. they did it in 10 years. Our profession is dying, or at least decaying into mediocrity. I am enjoying watching the Bar’s Vision 2016 process but your team has not really recruited many innovators. Instead there are lots of commentators, professors, etc.

* Reconsider your choice. Law school does not guarantee a happy and productive life, Get your priorities straight, money is not everything.

* Rethink the proposition. The state bars fail miserably in regulating the number of new lawyers entering the workplace. New graduates are struggling to find positions while state bars collect fees and require costly CLE courses. The cost of courses should be
included as part of the annual dues. I cannot think of a single benefit I've realized from being a member of The Florida Bar other than the right to practice.

* Steer yourself to the sociopaths who find cover under the guise of "zealous representation". They will make you question whether honesty, integrity and self-control have any place in our profession. Once those qualities are lost, then society will be lost, too.

* Think again. Try to make a more positive contribution to society than you will as a lawyer.

* Think of ways to effectively use a legal education not necessarily by actually practicing law. Understand technology to the fullest extent possible.

* This depends on the person. A lot of times the advice might be "don't".

* Try to find something else.

**Miscellaneous – 69 Responses**

* Do it. (9 Responses)

* Have a back-up plan/career. (4 Responses)

* A law degree can be valuable even if the person does not plan to practice law. Our world is increasingly relying on the rule of law to regulate our activities, both in the US and globally. Gain an understanding of the basics of operating a business, including finance.

* Although there are a lot of attorneys today, as my professor told me, it continues to be possible to live greatly in the law. It must be done with honesty and integrity.

* Always have respect for Judges.

* Be aware of the changes that the profession is experiencing and to avoid being too ideologically motivated.

* Be open to alternative uses of your law degree beyond the practice of law.

* Be passionate and proud about the practice of law because you will be devoting your life to it both now, as a student and later in practice. Be prepared for the unexpected. Be willing to always learn and find the absolute best answer/solution and always be honest with what you don't know so that your client knows that he or she can trust you to do the best job or have the matter handled by the attorney who can do the best job for the matter.

* Be prepared to have to build your practice. At some point, you have to have your own client base. If you want to practice in a niche area, be prepared to move to a major city or
at least in a national firm because it is much more difficult to develop that type of practice other than in a large city. Laws focusing on governmental regulation, for example, are best practice in national firms or in large cities, particularly Washington and New York.

* Better understand career alternatives and objectives.
* Can you handle high levels of stress?
* Consider whether you are comfortable being able to help people and tolerate not being able to help.
* Do the best that they can in law school and attempt to get practical experience in the areas in which they appear to be interested.
* Don’t do it unless you want to do transactions and wills.
* Don't get married until after law school and most definitely do NOT have children unless a parent lives in the house or a nanny can be hired.
* Don't let anyone get in the way of your dreams.
* Don't limit prospective jobs to private practice.
* Engage in law as a profession not as a business.
* Everyone thinks that they will be respected if they become a lawyer. In reality, lawyers are not well liked, are made fun of, and most people still think of them as being one step above used car dealers. It is very hard for the public to find good, affordable lawyers and so many people resist getting a lawyer for simple things that often turn into quagmires just to save a penny. There is a lot of stress in this profession. Spending many hours preparing for trial and constantly worrying about the outcome drives many to drink or take drugs. If you cherish your health, don't bother to become a litigator.
* Follow your own path, don't copy someone else.
* Get used to dealing with people’s problems. Then get used to having to explain to them that the "real" law is what the judge says it is in his/her courtroom, not necessarily what years of case law or statutes might say.
* Go into business.
* Go with an open mind. Do your best. Be open to all prospects for employment once you graduate. A law degree is worth it even if you don't end up practicing law.
* Go.
* Go. Avoid the practice of law, but the learning is great.
* Have a back-up plan and get a degree that is marketable if you are not successful in or simply don't enjoy practicing law one you are admitted. Take advantage of internships and clerking positions that will expose you to different areas of the law to allow you to find your niche rather than just taking a job with a firm upon graduation.

* I attended law school because I had a passion for the subject. I continue to believe it is one of the best post-graduate experiences. I would advise students to keep an open mind to the wide range of opportunities they can pursue with this type of advanced education, and not limit themselves.

* I would encourage them to go and get that education, but try to maintain their integrity.

* I would have had a lot of advice years ago, but expectations have been so heavily lowered, I don't really know what they are anymore.

* It is not what you see on television. Silk stocking firms are a rare and dying breed. You will work more hours then you believe you should even in the public sector. It is important to create a law career that meets the needs of your family and personal life and not be dragged into just the allure for money. Balance is the true key to happiness. The law profession makes a difference in the personal lives of your clients. You should always consider their best interests even when they won't which means that you will not always see eye to eye with a client.

* It's awesome, builds character and skills whether you ever practice law or not.

* It's still a valuable education whether you practice law or not.

* Just get through it. I do not feel much of what you learn in law school prepares you for real life law practice.

* Know that law school and the practice of law are two completely different things. It’s the difference between being a librarian and an author. One reads about life through the words of others. The other lives life and writes about it.

* Know what you want to do before you start law school.

* Law is a jealous mistress so be prepared that dependent on what area of law you may be interested that your time may not be your own so you need to determine very early on what area of law interests you and weigh the pros and cons involved with that area/practice of law.

* Law school is completely different from the practice of law. The problem with law school is that for the most part, the courses are taught by people who hate being lawyers.

* Law school opens many doors to a legal or none legal career. It is a great experience for anyone interested.
Learn how to understand relationships between people and the various factors that go into whatever agenda they bring to the legal issue existing between them. Often, this comes from life experiences they have been through.

Learn how to work well with others.

My advice would depend entirely on my assessment of the student’s ability and concern for fairness.

None that I can think of, other than encouraging them.

Open yourself up to the entire experience and don’t focus too closely on one area or path.

Particularly for young women: do they want to have children? If so, when and where do they think they will be in 5 years of practice? The truth is most women are staring down partnership when they are also looking to have children and while the two are not mutually exclusive, they normally delay each other. This is not to say folks should not become attorneys, but I think there are too many coming out that have no idea of what the profession (not job) requires.

Read 5 books written by John Grisham, two of which should be "The Litigators", which describes law practice at the high end of the "food chain" and at the street level of divorce, accidents, etc., and "The Rainmaker", which was also an excellent movie. No kidding!

Research the legal jobs available and determine if you would be satisfied with doing that type of work.

Set your sights on getting an LLM after your JD, and seeking admission to practice in more than one state.

That it is indeed trade school, despite the theatrics and claims that it is an academic endeavor.

That would depend on the student. There are both pros and cons to law school.

The field is overflowing. If you go, look broadly to use your training after graduation. Some lawyers are not nice people, just like in other professions. Do not believe TV portrayals.

The legal profession is NOT what you see on television.

There is no specific path from an educational degree perspective that actually prepares you for law school. The study of law is not for the faint of heart, but if you want to make it through, you will. Go in with an open mind; recognize that the classes you enjoy taking are probably the areas you will enjoy practicing in later on; take additional courses in an area of law that interests you.
They should understand that practicing law is very different from going to law school as the skills needed to succeed in law school are very different than those needed to succeed as a lawyer. For example, the ability to get along with others and to develop business is not valued (or taught) in law school. But those are some of the most important aspects of being a successful lawyer.

Think about the work hours involved in a law career before opting for law school.

Understand the need or the ability to attract clients. Have self awareness and preference. Perhaps being a great appellate lawyer is the career that suits your personality rather than doing TV ads about how you say your prayers at night, work with your wonderful family, and love your dog.

View it as vocational training.

What are the services that you can do that are going to be helpful to clients? Consider this: Does someone have to win, or can actions and results be beneficial to all parties?

Young students who feel drawn to the legal profession may rest assured that they will find it an opportunity for success which is probably unequaled elsewhere.

Take Work Experience/Internship First – 66 Responses

Work in the legal field first. (12 Responses)

Work outside of the legal profession first. (3 Responses)

Any individual considering law as a career needs exposure to the reality of the legal practice rather than the TV version. Therefore, some kind of pre-clerkship on the area they aspire to practice should be available at college level before even applying to law school and being admitted.

Apply for a job at a law firm (even if it is sorting the mail) and see if it is something that interests you.

Consider taking time off and not going straight to law school.

Do not go straight after college. Build life experience by working/traveling for at least two years.

Do some manual labor for a while first.

During winter and summer breaks in law school and when time otherwise permits, take every opportunity to get hands-on experience, even if it means working for free. The more hands-on experience you have, the more desirable you are to those hiring.
* Get as much hands-on and mentoring experiences as possible.

* Get as much practical experience as possible.

* Get as much real world experience in various types of settings as possible. Learning how to deal with and manage different personalities in different environments is a HUGE asset.

* Get as much varied experiences as possible.

* Get hands-on experience at a law firm first in the area you anticipate practicing in.

* Get practical real world life experience before attending law school to help you focus on an area in which you want to specialize. No one can be an expert on every element of the law. Find any field that interests you and become an expert in that too. Every industry needs lawyers but clients prefer those most similar to themselves.

* Get some exposure to the real world of practice. Don't rely on media stereotypes to form your impression of whether it is a suitable profession for your skill set and temperament. Too many young people turn to the law as a fall back when their other plans go awry, or because they think it is an easy way to make a good living. These false premises cause many young lawyers to become disillusioned.

* I always advise young people who are considering going to law school to do what I did and get out and work for a few years between undergraduate school and law school. I think it inculcates in them an appreciation for what their clients have at stake when they entrust a case to the attorney. I tell young people that they should appreciate what a client goes through when they bet the farm on the advice the young lawyer has given them. Literally, it can put the client's home, business, and family assets at risk.

* I think they should not, unless they can go for free. Many people straight from undergrad want to delay life by doing grad school. But, then they should do a Master's or PhD in something, because most Master's and Ph.D. programs offer graduate assistantships and fellowships aplenty that come with tuition waiver and stipend. Law school doesn't have a path to paid work with tuition waiver, and that makes it a bad place to tread water and delay life. For people who did something else and have more perspective and focused goals, law school is fine, because those people can better understand the total cost and have a real choice between their current life and law school. They are acquiring a tool. They are much less likely to be trying to delay life.

* I would advise her/him to try to get summer clerkships or internships.

* I would suggest participating in a legal internship with a local law firm (most likely unpaid) to get some practical experience beforehand.

* I would work for at least two years before applying to law school. I would observe courtrooms and talk to as many lawyers as possible to learn if it's a career that you really want to enter.
* Intern in law office or other legal environment to determine if it is something they would like and thrive.

* Know that your career will demand long working hours, know that practicing law is not like what you see on TV, try to get as much legal experience (work or volunteer for lawyers/firm/legal aid, etc.).

* Know what field you want to enter and focus only on those areas. Take as many clinic classes as you can.

* Law school should not be seen as the fall back for those seeking to delay entering the employment world or those who are unable to gain admission to medical school or other graduate programs. They should delay seeking admission to law school until they have a concrete idea of the type of law that they want to practice.

* Look for hands-on experiences and opportunities to actually practice what you are learning.

* Take a break between your undergraduate education and law school to get some practical experience, not necessarily in a law-related field, but try to obtain some "real life" experiences outside of academics.

* Take a summer job as a “gofer” in a law firm. See whether the philosophical, psychological, and practical aspects of a law practice really are motivating, and mesh well with their personality, before they commit to a potential career that will entail long hours, less opportunity for life-balance, is stressful, is highly competitive, is adversarial, and, for most, is not likely to lead to a level of income comparable to what they might achieve in many other potential lifelong employment pursuits.

* Take a year off between college and law school and obtain experience in the area that interests you.

* Take a year or two to work in an area that is of interest. For example, if health law is an interest, work in the medical field after graduating from college and before law school. Learn the industry and how it operates so you are more prepared to handle legal issues important to that industry.

* Take advantage of any opportunity in high school and college to participate in mock trial, moot court or other law based programs and competitions, such as "We the People" and Model U.N. Volunteer for your Congressman, visit Court. If you are able, speak to a judge or a litigator. Some State Attorney's offices have internships for undergraduates. Take advantage of that. Talk to lawyers and find out what they like about the profession. Explore the many areas of the law.

* Take as many opportunities as possible to learn practical lawyering and network with local attorneys.

* Take time off and think it through.
* Taking some time to work between undergraduate and law school will give you better perspective on law school and post-graduation employment.

* They should see if certain firms or governmental agencies (local government offices) offer volunteer or paid internships prior to going to law school and take advantage of such opportunities.

* They should start getting practical experience as soon as they can, be it working or getting involved in extracurricular activities. Merely studying and getting A's on exams in not enough to prepare you for the rigors of law school.

* Think carefully about it, and perhaps get a year of work under your belt first.

* To get some experience working in the legal industry before enrolling. For example, if they are interested in real property law, do an internship with a title company. If they are interested in litigation, do an internship with a litigation firm.

* Try a summer Internship with a firm or government agency's legal department before committing to law school. You should understand what the practice of law entails before committing that much money and time to something you may quickly learn is not for you.

* Try some CLE courses such as the overview.

* Try to clerk for a judge and do an Internship before you get out of law school, so look at schools with a big network that help you with those opportunities. Be prepared to be frustrated. Be prepared for negativity but there are definitely awards and opportunities. Keep in mind that 50% of law school graduates don't become lawyers so it does still help. Law school doesn't teach you everything you need to know.

* Try to gain as much practical skill as possible.

* Try to get some in office experience to get a feel for several different areas of legal practice to see if you would like to pursue law as a career.

* Try to participate in clinical classes to gain practical knowledge.

* Try to work in one or more law office while in school to get introduced to the practical application of what is being taught and why.

* Unless you are sure you want to go to law school, get some real world experience first.

* Volunteer at a law firm, public agency, legal aid organization, or the like to see first-hand what the practice of law entails, including substantive law and dealing with clients.

* Volunteer or intern at anything other than law-related activities. See "real" life. Many college kids have not really seen the real world. Others have.

* Volunteer or work in law office, legal service organization, or legal department.
* Volunteer to get an idea of what's involved in a legal career.
* Work at a law firm first, and see whether the quality of life is something that looks appealing.
* Work for a year before going to law school.
* Work for two years first and then go to the best law school situated where you want to reside after graduation.
* Work in something OTHER than law for a year or more before going to law school. Sell securities, be an accountant, teach school, tour in a rock band, work in a factory, work in a hospital, work in a restaurant.

**Be Prepared to Work/Study Hard – 63 Responses**

* Be prepared to work hard. (13 Responses)
* Study. (5 Responses)
* Be prepared for a rigorous commitment and to the extent possible make sure that practicing law is where your gifts and desires lie.
* Be prepared to be focused on your studies and dialogue with you professors frequently.
* Be prepared to pour ALL of your time into learning. If I could go back in time, I would put more time and effort into my legal education.
* Be prepared to read and write a lot, and absorb a lot of information over a short period of time.
* Be prepared to read more than you ever have before.
* Be prepared to read.
* Be prepared to work hard, but also know not to compare yourself to others excessively.
* Be prepared to work hard, but the rewards can be enormous.
* Be prepared to work hard – both during and after. Learn technology. Specialize.
* Being a lawyer is a rewarding profession, but it is not for everyone. If you are considering law school, you need to be 100% committed to learning. Obtaining a law degree requires dedication and motivation.
* Come to grips with the idea that it is law school, not lawyer school.
* Consider alternatives other than law school. Go to law school only if you are equipped to excel academically.

* Do not try to hold a job at all your first year. Develop your organizational and study skills.

* Don’t waste the education opportunity by trying to get by.

* Don't go unless you actually enjoy critical reading and writing. It is not easy, the hours are long, the work is demanding and mentally draining, but the financial rewards can be great. Nothing is handed to you out of law school, you have to earn it. Be prepared for hard work.

* Expect to work hard, set goals based on other things besides economics. Care about people and helping them.

* Figure out a good study method that will help you retain the information you read for class, learn from class, etc. Take good notes and go through them at night to make sure they are clear when you go to study from them later. Help your fellow classmates as often as you can as they are not your competition; they are your colleagues and you may need help from them one day.

* Find a 2L and learn the arcane and archaic case briefing and Socratic Methods you will need to make it 1st year.

* Get ready to work hard! It's not the glamorous profession depicted on TV. There is a lot of hard work and working with others.

* Go to the best-ranked school you can, study hard first year and make law review, and network within the local bar association.

* Have a thorough understanding of the future of the practice of law. Conduct research.

* Have an idea what you want to do in the practice of law and maximize efforts in law school to achieve that objective.

* I would stress the need for meticulous preparation. Also, a willingness to work hard and to analyze thoroughly.

* I would suggest they either go to the law school that interests them or a nearby law school to see if they would be able to sit in a few different classes to observe. In addition, they should not just rely on the technological equipment for doing their research but should still learn how to research through libraries and books; equipment is not always available or may not work.

* If they are hell bent on practicing law, I would advise them to major in English and to study their butts off.
If you are determined to attend law school, focus the 1st year on creating a solid base of basic legal knowledge and then focus the last 2 years on the type of law you think you want to practice so that you can not only gain the knowledge but introduce yourself to the "practice" aspect of the law. Learn how to be a practicing lawyer, not a law student that is only concerned with passing the Bar Exam.

If you are disciplined in your studies, you will put yourself in a good position for success.

If you are not prepared to do everything it takes to graduate in the top ten percent of your class, do not go.

If you are working hard, work harder. If you're not working hard, forget it.

If you commit to law school, seize the opportunities available. Bust your hump to excel academically, grab any and all internships (paid or unpaid) available to you, and try to find a mentor.

It is neither easy nor fun.

Learn to study. Don't give up! If you were smart enough to get into law school you're almost certainly smart enough to succeed if you apply yourself. There are a lot of brilliant lawyers, but there are a lot of really stupid lawyers out here too. They made it and so can you!

Lots of reading of matters related to procedures.

Practice, practice, practice and volunteer in areas you like or think you like prior to going into them.

Read all assigned material and suggested secondary sources, always attend class, take advantage of clinical of internship opportunities, and be involved with other activities at the law school. Immerse yourself in learning the law.

Study hard and don't let a senior lawyer beat you down. You will fall but make sure to get up and keep pushing.

Study hard and work hard in your first year. It determines everything in your career.

Study hard in undergrad area they like and may even want to develop into a career without a thought towards whether it will be subsequently useful in law school. Almost any degree is applicable and will be beneficial in some way.

Success today requires greater focus and determination than it did years ago. There are still great opportunities, but they're not for the squeamish.

The advice my father gave me is you will never be bored and it will make you old. One should know that it is hard work to do the job well and one will also need to study hard.
There are too many lawyers so do not expect to graduate and get a decent career unless you are committed to: 1) Studying and getting good grades; 2) clerking; 3) being on Law Review or Moot Court.

Understand that one can still be very successful in the practice of law, provided they are VERY skilled, work hard and are able to ethically get that word out and produce-knowing how to ethically practice law.

Work as hard as you can and get through the first year. After that, it is smooth sailing.

You don't have to be the brightest but you have to be prepared.

You will learn a lot of "stuff" that is inapplicable to your eventual work life; but keep your focus, learn to "think like a lawyer" and realize that this training is relevant to myriad professions, not just trial practice.

Too Many Lawyers/Saturated Job Market – 61 Responses

Don't - too many lawyers. (8 Responses)

As few jobs as there are today, don't do it unless you are going to be in the top 1/3 of the class, or you specialize, and you have some life experience associated with that specialization.

Based on the excessive number of lawyers and law students, and the disruptive nature of technology, law practice is generally not as lucrative or satisfying as it was in the past. You are not guaranteed a job, much less a large income.

Be sure you really want to do this because the job market is bad. If you really like law and do well in law school, you should be able to get a job and enjoy a successful career.

Beware of potential employment pitfalls.

Carefully consider the current job market.

Choose a different profession. There are more law students graduating from law school than jobs available.

Consider another field for your primary choice; there are too many lawyers in the workforce, competing for a finite amount of business.

Consider the choice very carefully; while the job market I entered after law school was not great, I believe that today's market is even tighter. If your desire to practice law, remember that it is a passion.

Consider the job market, but it's a great education.
* Consider the low demand for and high supply of attorneys, and the under and unemployment of many graduates. Research the high levels stress in the field and consider how you would cope with attorneys and parties who frequently lie and many judges who don't follow the law even when it is spelled out and provided to the judges.

* Consider the quality of available jobs versus the cost of tuition and make an informed decision.

* Consider what you want your work life to be like and what job opportunities are out there before committing.

* Consider whether a job will be available.

* Determine where you want to work and see if there are jobs there.

* Do not go to law school. 1) There is a glut of law schools, which has led to a glut of lawyers, which has watered down the competence of the profession as a whole. You are going to pay a whole lot more for your JD than it may ever prove to be worth; and 2) if you choose to ignore #1, commit to being a GOOD lawyer.

* Do not go! There are too many lawyers and not enough clients. Go into the medical field as the population ages and need for workers increases. In my own office, we are losing experienced legal secretaries who are going to school to be nurses, ultra sound techs, and other medical related jobs, including coding and billing. Always follow the help; they know the lay of the land.

* Don't do it - the field is already overcrowded.

* Don't! We have a dozen law schools in Florida now, pumping out too many lawyers than society can absorb. These exiting law school grads will find that jobs are hard to find and the jobs out there will be mostly low pay. I would advise anyone considering law school to go into something else.

* Don't. There are too many lawyers. And if you do go you must work hard in order to distinguish yourself from your peers in order to get a quality opportunity. Even then you will not have a happy life.

* Examine the job market trends, compare the market to what law school will cost you.

* Explore the area/job market you want to be in post law school because certain areas of the state are so saturated you can't find work.

* Florida has too many lawyers and new law schools have been approved in recent years without the need for them.

* Given the over-saturation in the field, I would advise against it.
* Go only if you want the education and not to find a "good job" since those types of jobs are so scarce. Attend a school that in highly ranked or is well respected where you are certain you wish to practice.

* Go to business school and be prepared to use your legal education in areas other than being limited to practicing law. The population ratio to lawyers is way out of kilter, with too many lawyers trying to earn a living in the practice of law. Electronic and internet services are replacing much of the product that the lawyer previously offered to the public. Law schools are profitable and therefore have multiplied with the result of graduating too many lawyers to survive in the market place, thereby increasing the exposure to the public of incompetent representation and unethical practices by lawyers who are not properly trained and lack experience.

* Go to medical school. There are too many lawyers who graduate and can't find a job with an experienced lawyer who can put them through an apprenticeship to learn how to be a practicing lawyer so they end up working with a law school education but no practical experience in how things really work.

* Honestly, I am not certain I would recommend going to law school to any college student. While hiring statistics are improving, there are still many students leaving law school without jobs.

* I told both of my daughters to go into the medical profession. There are too many law schools putting out too many lawyers. These law schools appear to be more about profit and quantity versus quality. I interview lawyers all the time that have no experience and are waiting tables or handling cases they have no business handling. I visit with law students periodically and I always tell them that their best option is to try to get on with Prosecutor's office (SAO) or the PD. These opportunities provide invaluable training for young lawyers.

* I would advise a college student that there are already too many lawyers being pumped out by the ever increasing number of law schools. I would also caution them about the difficulty in finding suitable employment after graduation.

* I would advise them NOT to go to law school. The market is already over-saturated with attorneys and there are so many graduates who finished law school and were unable to find employment. With the explosion of new law schools, there are just too many new attorneys to be absorbed into the dwindling attorney job market, considering that there are job functions which were previously performed by attorneys but are now being outsourced.

* In Florida, the profession is overcrowded and the chances of making a good living are declining. I would not settle in this state. Instead, I would look to a state like Vermont or some other state with a lower population.

* Jobs are scarce. Don't go to law school believing that it is an assured path to a good paying job.
* Keep in mind that due to differences in reciprocity in admission requirements among the states, relocation may be impractical, expensive, and time consuming. Realize that the nature of law practice now and in the future is and will become more specialized and concentrated in fewer and fewer large firms. The days of small law firms, romanticized in fiction and movies, are vanishing so that you will likely become less independent and more of a corporate player than in the past.

* Make sure you are prepared to be in a flooded market when you graduate.

* My gut reaction was to tell them, "don't do it." I would tell them to make sure they are going in with their eyes wide open. In the years I have been practicing, which doesn't seem like that many, the number of lawyers who have joined the Bar has increased by more than 50%. It seems like you hear almost yearly plans for new law schools churning out new lawyers and you wonder where the need is. When you advertise for paralegal positions, you end up with a stack of lawyer resumes as they are hoping to get hired and get some work. It is crazy but law schools keep graduating lawyers who have massive debt and cannot find law jobs.

* Put all of your energy into the first year since that is where your legal career will be set. If you get on law review and moot court, you have a better chance of having a decent legal career. Otherwise, begin networking for a job as soon as you get to law school. Don't wait until your second or third year to look for a job. The game is over then and you are more likely to be unemployed or working a lower paying job when you get out of school.

* Realize the limited jobs vs. the number of grads and not all folks will play by the rules as one would expect or hope.

* Right now, I would say don't do it. We have way too many attorneys, competing for too few jobs and clients.

* Run away, the legal profession is overcrowded and law schools will accept anyone who can pay. Go to dental school instead.

* The field is too crowded; consider another profession such as business administration or MBA.

* The field is too large, and the cost may be too high. Consider a different profession where the demand is higher and constructive need is more advantageous to the professional. The job market is not good.

* The legal profession is overpopulated and they should look to another profession because of the lack of employment opportunities. This is sad because I have truly enjoyed my career.

* There are over 100,000 lawyers in Florida, many of them ill educated and struggling, with whom you will be both competing for business and litigating against.

* There are too many law schools and way too many lawyers out here.
* There are too many law schools and too many lawyers.

* There are too many lawyers being graduated. It has caused there to be a proliferation of frivolous or low merit cases being pursued with much greater frequency.

* There are too many lawyers! Find a different career because you're not likely to find a job you'll like in Florida!

* There are way too many lawyers today. We have so many law schools that we are producing lawyers like Kleenexes, and few of the graduates have the knowledge of the law, the talent, or the skills to be effective.

* There is currently an overabundance of lawyers and many new graduates are unable to find employment, so I would ask her to be sure about what she wants and maybe consider other alternatives.

* There is no way many of them should go to law school at all. There are far too many lawyers and with the working life of a law school graduate going from the time they graduate to age 65 - the problem isn't going away. For some ridiculous reason, Florida has allowed there to be far too many law schools in this state. There is nowhere close to the need for all of these lawyers. They are also tricked by the banks and the law schools into paying far too much for their legal education which is going to bring them far too little rewards and much debt over their careers.

* Think twice. There are far too many lawyers. Success usually means working long hours for one's entire career. But if you commit, it is a worthy and rewarding profession.

* Thoroughly explore job opportunities available; the job market in Florida is currently flooded with new grads who can't find jobs.

* Tough job market right now. Be sure it’s what you really want to do.

**Improve Reading/Writing/Various Skills – 49 Responses**

* Learn how to write well. *(8 Responses)*

* 1. Become proficient in some academic area that is not law. It can be almost anything: engineering, medical technology, English, math, history, economics, drama, athletic physiology, hospitality management. 2. Study bookkeeping, accounting, finance and banking – take two or three courses, at least; even if you find it boring; even if you think it will hurt your grade point average. 3. Write expository prose that is circulated to more than just your friends, and then learn from the misunderstandings that people express about what you have written. The goal is to be able to communicate clearly and concisely without gratuitously antagonizing the reader or listener.

* Be an avid reader.
* Become a good writer for law school and Bar Exams.
* Concentrate on writing skills.
* Develop your writing and speaking skills.
* Get a good English background or forget it.
* Get as much writing experience as you can. Do whatever it takes to excel in your first year.
* Go back to basics, writing skills, fast reading techniques and time management.
* Hone your reading and writing skills and practice good time management. Shore up your support system. Use the Career Center to conduct career assessments. There are certain skill sets that every lawyer needs to have at some level. Make sure those are skills you either have or want to acquire.
* I would stress the need to be able to communicate both by writing and verbally.
* Improve your writing, reading and verbal skills.
* Increase rate of reading and comprehension.
* Learn how to effectively express yourself, both orally and in writing.
* Learn how to read and write.
* Learn how to write well. Edit over and over and over until you have trained yourself to instinctively write well/correctly to reduce editing time.
* Learn how to write. Take classes that challenge you to think critically as opposed to class where rote memorization is necessary. Anything that requires synthesis of ideas or comparative based classes would be good.
* Learn NOW to concentrate, focus, organize and improve your reading/comprehension skills.
* Learn to read, write and think logically.
* Learn to use language appropriately.
* Learn to write (English, History etc.) and be able to think creatively and analytically.
* Learn to write and present well. And learn both skills somewhere other than a law school.
* Learn to write like a lawyer.
Learn to write well before you go to law school. The analysis your legal writing must demonstrate is hard enough to hone without also having to learn to be a good writer once you arrive on campus.

Learn to write, speak and think.

Make sure you have a good background in writing and reading comprehension.

Make sure you have developed good time management and writing skills as most law school courses just have one exam at the end of the semester.

Make sure you like reading, writing and working with people with problems.

Pre-law is not the way to go. You can learn how to read a case when you get to law school. Learn to be a great writer and an excellent problem-solver. Take leadership classes and be comfortable with team work.

Read and write a lot; diversify the courses taken; participate in community service.

Read as much as you can and perfect your writing style.

Read, read, and read! Not just fiction for pleasure but nonfiction, dense complicated scientific and technical writing and essays, political and social commentary, essays on everything! Newspapers – local papers, New York Times, Chicago Tribune., LA Times, Wall St. Journal etc. and learn the importance of words and the impact they can make. POETRY, yes poems, will teach you the power of words and how to be concise and get to the basic essence of a thought, idea etc with the most compelling words!

Read, read, and read.

Read.

Read. Write. Follow current events.

Take a significant number of writing classes.

Take a speed reading course and keep up with that skill.

Take as many writing courses as you can.

Take at least one writing class and a speech class.

Take writing courses.

Work on research skills.

Work on thinking and writing logically.
Shadow Attorney – 40 Responses

* Become friends with someone already in law school so you get a realistic idea of what will be required of you. Try to work at a law practice to see what lawyers have to do if and when they graduate from law school.

* Consider working at a law firm or shadowing a lawyer to see what your chosen profession is like. This way you could make a more informed decision if this is the career path that you want to employ all the time and money needed to become a lawyer.

* Consult practicing lawyers in the specialty which you prefer.

* Determine what you want out of life and spend some time with attorneys in their practice (follow them to client meetings, depositions, hearings, and office work to determine what they really do in their daily routine). Remember that it is a business, not just practicing law!

* Do not go for the wrong reasons (i.e., family pressure, because you think a law degree sounds good, etc.) Law school is a lot of work, a lot of pressure, and (can be) very expensive. It's all worth it if it's what you really want to do. Talk to practicing lawyers (different types) before going to law school to find out what they like/dislike about their practice/career.

* Don't unless you honestly believe it is the only profession for you. Spend as much time as you can with lawyers practicing a variety of specialties.

* Find a mentor and get as much practical experience as possible. Read law books if available.

* Find someone in their third or fourth year of practice and ask them about their experiences. Intern with a practitioner over the summer before senior year.

* Get a job with a law firm to see what they do and determine if you enjoy it.

* Get a mentor and learn what the real world of law practice is like.

* Get advice from law students or lawyers who recently graduated. DO NOT get advice from guidance counselors.

* Get involved in some type of mentorship to get a feel for a career in law.

* Get involved with local bar associations with mentoring programs. A good mentor will be a great teacher and counselor about the practice of law.

* Go on informational interviews with attorneys from different areas of the law to determine if law is really what you want to do

* I challenge them to sit with an attorney to see the real day to day tasks of the job.
I would advise that they seek out a practicing attorney or firm and observe prior to making a decision.

Know what you are getting into. Go sit in on a court case, volunteer for a legal organization and talk to lawyers.

Meet with as many attorneys as you can and ask them questions, lots of questions.

Perform substantial research into all law schools and their curriculum, as well as speaking with practicing attorneys to fully understand the level of commitment, dedication and financial sacrifice necessary for law school and future legal career.

Really think about it. Talk to as many practicing attorneys as possible; including those who are recent grads and those who have been practicing 5-10 and 10+ years. Interview a representative cross-section of practicing lawyers. Don't rely upon the school's representations.

Re-think it. Get with a law firm and watch what is required of attorneys now.

Shadow a lawyer and a judge for at least 3 weeks.

Shadow a variety of lawyers in order to understand what lawyers do on a day-to-day basis.

Shadow an attorney before you go to law school.

Shadow an attorney/judge, and ensure that you're doing it for the "right" reasons.

Shadow or find a firm in your geographic area where you go can go into the office for more than a day or two and get the real feel for the practice. Find a government agency (if possible) or in house legal office to do the same. In other words, actually find out what the typical daily practice of law entails in a meaningful way before you ever sit for the LSAT.

Speak to and shadow an attorney in the area of law you are considering. Understand your strengths and weaknesses to help you focus in on certain areas of the law.

Speak to several practicing attorneys and/or judges prior to making your decision.

Speak with lawyers and perhaps work or intern at a law firm to be certain that you want to be a lawyer. Law schools (for the most part) are profit driven.


Spend a week sitting in courtrooms at your local courthouse.
* Spend as much time as possible shadowing attorneys in different areas of the law to truly learn what each different field is like. The classroom knowledge cannot prepare you for the day to day practice of law.

* Talk to a lawyer. The things you think you will be doing as an attorney are probably not what most attorneys actually end up doing as part of their work. The practice of law is often glamorized and the reality is far different. Make sure you know what you are getting in to.

* Talk to and tail practicing lawyers in various areas.

* Talk to and watch attorneys practice law.

* Talk to attorneys about what being a lawyer involves.

* Talk to experienced, successful lawyers about the practice of law to make certain that is what they want to do. Shadow an experienced, successful lawyer for a few days in his/her office and in the courtroom to see what the actual practice of law is all about. Talk to experienced judges about the practice of law and what qualities the judges feel are necessary to be an ethical, successful lawyer.

* Talk to practicing attorneys, consider the work life balance and thoroughly evaluate your long term goals.

* Try to find lawyers who would offer guidance and mentorships. I had none whatsoever, so I went in blind when I went to law school.

* Work at a law firm and observe the life of a lawyer before you make the investment of time and money and make sure that this is what you want to do.

**Consider Where to Go – 20 Responses**

* Attend a public university to minimize student debt.

* Choose a law school located within the State in which you plan to pursue your law career.

* Do not go to a "for profit" law school unless it is your only option and they give you a full ride.

* Go to a law school that offers a combined degree program or offers the most practical courses in the 3rd year.

* Go to a state school, better tuition rates.
Good lawyers will always be able to make a living in a very fulfilling profession, but if you can’t get into a good law school it probably will not lead to a satisfying career coming out of a second or third tier school.

I would tell them not to go to a for profit law school. In Jacksonville, Coastal School of Law has flooded the market with law students who in large part have tremendous debt, trouble passing the bar exam and cannot find jobs. They hang their own shingle and have no idea how to practice law. It makes litigating against them difficult and more expensive for our clients. The Jacksonville Bar has started a mentoring program but a lot of students don't utilize it.

I would tell them to only find a top law school. Don’t get caught up in a basic law school diploma mill.

I would tell them to think about what they are actually going to do with their degree. In my opinion, we are pumping out too many lawyers for the market to bear. As a result, if a person wants a job at a top law firm, they had better go to a Tier 1 undergraduate school, and a Tier 1 law school. They had also better be in the top of their class.

If you are going to a national law school, where you are taught to think like a lawyer, it can be a wonderful experience. Otherwise, you may want to consider other alternatives.

If you are to begin law school, ensure that it is a high quality school.

If you cannot attend a top 30 law school, go to a state law school in the state where you want to practice, preferably located in the city where you want to practice.

If you cannot get into a first-tier school, don't go.

Only go if you are going to a top tier school; way too many subpar schools pumping out grads that have no business being lawyers and are left often with heavy debt.

Really make sure the investment is worth it. The LSAT is nothing like Law School. Be prepared to read hundreds of pages only to find out you probably could have gotten the same information in a quicker fashion. Be ready to change your thinking and get your confidence challenged. Forget everything you've learned in the past. Be prepared for a life-changing event that can really disrupt things. Be aware of the stress and strain it puts on others around you, especially spouses and children. If you have any doubt, don't go. Understand your goals and align your law school choices around them; for instance, if you plan to be a Tax Attorney, go to NYU or Georgetown. If you want to go to a big firm, research the schools they recruit from. If you want to go to work for a mid-sized or small firm, or go a non-traditional route, don't go to an overly competitive and expensive law school; just go to get your degree. Go to an ABA Accredited School. Try to go to a school in the State you think you will practice in.

Research the field of law that they want to practice, taking into consideration the geographic area in which they would like to practice. Be sure to join a study group once you enter law school.
* They should avoid going to these "for profit" law schools that are cropping up everywhere and get into the best law school with the best reputation that they can. There is still snobbery in the law after all. It is by no means the same profession it was when I was sworn in 1989. I am not sure that I would choose law school now as I did then, even though for me, it has been the best career choice ever. But the environment is very different now. I would think of law school as something that might be used to assist in a business career or an entrepreneurial endeavor more than as a means to practice law.

* Try to find a school in the geographical area you want to practice.

* Try to get in to one of the top 25 law schools.

* Unless you are accepted to a top national law school, you should consider attending a law school in the City and/or State where you would like to live and work.

**Grades/LSAT Related – 7 Responses**

* Don't freak out if you make "C's" in law school. 90% of your class will make C's.

* I would advise them to put their money into a really good LSAT course to be sure to maximize that score.

* I would hope that they could pursue interests that they love in a way that they would develop their reasoning and communication skills and their work ethic. However, currently my advice to college students is to try to get the best grades possible, because admission to law school is, sadly, all about numbers.

* If you are focused on law school, take the LSAT and apply to school. If it is only lower tier schools that are within your range of acceptance, seriously reconsider your objectives.

* If you don't have solid LSAT scores above at least 145, you may not have the intellectual ability you need to do well in law school or on the Bar.

* If you plan on attending, then plan on graduating in the top third of your class. Also, begin with law review or moot court and plan on clerking.

* If you want to go to law school you have to get admitted. Main criteria for admission are GPA and LSAT score. Pick a major that will enable you to get a high GPA.
20. Besides law school, have you had other professional schooling (graduate level courses for another field)?

If “Yes”, please indicate in what area and whether there was anything from that learning experience that you feel could be applied to the structure of legal education to make the learning experience for future law school students more effective:

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

**Master’s Degree – 11 Responses**

* I earned a Master’s Degree from a business school. They had a night program and the flexibility to allow you to take as much or as little time as you wanted. Courses were taught by adjuncts that had real life experience that they brought to the classroom.

* I have a Master’s in education. With that degree, I learned about multiple learning styles. A weakness in law school is that the Socratic Method with one exam at the end of class allows only a certain type of student to do well. However, in practice, those skills are not really the skills needed to be successful.

* I received a Master’s in Animals and Public Policy. There were 13 people in the program and we sat in a circle and studied topics in depth. The learning experience was like none other. In comparison, my law school offered the majority of their classes to 100 students at a time. The classes were impersonal and cold. The learning environment lacked discussion and in depth study due to its focus on lectures. I believe an effective and efficient way to learn is to have an enriched environment that promotes learning and collaboration. Law school promoted the ability to test well and competition. The real world is about learning to work well with others, regardless of if you are in a courtroom in an adversary system. The truth is people who work well with others and have the knowledge they need to succeed get stuff done. I can honestly say I learned more in my one year Master’s program then I did in my three years at law school. Law schools should focus on not only teaching the law, but engaging it. Lawyers engage the law everyday with other professionals, which is why it is called "practicing" the law. Law schools need to teach students how to practice the law not just take the bar exam.

* I took Master’s level public administration classes. I think organization management and organization structure and behavior could have been very useful.

* M.A. in Communication.

* M.A. in Criminology. Helpful to understanding crime, punishment and administration.

* Master’s in Agricultural Engineering. The courses were very hands-on, which made the learning process much easier despite the difficulty of some of the classes.
Master’s in education and a Master’s in East Asian studies that I acquired with my law degree. I'm not really sure schooling is substantially more than a rite of passage. I got those degrees because I was fascinated by the subject matter. The first was part of a path to become a professor (which I quickly realized was a dead end because of the shrinking and quixotic academic market place) and the second was to set myself apart from the far-too-many who are attending even the top law schools these days.

Master’s in Education. Some of the coursework was online, which allowed me to work full-time.

Master’s work in Urban and Regional Planning.

Strategic Communications Management, M.A.

MBA – 9 Responses

MBA. (4 Responses)

Coursework in Master of Accounting Program. Hold a Master of Business Administration Degree. The MBA program was a highly cooperative and practical program consisting of numerous courses that provided practical experience that I was able to utilize immediately in my career at the time.

I am currently earning my MBA part-time as I practice law. The classes have helped me get a broader perspective and any additional learning is going to be helpful at some point, even if it simply helps me to have a conversation with a potential client.

I hold an MBA. There is nothing from that learning experience that I feel can be applied to law school students.

Some MBA courses.

Took some MBA classes- nothing really worth noting.

Graduate Programs/Classes – 6 Responses

Finance and accounting and they were very beneficial to understanding business practices and documents.

Graduate program in history.

Human behavior/organizational psychology/counseling.

I received a graduate degree in History. It was very similar in some ways to the law school experience, except that the class sizes were smaller and the method of assessment
was less structured. I taught history for some time at the college level prior to entering law school and overall, I believe the education I received in law school was much better.

* I studied for a MAMC in Communications Law, primarily researching FCC decisions. The extensive writing of papers in that study was immensely helpful. Law school students do not write enough.

* Philosophy and Neuroscience. The paper writing process was very good for learning and could be applied to a legal education. Requiring a critical paper on a subject and discussing the process of writing that paper, and then presenting your findings to a professor and a small group of peers who have an opportunity to critique your work could be translated very well into the legal education because it would create a greater depth of knowledge and understanding on a particular subject of law, and then create a forum similar to the courtroom in which your findings can be questioned.

**LLM**

* After graduating from Nova Law and passing the bar in September of 2013, I immediately attended the University of Miami's LL.M. program in real property development.

**Miscellaneous**

* I am a pharmacist as well and the learning experience from pharmacy school that should be applied to legal education is a required internship. Most students do not have any idea what being a pharmacist is like when they start pharmacy school and the required internships help the student get an idea of what pharmacy practice is like before they go through the entire pharmacy school experience only to be disappointed upon getting licensed and only then realizing the demands of the job.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

**Graduate Programs/Classes – 64 Responses**

* Accounting. *(4 Responses)*

* Counseling. *(3 Responses)*

* Business and Finance. *(2 Responses)*

* Engineering. *(2 Responses)*
* Mediation and Negotiation. (2 Responses)

* Acting. It's very beneficial to trial work.

* Although not graduate level, post-undergraduate I obtained certificates in Florida Police Minimum Standards and Emergency Medical Technician for employment as a ranger with the National Park Service.

* Business and accounting. I believe accounting makes you much more skilled in commercial litigation matters and complex divorce or Tax situations.

* Business and insurance classes.

* Certification as a civil and county court mediator.

* City and Regional Planning from the University of North Carolina. We were required to take at least one related course on the graduate level in another department. It would be good if a law student were required to take a related course in other department to better understand an area in which they may want to concentrate upon graduation from law school.

* Civil Engineering - more like a bar review course.

* Computer Science.

* Criminal Justice - very helpful.

* Economics. The economics studies focused more on reaching the right or better result, whereas law school was more oriented toward arguing at least two sides. I think there is often a solution that is more socially beneficial when choosing between two or more arguments, and discussing which may be the better outcome or discussing what problems a law creates, are worthwhile subjects for additional time in law school although they are already discussed to some degree. After all, it is the law that governs society and some laws and outcomes are better than others.

* English (American Literature) An intense focus on complete texts, with appropriate context, is better than contact with a more extensive array of fragments. In the law school context that means casebooks should present more complete case decisions even though it means fewer excerpts or summaries can be presented.

* English Education; English Literature.

* English graduate program. Nothing that I believe is applicable to legal education, other than processing large amounts of written information.

* Foreign languages.

* Geology - nothing that pertained to law.
* Graduate Accounting degree; nothing else special should be adopted.

* Graduate level business classes are helpful for commercial litigation and transactional work.

* Graduate level International Relations courses.

* Graduate studies in Public Administration.

* Graduate study in political economy in England. Very helpful to study in a different environment that reflected a European perspective.

* Graduate work in education and other than learning about how people learn the rest of grad school consisted of theories of instruction, curriculum, etc. - nothing that would enhance law school.

* However, after getting my BA in 1975, I did go to nursing school in 1991. Nursing school was very rigorous in that you had to maintain a "B" to stay in school, so it promoted the survival of all who were fit; minus the intense competition, so it was certainly more collaborative and served me well.

* Humanities. Socratic Method was very effective.

* I attended Real Estate classes and obtained a Real Estate broker’s license. I was a Real Estate broker for 5 years before applying to law school. That background was very helpful in preparing me for private practice. I did not work for a law firm before starting my practice. That was in 1973. It would have been easier if I had worked for a firm. The first several years were hard. This was before lawyer advertising and I got involved with many groups to get my name known in the community. I think face to face marketing is still the best method of developing a practice. If you attend a Rotary meeting each week, you will obtain new clients.

* I did a significant amount of writing when I took graduate courses in English. I developed a basic foundation in English grammar and composition that so many lawyers are lacking.

* I hold a Chartered Property-Casualty Underwriter (CPCU) designation. It involved taking and passing 10 semester-long courses in various aspects of the insurance industry, as well as passing a character and fitness check and having experience in the insurance industry. Because you were required to have experience, you were required to get recommendations from others in the industry. To the extent that legal education was changed to require a mentoring or shadowing component, recommendations would be good.

* I took non-matriculated courses in graduate economics. I do not think they were pertinent to my later study of law, but were very informative.

* I was an engineer prior to law school.
* International relations.
* Management.
* Maritime, which is quite similar, really. The notion of learning the ropes, by making someone do it- should be applied to Civil Procedure.
* Mass Communication.
* Military Science.
* Navy training- former aviator (flight school, warfare etc.)
* Organizational Communication, Dept. of Speech Communication. We had to submit papers, which were of publishable quality, on a weekly basis and do some extensive presentations/explanations of our work in every class. I also taught college for almost 20 years before I went to law school in 2001.
* Paralegal certification with 32 credits above my bachelor's degree.
* Philosophy.
* Physical Therapy.
* Post graduate courses in securities law.
* Professional Military Education. Not sure if it offers any carry over to law school, other than its emphasis on the military ethos of service before self, excellence in all we do.
* Psychology Intellectual Disabilities (Mental Retardation).
* Public Administration.
* Real Estate and Banking professional courses.
* Sciences
* Seminary.
* Tax
* Theater. Very practical. Hands on and the creativity is essential. Take substantive law and apply it creatively to the situation you face.
* Theology and Christian Philosophy. The ability to write, think and speak.
* Took master’s courses in Finance and they didn’t really apply to now. Undergrad courses were much more applicable.
* Trained mediator and certified addiction therapist.
U.S. army infantry officer training gave me discipline, mission, respect for the institution.

**Master’s Degree – 47 Responses**

* Master's Degree in Education. (3 Responses)

* After being a victim of "downsizing" in the recent recession, I returned to school and received a Master’s of Social Work degree, basically because of my strong desire to continue to help others. Some of the courses there, with their emphasis upon empathy, how to speak to and counsel others, would have been helpful to know when I graduated law school and entered the legal profession.

* Classes in a Master’s program for Music Education. The educational psychology class was fairly universal.

* I got my Master’s Degree in Slavic Linguistics. I couldn't say that my experience had anything to do with law.

* I had a Master's Degree in Secondary Education before going to law school. That program required a student teaching internship as well as course work on a practical level for the subject to be taught. I believe that the internship was by far the most valuable experience and should be widely incorporated into the law school required curriculum. In the College of Education, "methods classes" were required for graduation. These classes taught students how to teach in the classroom rather than theorize about teaching. I believe law students would benefit from a wider choice of similar law classes.

* I have a Master’s Degree in motion picture producing. We had to take an idea, turn it into a script, and then turn it into a film, which was screened at the school's film festival. A similar concept could be applied in law school by following a case (civil or criminal) from inception to completion.

* I have a Master’s Degree in teaching (not education) and it was VERY helpful (as well as my experience as a teacher) since I was able to effectively determine what the most important points were that a professor was trying to get across. This allowed me to figure out what I had to do and what I could get away without doing, since I believe it is humanly impossible to do all the work assigned, especially in the first year.

* I have a Master’s Degree in Urban Planning. I worked as an urban planner before law school. My urban planning degree helped me in property law and land use law in law school. The Urban Planning Master’s program had a "practice" element that taught how to draft codes, write plans, design cities, etc. law school could use more practice focused courses.

* I have a Master's Degree in History. The research and writing work I did in graduate school has had a greater impact on my writing as a lawyer than any of the Legal Writing courses, or practice memos for other law school courses. I think the requirements of frequent writing, without artificial constraints of a memorandum format, benefit the
student far more than lectures which all too frequently fail to impart actionable, practical knowledge.

* I have a Master's Degree in Library and Information Science. That degree required a lot of collaborative work and oral presentation skills (other than the oral advocacy experience I had in law school).

* I received my Master’s in Science and worked as a Nurse Practitioner. A clinic requirement in healthcare was very helpful. Although it was more time consuming, it was beneficial. Although a majority of my law classmates worked at law firms during the summer, myself included, having your own client in a law clinic setting was a different experience for me.

* International Master’s of laws.

* Law school in another country; Master’s in Philosophy.

* M.A. in Library Science. I learned good work/study habits and how to conduct basic research.

* M.S. in Accounting at NYU Graduate School of Business. Students must understand business and learn to read financial statements.

* MA in History. Writing skills.

* MA in Human Relations. Little applicability to law school.

* MA in Psychology. It teaches you how to discover the most effective method to learn, and how to interact with people. Also a Ph.D. in Business and Human Resources.

* MA political science provided broader understanding.

* MA, English. Helpful in clearer writing style, critical reading skills, experience in presentation of substantial research.

* MAS - Master’s Program contains a lot of writing requirements which makes you a better writer, hence communicator.

* Master of Laws in Taxation.

* Master of Public Administration. I did a lot of group work and learned about government operations and agencies, which was beneficial to my career.

* Master of Science in Digital Forensics. Not really anything to apply, completely different mental processes.

* Master’s Degree in Judicial Studies.
* Master’s Degree in Library and Information Science, which was obtained primarily online (two to three day on-campus classes once a semester; otherwise, all online), while in current position, which explains my hesitancy to allow law students to take too many online courses. The face-to-face interaction and ability to collaborate is so incredibly important. Not only does this degree make me think about online legal education, but in those classes, there still was a lot of opportunity for group work and collaboration, and many hands-on exercises.

* Master’s Degree work in Microbial Genetics.

* Master’s Degrees in History and Counseling as I attended as an old guy after twenty years in the coaching business. Life experiences! Master’s in Agriculture: nothing there helped with law.

* Master’s in Creative Writing to help my Legal Writing skills. Now deceased, professor Jerome Stern who taught creative writing at FSU taught creative writing to bar conferences or judicial conferences to teach how to make an argument or opinion interesting to read. We probably need more of that influence too. It has helped me greatly.

* Master’s in Education and a Master’s in Business combo. MBA/JD is effective for those who do not want to practice law but enter the business field instead.

* Master’s in Education. There was practicum for in the field, and a practicum would be helpful to law students.

* Master’s in Education. It was useful in explaining complex matters to clients.

* Master’s in Education, Counseling. It greatly helps in my Marital and Family Law practice.

* Master’s in International Law.

* Master’s in International Relations.

* Master’s in Law.

* Master’s of History. What do you mean by effective? They need to learn to think and read and stay away from the Internet. They need to learn to be ethical and hold higher standards for themselves; to have intellect and curiosity. They need to read the classics (Charles Dickens, for example). My background in the classics and history is what helped me to graduate 15th in my class; not an ambition to “get a job” and earn money alone.

* Master’s of Liberal Arts. Humanities provide higher level of excellence.


* Master’s of Science provided critical thinking with practical application.
* Master’s Degree and specialist degrees in education. And yes, I learned strong language skills and logical thinking.

* Master's Degree in Journalism.

* Master's Degree International Affairs/Public Affairs. Internship and mentorship were mandatory components. I think they really strengthened the learning process and provided a network upon graduation.

* Studied master’s level courses in economics and business administration.

* While in law school, I quietly completed a MA in Criminology at USF. Also, later completed a M.Div. And, later, a D.Min. The two Master’s were fairly traditional, though the divinity degree was drawn out a bit due to working. The doctorate involved class work, but on an intensive basis, Friday's and Saturdays. That seemed to work well.

**MBA – 37 Responses**

* MBA. (11 Responses)

* MBA in Public Administration. (3 Responses)

* Business - MBA. (2 Responses)

* 9 hours of MBA credits.

* I also received an MBA while attending law school and I think that it helped me to understand the business behind the law.

* I obtained an MBA 10 years after graduating from law school. The training I received in this program greatly assisted me in time management and case management. That portion of the MBA requirements could easily be offered as part of the law school curriculum.

* I took courses toward a Master of Business Administration.

* I was working towards an MBA which was not completed. It did give me exposure to business concepts which have always helped during my career.

* Master of Business Administration. It helped me enormously in developing long-range thinking and in analysis of small businesses in order to file for employment visas for international clients.

* Master of Business Administration: Yes. There were a significant number of courses on interpersonal relationships and game theory. I think game theory is very significant in application to the law. Also, knowing business and business concepts is crucial to most legal work. Master’s of Science (Insurance and Risk Management) This was an online program, very well done. The significance of this program is that the student population
was excellent. The students were all more mature students and involved in the insurance industry and well experienced in it. I learned from the students as much as the coursework at times. MBA - very helpful in understanding business related issues, whether for corporate or litigation work.

* MBA courses.
* MBA in Public Administration. Yes, more Administrative Law classes would be helpful.
* MBA with finance concentration.
* MBA. Assisted me in the financial realm of law.
* MBA. Finance and accounting courses were critical to practice in capital markets; unlikely to be generally useful.
* MBA. Having a strong background in finance is helpful to anyone planning on practicing in business transactions and business litigation.
* MBA. The degree was of little value to me since I practice personal injury defense.
* MBA. The entire course was taught online by working lawyers. Best experience ever.
* MBA. Working collaboratively, and being taught by people with jobs outside academia.
* MBA in marketing/management.
* One year in MBA school.
* Some MBA courses. Focus was on problem solving as a group.
* Started MBA program. Also, multiple courses toward professional certification in chosen profession.
* The MBA degree did not require as much intellectual participation; however, the school put forth an excellent faculty with real world experience. Law School had too many professors with no courtroom experience.

**LLM – 14 Responses**

* LLM in tax. *(8 Responses)*
* I obtained an LL.M. in Estate Planning from the University of Miami. We were required to take a drafting course which was very good. They also used practicing attorneys as the teachers for the second semester of school which gave us true insight into the practice area.
* LLM in Health Care Law.

* LLM in Taxation: I am currently in this program. I like the semester layout. There are two courses a semester to be taken. However, each class is concentrated for half of the semester so there is only one class time.

* LLM program for the area of my practice provided more specialized learning.

* No degree, but I took some Tax and Real Estate LLM courses while enrolled in law school. Coursework was designed to integrate into a law degree or secure a dual degree.

* The LLM is a law degree so I will not elaboration on that degree.

**Ph.D. – 9 Responses**

* After law school, I returned for a Ph.D. in anthropology/archaeology. The law school coursework was much more difficult and intensive, but some of the archaeology classes better prepared me for a job. My law school classes were great as far as theory, but too few offerings prepared a person to join a small firm or enter into solo practice.

* Before going to law school I received a Ph.D. in pharmacology from a Midwestern medical school, and the camaraderie in graduate school was the exact opposite as it is in law school. While your colleagues in graduate school would do whatever they could to help you, law students would conduct themselves in nearly the opposite fashion. It was a hard culture shock, but it was indicative of the practice of law.

* Doctor in Civil Law; five years in foreign country.

* I hold a Ph.D. in History. I taught at the University of Illinois before attending law school. Law Review editor, also. My first degree was obtained at age 28, the next at 32, the JD at 38. I believe working had a very helpful effect on my legal education allowing me to see through many of the simplistic processes in law school.

* I worked on a Ph.D. in economics. It helped my analytical skills.

* Ph.D. Education improved my ability to read, understand, and think.

* Ph.D. in Materials Science & Engineering. I worked as a research assistant in the laboratory the entire time that I was getting a Ph.D. and had to develop my own programs, get them funded, publish papers and present them at conferences, and I generally did what an engineer and scientist would be expected to do upon graduation.

* Ph.D. in Microbiology and Cell Science. Experiential (hands-on) learning was important in graduate school and provided valuable insights into problems and problem solving. I believe this has practical implications and usefulness for law students and the practice of law.
* PhD in Economics. More collaborative learning in smaller groups.

**M.D./Pharmacy – 2 Responses**

* M.D. Yes, I think that there is a large potential to share educational courses between law and medical students, probably best handled by and M.D./J.D. or D.O./J.D.

* Pharmacy degree. It didn't help for law school but it did help for the practice of law regarding forensics.
21. Please provide any suggestions or ideas that you may have in relation to improving the law school structure or legal education process:

**Lawyers Who Graduated 5 Years Ago or Less**

**Practical Experience/Internships – 29 Responses**

* Clerkships in 3rd year of law school.

* Externships and trial and pretrial preparation. I feel that those two substitutions will better prepare a law school student to have focus and the skills necessary to succeed in any future endeavors as a law school graduate.

* Focus more on practical skills: both legal skills and the application of legal skills to non-law jobs. Learning issue-spotting is critical, but it doesn't take three years to learn and it can be taught in skills classes as well as theory.

* I believe that a postgraduate residency program is needed, much like medical school, offering experience in various areas of law may be quite beneficial.

* I believe there needs to be an emphasis on learning how to practice as a lawyer rather than continued focus on how to think like a lawyer. Thinking like a lawyer is certainly important; however, there needs to be a transition to prepare someone to join the workforce. At this point, that transition is inadequate. A practical experience program could change that.

* I feel that more practical training as a required part of the curriculum is crucial.

* I got a lot out of the workshop courses that applied practical lessons such as document drafting, landlord tenant law, and real estate closings, which I could use in the future. Not only did the workshop type courses provide me with a basic skill set to build upon but it also exposed me to the common software or other CLE’s and internet resources used by attorneys practicing in that industry. I would recommend that the last year of law school or perhaps the last two years of law school get away from Socratic case law and focus more on the practical aspects of the practice of law. I thought Nova Southeastern did a good job of making these courses available, however, I noticed that most students strayed away from the courses that involve weekly assignments, instead taking the "easy" courses with the professors that everyone loves or the courses with good outlines circulating amongst the students.

* I think law schools should incorporate more practical, hands on experiences for their students to better prepare them for working in the legal field.
I think that more practical experience would have prepared me more fully for the practice of law, but I do not think that practical learning opportunities should displace the substantive courses.

Improving law school career planning and placement offices and making it a requirement to see a career counselor. Also, creating an almost residency for law students who intend on taking The Florida Bar Exam, which may be coordinated through a law school's office of career planning and placement.

Incorporate more practical skills learning and more externship opportunities.

Incorporate practical legal experience. I do not, however, think that reducing law school to two years with one year of practical experience is the best method. Rather, practical experience or mentorship should be incorporated in the third year or added as an hourly requirement after graduation (similar to accountants seeking a CPA designation or engineers seeking certification). It may be considered "slave labor" to some, but it is one way to ensure that new lawyers have practical on-the-job training under supervision of a more experienced attorney.

It should be more hands-on, rather than theoretical. I got so much more out of my internships with a Circuit Court Judge and sole practitioner than I ever did in the classroom. Rather than having a third year of class material, I believe it is much more beneficial to require some form of internship/apprenticeship with a practicing attorney.

Law school needs to be structured like medical school with two to three years of classroom experience and an extra year or two of practice-based experience. This will ensure competent attorneys upon graduation or taking the bar. It can also control the quality of new attorneys, which would better the legal field, especially when many of them hang a shingle when they can't find work.

Make courses more practical and less theoretical.

Make more paid legal internships that allow practical learning as well as funding.

More clinical and experiential opportunities outside of trial team. Offer more classes or intramural trial team activities. Also, sponsor clinics where law students who have been certified as legal interns can provide pro bono assistance to indigent individuals.

More practical requirements and more exposure to alternative careers in or related to the law.

More real-world experience should be incorporated into the curriculum. I think there's a big difference between "academia" and the real world practice of law. Just because you're good at law school doesn't mean you'll be a good lawyer, and vice versa. The practice of law involves a lot more than just listening to a professor for four months and then writing essays. You have to deal with clients, co-workers, stress, deadlines, annoying opposing counsels, and oral hearings before judges.

Need to make it as practical as possible.
* Participating in at least one mock trial should be mandatory.

* Practical education is a must! Internships, externships, volunteering, trial advocacy programs, and part-time jobs in the legal fields are invaluable.

* Practical experience in real-world situations for which there is no substitute.

* Reach out to firms to have them cooperate and take in one intern a year/semester. Have the students’ grade reflect their performance based only on showing up and a suggested grade/feedback by their employer. Offer each firm a tie in with a local school and this will help build the community, relationships amongst attorney and cooperation in the future.

* Required internships or residencies during law school would be a big step in improving the legal education process and the quality of lawyers.

* Required practicum, externship, or apprenticeship portion in the last year.

* There needs to be courses or clinical programs similar to that offered to medical student during residency training that provides law students practical skills of day-to-day practice and litigation procedures. Perhaps extending law school from 3 years to 3 and-a-half or 4 years.

* Three years of law school plus residency-type training after law school would better prepare lawyers.

* To the extent new law students are unprepared for the practice of law; some kind of residency should be required. The limited skills courses offered by law schools are not sufficient, and in my opinion, never will be given the variety of jobs law students will eventually go into. There is no substitute for practical experience. Similarly, I do not believe that making law school more convenient, or shorter, will provide any benefit to the profession. Happy lawyers tend to be the ones that enjoy the law, and therefore, tend to enjoy law school. The theoretical background established in law school is absolutely essential to creating good lawyers. There are plenty of bad lawyers out there, no need to make more.

**Cost Concerns – 9 Responses**

* CLE’s are also often too expensive for young attorneys to get the practical knowledge they need. More CLE’s for young attorneys should be required but at a much reduced cost (or no cost at all).

* Cut back on the maximum dollar amount of student loans someone can acquire.
* Given the increase in number of new attorneys and decreasing salary of new associate, and even two to four year associate, there should be an option to avoid incurring the costs associated with the third year of law school. I would suggest that upon completion of the second year of law school, individuals be allowed to sit for the bar exam if they choose. At that point, the lawyer would have a license that would allow for gainful employment and avoid another year of crippling law school loans, while participating practice-based learning.

* Law school should not be for-profit.

* Limit on tuition that may be charged by law schools and a limit on the number of students that may be admitted (that it would somehow relate to the market for new attorneys).

* Lower costs.

* Revise the third year curriculum. The cost of law school is out of hand. Even with almost half of my tuition paid via scholarships, I graduated with over $100,000 in loans. This prevented me from even considering many fields of practice.

* The Florida Bar should cap admission rates based on the number of attorneys retiring or leaving the profession each year and adjust for population growth. Currently, students are spending $200,000 on a legal education and being forced to work at Chili's because there are no quality legal positions available. We should also base bar dues on earnings. A partner at Holland & Knight is making $850,000 a year and pays the same bar dues as a Family Law attorney making $30,000 per year. We should also consider implementing a mandatory retirement age. We should also limit the number of students that each law school can admit based on a number of factors, including employment prospects, internship opportunities, and bar passage rates.

* There should be more regulation of law schools to prevent students from enrolling in schools that are only in business for profit.

**Too Many Attorneys/Job Market Concerns – 9 Responses**

* Eliminate the majority of law schools. The barrier to enter in the legal profession has steadily declined over the last few decades (particularly the last few years). If someone can spell his name correctly on the LSAT, chances are he can find a law school that will accept him. We have what, 13 of them?!? After about 3 years, he may be able to regurgitate enough legalese to trick the bar examiners into thinking that he should actually be allowed to practice law. He, like 70% of his colleagues, will pass the bar and enter our wonderful profession. Soon thereafter, he will realize that there are significantly fewer jobs than graduates and maybe start to see that just because he got into a toilet of a law school didn't mean he should have actually attended. But I digress… P.S. Please don't think I am just bitter, I actually have a great job that I love. I do, however, know many folks that fit neatly into the above description.
Florida's legal community cannot, and has not been able to, support the increasing influx of graduates and lawyers. The fact that the number of law schools in Florida has actually increased in the past few years, despite the increasing disparity between available attorney employment opportunities and new Florida-licensed attorneys, is the greatest failing of the current law school structure and legal education process. Class sizes need to be drastically reduced. Schools like Ave Maria and Florida Coastal, from which over 40% of the graduating class fails the bar exam, should not (and should not be permitted to) continue to promise the sky to prospective students with grossly misleading employment and salary information from recent graduates.

Generally, the law school structure is not bad. I do believe that students need to be better prepared for the practice of law. I also believe that better reporting of job statistics are needed. The job market is really bad and I do not think that entering students are provided with the best information. There is a systemic effort to scrub the numbers in order to fill all the seats. So many of my classmates struggled to find jobs and continue to find employment. I think The Florida Bar needs to do their own reporting of job numbers. Lastly, there are far too many law schools in the State of Florida. Why Cooley and Ave Maria were allowed to move into a state that was already saturated with attorneys is beyond me. There was no need that either school filled. There were a variety of options in State before those two schools moved in.

Get rid of about 80% of the law schools.

I also feel that the ABA or The Florida Bar should be more protective of the profession by limiting the number of law school admissions/graduates as the profession is oversaturated with attorneys. Jobs are scarce and law firms are no longer providing the practical training that they once did. Too many young attorneys come out of school and are forced into private practice before they are competent.

Stricter selection criteria. Too many lawyers and not enough jobs. Law schools are tuition hungry without regard to the students’ prospects in the marketplace after graduation.

The legal profession cannot sustain the number of potential attorneys the law schools pump out, and there are few resources for solo practice straight out of school. Most of my classmates were considered employed because they opened solo practices. The system ill prepares you for competing with 250+ people for every job.

There needs to be fewer law schools, and it should be more difficult to get into law schools. Certain law schools are simply cash-cow diploma mills that churn out more graduates than the economy can support.

We need fewer law schools. We need to raise the standards for getting into law school. We need to stop pumping out poor trained "lawyers" to flood the market with additional frivolous claims, and we need to more strictly enforce ethics rules.
Miscellaneous – 10 Responses

* Eliminate tenure of professors. That system protects the professors at the expense of the students. Second, hold career services responsible for placement rates, pay them no salary only commission...and watch how that changes their effort. Career services is a joke. Develop a core curriculum that must be taught in Florida beyond the customary torts, property etc. It’s crazy that Federal income tax is not required. Every legal issue has tax consequences. Administrative law should be required. "Hard" business law classes. Not "animal rights jurisprudence" or "Harry Potter and the Law". Let’s make the title attorney mean something. There needs to be a minimum standard of quality; not the refuge for liberal arts majors trying to launder useless degrees.

* Ethics should be required all three years of school. The Florida Bar should give courses at all the Florida Law schools to educate the prospective Bar members as to what to expect if there is a violation of the Bar rules.

* Foster an environment of greater diversity, not simply diversity of race, religion, national origin, sexual orientation and the other typical attributes though to create diversity, but also diversity of background. There are many who may be denied the opportunity to attend law school on the basis of their background, not everyone starts at the same place, with the same advantages, and some without a shred of privilege. Law school should seek to bring out the best in its students and live up to the ideals of the profession. There should be little room for hypocrisy. An example is where students are coaxed into law school by misleading statistics (ask any entering, or applying student what they believe about those statistics), yet they are preached to about the values of candor as soon as they pass the gates.

* Get rid of the third year. Reshape legal education into something more substantial and don't make it a predicate to admission to the bar.

* Law school should provide more opportunities for feedback throughout the semester. As someone who came back to school after working for several years, I developed skills that allowed me to be successful in my chosen field. These skills were different from what I needed as a law student, but it took me a couple of semesters to figure out how I needed to change to improve my performance.

* Law schools should focus on providing students with the best education possible; rankings are misguiding and lead law schools to focus on rankings and numbers which do not translate into benefits for their students; class sizes and professor publications have little bearing on the quality of a course and the professor's ability to convey a practical and working understanding of the law. The same can be said for many of the other considerations for those rankings. I would also suggest that law schools and the bar reconsider their push on ethics because their focus is not on practical matters that most lawyers face in practice. I would suggest that as many or more bar concerns that arise in practice are not moral ethical issues but regulatory technicalities; however, such focus is placed on the moral hazards (which are generally obvious on their face) and less so on the
technical compliance issues which are experienced on a regular basis (i.e. trust funds, fee and settlement agreements, conflict both present and foresight as to what might arise as case proceeds, personal conflict as well as conflict deriving from other members of firm, etc.)

* Learning about legal systems in other countries.
* Legal writing should be structured better, where writing tutors are available when the professor cannot meet with all of her students multiple times.
* Make accreditation more difficult and regulate private institutions that charge very high tuition. Schools such as Nova, Florida Coastal, etc. are flooding the market with lawyers who are unprepared, lack a basic understanding of the legal process, and have terrible courtroom and professional etiquette with fellow lawyers. This is exacerbated by their need to make enough money to cover the astronomical cost of their education. Make experiential learning a requirement. Create a Florida suggested curriculum for students that will cover a more broad variety of classes that have universal application and bar passage value. Make Pro Bono service a law school requirement. Offer networking opportunities to different law schools so that students can interact and receive tips and information from well established and successful attorneys. Require a more academic or more robust writing requirement so that the law school experience is not merely based on shotgun style finals.
* The Socratic Method is outdated and dysfunctional; it benefits the professors more than the students. Case method still has some benefits, but there should be more scenarios discussed in class with real world issues.

**Lawyers Who Graduated More Than 5 Years Ago**

**Practical Experience/Internships/Mentorship Programs – 172 Responses**

* More practical experience. (28 Responses)
* Required internships. (4 Responses)
* Mentoring. (3 Responses)
* "How To" courses in drafting pleadings and legal documents Quality internship experiences. Opportunities for pro-bono experience- legal aid, etc.
* A Legal Residency.
* Add mandatory clinical and community service components. Require more rigorous writing assignments.
All law schools should provide sufficient clinical programs to allow students to gain experience in their areas of study.

An internship would greatly help new graduates understand more about the ACTUAL practice of law.

An internship-like process.

Apply theory learned in the classroom to actual practice through mentorship programs.

Apprenticeships.

Attorneys should practice one year before being allowed admission to the bar.

Based upon my experience, the academics were covered. I would suggest additional practical programs, mentoring and internships.

Being a solo practitioner since graduation, I learned all my practical experience from the school of hard knocks. The profession would benefit from mandatory clerkships with judges and/or legal aid internships. This would give practical experience to future attorneys and help the community as well as showing future attorneys the "right" way to do things. Too often, school clinics which attempt to do this are run by professors who have extremely limited knowledge in the practical aspects of practicing law.

Bottom line: Students need accelerated exposure to the actual practice of law and the practical skills necessary for lawyers to survive, including basic technological competency.

Changes to law school should make it more down-to-earth. There should be more focus on practical courses. Evidence and Administrative Law were not required at my law school! What is that? There should be more required courses that are things students will actually use later. The coursework should have something collaborative. That would have let me meet my fellow students in a way that was built-in to the classes.

Clearly, there is a push for online learning in every area of education. I was attracted to the notion of completing an E-JD when it was first discussed. However, having been through a traditional law school curriculum, I certainly benefited from the in-class learning and discussion that occurs. I have taught online programs via computer where there are students available via the web. However, the experience and discussion are not as free flowing. For the third year programs, more creative scheduling might be helpful to enable students to obtain more practical experience for credit.

Clinical experience or externships should be mandated before graduation. Schools should also maintain writing requirements for graduation and should exhibit a preference for students who have worked for a at least one or two years prior to admission.

Coop legal work experience is essential; more interactive classes; role playing different legal situations.
* Create more practice experiences with degree credits in 3rd year such as corporate/law firm internships, clerkships, etc. Have practitioners (law partners in firms) teach practice courses instead of law professors/academics that often never or only briefly practiced in a firm.

* Curriculum needs to be updated to reflect the practice of law and more practical experiences are needed.

* Don't eliminate the third year just because the "world" today doesn't want to invest the time in the required education. A complete recipe includes time to learn, grow and practice. The third year should be at least part clerking and/or internship. You will cheapen the practice of law, beyond the paralegal and form practice that is already supplanting much of what used to be law.

* Encourage group projects and collaborative learning. Require legal clinic and pro bono experience.

* Give practical training. The case method does not work well anymore. Some cases might be okay but we need to have competent attorneys when they graduate that can pick up a file and know what to do, at least know the general basics. Maybe the third year, at least part of it, should be shadowing a mentor and even doing some real work (drafting motions and orders, doing a closing, examining title, reviewing leases, etc.). Maybe there should be an internship for at least 6 months or a year. We don't need to shorten law school. We just need to improve it significantly.

* Having a course or courses on the office practice including the business of practicing law. How to be a business person; marketing and advertising due to the large number of lawyers today competing with one another.

* Having an assigned mentor working as a practicing attorney may have helped me understand the big picture of practicing law.

* I believe a "residence" program, similar to medical school, makes sense.

* I believe a post law school, apprenticeship, before being fully licensed would be very helpful. Also, requiring a mentor during law school and making skills courses mandatory

* I believe all students should have mandatory experience working in a law firm (internship) or in a clinic - at least one full semester

* I believe law school graduates are unprepared to be lawyers, especially trial lawyers. I think law students should be made to experience the practice of law under supervision similar to a medical student. A residency or supervised period of actual practice should be mandatory post graduation.

* I believe that more experiential learning should be required of students. I don't think there is such a big problem with law schools and legal education, except for the exorbitant price. I think the problem is more that the legal profession is based on billable hours, frivolous lawsuits, and greed.
* I believe that the trend is to have law school students perform practical activities; if this is the case, that trend should be continued.

* I believe the core classes and Socratic Method are important and necessary, but I think a return to a more entrepreneurial system for the third year would better help students prepare for practice.

* I feel that more clinic classes would prepare a student for the actual practice of law.

* I had a Master's Degree in Secondary Education before going to law school. That program required a student teaching internship as well as course work on a practical level for the subject to be taught. I believe that the internship was by far the most valuable experience and should be widely incorporated into the law school required curriculum. In the College of Education, "methods classes" were required for graduation. These classes taught students how to teach in the classroom rather than theorize about teaching. I believe law students would benefit from a wider choice of law classes devoted to the "how to do it" approach.

* I have been very happy with my legal education. The traditional legal course work I took has served me well. Without minimizing that, the addition of clinical work is both a recent and welcome addition to legal studies.

* I just never understood the value of the "multistate" portion of the exam. The ability to spot an issue and argue either side of the issue (never know what side your client may be on and need to have the ability to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the other side of an issue) is paramount in training a good lawyer. Create an internship and residency type program. Work with retired judges, the judicial system and private law firms in creating the system. However, there must be a screening process by the law school. I have experienced law school students and graduates that have very poor reading and reading comprehension skills. When given a project, the results are just sad. Remedial programs for underperforming students are needed. Don't rely on the bar exam alone. Up the ante and work the students harder because they are out of college and it's time to get to work. I know what it takes to be a good lawyer, and I know how hard the MD's work in medical school and beyond, dealing with patients day in and day out.

* I strongly believe that at least half a semester should be an externship. Also, a course on law office management should be available. I also suggest a course on client development and retention in private practice.

* I strongly believe that the last year of law school is important to create better lawyers. The first two years are spent on the various areas of law, but do not provide a mentorship opportunity. The last year of law school opened doors and enables students to try a practical internship or work with a practicing lawyer. The law profession is a profession and the way to achieve professionals is for them to be mentored.

* I think a few practical courses would be beneficial, i.e. internships where people actually practice law.
I think a mentoring program would be great, as since the economy has declined, there are fewer jobs with big law firms. Thus, many law school graduates are opening their own firms with little or no experience as to how to "practice" law. They need help with how to treat other lawyers, local rules, etc. I also think the Certified Legal Intern program should be required in the third year, as it was very important in giving me a glimpse at what it was like to be a real lawyer.

I think law schools needs to be more practical. The legal profession is not as prestigious as it used to be so the law schools need to change with the times. Increase the career services staff and put competent "recruiter" type people in there instead of a donor's son or daughter who knows nothing about the job market. Also, law schools need to focus on technology and teach students about legal software like Summation, Case Management databases, etc. This will make them marketable as well. Also, students should be using courtroom technology as well so when they get out they will be ready to go to court. Legal employers now do not want to train students anymore. The employers don't want to pay to train new attorneys on billables, discovery, etc. So, if law schools can get the students prepared then they can get jobs sooner rather than later. Also, I think law schools need to have one track for academics and another track for practical experience. It seems like they are intertwining academics and practical skills and students are getting lost in the middle. If a student wants to be a professor, then they should go to class more. If a student wants to practice, then they should have more internships. Right now, it seems all disorganized and the students are leaving school with no practical skills and most of them do not have the grades to be a professor/academic. Also, have the career services department meet with every first year student and help them develop a "career" plan as soon as they get to law school. The career services person can sit down with the student and talk to them about what they want to do and then help design a plan to get there. For example, if a student wants to be corporate counsel, the career counselor will tell them about what classes/internships need to be taken and what type of grades they need to have in order to be attractive to a company. This could work for Family Law, Real Estate law, employment law, Criminal Law, etc. But, if they can get to the students early in the process, either before classes begin or early in the first semester, then the student has an idea of what they need to do in terms of grades to get in the best position to get the job they desire.

I think mentoring is so important, so anything that can be done to make it mandatory for the students is equally important. We participate in pairing events, but frequently it's with students already competent, sophisticated, and well-connected in the legal community. They have no need to stay in touch. At the other end of the spectrum are the marginal students, who desperately need mentoring but hardly ever participate in voluntary pairings. Yet those are the students who, as lawyers, wind up before The Florida Bar in disciplinary proceedings, often because they simply don't understand the Rules. Then there are those with iffy credentials, ethics, and professionalism. They, too, would profit from mandatory mentoring.

I think more hands-on, practical day-to-day skills should be taught in both on-site classroom courses and clinics in which law students are given live interaction with the public handling legal matters in a supervised fashion should be the focus of the third year
of law school. These types of courses should replace any requirement for a senior paper, which I felt was interesting, but totally a waste of time for the future practice of law.

* I think students should have to serve as an apprentice of sorts before becoming a lawyer. Nothing provides an education like practical experience.

* I think that the highest ranked students do not have real life experience. They just study, do well on tests, participate in moot court, and do not have many interpersonal skills. Most top law firms love these types of students. However, I hear these same law firms complain that their new hires do not do well in obtaining new clients. These same law firms complain that their associates do not work well together. I am a sole practitioner now, after 3 years working in firms. I had significant career experience before attending law school and worked full time during law school. No big firm would consider me as an applicant because I did not participate in moot court since I was working. Now, I have a significant book of business that I built for myself and am confident that I would have made a good rainmaker for a big firm. I would never consider that now, because I enjoy the work life balance I have created for myself. The focus needs to be on the "entire package" and just not moot court. There have to be other ways to judge the potential success of a law student.

* I think the value of the third year of law school should be evaluated and compared with an apprenticeship-type of experience. I will be interested to see how the new ABA standards purporting to evaluate law school effectiveness play out. I think the structure of the bar exam needs to be seriously re-evaluated, particularly the format in Florida. I recommend adoption of the Uniform Bar Exam and granting reciprocity. Florida is losing good lawyers to other states because the practice of law is rarely contained just in one state anymore and people do not, or would prefer not, to be restricted in where they can practice their chosen profession without adding the significant additional costs and time commitment to pay for bar prep courses and take another bar. I think Florida is also losing good law students because of its clear decision to deter out-of-state lawyers from relocating here, but making the entire process as painful as possible. That may have saved the local bar from some high priced retiring lawyers but it is more significantly affecting the young people of this state in an era of globalization. I cannot see any justification for an attorney in good standing to take the MPRE. The Florida State Bar already has the best evidence possible of that attorney's capability to ethically practice law. The MPRE adds nothing to that calculus except additional bar and bar prep fees.

* I think there should be some internship/residency program before you can actually hang out your shingle.

* I went to law school a long time ago. Things may have changed, but I would put more emphasis on practice management and real-life experience. I would devote the entire third year of law school to that.

* I would have more hands on training beginning with the first year. Legal aid clinics helping the underserved would be great training. The business model has to change because of programs like Legal Zoom.
If law schools expand "experiential" or experience classes, these have to be taught by professors with significant experience - not a theoretician but someone who understands the pressures of time, advocacy, efficient analysis and counsel. Any clinic or internship program needs to have a professorial component to analyze what is being done in the clinic, good points and bad points, good habits and bad habits, ethical practices and unethical practices. This professor also needs to have practical experience- best if he/she is considered a top lawyer in the community. Theoreticians cannot address the nuances of how to argue to a judge of limited experience or time for reviewing written submittals, how to use a patronizing lawyer opponent in a negotiation to your benefit, or how to diffuse tempers in a contract negotiation or a mediation to reach a solution.

Improve Legal Writing. Improve public speaking and parliamentary procedure. Have a mandated Internship program with approval by an experienced practitioner, and considering prior criminal, drug and social history.

In addition to my earlier comments about practical experience, there should be a stronger emphasis on ethical practice other than what is done with regard to the ethics code. Regardless of the oath of admission, most attorneys fail to put their clients' interests ahead of their own. It has been shocking and disheartening. Perhaps the practical experience should involve some degree of service to people in need (for free) with the assistance of a mentor so they can learn on a real level and see the results more readily.

In addition to offering a course on law office management (couple it with ethics) and courses on the mechanics of filing a suit, getting subpoenas issued, etc., I'd like to see a period in which the 3rd year student must intern in a law office, state attorney's office, public defender's office, or other qualified community service law firms (legal aid).

In my experience, the areas of focus to improve the legal education process need to be on the practical aspects of earning the degree and getting employed in a meaningful occupation. Law schools do not educate prospective students adequately on the "business" of obtaining a law degree, i.e. cost of tuition versus prospective employment available to make the right return on your investment. Law schools are focused on enrollment, not on properly educating the kids, and I say kids because most law school enrollees have barely had a credit card in their name for five years, on one of the biggest expenditures of their lives.

Incorporate more skills courses in the 3rd year (as opposed to seminars).

Incorporate more writing opportunities across the curriculum (and not just in Legal Writing courses). Encourage or require pre-law majors to take writing courses.

Internship requirement; actual litigation experience on a real case. But both will be difficult to provide to as many students as the law school system wishes to pump out.

Internships at law firms should be required in order to graduate. All students should be required to take a class regarding ethics, negotiation tactics, and the business of running and working at a law firm.
It has to be more practice focused. Most of my law school courses were worthless, dealt with subjects I never used in practice, and focused on theory rather than how to use the information in a practical manner. I actually think my liberal arts undergraduate education, with a focus on analytical thinking, reading and interpretation, and clear, concise and logical writing skills, better prepared me to be a lawyer than law school did (and I attended a "top 5" law school). If law school is supposed to provide something that undergraduate education doesn't, it certainly doesn't accomplish that as presently structured. It needs to prepare you for the profession, rather than trying to make you "think like a lawyer" by studying useless subjects.

It needs to incorporate some level of actual practice skills training.

Just like physicians, I believe that lawyers should have mandatory residencies before they can actually take on clients. As it is, a graduate can hang a shingle and have no idea how to actually represent his/her clients or even where to start. A new lawyer does not know what he/she does not know because there is no mandatory practical training required of lawyers.

Law school education needs to have a mentorship or internship component like medicine and accounting.

Law school needs to teach the nuts and bolts of each practice area. Students should "major" in one area of law and take numerous courses in that area and have clinical experiences in that area.

Law school should be structured in a way to provide as much practical experience as possible. How is it possible that it is not even a graduation requirement to have a practical experience such as an externship, clinic, etc.? For example, Northeastern law school is designed on quarters. Each student spends a quarter (11 1/2 weeks) in class work, then a quarter doing a practicum. Every student has four practicums by the time they graduate. They also have an excellent first year legal research and writing program called Legal Skills in Social Context where students have client organizations and are organized into "law offices" where they research and produce a written work product for the clients. Their law school has a public interest focus so this program wouldn't work in the same way for other law schools but could be adapted. If not a total reorganization of the semester structure, then the third year itself should be redesigned to have more of a structured clinical/practical experience. Almost all of the students' time should be spent on real cases. There is so much legal need out there that the legal profession is not serving (both low-income and middle class) and law students can gain practical experience while providing a public service.

Law school should teach the basics of running a law office and basic civility. Practical experience is certainly necessary.

Law schools need to focus less on so called social activism (although there is a place for this) and more on training practical law skills and protecting our republican form of government and constitutional rights.
* Law schools need to teach more practical skills. Also, provide greater specialization to cater to the career goals of the students.

* Law schools need to be more affordable and they need to actually produce lawyers, not just law school graduates. Without practical, hands-on, real-world experience a law school graduate is pretty useless.

* Law schools should begin the second year getting the law student prepared for the actual practice of the law with courses in law office management and additional courses dealing with hands-on issues, such as moot court, different clinics and eventually some type of mentoring program where the student will be working under an attorney, but will also be provided with an opportunity to understand the workings of the law firm.

* Law schools should encourage clerkships, externships and internships at various legal departments, whether they be in the judiciary, government agencies, in-house corporations or private law firms.

* Law schools should focus more on providing students with the tools they need to be successful in a specific area of practice. Learning the basics (i.e., Torts, Contracts, Civil Procedure, and Criminal Procedure) is nice to know in the short-term but the farther one distances themselves from these concepts based on their chosen legal practice the less useful they seem on a grander scale. Speaking with fellow attorneys who are not in the criminal field, it's clear that the basic tenets of law learned in a Criminal Procedure class have been lost because that person's area of practice never touches upon the subject.

* Law schools should really offer Internship/Residency/Fellowship type education similar to what they do with medical students.

* Law schools should teach students how to practice law, manage a law practice, time management and organizational skills.

* Make it more real and relevant to every day practice.

* Make it relatable to the real world.

* Make law school a more practical legal education experience than it has historically been. Get the students out of the classroom and into law firms, government agencies, non-profits, etc. Give them the opportunity to see what the day to day practice of law really entails. Afford students the ability to meet possible mentors and find networking opportunities.

* Make the curriculum more real-world oriented.

* Make the third year a clerking year. Structured, both transactional and litigation. Loads of opportunity in pro bono, prosecution, defense, guardian ad litem, various agencies. Not just cheap or free labor, but a structured program with measurable goals.

* Mandatory internship in legal field.
* Mentor/Apprenticeship programs during third year.

* Mentoring programs need to be implemented. Students need to come out of law school with a clear understanding of what will be required of them as an associate in a law firm.

* Mentoring the lawyer at all levels from first year of law school through the fifth year of practice.

* More "black letter" instruction; less egotistical Socratic Methodology; and more early practical experience as an apprentice under a lawyer.

* More clinical education in both civil and criminal.

* More clinical programs, more office management education.

* More clinical training.

* More courses focused on managing a law practice.

* More courses with practical experience and more online courses.

* More focus on practical application. Mentoring is also important and it gives the new lawyer someone with perspective to help answer questions and guidance. In Florida, there are over 100,000 lawyers. Give lawyers some small Ethics credit for mentoring. It wouldn't take very much to have most new lawyers have a real mentor for the first year or two out of law school.

* More frequent writing exercises and the development of mandatory internships.

* More needs to be done to prepare students for the management of a law practice.

* More opportunities for practical legal experiences/more opportunities to learn the "practice" of law.

* More practicality. Real Estate courses should take their students on a field trip to the local courthouse to see how the land recording process works. Estate courses should take their students on a field trip to the local courthouse to see a probate judge's ex parte day hearings.

* My preference would be to require law students to either do an apprenticeship before school or an internship after schooling before being admitted.

* Need for deans of experiential education who can think holistically about tying clinical courses and externships together with other skills-based courses, and that provide opportunities to channel students into their areas of interest, i.e., Criminal Law, Family Law, Immigration Law, etc.
* Not sure where to start. Maybe begin with professor (academics the first year and part of second year) part of second year, actual practitioners. The third year, multiple internships and education experience to help new lawyers learn what it is really like.

* Offering practical experience courses.

* Perhaps the profession should have an intern or residency requirement.

* Practical skills are critical. Every law student should watch at least a few real motion hearings, trials, and appellate arguments. All should have a basic grasp on drafting everyday legal documents.

* Practical skills over professorial interests. If I'm going to trade-school to be a plumber, I want to be taught about plumbing by plumbers, not taught pipe-theory by an anti-plunger activist who proposes that hair clogs be addressed through government-mandated body waxing.

* Present opportunities for practical application: students should actually write contracts, wills, and corporate documents.

* Provide attorney/firm marketing and management instruction and some form of apprenticeship.

* Provide clinical and professional experience along with the required course work. Add investing money and time management, and stress management courses to the curriculum. On line instruction would suffice.

* Provide training in the practicalities of practicing law such as running the firm or practice as a business, dealing effectively with clients and opposing counsel and management of conflicting pressures of time management, case load and client expectations.

* Require an internship as a part of curriculum.

* Require intern and residency programs as conditions of admission to be able to practice law in Florida. This was an area of concern that was being addressed by the Student Education and Admissions committee a number of years ago when I served as the co-chair of that committee. At that time the Florida Supreme Court directed that the committee stop its work as the Court controlled admissions.

* Require legal residencies.

* Require most learning of fundamental law courses during the first two years and put more emphasis on developing skills at applying the law during the third year.

* Required and or more access to clinic/hands on type experiences.

* Required part time job or internship.

* Residency - like medical school requires.
* Scrap it. Try the method that worked before someone figured out how to make money from students: apprenticeship.

* Simply to offer a practical internship or mentoring program.

* Socratic Method can be boring but is necessary to teach lawyers how to reason for future application. Also, more involvement internships so practical application is learned.

* Strongly support an externship and apprentice approach to closing out the law school experience.

* Students need actual experience that cannot be taught in a classroom. Internships or clerkships should be mandatory for all students from the first year. Students should be required to change their internship each year to try different areas of law to gain a better understanding of the entire judicial system. Career Services should focus on assisting all students find employment, not just the top 10%, and match students appropriately based on their individual strengths and weaknesses.

* Students should start with hands-on practical experience in addition to classroom work from day one.

* Talk to Sandy D'Alemberte about the difference between Medical School and Law School.

* The current structure is working, but if a change is being contemplated, then there should be more hands-on practical exposure to life in a law firm. That would be very useful to third-year students.

* The law industry has erred by moving away from a more formal intern-type process whereby after law school there is a period (like a doctor) of study under another lawyer. At a minimum, I think schools should encourage seeking those kinds of experiences prior to full-blown practice. This would increase retention for law firms and job satisfaction for lawyers.

* The more clinical experience and courtroom experience you can provide the students, the better off they will be in practice, if they have learned the law. While this has improved in recent years, when I attended, we had only one moot court experience and that was the only trial experience we were offered. When you were admitted to the Bar, you simply had to fend for yourself unless you were employed by a large firm that offered mentoring.

* The process of obtaining a legal education should not be turned into a purely skills-focused, trade school mentality. I think the rise of lower tier law schools focused solely on teaching to take the bar exam do not serve the legal community in Florida. The honing of critical thinking skills in an academic setting is important. However, the 3L year (when the skills are most pressing) should provide students with the option of enrolling in at least 50% of credit hours in more skills based classes above and beyond those purely focused on Trial Advocacy.
The school I attended was focused on grades, homework, and it felt like a war. Something to try to survive and get through and then try to put behind me. I had little by way of instructors who cared for students, or seemed to want their students to succeed. By the same token, there was little practical teaching. People learn by doing, not by being lectured, or by professors humiliating them. So, training lawyers by having them do, makes far more sense. I also never was made to feel valued (for what was paid for my education, they should have been kissing us all every morning, but instead we were treated like dirt), students were made to feel excluded, not included. The famous speech, look to your left, look to your right, 2 of you won't be here by the end of 3 years was what the entire staff lived and breathed. Some care for the emotions and support of students would have gone far. Most professors seemed to be bitter, tired, or just plain bored with their professions. Few seemed to enjoy what they did, and fewer seemed to enjoy teaching. So, for instance, rather than lecture on 50 years of contracts, why not immediately assign students to draft contracts, then have them in a mock suit sue over the contracts and use case law to bolster their position? Wouldn't that go much further in teaching contracts than lecturing and humiliating students?

The studies need to be rigorous, and standards set high. However, it should not be based on a grading curve or the survival of all who are fit. The third year should be an extended internship with mentors and practice providers who have a good reputation for practicing with dignity and respect.

The third year should be a one-on-one apprenticeship with a skilled teacher.

The third year should be online electives and an internship in court or law firms, but the internship programs must be qualified by The Florida Bar.

There is a disconnect between the business of practicing law and the profession of practicing law. Law school concentrates on teaching the profession only and doesn't prepare the student for the business.

There needs to be more practical instruction in addition to the academic instruction.

There should be a variety of real world experience in nonprofit, government, transactional, litigation, etc.

There should be a year of required internship, possibly in public service law.

There should be classes to expose law students to all the areas of practice, with a mentor program attach to it.

There should be some sort of apprentice program. Doctors have an internship and a residency. We need to have something like that!

Third year could be used more productively to get students in the workforce as mentors and with actual clients.

Third year internships.
Third year should be composed primarily of practical experience or internship. Law schools have to cut down on class size. Either cut down on law school graduates or increase difficulty of Bar Exam, or both. We are flooded with lawyers, most of whom have no idea how to generate income or deal with clients. I was fortunate to practice law in a time when the practice of law was not encroached upon by other businesses.

Trial skills classes should be a requirement, not an elective. When I was in law school, no one told me how important it was to take the trial skills class. I missed out on it and this changed the course of my life, to the detriment.

We need more practical learning than just teaching.

When I was in law school, the emphasis was on legal analysis - how to spot/argue legal issues primarily in writing. While those skills are fundamental, I could have benefited from more practical clinics, including negotiation strategies/techniques, trial advocacy, drafting actual pleadings, drafting, reviewing and understanding contracts. (In contracts, we learned the basic theories, but never read or analyzed the contracts themselves (for example, indemnification clauses). This practical/hands-on teaching would be beneficial.

While the law, itself, is very important, hands on opportunities in various sections of the law would be helpful in assisting students in deciding what they would like to pursue, as well as the various avenues open to them with a law degree.

**Too Many Attorneys/Job Market Concerns – 62 Responses**

Better job placement assistance for all levels of students.

Change the laws in all 50 states to allow attorneys to get jobs in any state as any other person in this country can easily do without having to take another Bar Exam; this will improve greatly employment opportunities for lawyers.

Cut back on the number of people either (a) being admitted into law school, or (b) being admitted to the bar, to ensure that those who become lawyers continue to find value in practicing.

Cut back the number of law schools to 4 and no more. Of course you can't do that. But, at least, for God's sake, don't authorize any more law schools for Florida. You are ruining the quality of the profession.

Cut down on the number of schools and the number of new attorneys. Far too many lawsuits are filed by attorneys who appear desperate for a big recovery regardless of the merits.

Do away with diploma mills.

Do not allow so many new law schools to get started.
* Dump the lower tier law schools. They are paving the boulevard of broken dreams with the shattered hopes of applicants lured by the availability of student loans most will find impossible to repay.

* Eliminate "for profit" law schools which are giving us all a bad name. They are accepting students that have no business practicing law. The Bar really needs to do something about this!

* Eliminate law school factories, which concentrate on the profit motive.

* Emphasize placement of graduates and more effectively connect law schools with potential employers.

* Florida has far too many law schools and is turning out far too many lawyers. There should be some restrictions. Schools should be very wary of simply teaching how to pass the bar. While this is important, many from these schools have no ability within the profession. All focus should be taken off of making money and how the law is a wonderful income producer. We have far too many lawyers who skate around ethics and justify just about anything (as attested to, for one example, by the current lawyer advertisements).

* Get rid of about 50% of the law schools and ban for profit law schools.

* I do not think the issue is the law schools or the legal education. I think the issue is that there are too many law schools and not enough jobs available for law graduates. I have met talented young men and women who have graduated from top schools in the State and have passed The Florida Bar and six months later are still looking for a job (any job in the legal field) and they cannot find a job. These young attorneys are forced to find a job in alternate careers or open their own practice without any kind of guidance or mentors. I think law schools should be more forthcoming with the reality of the job market for attorneys and should advise their prospective law students that a percentage of you would end up with jobs in the legal field, another percentage of you will end up with jobs in fields other than law (financial, marketing, sales, lobbying) and another percentage of you may not find jobs. That reality should be addressed by law schools. It may deter some from investing time and money for the next three years or it may not but it should be addressed during the admission process and not three years later when consulting with career services.

* I think the law schools need to be more selective in a way that does not depend solely on LSAT score and GPA. One of the big problems I think that we are facing in Florida is that there are too many law schools, some of which are not highly regarded, churning out too many lawyers. I think that the law schools should admit fewer students and focus on developing graduates who have some practical skills, acquired through internships, clerking positions, or even mock trial, moot court classes and seminars, the profession would benefit.
* I think there are too many law schools with too many graduates for the number of law firm positions available. If law schools were more selective then we would not have as many graduates without positions in the field of law.

* If the academic institution does not have a successful career planning and placement office, then walk away. It matters that you have the support of the faculty, alumni and friends to find a place to hang your license. Since 90% of lawyers will work in a small business, then 90% of law students must be taught how to "walk and talk" like a courtroom lawyer, even for the most basic segments of the legal population. Even Trust and Estate lawyers need to know how to admit a document into Evidence at a hearing.

* If the undergraduate student doesn't have the grades, commitment, and LSAT score to indicate they will do well in law school, then spare the student the time and expense of law school as they are too crowded already with these types of students. Do the profession a favor, too.

* In my experience, law schools focus on job placement for the top 10% of graduates instead of focusing on the larger population of students who struggle to make the connections that the 10% already have on paper. This is a disservice to the 90% who have made the same tuition payments and will not "burn out at the top" but instead promote the graduating institution by actually living out their career goals.

* It also doesn't make sense to be opening more law schools if jobs in law firms are becoming more difficult to obtain.

* Law schools and the ABA need to return the legal profession to a profession. We are graduating too many lawyers with too few credentials and lowering the standards. Clients have little faith in us, if we in the profession have lost ourselves, how can the clients and general populace trust us.

* Law schools need to be realistic about the number of attorneys needed rather than just churning them out. As noted above, the market is flooded and way too many graduates are entering the market with huge debt but no opportunity for meaningful legal employment.

* Less law schools. Law schools are a business. They take too many students. They graduate with big debts that take out the liberty to do good in the profession. Limit law school and students. Graduate less.

* Limit number of schools and students so as to not oversaturate the market.

* Limit the number of graduates so that the market is not saturated with attorneys.

* Limit the number of graduates; expand the number of paralegals; create a medium level profession similar to a nurse practitioner. There are two problems with the field: 1) Some lawyers are too lazy and don’t do enough. 2) Some lawyers are too persnickety and do too much. The system should shuck these types out.
* Limit the number of law schools. Withhold or withdraw ABA accreditation to law schools that are substandard. Have national standards that all potential student must meet in order to be accepted into law school.

* Provide realistic numbers in terms of actual attorney jobs which are available. The stats from law schools are so skewed showing that people are employed following graduation but they fail to mention that these people are not employed as attorneys, are under employed or employed in an unrelated field because the jobs just don't exist for these new graduates.

* Reduce class sizes and reduce the number of law schools. Remember that Bar Exams do not teach law. Bar Exams should not be used to regulate the number of attorneys licensed to practice. That should occur prior to entering law school.

* Reduce the number of "law factories," (which may happen anyway, as the population of lawyers increases beyond the public need, excluding the corporate employers, who get the cream of the crop). Just as in the medical profession, the number of "Family Lawyers" is decreasing, and the employable cadre of lawyers who are not snatched up by the major firms or their corporate clients and do not specialize are struggling in the competitive marketplace. This has resulted in an overabundance of degrading advertising, which has sunk to the level of defining lawyers as used law salesmen, so that in a social setting I never introduce myself as a lawyer.

* Reduce the number of law schools and the size of the classes. This will allow graduates a better opportunity to find a job or build a practice in the future.

* Reduce the number of law schools in Florida and nationally.

* Reduce the number of law students.

* Send the for-profit, no tiered schools back to Michigan. Make the bar exam almost impossible to pass to avoid the glut of attorneys that has made this once-enjoyable profession a barely-tolerable business.

* Significantly decrease the size of all incoming classes for the foreseeable future to allow the number of practicing lawyers to even out with demand for legal work. This would call for fewer law professors.

* Significantly increase the LSAT score requirement for law school entry and the bar exam score for licensure.

* Simple: eliminate the hack schools that are popping up everywhere. Those idiot law student graduates that somehow get in with a 130 on their LSAT, then graduate, somehow pass the Bar, and then take cases for so little it is impossible to compete. They do such horrendous work that our community suffers.

* Stop allowing more law schools! We have 12 schools, many of which are accepting and passing students that have no business in this profession.
Stop approving more law schools- they are not needed. Florida is Flooded with lawyers as it is.

Stop churning out graduates. Limit the number of schools willing to accept anyone with money to pay. Law school has become too accessible and it is a disservice to kids who will never get a job that pays them a living wage unless the graduate at the top of their class. Law school used to mean something; it doesn't anymore.

Stop handing out law school accreditations like hot cakes! The Florida Bar has done a massive disservice to what was formerly a profession that allowed its members to earn a decent living by blindly focusing on "access" issues and the willingness of a seemingly inexhaustible supply of federally funded paying law students. I submit The Florida Bar failed to consider the negative impact that today's glut of law schools, law students and lawyers has on the marketability/earning ability of its members. Essentially, I believe The Florida Bar did not conduct any market study to determine what, if any, need there really was for more lawyers before handing out accreditations!

Stop opening law schools! Slow down the number of lawyers entering the work force-and being forced to go out on their own.

Stop the proliferation of law schools. It degrades the quality of applicants and the quality of lawyers coming into the profession.

Stop using law schools as a profit making business and more like a seminary for an honored and essential profession; better screening of applicants to ensure they have adequate undergraduate preparation, less reliance on standardized testing and more attention on what courses they took, what grades, and how they been spending their free time. In law school; less time on the Socratic Method and more time actually explaining the substance of the matters covered by each class.

The ABA needs to stop accrediting law schools. The value of a law degree is being devalued as we flood the market with young lawyers who are underemployed. We are reaching a tipping point in the ability of the public to pay the hourly fees charged in some firms. We need to provide a more cost effective way for the general public to be properly represented and access the legal system. There are simply too many law schools and the quality of the students being accepted is declining as law schools struggle to fill seats and remain financially viable. Over time this is going to result in less qualified and skilled lawyers and poor representation.

The ABA should quit accrediting every new school that makes a request.

The Bar has to acknowledge the problem of too many lawyers and speak publicly, and often. They need to say that there is only a need for 50% of the law school graduates. Law schools need to be closed or cut-off from all sources of aid from the state or their larger universities. The bar association has to stop hiding behind "diversity" as justifying all of this runaway law school/law student growth in the face of no need. You can't tell me that an African American, Hispanic-American, special-needs student or his or her family is any happier that they graduated from law school and now have all of this debt
and cannot find a job. Also try a little "trading places". Make the dean of every Florida law school take 18 months off and open/run, and live off their earnings as a solo-practitioner in a storefront/office condo solo practice! They talk like they know what it is like - they have no idea. None. Same thing for the people in The Florida Bar office in Tallahassee. You know the finer points of correcting the problem - the last 15% - may actually take some work. But the largest part of the problem is easy - close law schools. Speak publicly about their being too many lawyers. Do everything possible to lower admissions by 50%.

* The number one problem facing The Florida Bar today: we have way too many lawyers. When I joined the Bar in 1983, there were approximately 30,000 Florida Bar members. We now have close to 125,000. The Florida population has not even doubled, yet the number of lawyers has quadrupled. There is not enough legitimate legal work around to support 125,000 lawyers. Something had to give, and it sure did. Professionalism died. It was a slow and painful death. You can try to teach professionalism, but when over half the members of the Bar cannot make a middle-class blue collar wage much less what they expected to make when they decided to go to law school, lawyers will say one thing in professionalism class and do quite the opposite in the real world. This is a long way of saying that if you really want to improve Florida's law schools, then you should start by dramatically shrinking the number of students who attend them. A good start would be to diminish class sizes at the publicly funded schools by 50%. The next move would be to raise tuition to the point where it is not subsidized by the State, except by need-based student loans. If we had fewer lawyers, the rest of the problems would sort themselves out.

* The schools have to stop accepting so many students. The schools have to come up with a program on how to educate the students on the real practice of law and the everyday issues that attorneys have to handle such as marketing and communicating with clients.

* The student crankout by law school diploma mills needs to be stopped.

* There are too many law schools and doing a great disservice to the student population. They are giving them a very bland education and charging excessive tuition and fees.

* There are too many law schools and law students. Law schools job projections are at the least unrealistic and possibly misrepresentation.

* There are too many lawyers, thereby creating an overly and inappropriately competitive atmosphere. Civility has also taken a hit in this environment.

* There should not so many law schools that are accredited. There are too many lawyers as a result of the number of law schools in the state.

* Too many people are going to law school, and it is hurting the sole practitioner.

* We are producing too many legal grads who want to practice. Also, the costs are astronomical. More disclosure of placements will allow the market to adjust.
* We are turning out too many attorneys. I am Board Certified which has insulated me somewhat from the onslaught of competition but I see too many hungry lawyers out there saying and doing things because they need the pay check instead of concern for their client’s best interest. There are book smart lawyers that need a real education in the practical and very practical individuals who do not know the law. We need to make certain that our graduates are prepared for both and understand both concepts. I see too many attorneys shoot from the hip without knowing they have a legal basis for their claim and too many spending client's money beyond the value of the claim.

* We have too many law schools accepting the lowest common denominator. Those graduates find themselves deeply in debt and unprepared to practice law at a responsible level.

* We need to graduate fewer lawyers so that the people entering the field have a realistic opportunity to be hired and earn enough money to be able to have a life while paying back their student loans.

* We only need about 1/3 of existing law schools. It makes no sense to super-saturate the market with such an excess of lawyers.

* When I graduated, there were only 4 law schools in Florida, and the vast majority of graduates were competent to practice. Now there are objectively too many law schools. The deeper into the talent pool we dip for students, we lower the odds of graduating those with an aptitude for the practice of law. The more competition we create over a limited supply of legal work, ethics are likely to suffer. As ethics decline, bar members and the public suffer.

* You need to close about two thirds of the law schools. We have way too many lawyers. The graduates have to focus on their fight to obtain and maintain gainful employment and not on being professionals. There are only so many good law professors. It's folly to expect that opening another school automatically creates good professors. Many students today are being cheated out of a quality education, because there are simply too many students being accepted into too many schools. There is no shortage of lawyers, and there is no need to have all of these pop up law schools. By flooding the market with unneeded, poorly educated lawyers you have diluted many good aspects of our profession and increase many bad aspects.

**Remove Tenure System/Suggestions on Professors – 11 Responses**

* All law schools should require their professors to take at least one course in pedagogy. Most haven't a clue of how to do their job more masterfully. Many tenure-track faculty seem unable to shift their focus from a Socratic Method to a more collaborative approach that would better accommodate the mental growth of students from a freshman class to a senior or post-graduate class. Some of this has to do with the "publish or perish" paradigm, which causes the nations law reviews to be filled with esoteric gobbledygook, and tends to delay development of real world, practical skills. It also causes them to be
less involved in TFB, which exacerbates their uneven skill levels. In effect, law schools are their own worst enemies, because of the mandates for tenure.

* Do away with the tenure system. It is detrimental to the students because the professors do not seem to care whether their teaching abilities and experience is reaching the students.

* Eliminate tenure. If professors are not working they should not remain employed. Professors need to be responsive to students; not to "publishing" articles that no one reads. Hire more professors with practical experience, rather than academicians. The best professors I had in law school had significant experience in the practice of law. Too many professors have but one or two years experience practicing law. Some have none. That has to end.

* Get rid of the academics and replace them with real attorneys who have actually practiced law. The classes that taught me the most were all taught by attorneys who taught from experience or were able to interject real world examples into the lesson.

* Hire more professors that have actually practiced law, especially Civil litigators and commercial transactional or commercial litigators. Teach a class on litigation basics to include topics such as litigation cost and fee structures and management, client management, assessing the cost/benefit of taking a dispute to trial, ADR alternatives to trial, etc.

* If the law schools allowed regular attorneys to teach a class on the actual legal profession as adjuncts, I am sure the students would gain much out of it.

* Law school should be taught by more "practitioners" rather than long term academics.

* Law schools should draw on Bar members to teach courses in which they have special skills.

* More emphasis on a good legal education by retaining qualified legal educators.

* Only hire professors who have significant experience practicing law in the area that they are teaching.

* Select professors based more heavily on teaching skills and practical experience as opposed to publishing skills.

**Cost Concerns – 10 Responses**

* Financial counseling. It is devastating to graduate from law school with a six figure debt, poor job prospects and not be able to begin paying the debt back.

* I really wish there was a way to make law school cheaper. Student loans can force attorneys to practice areas that attorneys aren't passionate about. Excellent government
attorneys are forced into positions elsewhere once student loan debt starts crushing them. Some future hope that the balance of your student loans will be forgiven down the road doesn't help the attorney who is drowning in debt right now.

* It has become a business. All the schools care about is bringing in more students so they can make more money and churn everyone out as quickly as possible, all with honors, so they can bring in more students and make more money. There needs to be a cost/benefit analysis not only conducted within the schools, but provided to potential students. It costs X to attend our school. It takes Y months/years for 90% of our graduating students to obtain jobs (not including hanging out their own shingle because they can't find anything else). Their average net pay (not gross receipts) 5 years after graduation is Z. Here are the names and phone numbers of 25 who have agreed to talk about their experiences with potential new students. Even this type of scenario would paint a ridiculously rosy picture given attorneys reluctance to be honest about how much (little) they are making, but at least it would make potential students start looking at the value of the education from a financial perspective. The education itself is also of value, but you need to look at it from a cost/benefit financial basis first, after that, it is a luxury that you (and your parents) either can, or cannot afford.

* Reduce the cost of law school or give law students credit for work experience during their third year that they do not have to pay for.

* Require law schools to stand behind the loans provided to their applicants and to bear some responsibility for repayment of those loans. This may prompt the law schools to be more rigorous in their admission practices and to provide some realistic gate-keeper counseling to those seeking admission.

* Schools charge an unreasonable amount of money to attend. You end up with huge loans after 3 years.

* Students should be counseled on student loan debt before they start.

* The amount of debt that new graduates are saddled with is not justified by the earning potential following graduation. Therefore, there is a need to inform students of alternative career possibilities following graduation.

* The cost of a law education including undergraduate is disgraceful. The economic burden being thrust upon our students is a national embarrassment. Education benefits all society and should be readily available at a reasonable cost.

* The student loan indebtedness is a huge problem.

**Miscellaneous - 74 Responses**

* Smaller classes. (4 Responses)
* An improved emphasis on ethics and professionalism integrated into all courses in law school, across the board.

* Classes should be taught concerning how technology impacts the practice of law.

* Counseling and confidence building for students.

* Dump the Socratic Method. Follow the German model.

* Each 1st year student should be assigned a mentor (if nothing else, a 3rd year student) and each class should have at least 2 exams, not 1.

* Ethical and academic standards, as well as community service and a mentor or internship program, should be required for every candidate. The ethical and academic standards need to be returned to where they once were. I see a push for professionalism, but professionalism has to stem from something deeper an understanding of humanity, community and the law. We as a profession have lost much of that.

* Every candidate should be REQUIRED to take a class in manners and dress. I think going to court in flip flops or granny dresses is totally unacceptable and the attorney should be sanctioned. However, it starts with the "professors" - dress up, people. Be respectful.

* Examples of good and bad attorney and client behavior should be a large part of the ethics taught in law schools.

* Follow the recommendations of the Carnegie report: think like a lawyer, professionalism, how to be a lawyer (issue a subpoena etc).

* Get rid of it. I already explained this earlier.

* Given the excessive number of lawyers, law students, and law schools in Florida, and the increasing scarcity of work for lawyers, The Florida Bar should focus on improving the quality, not the quantity, of new lawyers to meet future demand. Consequently, the Bar should increase academic and ethical standards for both law schools and applicants to the Bar.

* Help create a foundation to change the paradigm from "hourly work" to task-based compensation. We need to be competitive with counselors of all ilk’s who are able to cost a job for the client.

* I don't agree with the Socratic Method.

* I feel that there is something basically wrong with a profession that required only a written test in order to go out and take on responsibilities that one may very well not be qualified to engage in. I believe that the English system has more merit in that a law school graduate must be under the tutelage of a Barrister for two years before they can appear in court by themselves.
* I frankly think we bury our first year students with too much material. There is so much reading in so many classes that there is not enough time for comprehension and rational thinking.

* I graduated from law school with almost no experience in the courtroom. I think it will be great if a law school student would be required to spend a day in court a few times and then write a report about what he saw and at least one issue of law discussed based on the court proceedings viewed.

* I still teach college (not law school) in Florida in the state university system and I have for the past almost 30 years, since around 1984. The quality of student is drastically at an all-time low, particularly noticeable in the past ten years when schools have lowered their standards to solve the low-quality/low-performance problems. I have watched it happen and anyone in academia for (at least) the past 25 years knows this is true. Notwithstanding the many tools available to them, too many current students are lazy, undisciplined, uninformed and misinformed, distracted/lack focus and concentration, and worse, most do not care they are this way. They do not use the tools available to them to increase their knowledge of facts, or they use them for social purposes instead. I have concluded technology (and the media contained on technology), like cell phones and laptops/computers with internet connections, have become such huge distractions in most or all classrooms and therefore they substantially negatively affect a student's self-discipline and ability to listen and concentrate on what is going on in the class. Students need to listen to the professor and, like driving a car, learning is a sophisticated complex task that requires total attention, which demands the elimination of distractions; cell phones and computers etc., should be barred from classrooms (except in classes about social media or computer-related topics). Until the competitive distracting technologies are eliminated, it does not matter what the law school or professors do because the student will not be fully or adequately engaged as a participant in the learning process so long as that student remains focused on a peripheral phone, computer, etc., usually for social reasons.

* I suggest that those running this survey and studying the future of legal education and the practice of law read "the Legal Profession: What is Wrong and How to Fix It" by Professor Sheldon Krantz.

* I think law schools have sacrificed well-prepared graduates for tuition. What passes as acceptable work and the 'quality' of graduates has become a joke. I just keep thinking I hope this isn't going on in the medical profession or we'll all die at the ends of incompetents. I don't take the pride I used to have in having a law degree because they seem so liberally granted now. College courses counting as law school, incorporated MBAs, online and part-time classes, my experience as a lawyer and at times an educator is that law school is just something people now do in their spare time while they're living their real life.

* I think the idea of mentors without trained and interested guidance counselors (who can still be bar members) is a cheap way to absolve the school of responsibility for the maturing process of students. A combination of wisdom, insight, and training to spot
cultural or social issues could widen the influence of law schools to support entering other professions preferred by the student.

* I think they are doing fine.

* Increase the standards for entry to admit only the brightest; there are too many idiots practicing law now and it's costly for clients and yields to lower public opinion of lawyers.

* Integration of professionalism throughout entire law school curriculum. Teach students what it means to be a professional, rather than a businessman. That is becoming increasingly difficult in today's legal environment, but I believe it is the only way to save the profession as we know it.

* It is a fallacy to speak of "online" classes as if that means anything in a uniform way. There are lots of different types of "online" classes, and they can be good or bad, depending on the instructor and how they are set up. The best online classes are hybrid, where there are both classroom and electronic content. These types of learning experiences could be integrated into legal education in 100% of classes, with mostly positive effects.

* I've been disappointed in the quality of young people who are attending our local law school and the poor rate at which they pass the bar exam.

* Law school is intended to teach its students how to think like an attorney. Experience following graduation is the source of learning how to practice. I am not sure just how effective teaching ethics and other attorney conduct is, as it may not change things if the will is not there. But I think the effort should be made to teach students to be ethical and maintain their integrity.

* Law schools need to re-focus their direction. So many are concerned with their bar passage numbers. And while passing the Bar is critical, so is learning how to be an advocate for a client. So many of the students I teach (I am an adjunct law professor) do not seem to understand the necessity of examining the law and the facts with an objective in mind. If you are a practicing lawyer, your client wants or needs something. That is why they have come to you. How do you get your client what the want/need with the given facts and law? Law schools need to introduce their students to this concept of "practicing" law.

* Law students need to learn computer and technology skills from early childhood education, specific general applications by high school, and introduced to different legal applications in law school. They need to be taught about Internet and Social Media.

* Legal ethics, professionalism, and the importance of treating colleagues and judges with respect and courtesy should be highly emphasized. Role playing should be encouraged in ethics class with real life scenarios played out.

* Make sure everyone emphasizes and demonstrates the importance of honesty and integrity in the practice of law.
* Many reading and discussion courses.

* More emphasis on etiquette, manners and attitude development.

* More legal writing. Do not do away with Socratic Method because a lawyer who cannot think critically is worthless.

* My law school (not in Florida) actually boasted about the fact that it did not gear its curriculum toward its students passing the bar exam. So, of course, it did not have the highest pass rate. Law schools need to emphasize the classes required to become licensed in that state, and maybe even review those classes in the last year.

* My personal observations are that (noting that I graduated from law school about 33 years ago) new lawyers come out of school these days with a sense of entitlement simply because they now have a law degree and have passed the bar exam. The work ethic we see in new lawyers today is somewhat pitiful compared to what I was expected to do as a new lawyer. I was prepared for the work expectations and hours of commitment when I got out of school. I don't know what or how that is presented to law students these days, but they sure come out of school with the attitude that long hours and weekends are not part of the work expectation and learning curve.

* Need better Bar preparation from the start of 1L year.

* No law school class should have more than 15 or 20 students. Every student should be speaking frequently in class.

* Not to undermine the profession, but law school would be more effective if it operated more like a trade school.

* Perhaps students can be given a reality crash course that law school and the legal field is not for everyone.

* Please eliminate cheating! Place more emphasis on honor code and sanctions!

* Plenty of people make a great case for a liberal-arts approach to training lawyers. Fostered by many private high schools and colleges, kids learn how to think by surveying many things, comparing and contrasting them, figuring out benefits and disadvantages and then- in the midst of this personal exploration, they somehow discover a passion and undertake a journey to find their place in this world. The Socratic Method in law school is a clear offshoot of this practice. And I think it works pretty well. But we delude ourselves into thinking that conventional delivery is the only way to achieve these objectives and further that there isn't a better and more economical way to achieve these same ends. Quite honestly, higher education today is a bit like theatre is to interactive videos. Yes, one-on-one Shakespeare draws you in and has something unique to say, but, there's a whole lot more breadth and depth to instruction that people coupled with technology can bring to the table. Most specifically, that fact that many other playwrights can simultaneously weigh in with their perspectives that can help us see a much bigger picture with greater depth and clarity. Unfortunately, it’s the lawyers of yesteryear who
are calling the shots within the profession, and most of us are conservative, cynical, and only too happy to rely on the past to create the future lest we upset our applecart. Information is not knowledge is not wisdom. The future of law is about empowering people to undertake relationships with greater clarity and certainty to mutual benefit. It is about enabling people to collect, distill and integrate vast amounts of information into more efficient processes and decision making to help us lead better lives while simultaneously keeping our humanity. The ends in this case help define the means.

* Raise the standards for admissions and stop passing people who can’t write well. Make study more dependent on writing and reading skills so that the profession is maintained as a “guild” of extra-smart people who have something to contribute whether in business or government. Keep the risk-adverse status seekers out unless they have the intellectual skills to keep up intellectually. Catch all the cheaters and expel them. Keep it three years long. Don’t teach online; that is asking for trouble. Look for the students who are strong in the humanities and prepare them for membership in a special guild with a strong focus on reading and writing and thinking- not to suit the corporate job market. Teach more computer literacy, but not for credit. Make success in law school dependent on students’ intellect. There is nothing wrong with the Socratic Method.

* Remember that the bar exam covers all areas - not just the ones in which you are interested.

* Require all students to achieve a high degree of understanding regarding the law. Do not graduate students if they do not meet the degree of knowledge that is expected of a student. Do not pass or graduate one if there is doubt as to his/her abilities.

* Require more opportunities to write memorandum or other written legal analysis. Students should be required to participate in Moot Court Competitions, Law Journal or similar activities.

* Since many young lawyers do not become employed by large firms, they need to have a certain understanding of business, dealing with people, and where to get answers to questions and problems they encounter. Perhaps a mentoring program should be developed in every local bar association. Where possible, they may be encouraged to stay in communication with their professors after graduation. I have found over the years, professors usually are happy to assist with "real life cases" and improving the profession. Some psychology could help if taught in the context of the class.

* Specialization of coursework as if the student had a major.

* Stop the terror of random strikes to recite facts and then get picked on for the rest of the class. It just shut down participation in every class I ever attended that was taught that way.

* Stop using scare tactics to intimidate students and provide online or part time legal education so that students who need to work while going to school can do so.

* Summarize the subject at mid-term and end of the semester.
* Teach the students that the profession is based on securing the public's trust that lawyers are law-abiding, honest and ethical and that should they fail in this, the profession is doomed. We are supporters (not destroyers) of the U.S. Constitution and should make our voices heard when an elected official violates that document. Otherwise, we are complicit in his crime.

* Teach them that Law as a profession should not allow every matter to become involved in litigation, that attorney ethics should be also about the good of the general public.

* Teach time management and work life balance.

* Teach young lawyers how to write well.

* Teach/cultivate problem identification skills whether it is the legal issue or dealing w/problem client/opposing counsel. Then move on to the problem resolution skills.

* Technology.

* The Bar needs to work more closely with law schools. I have given three thoughts, above, about how to effectively address the issues causing major deterioration in our profession. I would also add to those suggestions that The Florida Bar initiate and sustain a very aggressive "member friendly" public relations campaign. The Florida Bar is sterile, cold and at least in my part of the state (far, far from the Capitol) very uninvolved and unresponsive. The general perception, although not accurate, in my legal community is that The Florida Bar's only mission is to disrupt and harm lawyers. I repeatedly heard since my arrival a decade ago, and from some lawyers very respected in this community, not to trust The Florida Bar and that their only mission was to charge lawyers and use that money to make life as difficult as possible and to disbar them as soon as possible. That made me sad. I came from a state where the Bar was very member oriented and provided very valuable services. I believe the same is true of The Florida Bar, but there is a perception problem that can be cured with a focused public relations effort.

* The expectation of law students still seems out of line with reality. Although law school provides a great education, it does not necessarily mean that every law student should or has the capacity to practice law.

* The fundamentals of IRAC should be taught at the very beginning. Issue Rule Analysis Conclusion. This would greatly improve understanding in the first semester of law school.

* The law school graduates that I've encountered the last few years seem very immature and ill-equipped to work in a professional environment. Their level of un-professionalism is appalling. Outside the courtroom, they don't return phone calls; they procrastinate; they share confidential information; they're evasive and misleading in their communications sometimes to the point of downright lying. Inside the courtroom, they don't respect the decorum of the court; they text or post on Facebook during court; they're snarky with the judge; they bring food and beverages into the courtroom; they dress casually (Flip Flops and jeans!); and they make flimsy excuses for their unpreparedness. Law schools need to
do their part in upholding the image of the profession. The minimum requirement for being eligible to take for the bar examination should be graduation cum laude.

* The practice of law is now a business first and then a profession. Very regretful. New lawyers need to be prepared as much in running a successful business as well as the profession of law.

* The process of law school should not be about weeding out students, intimidating them, and boring them with rote memorization of case law and statute. Law school should be more about teaching the student how to research the issues (where to go for guidance, statutes, etc.), think them through, and be able to present a solution. There is too much emphasis on memorizing statutes when in real-life practice application, an attorney can go to a book or website and get the statute or law as needed. While you are in law school you learn or memorize tremendous amounts of "law" only to forget the majority of it within months of leaving law school. What is the purpose of that kind of education?

* The recent law graduates I encounter most often these days cannot write and are poor listeners. Those characteristics make for lousy future lawyers. Further, the answers cannot be found in one's cell phone so stop looking there 23 hours a day.

* The Socratic Method is not very practical and should be kept of course, but diminished in emphasis. Students should be exposed to on the job type scenarios much sooner than third year. Even dictating a short brief or completing a lien or routine paperwork is often handled by staff, to the detriment of a lawyer's independence.

* There are so many law schools and lawyers that you need to distinguish yourself with additional education or fields of education. Having an engineering degree or an accounting degree is beneficial.

* There is a lack of maturity in many graduates. I do not know how to teach work ethic.

* There should be a course either in the law school or a course in conjunction with the business school that teaches student to understand the basics of financial documents like balance sheets, P & Ls, loan documents and the like. I had no business courses in undergraduate school and I had to learn that on my own. If you have any type of practice, that is a skill set that every single lawyer needs.

* Train lawyers, not plumbers. The practice of law is a profession, not just a job.

* We need to communicate - law schools and legal profession - constantly. Both sides need to collaborate and share in the responsibility for legal instruction. Law schools shouldn't "teach to the Bar" or teach to one particular legal employer, but we should be discussing skills and competencies.

* Working in groups helped me most, so more group assignments. Mentoring also would be helpful.
Several states have either approved or are considering authorization of trained, regulated, nonlawyers to provide basic assistance to a client in approved areas of the law outside of the supervision of a lawyer. Do you believe Florida should consider such a program?

If “Yes” or “No”, please explain:  (285 Total Responses)

In Opposition to Program – 197 Responses

* There are already too many lawyers. (12 Responses)
* Not a good idea. (4 Responses)
* Supervision by a lawyer is important. (2 Responses)
* A nonlawyer is more likely not to appreciate the ethical duties inherent with the legal profession. Further, a nonlawyer may not appreciate when a service is no longer basic not having a lawyer's education, training and general breadth of knowledge. The medical industry is inappropriately shifting health care decisions to nonphysicians to control costs, but the service is often inferior.
* A nonlawyer may not see the big picture or understand the ramifications of the documents/assistance/advise provided. There is a real risk of harming the client.
* A nonlawyer should not be drafting legal documents or providing legal advice to clients.
* Absolutely not, except for simple assistance in filling out bar approved forms. Someone's bar number and malpractice policy should be at stake when it comes to advising someone of legal rights that could greatly impact their lives.
* Absolutely not. I have seen way too much damage caused by paralegals who think they know more than lawyers or who are unsupervised. If they want to give legal advice, go to law school and pass the Bar.
* Absolutely not. It's hard enough to earn a living and recoup the money invested in a lawyer's education without forcing lawyers to compete with nonlawyers who may provide traditional legal services.
* Absolutely not. Nonlawyers should not be practicing law or providing legal services. There is a reason one has to go to law school and take a bar exam to practice law. Whether or not law students could be better prepared to practice is entirely different that whether or not one even needs to go to law school.
* Advice varies from lawyer to lawyer, and it's not a checklist of symptoms.
* All paraprofessionals should fall under the direct supervision of an attorney to prevent the misrepresentation of the legal issues that could ultimately have detrimental legal outcomes for the client.

* Allows unqualified persons to practice law.

* Anyway you call it or slice it; it is the unlicensed practice of law. Some paralegals are very qualified to render legal assistance, but should only be done so under the supervision of an attorney.

* As a judge, paralegals can be a disservice to people going through a divorce by not checking out whether the woman is pregnant, for example. The worst is paralegals in minority communities. But these weren't under direct supervision of an attorney. They would, however, have to come a long way for me to trust their work.

* As in medicine, where does it stop? One cannot say that a paraprofessional has the same level of knowledge and training as the professional. If that were the case, then why even grant a J.D. or an M.D.? On one hand, the public is getting more access and cheaper access. On the other hand, does the public deserve substandard legal or medical attention? Thus, I am not in favor of paraprofessionals working outside of the supervision of a professional licensee.

* As mentioned above, there are already too many lawyers practicing in comparison to the needs of clients. Allowing in a class of individuals who can provide those services will (a) further dilute the pool of individuals who need the assistance of an attorney, and (b) allow for what is essentially the unlicensed practice of law. Most paralegals that I know are very skilled, but do not know how to do Legal Research, how to interpret cases, etc., and that is paramount to being able to adequately advise a client on the correct course of action to take. This will also continue to make law school, and the practice of law, must less attractive given that it will likely result in a general decrease in the average income for attorneys.

* Because the Florida government is so messed up now, I would not trust the reforms.

* Because the nonlawyers do not have enough education.

* Dangerous; no insurance for errors.

* Disservice to clients.

* Do I really need to say why?!

* Don't take work away from people who have earned the title "lawyer", spent years studying and spent over a hundred thousand dollars to be able to provide legal services to people. It is ridiculous how many unemployed lawyers there are here in Florida. To go through all that we have to go through and then not find work, be broke and actually be able to qualify for public assistance benefits is absolutely absurd. Why would anyone in Florida go to law school if there was a way to provide legal services and make a living doing it without giving up years of their life and owing $100,000+ in student loans? A lot
of lawyers have had to resort to providing just "basic assistance" to people just to get some money through the door. Bottom line- let's try to keep lawyers from having to sign up for welfare.

* Even form-driven work requires an understanding of the broader concepts in law. The concern I would have is without any supervision, you are missing an important component.

* Even simple matters are complicated these days and so I think the services should be provided by lawyers.

* First, lawyers are having a hard enough time making a living without the intrusion of paraprofessionals into the profession. That is a hard, if unattractive truism. Second, many times in my career I have come into what I thought were "basic" scenarios only to quickly learn that the client's actual needs were broad and complex. We are simply inviting disaster and harm to citizens when we suggest that a nonlawyer can handle their legal needs.

* Florida cannot continue to churn out and admit thousands of lawyers while at the same time lessen the need for those lawyers.

* For medical paraprofessionals, we have a shortage of doctors. All signs point to a surplus of lawyers. Meanwhile, there are pro se litigants. And, pro se is more work for the court to handle, which costs everyone money. What should be done is something to allow the down-and-out JDs who are doing things that do not use the law degree to instead do something with the law degree and pair up with the low income people who cannot afford lawyers. Many of my law school classmates are not doing well and not doing much with the degree. Jobs for paralegals also tend to discard JD applicants because they think the person will be stuck up. But paralegal jobs pay as well as entry level public defender. It does not make sense to waste the legal training. Perhaps something positive that The Florida Bar could do is to encourage lawyers to hire JDs or fellow bar members as paralegals. If someone has been down and out for a year, that person is not going to be stuck up (although also not as useful as a seasoned and experienced paralegal). Anyway, paralegals are not the big change in law. Technology is. My first job as a lawyer was to do redactions that I could have taken a weekend and written a short computer script to do it for me. Happily, I was moved to research after 6 weeks, but I was shocked that anyone would do the redactions manually. All over in law practice, lawyers don't use simple tools and waste time. It got me my first lawyer job doing something that a person shouldn't be involved in at all, but there is no way that amount of waste in paid time can last. Even for me, hired into a job that should not have existed because a computer could do it so easily, the pickings were slim at graduation.

* Having an attorney overview and supervise non-lawyers helps to prevent fraud, misuse of client funds, and mishandling of cases. We have enough fraud and identity theft without adding to it.
I am a traditionalist. I have a strong medical background (I was an EMT and Hospital Administrator for decades) and I don't much care for Nurse Practitioners and Physician's Assistants. I wouldn't care for Paralegals providing legal guidance to clients.

I am an Assistant State Attorney, and when I have experienced dealing with a private attorney's secretary or paralegal instead of an attorney about a legal issue, it has been only frustrating. In my observation, private attorneys rely upon legal secretaries and paralegals for things that we, as state lawyers, would not. For example, I was recently asked to sign off on a proposed order that I am 99% sure was drafted by the attorney's assistant. The language probably made sense to her, but just was not specific enough and did not grant the exact relief the attorney had requested in his motion, and we had to go back and forth several times until she ultimately had to just ask her attorney anyway.

I am basing my answer only on immigration law, which is extremely detailed and picky. When it is an area of law that changes daily (not by Congress, but by the regulatory agency), it requires an attorney's analysis.

I am very concerned about the ability to regulate nonlawyers concerning the advice or assistance they may provide clients. I envision situations where the client has a need or issue that is beyond the scope of a nonlawyer's abilities or authorization but the nonlawyer will proceed to provide the client with advice and not refer them to a lawyer.

I believe that this will generally degenerate into many attorneys simply supervising numerous paraprofessionals, leading to poor legal advice. If this system is going to be implemented, it should be done with recent graduates giving them the practical experience they need to succeed on their own, and stop embarrassing our profession. Even hair stylist schools know better than to put a stylist on the floor that has not had actual experience doing their trade. Why can't the law profession do the same?

I believe the number of lawyers has tripled since 1980. There should be a sufficient amount of lawyers to provide these services. In general, without knowing more, I am against anything that takes away employment opportunities for lawyers.

I believe there should always be supervision of a paralegal. The buck has to stop with the attorney; not the paralegal.

I cannot envision a nonlawyer providing the necessary services or knowledge to a client without experiencing lawyer required activities.

I do not believe that those exposed to a much more limited legal education can deliver as good services.

I do not believe that would be in the best interests of laypeople.

I do not believe there should be any substitute for graduating from law school and passing the Bar as a prerequisite to providing legal services.

I do primarily family law. Many people cannot afford what I do. Paralegals are preparing documents but they cannot tell the person that you are entitled to this, that or the other
thing. If paralegals worked through attorneys to provide services to lower income individuals, more accurate information would likely be imparted as a lower cost.

* I don’t feel comfortable having my paralegal (even if a registered paralegal) providing my client with basic assistance.

* I don't think many of the "trained, regulated" paralegals would be of sufficient ability to work without some oversight from a lawyer.

* I firmly believe that the skills involved in "counseling" involve more than pushing paper. What is "basic assistance?" A nonlawyer can perhaps help draft a basic document, but who is asking the pertinent questions and "what ifs" to protect the client and prepare for the unanticipated challenges.

* I have had experience where a notary had represented/assisted a client in a manner that very much prejudiced that client. I understand that we are discussing basic assistance, but basic decisions often have much larger implications.

* I have personally seen disastrous results from folks who did modifications of say, child support, without an attorney.

* I have read research articles that deal with the interactions and use of nurse practitioners and physician's assistants that report that the physicians seem to undervalue the work of the other two groups. The other two groups seem to overestimate their knowledge and abilities. I would be concerned that in certain areas, particularly domestic relations, the potential for mischief due to ignorance would be great (i.e., failing to preserve certain rights because they are not asked or omitted from a petition).

* I have seen the work of private paralegals, and also the expansion of Supreme Court approved forms, and I am terrified at what can happen when someone trained but without ethical restraints, without a commitment other than $ would accomplish. Lawyers have concerns with their ethical obligations to the clients, to opposing parties, to judicial officers, and to the community. Lawyers are in a position to give advice and counsel. Paper-pushers using forms cannot give guidance or proper perspective. I know some wonderful paralegals to which I routinely refer bankruptcy matters because I know they are meticulous and have scruples and I have seen the work product of bankruptcy petition preparers that was nothing short of abysmal. I can see the handwriting on the wall. The concern that access to the Courts are being denied due to the high cost of legal representation (if someone were earning $10.00 per hour and I am charging $300.00/hour, after 1 hour 20 minutes I will have earned their entire gross income for the entire week!), but having nonlawyers being mini-lawyers is not a good thing, IMHO.

* I have seen too many errors and mistakes in the paper work from these types of programs that could have a serious effect on the case at hand.

* I just feel this is a slippery slope and who knows where it could end up.

* I like to see a doctor, not a practitioner. I feel that if law follows this pattern, it will water down the profession.
* I practiced, to some extent, in the residential Real Estate field, which has been taken over by title companies. In my opinion, title companies give the impression they are giving legal advice when the competency is sorely lacking. Same issue with estate and trust field and bank trust departments.

* I review document prepared by paralegals that then send the clients to file them in Court. I have yet to come across one that is correct, met the client's needs or enabled the client to get what they wanted.

* I strongly believe legal services or assistance should be provided by a licensed attorney only.

* I strongly oppose such a program. Already, we have lawyers who cannot even get jobs and too many law schools producing too many more lawyers. How will they all survive if you start promoting the idea of paralegals doing what was formerly the work of lawyers? Frankly, I do not think we should be encouraging people to go to law school to the extent we are now promoting enrollment, due to the scarcity of jobs. In the town where I practice, in the past several years more and more lawyers have opened offices, even though there is not commensurate growth in our community's population. Many have come because they are graduating from a law school located in the area that teaches weekends and nights and summers, as well as following the normal school year for traditional students. They are already rooted here so they just hang up a shingle and try to practice. Recently, my dentist informed me that during the recession he attended this law school because he "thought it would be neat to get a law degree" and dental practice was slow because of economic hard times.

* I think that limited knowledge is dangerous because you don't know what you don't know. A variety of classes as are required in first year law school at least alerts a lawyer to a potential problem outside of his or her expertise.

* I think that the rigor and discipline required of lawyers distinguishes them from nonlawyers. I think that having nonlawyers provide basic assistance will lead to structures where most clients interact with nonlawyers and little communication takes place between lawyers and clients.

* I think that would be a major step in the wrong direction. We have too many lawyers as it is, and most of them are improperly qualified to do what they're doing. Utilizing nonlawyers will just make a bad situation worse.

* I think that would lead to way too much fraud that we have already seen in Florida.

* I think the public could be endangered by this. They would be at a higher risk of not getting their legal needs met or exposing themselves to higher instances of liability, fraud and malpractice.

* I think this devalues the significance of having attended 3 years of law school, passing the Bar, and having the legal training to perform legal services.
I was an adjunct professor in a university offered paralegal certification course. I don't feel that completion of the curriculum prepares the paralegals to perform the function of an attorney outside the supervision of a lawyer.

I would be concerned about delivery of legal services by nonlawyers. I am concerned that a nonlawyer would miss something important, or not realize the significance of something.

If it's a legal matter, then lawyers should handle it. If lawyers can associate with other professions, that might be more cost effective, time effective to the client, then they should.

In my experience, in terms of client contact, paralegals only have the skills level to complete pre-drafted forms and are unable to provide the wider understanding of the client's issues that an attorney can provide.

In states that allow third year practice for law students, they generally do so under the supervision of a licensed attorney. If Florida were to consider such a program for law students, I would be concerned that law students, who presumably have had similar and likely more rigorous exposure to legal course work, be supervised. If Florida concludes that third year practice is appropriate, with supervision, then I am not convinced that paralegals should be unsupervised.

Issues can unwittingly arise for which a lay person may not have an answer or even recognize the issue. Many clients contact our firm for what they perceive to be one issue, but which is actually something quite different.

It is already difficult to handle attorneys that are ineffective, creating another group will not help and it also minimizes the role of an attorney.

It is dangerous to ignore the fact that every area of the law intersects with other areas of the law. Providing advice in a vacuum can have serious repercussions. For example, advising a client to file a pro se answer may unwittingly waive a client's right to contest jurisdiction. Paraprofessionals tend to be untrained or lack the practical experience to identify the grey areas.

It is extremely dangerous and detrimental to clients for nonlawyers to be giving legal advice or services.

It is my opinion that the ultimate responsibility for giving legal advice should fall to an attorney.

It might open the door for lesser trained individuals to give legal advice or representation in areas that they may not really be suited for.

It takes an attorney to see the whole picture.

It will erode the caliber of legal work in the state. I have already seen many disastrous situations created by nonlawyers helping others fill out forms, make wills, deeds, etc.
* It would effectively destroy the legal profession. The legal profession is already beset with costs, fees and excessive regulation.

* It's asking for trouble.

* Just as in the medical profession, one would want a surgeon to perform a medical operation, so would one want a legal professional to conduct the work that will impact the outcome of the case.

* Law is not black or white and so any areas of grey which may involved should best be explained by a fully trained lawyer.

* Lawyers are licensed professionals. I think it would undermine the profession to allow nonlawyers to provide legal assistance to members of the public.

* Lawyers are needed.

* Lawyers go through years of training and developing knowledge as to handling of legal issues. Allowing nonlawyers to handle certain items diminishes the worth of a lawyer.

* Lawyers have to pass a character and fitness examination and are bound by ethical rules. To be a good lawyer requires years of training and experience. Nonlawyers will not have to go through the rigorous training that lawyers go through. The solution is for lawyers to deliver legal services in the areas not traditionally served by lawyers at a reduced cost which can be subsidized by the state and the bar.

* Legal advice should be rendered by lawyers.

* Legal jobs are difficult enough to get once you have a JD. Attorneys shouldn't be competing for jobs with others who do not have a JD.

* Many attorneys would go out of business.

* Many issues are not basic or simple and a nonlawyer may not realize when there are more complicated legal issues. For example, dealing with homestead property in a will is not simple.

* My “no” is not emphatic, but I think there is a potential here to degrade the law profession into a law business, which I do not agree with. There are certain areas (like Real Estate) that lend themselves to a staff-centered practice because there are many components that can be trained and are not in and of themselves legal services. I worry about marketing businesses like "ask Gary" and volume document businesses like "Legal Zoom" which purport to replace the judgment of lawyers with nonlawyers (or the judgment of lawyers who have never met the client), and I think with detrimental results.

* My concern is where to draw the bright line between paralegal/legal assistant and lawyer. I see too many legal assistants/nonlawyers engaging in the practice of law.
* My experience has been that unsupervised paralegals do not always understand all of the idiosyncrasies of the law and the effect of certain actions.

* My experience with paralegals, even the best, indicates that they have not traditionally been trained well enough to provide true legal advice.

* No one under the employment of a lawyer should act without supervision by a lawyer.

* No, because the training for paralegals is woefully insufficient. At a minimum, the program would need to be a 2 year graduate-level program.

* No, because there are too many lawyers as it is. Additionally, I think the dedication necessary to complete law school and obtain a Bar card is essential for proper client service.

* No, unfortunately, I see too many lawyers making mistakes. I cannot imagine how many people would be affected by these "trained nonlawyers".

* No. I wouldn't ask a nurse to perform surgery. Public adjusters are a joke and those who use them end up worse off than hiring an attorney. Nonlawyers provide work to lawyers to have to try to undo the mistakes of the nonlawyers.

* Nonlawyers do not have the breadth of knowledge that lawyers have.

* Not convinced paralegals are qualified to provide legal services to clients without attorney supervision.

* Not if legal advice or opinions are rendered by nonlawyers.

* Not without direct supervision of a lawyer.

* Nothing should be offered without the supervision of a lawyer.

* Once the horse is out of the barn, it is sure hard to get back in the barn. If you give nonlawyers an inch my guess is that they will take a mile and UPL will become rampant.

* Only lawyers should be allowed to provide legal services; otherwise, there might not be any point in getting a legal education.

* Outside of supervision is bad idea.

* Outside of the U.S., being a notary is considered part of the legal profession and an expertise. However they are lawyers. The permission to create offices to do some kind of work has opened the door for abuse. Not surprising at times the unauthorized practice of law, misrepresentation and fraud. That practice like allowing paralegal to practice law in some areas not only is a disservice to the community but creates a second rate legal service provided mainly to the poor middle class who are always the ones who are looking to stretch the dollar. Shame on us for allowing our profession to be destroyed.
Outside the supervision of a lawyer? No. Absolutely not.

Paralegals can't possibly give legal advice. They can only prepare the documents and give simple instruction.

Paralegals should work under lawyer supervision.

People misunderstand the need for legal services. It is rare that a situation can be solved by a "fill in the blanks" forms. As a practicing Real Estate attorney, I can tell you that allowing realtors to fill in the blanks on Real Estate Contracts was probably one of the biggest mistakes made. It is often difficult to understand what the parties are agreeing to, the forms are not always filled out completely, and this is with a supposedly professional Real Estate agent, who works with these forms every day! People do not realize the consequences of using standard forms, and I believe that only an attorney, who has the knowledge and experience in handling that type of transaction, can help to foresee all possible issues.

Probably depends on what is meant by "outside the supervision of a lawyer." The potential consequences are too great for that.

Quite a slippery slope.

Responsibility and expense of correcting issues that arise.

Significant risk of fraud. Unlicensed assistance would be cheaper, and people would avoid going to attorneys. The resulting harm would cause more work to untangle (for courts and counsel) and could cause monetary damages and loss of rights for those affected. General public is not very knowledgeable with regard to what issues should involve an attorney's assistance and when that assistance should be sought in the process.

So who is going to do this - excess lawyers who can't find jobs being a lawyer?! As funny as that may sound to you that is what is going to happen. If lawyers who can't find jobs are already working in Starbucks, Kinko’s and Target, why wouldn't they go for these jobs? They already have a law degree.

Solo practitioners, like me, are at a strong disadvantage.

States are ill-equipped to train anyone to do anything or to regulate except in traditional areas (utilities, railroads, etc.).

Strong potential for erroneous advice; lack of strong ethical training; emphasis on income, not client.

Such a program would immediately devalue law degrees in Florida. There exist enough lawyers committing errors without adding nonlawyers to the mix. Also, there are a large number of qualified lawyers who are un- or underemployed. Additionally, Florida is a popular retirement destination. Such a program would allow lawyers from other states to retire, move to Florida, and set up shop without becoming licensed in Florida. It would skew the competition.
Such individuals could never have the depth of legal understanding derived from a full legal education. They would be glorified secretaries, doing things by rote without the legal understanding behind what they were doing.

Sufficient numbers of lawyers are available to provide services to the community we serve. Cost can be addressed through loan forgiveness, tax deductions or other economic incentives for providing low cost or reduced fees even in the private practice setting.

That sounds like the unauthorized practice of law to me.

That will further diminish the reputation of and need for qualified attorneys. It is difficult enough for young lawyers to attain their first job yet alone establish a practice, without needing to compete with nonlawyers.

That’s a very slippery slope which potentially can cause harm to Florida citizens without recourse.

The field of law is complex and there is opportunity for mischief and error. Nonlawyers desperately need to be supervised.

The Florida Bar should be protecting lawyers and their business and by allowing nonlawyers to do things you are hurting the very people and profession you are supposed to be representing.

The Internet already does this.

The intricacies of the law are difficult enough for a licensed attorney, let alone a nonlawyer who may not be liable for errors and omissions.

The knowledge, training and experience of a licensed lawyer cannot be duplicated by those who do not meet the standards to practice law in my opinion.

The law is becoming more complex. Law school trains a person to think a different way and exposes the law student to all the nuances of case law, precedent, etc. Without this basic platform, I am not sure a nonlawyer could competently represent someone not knowing all the pitfalls of the law. Maybe, in some circumstances, such as basic wills and POA's, etc, but they should be liable if they give bad advice.

The legal profession has problems with ethics already. The fact that lawyers can't abide by rules they should know prove that it would be a huge risk to allow nonlawyers to be exposed to encounters that could result in additional ethics violations. There are reasons why unlicensed practitioner laws are strict. I think allowing others to handle law related activities is a "cop out". Where do you draw the line with "basic assistance"? We already have nonlawyers giving advice. By lawfully allowing others to do this, we devalue the legal profession and those of us who spent the time and money to earn an honest legal education.

The level of practice among admitted lawyers is low enough without extending the concept to an entirely additional group of unsupervised personnel.
The model of the medical profession is not applicable to the law profession as they have training and certification and nurses, techs, etc. They are not paraprofessionals, but have a different role and tasks and duties! For example, a nurse can take your temp but cannot operate on you! A tech can perform a test but cannot diagnose! Even such extenders as PAs must have supervision and have very specific tasks! A nurse practitioner has extensive training, academic and clinical, and has to take exams, etc. A nurse practitioner also has two degrees and the required time for academic training and clinical experience is longer than the amount of time it takes to become a lawyer! That is why nurse practitioners can do anesthesia and deliver children.

The paralegal is quite good at filling out forms but it comes back to the paralegal does not know what the paralegal does not know. It is the issue spotting that the paralegal is not trained to do.

The potential for harm to the public is too severe and outweighs the potential benefit.

The practice of law should be performed by a lawyer.

The practice of law should not be taken lightly nor undermined. The inability for all to obtain all manners of legal services is not an issue that should be dealt with by lowering the Bar for those that can provide those services.

The profession of law is quickly eroding into the past. Law is becoming a form completion activity and pro se people encouraged to represent themselves with courts hiring case managers to send letters telling them what the next step is for them to take. It’s sad but pretty soon judges will just hear the stories and the formal "trial" will be replaced with liberal rules of "justice" that does not require law. Additionally, people will not receive legal expertise and assistance in general because it is not required so they will miss opportunities and make unwise decisions. Sad, because attorneys are pushing these changes that appear to benefit the poor so they don't have to hire an attorney but they will result in a wide public perception that attorneys are just not needed since I can do my own thing with forms I buy and letters from court, etc.

The purview of lawyers is already under attack. Narrow it further and it will just not pay to become an attorney.

The quality of legal services is declining and this would contribute to that trend.

The quality of practicing lawyers must be improved before advancing to areas outside supervision of a lawyer.

The rate of negative implications/consequences is sure to increase, and to the client's disadvantage.

Then why go to law school?

There are already too many lawyers chasing too little work, so clearly more practitioners is not the problem. It seems like the issue is affordability. The less skilled lawyers
through supply in demand should start filling this low cost option. Perhaps the European model with tiers of lawyers based on skill and certifications is the answer.

* There are already too many lawyers in Florida, more than enough to serve the state population. We actually need to reduce the number of lawyers that can practice in the state; this includes making the bar exam harder, reducing the number of law students, etc

* There are enough Florida lawyers to provide these basic services, and the advice given by some "Legal Clinics" has been less than stellar.

* There are too many seemingly simple issues that turn out to be far more complex than anticipated. Anything beyond providing templates and forms would require not only the nonlawyer's knowledge of the area of law, but also their ability to elicit from the client what is needed, which is where a broader base of knowledge first comes into play.

* There is a reason for the requirement of an education. I think paralegals and legal assistants already provide the level of assistance a nonlawyer would be able to provide.

* There is a reason we go to law school. It is to understand the concepts under which the laws operate. I find most paralegals know "how", but rarely know "why". To allow someone with no legal skill sets and no supervision could be disastrous to the unsuspecting public. How much time and resources does TFB employ in UPL where the public has been injured?

* There is already enough competition and anything that will allow for a less expensive alternative will make earning a living even more difficult.

* There is an oversupply of attorneys which has decreased or caused stagnation of wages in our profession. Creating these programs will only further depress wages. Depressed wages make it more difficult for attorneys to provide pro bono or discounted legal services and increase the likelihood of ethical violations. Defend the right of attorneys to make a living. You represent us. Look out for our interests as attorneys.

* There isn't enough work for licensed attorneys. Moreover, even the most basic circumstances may have more complex issues beneath the surface that must be recognized.

* This dilutes professional responsibility and provides a superficial level of "representation" by those not fully trained.

* This sounds a lot like practicing law without a license. Why not let folks practice medicine without a license too?

* This sounds like practicing law without a license.

* This will not help the economy.

* This would invite the unlicensed practice of law.
This would open the door to clients being misadvised by lay persons seeking to make a quick buck. Trained personnel under the supervision of a lawyer would monitor their work to prevent that from taking place.

To what standard do we hold these nonlawyers to?

Too many licensed attorneys that I have contact with fail to provide competent legal services. To have nonlawyers render services would exacerbate the problem.

Too much risk of misinformation.

Too risky if the barriers to entry are not very high.

Unlike the medical field, which does not have a glut of doctors, the legal profession cannot afford to utilize paralegals as those individuals will further dilute the already crowded competition for clients.

UPL.

Very dangerous to the client due to the "what ifs" and contingencies that a lawyer is trained to ask and plan for within his or her practice area.

Very few legal matters are simple, despite initial appearances. Even certified, very experienced paralegals I have worked with could not properly counsel a client on much more than filling in blanks on a form.

Very few nonlawyers are experienced and knowledgeable enough to provide advice without a lawyer's guidance.

We already have this going on. I occasionally have to file suit or take other action to correct their work.

We are held to such a high standard of professionalism. Only if that person can pass the Ethics portion of the Bar and has taken courses on ethics would I consider it.

We have a strong guild and the more we dilute it by allowing nonlawyer to deliver legal services the less we will take responsibility for our profession. Look at the trust rules - we just had to tighten them up because too many lawyers were arguing that the trust account was "somebody else's" problem. YOU are responsible for the legal profession, so stop trying to divvy up the profession. Do we really want to become like a doctor where we create little "profit centers" in our offices? How many paralegals can you effectively supervise now? If they start delivering legal services are you going to supervise more? How many associates do you supervise effectively now? Pretty soon you will be like a doctor - seeing a "patient" in 7 1/2 minute intervals and never getting a handle on the problem. It appears from these questions that the preconception here is NOT the betterment of the law student, but the increase of profit at the expense of society. Being a professional is not the same as having a job.
* We have enough problems with the many unprepared or incompetent lawyers we have now. There is no need to add to that problem.

* We have lawyers that cannot earn a living.

* We have many underemployed lawyers. They do not need further competition from poorly trained paralegals.

* We need to stop lessening the role of the lawyer in Florida. We need to support and promote the lawyer as the trusted advisor.

* What difference does it really make? You can’t even regulate lawyers. How are you going to regulate paraprofessionals? When you allow that it will be caveat emptor!

* What would be the ramifications for them giving bad wrong advice? I think only those who have put time and effort into earning a law degree and passing the Bar and who have that all to lose if they violate ethical standards should be giving law advice.

* What's "basic assistance"? A nonlawyer with limited expertise can lead a client down a dangerous path without the supervision of a licensed lawyer.

* While I would like to see the public have better access to the legal system by allowing nonlawyers to provide such work, my experience over the years is that unsupervised work by nonlawyers is not handled correctly in too many cases. I fear the public would be hurt or worse, ripped off, by such form fillers. I wish this were not the case. I think the equivalent already occurs with non-professional tax preparation services. Too many people with bad intent come into such a system to the detriment of the public at large.

* Why go to law school to become a professional if a non-professional can perform legal services?

* Won't be able to hire competent help if they can do it on their own. They will be like attorneys, once properly trained they hang a shingle.

* You are killing the profession. You are buying into the “entitlement” trend. 1) There are enough reasonably priced lawyers to provide services, if only we did not have to compete with the mills and if only the Bar would help us marked our services. 2) There are nearly 100,000 lawyers in Florida right now, many who cannot earn a living. 3) The public will be taken advantage of by these people. I have experience with clients who have sought paralegal assistance, the paralegals are misleading them into mistakes. 4) The public already has a sense of entitlement over the right to cheap legal services and they are being badly served while losing respect for what attorneys can truly do for them. 5) You will lower respect for our profession even more if you allow paralegals to do the work. 6) Most importantly, the model you are proposing is really a structure for the “mill” to have cheap labor while spending a fortune on advertising and putting everyone else out of business.

* You are narrowing the field of law and taking away the usefulness of the lawyer. I have done much divorce work and mediation. Much of that is routine. Nevertheless, a lawyer
spots issues and handles them strategically while someone not trained to have a broad knowledge of a multitude of issues/situations will not spot the issue, warn the client or offer strategies to prevent or minimize the impact. If people want to fill out their own forms, let them, but if they are asking for assistance, we should not be handing them a boat load of problems next year because the paralegal just filled out the form.

* You open the future to a never ending battle over where to draw the line.

* You should not be considering this. I am shocked that you are. My practice is probate, estates, and trusts. A "simple Will" does not exist. The public would suffer great harm if nonlawyers could provide any kind of legal assistance to the public. You are taking a great profession and running it into the ground- to the detriment of its practitioners and the public it serves.

**In Favor of Program – 88 Responses**

* 50% of all people in the U.S. don't know a lawyer, and most can't afford one even if they find one. For simple matters that most people need (wills, trusts, incorporation, bankruptcy, divorce etc.), there is no reason a trained professional without a J.D. can’t be taught to help such people.

* A law degree is not necessary to provide basic assistance and more people would receive basic legal services.

* A nine Laurier with specialized training could provide basic advice in much the same way that nurse practitioners and doctor assistants provide medical treatment.

* A supervising attorney should, however, be in the picture in case more complicated issues arise.

* Access to lawyers and the legal system is hard enough. UPL is a bogus self-preservation scheme. If other professionals can provide quality assistance in transactional fields, they should be able to. The market will weed out the winners and losers.

* Access to legal services is a big issue. If lower cost alternatives working under lawyer supervision are available, that might be worthy of consideration.

* Advice on simple matters or preparing simple forms can be handled by nonlawyers. On the other hand, the client takes a big risk that the nonlawyer is unqualified.

* As a cancer patient, I dealt with ARNPs and highly trained oncology nurses in addition to my doctors. They were extremely capable of doing what they did. I'm not sure all of the areas where similar paraprofessionals could be used in the law, but I would be open to exploring such a program.

* As long as the person has the requisite knowledge of the subject matter on which they are advising it makes difference whether they have a diploma from a law school.
As with physicians, you still need the supervision of a trained professional.

Basic assistance should be limited to attorney approved pleadings or documents to assist in the legal matter.

Basic wills, Contracts and negotiation prior to litigation.

Certain legal services are capable of being competently handled by nonlawyers (like simple wills, simple marriage dissolutions, etc).

Despite pro se forms being available for some filings, the ability of many to thoroughly complete the forms is limited and legal assistance groups are over loaded with cases of those who cannot afford to hire an attorney.

Everything is worthy of consideration. This particular idea could be applicable to basic services that legal aid are unavailable to provide and/or services that the public cannot afford to pay attorneys to accomplish. For example, dealing with property damage claims against insurance companies, small claims, etc.

Florida should "consider" such a program. We should carefully study the experiences of the other states before embarking on one for ourselves.

For certain rudimentary procedures, much like a certified medical assistant, I have no problem.

For county court matters, such as landlord tenant law.

For people appearing pro se, it would be helpful for them to get some assistance.

For simple legal matters not involving court room practice.

Good program if properly trained.

Hopefully, trained non-lawyers can provide less expensive guidance to the multitude of individuals who need help but can't afford it.

I believe that there are some rather technical legal services could be provided by nonlawyers who are properly trained.

I know plenty of nonlawyers who are smarter and more thorough than many lawyers. The problem is identifying those nonlawyers, but the same problem exists when trying to identify a good lawyer.

I think it is worth considering, but it would have to be studied thoroughly. Medical paraprofessionals like physician's assistants and licensed nurse practitioners have a great deal of education and training and they still must operate under a doctor's license. The same would have to be true of any legal paraprofessionals. A lawyer would have to be willing to take the risks associated with the supervision and practice of that
paraprofessional. Otherwise, the public would be at risk to low quality nonlawyers just as they are already at risk to poor quality and under trained lawyers.

* I think it would be beneficial in order to provide services to those who cannot afford to pay for legal assistance.

* I think some of the most basic questions and issues can be effectively addressed by a paralegal.

* I think supervision by a lawyer, even if not close supervision, should be necessary.

* I think that there are underserved markets that need assistance with matters that could be best provided by a trained, regulated nonlawyer that concentrates on those specific matters for which the nonlawyer is trained.

* I think the concept should be explored thoroughly. I would not dismiss it.

* I think the use of such paraprofessionals would depend on the area of law involved.

* I think there are very simple things that are fine to be handled by a regulated nonlawyer, such as simple wills, uncontested divorces with no children or property and stepparent adoptions where no one is contesting the adoption.

* I think there remain areas where clients cannot afford the full services of an attorney or a law firm. Many of these people go without services rather than seeking services from an attorney. Perhaps a program, like the medical profession has used, will help get some of those people into law firms to obtain services that they may be able to obtain from paralegals who will have attorneys overseeing their work. In this way, those potential clients may have the opportunity to receive services that they would not be able to, or might not have been willing to, obtain before.

* I would agree that services that are straightforward and do not rely upon in depth legal knowledge, theory, or research would be candidates for such a program. This might include the preparation of wills, durable powers of attorney, deeds, etc., but not complex estate planning, involved Real Estate closings, etc.

* If it is an affordable option on minor matters, I would be OK with nonlawyers assisting directly.

* If such folks are trained and regulated, they might as well be lawyers.

* In certain circumstances, I think it would be okay.

* In limited areas, a trained paralegal can do just as well as an attorney. Additionally, the public would appreciate the reduced costs.

* In limited circumstances.
In my field of reemployment assistance/unemployment compensation, I believe that non-lawyer representation works well: there are bad ones and good ones. The bad ones usually don't last long.

It could work in some instances such as Medicaid and Medicare filings, Tax preparation and defense, simple wills. However, once this door is opened, it will be difficult to close and regulate, even if there are regulations designed to prevent a problem.

It helps people who cannot afford lawyers.

It would have to be very basic stuff and would need to be regulated with persons supplying services needing to obtain a license.

Lawyers are expensive regardless of the matter so there are a lot of basic services involving a small amount of money or risk that could be affordably offered by trained nonlawyers.

Lawyers are expensive, and the thought of paying legal fees and costs is enough to drive many people away from seeking legal advice when they really need it. Unfortunately, I believe that our profession over protects its "turf", and is not nimble enough to recognize societal changes and think outside of the box that we have constructed.

Legal services to the "poor" could easily be performed in areas such as living wills and powers of attorney.

Many experienced legal staff members are capable and experienced to be helpful to clients.

Many forms don't need a lawyer's supervision.

Many of the matters reserved for licensed attorneys can easily be handled by paralegals.

Meeting the needs of the public should be more important than protecting jobs for lawyers. If a need can be met with nonlawyers, it should be embraced. That will free good lawyers up to do more of the substantive and interesting work we like.

More competition is always better for the profession.

Must be under supervision of attorney.

Never hurts to consider making changes.

Nonlawyers provide representation to parties in reemployment assistance (unemployment compensation) hearings. In many cases the nonlawyers do just as well as the members of the Bar. This practice should be maintained, or expanded.

Only for well-designated and very simple areas of the law and pro bono needs.
* Paralegals could assist pro se individuals in filling out forms for basic litigation such as small claims court, uncontested divorce, and family administration.

* Paraprofessionals with specific, concentrated training can provide more efficient and proficient service in their specific areas than the professional can in many "routine" areas.

* Particularly in the realm of routine services to individual clients, especially for indigent clients.

* Prices for lawyer services preclude as much as 80% of the services being provided. That is a fact of life and paralegals do help diminish that percentage.

* Properly trained and regulated individuals could certainly provide many basic services in commonly sought areas (filing, tickets and misdemeanors, appearances, contract formation, extra-judicial discovery, mediation) for a reasonable fee that would open up access to many more citizens.

* Rules allowing non-lawyer partners should be adopted.

* Same as P.A. - basic assistance should be provided. If more complicated, it goes to the attorney.

* Seems reasonable to allow this lower cost option for basic services.

* Should be able to assist in cases involving only documentary issues.

* Simple transactional document can be standardized and used by trained nonlawyers.

* So long as the liability of the attorney is adjusted accordingly so that the regulated paraprofessional bears risks too of own actions.

* Some basic matters involving forms.

* Some supervision is a must: there is a tendency for individuals, even lawyers, to begin to slide away from approved procedures and laws the longer they've been away from refresher training. Fortunately, most lawyers who appear in court are indirectly supervised by the court through wins or losses. So while I fully support the existence of such individuals, I strongly believe that they must be supervised by a professional lawyer, but not just every lawyer, but one qualified to practice in the field in question.

* Supply and demand. When a lawyer performs a standard service at twice the cost of a trained paralegal that can competently perform that same service, then there is no benefit to the community to have the lawyer do it. That doesn't mean people won't still pay extra for it, just that having the opportunity to buy it for half price will get that service out to more people. Where lawyers choose not to undertake certain legal activities because of interest or price point, paralegals should be used to fill in the gap. But those trained folks need to be regulated much like the health professions. And lawyers need to be insulated from liability for the actions of these regulated folks in their employ.
The citizens of Florida are not being fairly represented in Florida.

The cost of legal services has become prohibitive for many middle class persons. The poor have legal services and the rich have no access problem.

The system of accredited representatives in the field of immigration non-profits has worked very well, as long as there is sufficient training and technical support.

The use of paralegals to perform many of the ministerial tasks associated with a legal matter should result in more affordable fees and services.

There are a number of areas where a trained, nonlawyer could provide representation to underrepresented, including domestic relations/child support; basic will preparation; simple Real Estate transactions; landlord/tenant. In my experience in Administrative Law (where qualified, nonlawyer, representatives are allowed, the best representation does not necessarily depend upon the credentials, but rather, upon the dedication of the representative to use the skills and knowledge that they have acquired.

There are many simple services that non-lawyers are providing anyway. It would be better for them to at least be regulated. Simple deeds, simple wills, trusts, creation of entities. Ideally, yes, a lawyer would be involved in all legal matters and there are things that will go astray or not be handled in the best way by nonlawyers. But at the same time, there are a LOT of not well trained lawyers in Florida who are also screwing up these transactions, and a lot of other people and entities that are providing these services. Given the high cost of a legal education, the cost that needs to be charged for basic legal services required to provide a return on that investment is too high for many Florida residents who could be better served (at least marginally) by regulated professionals rather than operating on their own and pulling forms off the Internet.

This is the perfect spot for use of a graduate law student.

This would greatly assist the lawyer.

To a limited degree in matters deemed by the Bar to be properly serviced by trained and regulated paraprofessionals.

Too many people who are indigent or middle class cannot get appropriate legal assistance for many basic things, like collection company tactics, divorces, child custody arrangements, bankruptcy, rights under leases and mortgage agreements.

Too many unqualified lawyers already giving counter advice due to economic necessity!

Too many who cannot afford legal services are being denied them. While it is ideal that attorneys handle legal problems, these individuals will have no chance of having their legal issues handled unless we allow nonlawyers to step in on a limited basis.

Trained and regulated are the key words.
* While I don't have a problem with basic assistance to fill out standardized forms, beyond that the practice of law is a profession with expertise that should not be doled out by non-licensed individuals.

* With an expanded education and internship requirement, I believe FRP's can act in a similar capacity to solicitors in the UK.

* Would possibly enable persons with limited income to make themselves more open to seeking legal services.

* Yes, because there are many indigent people in Florida who cannot afford an attorney for even simple legal issues.

* Yes, because there just aren't enough lawyers out there?

* Yes. With proper training, nonlawyers can certainly offer legal guidance in limited, practice specific areas.
30. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding nonlawyer licensing and authorization for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission:

**Opposed to Nonlawyer Licensing and Authorization – 148 Responses**

* I am opposed to nonlawyer licensing. *(22 Responses)*

* Nonlawyers should not be permitted to practice law. *(4 Responses)*

* A medical assessment should not be equated with a legal assessment. In the medical arena, if a P.A. that does not properly assess the medical situation, the patient continues to present symptoms and the issues can be escalated to a physician. In the legal area, if a paralegal does not properly assess the legal situation, no one is the wiser until it is likely too late (the contract is signed, the will is executed, etc.). The unsuspecting client does not know how "sick" s/he really is.

* Allow lawyers to be lawyers. Do not sacrifice the profession.

* Allowing nonlawyers to provide any legal services would be a profound slippery slope with grave consequences.

* Allowing nonlawyers to provide legal assistance will force attorneys not only to compete with each other but with nonlawyers who will be able to charge a lower fee. Further, there are many issues that are difficult for lawyers to understand, apply and explain to clients a nonlawyer would be more likely to get it wrong.

* Any program to license nonlawyers to perform legal services should not be allowed.

* As a board certified specialist in Wills, Trusts and Estates, I see the unauthorized practice of law occurring. Clients receive substandard work from untrained individuals. Every person believes any attorney can draft a simple will. However, the advice that is given is an essential part of the process and to those not trained in the area, the advice borders on malpractice.

* As a Real Estate attorney, I complete with nonlawyer title companies and Real Estate agents that regularly provide services I would consider the practice of law. While the Bar can't restrict my competitors advertising, the Bar basically prohibits me from telling the public to use a Real Estate lawyer in a Real Estate transaction.

* As I have previously indicated, The Florida Bar represents the lawyers of this state. There are already too many lawyers and law schools in Florida as it is. We have lawyers from other states coming to retire here. The competition in Florida is stiff. We do not need the added competition from nonlawyers giving advice and doing work that should be regulated to a lawyer. It is bad enough that Florida does not require an attorney to be involved in the closing of a property. So many lawsuits and fraud could be avoided if only lawyers were allowed to handle closings. The model of PAs working with
physicians is horrible and it is not one that The Florida Bar should attempt to emulate. The people of this state deserve to have good legal advice, not opinions of nonlawyers, which you know will do things beyond what they are authorized to do.

* As we stand now, many lawyers (while not admitting to same) use paralegals in a way that teeters over the border of practicing law. If lawyers were better regulated I believe that would go a long way in providing legal services to Florida citizens as opposed to licensing nonlawyers. Lawyers should be required to spend at least 40 hours a year doing pro bono work and not be permitted to pay their way out of it.

* Aside from filling out data on a form, most nonlawyers may do more harm than good for the public. Without the law degree, nonlawyers do not have the legal reasoning to understand why things are fine a certain way, the options that are available, and are not qualified to provide legal counsel which is the most important role for an attorney.

* Bad idea unless you are also closing law schools or drastically decreasing the number of attorneys who may practice law.

* Bad idea, unless you are going to get rid of the law school requirement for being a lawyer. You already require people to sink thousands of dollars into an education system that doesn't prepare them for the practice of law, and now you are considering allowing people that didn't do that to take away some of the potential legal work these people need in order to survive. Either get rid of law school entirely (and allow anyone to sit for a bar exam based on their knowledge and experience) or make anyone that provides legal advice go through law school and pass the bar.

* Be very careful. Once you have moved forward, it is very difficult to go backwards!

* Continue to be vigilant.

* Difficult to balance concept with concept of unauthorized practice of law.

* Don’t think it’s a good idea.

* Don't allow it. Once you open that door, then it will be people asking, "Why can we not just have nonlawyers handle all manner of cases?" Then it will be, “Why not just allow national companies of nonlawyers to operate in the state of Florida?” Foremost, it is not good for the people of Florida. This would promote 1-800 companies from out of State gaining a foothold in Florida and then just farming out the work. How would the bar be able to regulate that?

* Florida, and especially South Florida, is rampant with businesses conducting the unlicensed practice of law. Even the completing of forms, such as immigration forms requires the person completing the forms to understand the law and the consequences of requesting certain types of relief - which would be very difficult if not impossible for the nonlawyer to fully understand. I do not believe that nonlawyers should be licensed to perform legal services.
Florida has an active bar with a lot of attorneys and attorney advertising. Allowing nonlawyers to be licensed for expert legal assistance opens those individuals up to liability that they are not likely prepared to protect themselves or their clients against. Further, our state's population of older Floridians, migrants, and the working poor need resources that they can depend on which only an attorney can provide. Nonlawyer practitioners do not have the knowledge and resources to adequately help these people and in many instances are trying to take advantage of those people or create new markets that only benefit themselves.

Florida is swarming with new, unemployed and under-employed lawyers as it is. To create yet another class of employees to compete with these individuals is incomprehensible. While I suspect the Bar welcomes yet another source of revenue, its first responsibility should be to existing and future members of the legal profession. Why does the AMA find it necessary to protect the level of competition among its members, but The Florida Bar does not?

For economic reasons, I am not opposed to nonlawyer regulation. Obviously such persons should not be allowed any trust account function. The issues of protection to the public are: 1) Malpractice concerns. There probably should be a requirement for insurance, or a heavy disclaimer to the public that using a nonlawyer will probably result in no ability to recover damages if such person malpractices. 2) Scope of Practice. The question will become what is the extent of scope of practice for such individuals. For the profession: We will want the nonlawyers to be subject to the same sanctions as lawyers for misconduct. The clients who use nonlawyers should be advised that they will suffer the consequences of their nonlawyer’s misconduct.

Given the lack of regulation, the lack of accountability, the lack of insurance, the lack of standardization, The Florida Bar should recognize that it has an obligation to protect the public. This is one of the prime reasons for pro bono work. It is better that people who deserve free legal representation get free competent representation than be relegated to nonlawyer representation.

Good luck. Regulating the ones who pass the Bar is tough enough. Now you want them to be supervisors? Would malpractice companies be sponsoring this plan?

How about a little less regulation and people just being trained to do the right thing.

How much legal advice does the "Vision Commission" really think a high school graduate "certified paralegal" should be giving to the citizens of Florida? Just stop and think for a minute.

I am concerned that nonlawyers will be permitted to practice law.

I am hesitant about nonlawyer licensing because seemingly straightforward matters can develop into legal emergencies. For example, I used to practice immigration law and saw people who were victims of notario fraud and people who claimed to be able to assist them in filling out forms. But filling out forms is only one part of it and if a person files a fraudulent immigration application, it can cause them more trouble than if they had seen
a proper lawyer in the first place. I do think access to justice is an issue, but we should carefully consider whether nonlawyer licensing is the appropriate response, and the role of lawyers in any such system.

* I am skeptical about the slippery slope of having legal services delivered by a nonlawyer.

* I am very concerned about the quality of service that could be provided by a nonlawyer. We already have some examples: Many problems are caused by the title agents and realtors in real estate transactions where the objective seems to be to "get it done," rather than to represent clients' interests. I have observed engineers and surveyors try to represent property owners in zoning and such proceedings, and completely miss the legal mark (to their customers' detriment).

* I do not see the benefit to the public to have people who do not have the education, training experience practicing law.

* I do not think it is a good idea. If a person has a legal issue, they need the services of someone who is specifically trained to handle their representation. Also, if the nonlawyer does not adequately perform their service, what is the ramification?

* I do not think this is a good idea. We have trouble regulating lawyers and have considerable trouble with problems created by uninformed or uncaring lawyers who do not take the time to properly prepare or care enough to help their client as opposed to helping themselves. I do not think we should provide opportunities for others to have less training or requirements to be in the same position to create more problems.

* I don’t support it but there are areas of expertise where a nonlawyer knows more than a lawyer. An insurance agent may provide better counsel about insurance and a financial advisor on investments.

* I don't like how doctor's offices use paraprofessionals. I always want to see the doctor and in some offices you never do. So, I would not want that to apply to the legal profession. I understand that the practice of law is changing and perhaps has to change, but I don't think we create a business model that relies mostly on paralegals for the work.

* I find a most irritating trend when dealing with other lawyers: I get emails from paralegals, so I get two responses to my one email - a response from the attorney and a response from someone claiming to be the paralegal. This doubles or triples the time it takes on that particular case because we get emails from both the attorney and his "clerk" or paralegal who seems to be in charge. The alleged clerk/paralegal is very pushy and seems to be making the decisions for the lawyer, and often times states "you will never win on this motion, the judge will do this or that" This is very irritating and it seems this guy is practicing law without a license, and it is actually running up my client's bill based on the numerous emails received when only one email from the attorney is necessary. But whenever I deal with this attorney, I get two-three responses based on this clerk/paralegal.
I guess that I am "old school", but I still believe that the practice of law is a profession, not a business. I believe that doctors have all but ruined their stature, their profession and their ability to provide proper care for their patients, because they have moved from being in the medical profession to being in the medical business. Unfortunately, the practice of law is heading in the same direction. It will become more cutting corners, doing the least amount of work for the most amount of money and generally come down to dollars versus what the client needs. I feel bad for our younger attorneys who will have to live with this reality. I understand that in order to be able to provide "legal services" to more people in a cost effective manner, which the practice of law will have to morph into the business of law. However, I believe that everyone - lawyers, judges and most importantly, our clients, will be worse off.

I have known experienced secretaries who knew more law than the lawyers they worked for, and paralegals who were excellent. The problem is that a limited education such as a paralegal receives cannot give the individual the rounded view and understanding of the law and principles behind it which a law school education does.

I have served on several committees for the regulation of the unlicensed practice of law. I know that people are being defrauded by individuals in areas such as immigration, Real Estate, Family Law and injury claims by unlicensed "lawyers" who pose a serious threat to citizen’s rights. I'm positive that using licensed, Florida-Bar regulated lawyers will result in greater access to correct information about our systems of justice and awareness of one's correct legal rights and obligations.

I practiced a significant time in Virginia (I am also a member of the Virginia State Bar) and was intimately impacted by Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar, a decision which was, in my humble opinion, patently wrong. The next nail in the coffin was Bates v Arizona State Bar, which has opened up not only lawyer advertising, by advertising for all professionals, which I find abhorrent. I would not suggest anyone enter any professional field, due to the advertising component, and the sleaze it encourages, unless they were employed as corporate counsel.

I see universities establishing law schools to create an economic gain and not to serve the state, the professions or the citizens. Law school should be tailored to the states needs and restricted; so that, there is not an over population of Lawyers. Professionalism should be a top priority rather the rude behavior and half truths. This must start at the law school. Law school is more than leaning material in books. I think the use of non-attorneys is a bad idea.

I suggest that all matters regarding the Bar be by attorneys licensed and in active practice.

I think allowing nonlawyers to provide "certain" legal services is a slippery slope. I know some amazingly qualified paralegals, but as smart or experienced they are does not replace the vigorous training you get from attending law school and studying for the bar exam. Also, having gone through all of the expense/time to obtain a law license, I believe that most lawyers do not want to do anything that will jeopardize that license. Thus, they try to be diligent, careful and ethical in providing services to clients. Without as much at stake for the paralegal, clients can be at greater risk.
I think I have made myself quite clear. The Bar, as it is currently run, manages to drive sole practitioners into the ground. It is there for the "rich to get richer", so to speak. Then, when you call with a legitimate question as to how to approach an issue, what does the Bar do? "Oh, we don't give legal opinions." So how am I supposed to understand what the proper choice is on a unique issue? It allows big name firms to do whatever they please, while nitpicking small firms to death. And the staggering amount of unprepared students graduating from horrible law schools in this State is ruining our profession. I believe the powers that be need to begin worrying about how these incompetent attorneys should be regulated before our profession is destroyed.

I think it is a bad idea and only opens the door for more disgruntled clients to have an additional avenue of dissension.

I think it is a mistake. If someone wants less than a legal opinion because it is less expensive they will be often mislead. Information is everywhere on line and any one can receive an opinion. To receive a legal opinion, you must have a conversation with an attorney.

I think it is difficult enough to regulate licensed attorneys and make sure they are following ethical and professional guidelines. It takes a certain level of sophistication to not only practice within ethical guidelines, but to recognize ethical issues when they come up. Have nonlawyers practicing law, even in a limited capacity, will only aggravate the amount of unethical and unprofessional behavior.

I think nonlawyers giving advice on asset transfer strategies and planning for nursing home costs through Medicaid and Veterans Administration are very dangerous and reckless. These should be cracked down on for UPL. These individuals and companies have wider leeway to advertise and market than licensed attorneys. They don't have continuing education requirements, or the O&E insurance to cover claims. They can also make broader claims of results than licensed attorneys. Altogether, a dangerous mix for the public.

I think The Florida Bar should use caution in regard to considering nonlawyer licensing and regulation.

I think the one level of lawyer licensing is plenty- lawyer or not lawyer.

I would limit the practice of nonlawyers who are not under the supervision of a licensed lawyer to very basic "fill in the blank" types of law practice. I would not allow a nonlawyer to give legal advice unless it is subject to review by a licensed lawyer.

If nonlawyer licensing involves anything other than paralegals, I'm not in favor and, on paralegals, I've already provided my thoughts.

If the Supreme Court permits this, it will do a disservice to the state's citizens in need of legal assistance.
* If you are planning to have nonlawyers do more legal work then you need to close down about 5-6 law schools in Florida.

* If you back lawyers and let them be the best they can be, the rest will follow.

* If you start down this path, there will be more and more areas where the paralegals will take over the practice of law. This may be a trend, but is it in the best interest of the public?

* In my experience, the Bar should quit worrying about de-regulation of the actual practice of law, and instead focus on supporting innovation within the industry vs. destroying the marketplace by letting nonlawyers practice law.

* In the event nonlawyer licensing is being considered, it should heavily involve experienced lawyers in the process as they are able to evaluate the practical risks associated with the type of service involved.

* It blurs the lines between attorney and paralegal. Clients will hang their hats on advice they receive from a paralegal that may or may not understand the ramifications of the advice they are giving. My office employs FRP's who have been working in our area of law for twice as long as I have been an attorney and they still do not understand many aspects of what is going on in a matter.

* It is a bad idea. Some legal work is routine but a lawyer has the education to determine whether that is truly the case. Because of regulation and the body of case law on malpractice, lawyers take a greater responsibility than a paraprofessional.

* It is a ridiculous idea. It would make more sense to give more state aid to the legal aid programs around the state so that they could double or triple in size to meet their need - they already do a great job with very meager support.

* It is difficult enough for lawyers to make a living, as evidenced by the number of young and inexperienced lawyers who are starting their own firm right out of law school. This would put more lawyers out of work, cause them to earn less money, not be able to charge the current rates, and usually a lawyer will end up having to go back and try to fix what a nonlawyer has done.

* It is hard enough for the Bar to regulate lawyers as it is. Regulating non-lawyers would be next to impossible.

* It just seems like a slippery slope. I would not like someone representing to a client an expectation or outcome that I may not be able to fulfill.

* It should not be condoned. Nonlawyers are by their nature not trained to provide legal services and a watered down training program will not satisfy that deficiency.

* It should not be permitted.
It takes 5 years to become a good lawyer. I think nonlawyers can only be effective in limited areas.

It will no longer be a profession if nonlawyers are allowed to perform legal work.

It would be the largest mistake ever made by the legal profession to let nonlawyers provide advice or other services to clients. The first concern is one of public interest, i.e. the quality and accuracy of advice being provide to and relied upon by the public. That issue has long been the number one concern in our profession and the entire reasoning that has supported the requirements for our education and examination for more than a century. To permit nonlawyers to perform those services is nothing short of reckless. Indeed, why would we endure the education and examination if it was not necessary to provide well founded advice? Sure, a physician's assistant can give me a Influx shot but that is a scientifically and objectively quantifiable task. On the contrary, something like a "simple will" (which is actually a misnomer) is subjective and requires discovery and analysis of potentially arcane issues, which if missed could have a disastrous impact on several generations of a family and potentially will not be discovered for decades after the infirm advice is rendered. Second, there is already over-crowding in our profession that has and continues to result in a declination of professional conduct. Adding paraprofessionals to that competition for existing business is punishing those who spend hundred-of-thousands of dollars on an education and unreasonably stressing an already stressed profession.

It's a bad idea. Many licensed lawyers struggle to practice law in an ethical and responsible manner. Opening the door to nonlawyers would simply make inadequate legal representation more of a problem in the state.

It's a stupid idea and I resent the Bar wasting money on it. There is no justification for this folly, except to justify the employment of yet more people by The Florida Bar.

Law is still a profession, not a business, and the standards of ethics and high quality of integrity and values should be maintained. Do not dilute the legal profession by allowing other businesses to play lawyer.

Law school costs a lot of money. If nonlawyers will be allowed to be licensed to do what a lawyer does, this is going to make it tough to compete for the limited jobs that are available for attorneys. There are too many law schools in Florida already, now we are licensing non-attorneys too. That does not appear to be a strong vision.

Lawyers should do lawyer work!

Let's be realistic. Every area of the law is complicated. Pitfalls abound. Properly practicing law is difficult. It cannot be simplified. I don't care what technology you choose, or limited legal education you provide. You are considering letting people with half a legal education give legal advice to the public. Half a legal education means "half-baked" legal advice. I practice in Miami-Dade County, and directly see the harm that "notaries" do, for example, in messing up people's title to their homes. Go down this road, and the public will suffer, and not know it, until it's too late. I have seen this time
and again. The Bar should be encouraging the public to get legal advice from a lawyer. It should not be considering letting nonlawyers give legal advice. Wake up and smell the coffee.

* Licensing is one thing; allowing them to give direct legal advice or services is another. It should not be allowed.

* More emphasis should be placed on insuring quality service by lawyers.

* Non-lawyer licensing is a non-sequitur. The concept is silly in the extreme. Why would you "license" a nonlawyer? By definition they are not lawyers, so what license would they obtain? It is not the job of The Florida Bar to expand access to lawyers by fiat. By adding nonlawyers to the mix, we do nothing but featherbed the profession, making it more cumbersome and more stratified. This is bureaucracy at its worst. To put this into computing terms, we are creating Windows 10 and saying it is a good deal. When in fact, the same rotten software is at its base and we will never be rid of it. Do not add more layers to the profession. Make access more palatable and approachable instead. Provide an incentive for lawyers to provide greater access. Why are governmental entity lawyers so immune to helping out? Provide CE credit for actual work performed. Provide an online advice forum where in my down time I can assist others. Use technology to help the existing lawyers connect with those who need help. Loosen the requirements and the downside of my assisting others. If I give advice for free and help with online pleadings or answers, do I face malpractice claims of the full force and effect as if I were being paid and meeting face to face? Creating a NEW gatekeeper (the licensed nonlawyer) fills me with dread (and will pad the coffers of The Florida Bar).

* Nonlawyer licensing should not be approved. There are adequate methods and cost of representation in place.

* Nonlawyer licensing will only encourage legal services from other countries in a call center environment. I don't believe we will be doing anyone any favors by allowing attorneys to subcontract or outsource work to call centers operating from an unknown location (or anywhere in the world for that matter).

* Nonlawyers do not need to be licensed by The Florida Bar as they are employees of supervising attorneys. They are not independent contractors and they are no qualified to represent clients independent of oversight.

* Nonlawyers licensing will eventually be the death knell of the bar and clients will be worse off for it. Create a state legal aid system run by a state agency where private attorneys are paid a fixed fee for certain civil legal work. For each circuit or county the agency will have a list of attorneys who consent to accept legal aid work or cases at the agreed fee. A legal aid panel can be established that will fix the fee to be paid for each type of work. For example, the panel could decide that an attorney will be paid a fixed amount to represent a tenant in a landlord and tenant case where the tenant qualifies for legal aid. The panel will then issue a legal aid certificate for that amount and the lawyer will have to certify that the work was done. If it is a case then the clerk of court will also certify that the work was done. Many common law countries such as the United
Kingdom, Canada, Australia, etc., have such a system and it is time that every state in this country establish such a system. This will go a very far way in satisfying unmet legal needs. When nonlawyers perform legal work then there can be all kinds of unforeseen consequences.

* Nonlawyers should not be representing people. No court. The problem is where/how do they draw the line between providing assistance and legal advice. Having handled many divorces, people ask questions and insist you tell them what to do. They mention a thousand things that have implications some of which should influence the filing. A form processor/paralegal is going to move things forward by filling in an answer without understanding the consequences or explaining them to the requestor.

* Not recommended for obvious reasons having to do with competence, liability, theft and fraud issues.

* Paralegals may not practice on his/her own. Must be under attorney supervision. It would be a slippery slope of we allowed paralegals to open an office without an attorney and offer legal services.

* People hate our profession and do not hold lawyers in high regard because if you are middle class or even upper middle class financially, it is difficult to afford legal representation for a variety of needs-divorce, small business needs, etc. The billing structure of hourly rates without any promise guarantee of how long and how much is extremely frustrating! You would not buy a car unless you knew the total price! The public feels that lawyers have a stake in dragging cases on and on and that they benefit financially and that the legal profession doesn't put the client first and does not seek efficient resolution of cases! Remember, there is a strong case to be made for the following: The best lawyers who fight the hardest for their clients are often lower paid public interest lawyers, like prosecutors and public defenders, because they are often true believers, get paid the same and have no monetary consideration to deal with only the best interest of the client! Non-lawyers are just that. Only lawyers should be practicing law! Of course lawyers can rely on support staff to assist with cases but too often lawyers charge an hourly amount for paralegal services and keep a hefty chunk of the fees while paying the support staff a salary! My biggest issue with The Florida Bar is that you only represent the interests of "money lawyers" while giving lip service to the needs of the indigent, the middle class and all the lead remedies that do not produce money/profit! Remember, the Bar is not to take positions on controversial topics but they took a strong position on Tort reform, which as truly a controversial issue. the Bar refused for years to be brave and just and honor the constitution when they refused to take a position on gay adoption! Gay individuals could provide care for a child as foster parents but were prohibited to adopt or provide permanent forever home for the same children! I am a public interest lawyer and I do not feel the Bar represents me. My ethical and legal values (the ones I actually practice every day) are in direct conflict with the agenda and values of The Florida Bar. The Bar pretends to support pro bono efforts, pretends to support justice for all but in reality it is just a self congratulatory smug weak attempt-words in the Bar newspaper. Very few lawyers do any real pro bono because real advocacy requires too much time away from billable hours! I really resent the money I have to pay for my
Bar dues. You do not represent me or many of my fellow lawyers but yet we must pay for your advocacy on behalf of the powerful lawyers, i.e. the money lawyers!

* Practicing without a license is at an all time high with real estate agents and such attending motion calendar on foreclosure issues. This is highly problematic.

* Providing legal services to a client are a great responsibility. Lawyers attend law school for 3 years and even then are insufficiently trained to always effectively represent a client right out of school or for a time soon after. It is important to have supervision early on in a career, and more so for nonlawyers. Nonlawyers do not have adequate training or skills to offer the same services that lawyers provide. While paralegals and the like can be used more effectively and at a cost-benefit to a client, the types of services they should be permitted to offer need to be limited, and always with lawyer supervision.

* Rather than license nonlawyers in some capacity, open up the profession in all 50 states with one bar exam passed.

* Reduce the number of law schools in Florida and the number of students in law school. There are too many law school graduates for few positions.

* Regulation of the provision of legal service is a must if the public is to be protected. As things stand, there are too many unlicensed individuals providing legal services which are reserved for licensed attorneys.

* Technology will eventually make all but a few areas of legal practice archaic. The Court system which now requires years to resolve disputes will not survive in a world where business moves in milliseconds.

* The FMA says "If you want to practice medicine, go to medical school." I believe, "If you want to practice law, go to law school."

* The legal field is disgraceful. Judges behave like children. Lawyers are slapped on the wrist for ethical violations. Even those that are disbarred may petition to re-enter. Why? They either knew what they were doing was wrong or they did not learn the essential ethics when they should have. Either way, they should not be allowed back into the practice except, of course, that this methodology supports the business models in which the shareholders' interests are of paramount importance. The lawyers, as the "shareholders" are following the business models. Hence, the suggestion that we no longer send mixed messages. Accept that law is a business first and a provider of services to clients second and forget about ethics.

* The president of my local bar said at the inception of The Florida Bar we were creating a bureaucracy and this form shows how right he was.

* The requirement to take three basic CLE courses upon being admitted to The Florida Bar was a complete waste of time and gas for any attorney with more than 5 years experience. The requirement on The Florida Bar application to list all of your employment when you are 30, 40 or 50 years old is ridiculous. The letters sent out threatening that if a particular section of the application is not more fully explained then the application will be denied
and you will not be permitted to practice in Florida because it is a mandatory bar state is unconscionable. The lack of reciprocity is an insult. Requiring a 10-20 year experienced attorney to sit for the full bar exam and complete the infuriating bar application is disrespectful, as well as unnecessarily expensive. Why can't you do like other states-accept an out of state licensed attorney after that attorney passes a Florida law specific one-day or half-day exam that can be administered somewhere other than Tampa?

* The role of paralegals and other paratype professionals, if with limited to no supervision by an attorney, should be limited to clerical work.

* There are already too many lawyers in the state. We don't need others trying to practice law. It will minimize the seriousness of a client's problem. If an attorney chooses to overcharge a client for a "simple" matter, it is an ethical problem and not a problem that there aren't enough lawyers.

* There are many abuses which currently exist in Florida's legal community. Condoning the use of a nonlawyer will only increase abusive practices and will likely lead to increased grievances filed by Florida residents.

* There are too many lawyers as it is so creating employment for nonlawyers to do work currently being done by barred lawyers makes no sense.

* There have been too many changes already. This used to be a respected profession. We need to be more accessible to the public. I see too many people stuck in long-term cases without an ability to pay fees. I have personally handled way too many cases for such people without getting paid and I am now 60 without any meaningful retirement savings because I tried to do the right thing.

* There is no need.

* There should be no change in rules re: nonlawyers.

* There should be no nonlawyer licensing. They do not have the same repercussions as lawyers (losing your ability to make a living) and they can shed further doubt and dislike to our profession.

* They should be prosecuted.

* They should ONLY be allowed to work only under the supervision of a responsible attorney, who will be able to advise the client that certain paperwork prepared by the paralegal MUST be presented to the Court for a Final Order to be entered, so the "agreement" they may have made actually takes effect. (My example from above) OR do things like forms & research, again, under the direct supervision of attorneys. As you can see, I think the "We Are Not Lawyers" shops should all be closed.

* Think it is the slippery slope. We are dumbing down everything and the picture is not so rosy.
* This needs to be very carefully studied. Concern centers on ethics and the harmful effects of improper legal assistance.

* Too many lawyers are only marginally qualified. Adding people less qualified will only degrade legal services.

* Too much room for abuse. By the time you set this up with education/credits, licensing, regulation, enforcement, ethical considerations, etc. the person could have gone to law school. I don’t see the advantage either to the public or to the individual.

* Tread carefully. I am concerned about the competency of trained lawyers providing good value to clients. Another layer of individuals who could exacerbate this situation is not good for the public and the bar.

* We already have a surplus of licensed lawyers and the Bar is seriously considering making it easier for nonlawyers to practice law without a license?

* We have a huge issue with nonlawyers providing legal advice, even within our own industry. I have called law clerks at the court and corrected them after my clients tell them they were advised to do something or were given incorrect information. We need a better way to train, monitor, and reprimand such actions.

* We have substantial business generated by the preparation of documents by nonlawyers. It would be very dangerous without direct supervision.

* We have too many lawyers who are not well-qualified. We do not need to add to the overcrowded field with less qualified individuals. However, I would support nonlawyers within a community law program.

* We have too much unauthorized practice of law going on. Vendors, Public Adjusters, Contractors, etc. Licensing these trades like we have with public adjusters helps.

* What frightens me about nonlawyer licensing is that the nonlawyer may miss something that a trained lawyer would see. My impression of some on the nonlawyer work that I have come across is that the nonlawyer gives the client what the client wants and the client often does not know what he or she really needs. I worry that nonlawyers see issues as "black and white" and may miss the nuances that we lawyers see. As a lawyer, I am constantly questioning and examining all the facts presented to me, and I am usually researching to find out if there is a better approach than my initial thought. I also worry about the level of lawyer supervision of nonlawyers under our current structure. I have dealt with many law offices in which a paralegal or legal assistant seems to handle a great deal of responsibility that the lawyer should handle.

* Why degrade the practice of law further? Attorneys have a legal and ethical duty to their clients and losing your ability to practice law is of great concern to attorneys. I do not believe that the same would hold true for paraprofessionals (OK, some yes, but mostly no.) We have already seen paper mills and other situations were non-attorneys were performing attorney work right here in our state and the result has been that the public
has been harmed by this. The public may not fully understand the distinction between a licensed nonlawyer and an attorney and this could be detrimental to them in many ways. What about attorney-client privilege? Would that extend to a licensed nonlawyer? If not, that would be a big problem. It would become a sliding scale that would cause a lot of problems.

* Will limit business for attorneys. If you consider this, then there needs to be less attorneys to work.

* With over 100,000 lawyers in Florida, and the high dissatisfaction with the practice, nonlawyers should not be licensed. It is difficult enough to earn a living with the current and increasing level of reporting requirements. What used to be an enjoyable legal practice to serve the public is now unduly controlled. We in the everyday practice of law resent the requirements dreamed of by the Supreme Court Justices, many whom never were in private practice, and have little knowledge of day to day client contact and office management.

* With the flood of lawyers in the Florida marketplace, it would seem that adding nonlawyer licensing to the mix could simply exacerbate the situation. It could become quite a problem to regulate.

* With the numbers of lawyers we are graduating each year the public can and should get lawyers and not nonlawyers handling their matters.

* Your "vision" is to create a structure whereby a few mills who can afford massive advertising, can rely on cheap labor ("Paralegals") to make money for a small minority of lawyers to make money while the ethical and competent lawyers go out of business. Your sense that the public really needs cheaper and more accessible services is ideologically driven. The paralegal certification program is a racket. It makes money and fools paralegals into thinking they know something, and they provide cheap labor to substitute for hiring an associate. I know someone who teaches paralegals, and he cannot competently practice law or read a statute. It is a racket. Further, those paralegals do give legal advice. I clean up their messes all the time when a client comes in with a paralegal divorce disaster on his hands. They undercut us, and they give the perception that what a lawyer can do, anyone can do. That is the REALITY in practice. You are suggesting that the flat fee/mill model is appropriate for family law cases. I am a family law lawyer and all the people ever do is fight, fight, fight; there is rarely such a thing as a non-contested divorce and no competent, ethical family lawyer can do a proper job on a divorce without billing hourly. In fact, hourly billing is what keeps the litigants from overwhelming the courts any more than they already do. There seems to be a sense of "entitlement" to cheap legal services which is lowering our profession in the eyes of the public. Clients lie, misrepresent their assets, under-report their income enough as it is to find the cheapest lawyer they can. Small practitioners are already offering lowered rates, but we can't compete with Internet advertising and the Bar does not market us. Why don't you market us, the small practitioners, instead of paralegals? I know someone who gave a flat rate to a divorce client who turned out to have $300,000 in assets. You are being fooled. You are not realizing that this model for access to cheap services is ruining the profession. The
public has plenty of access to inexpensive services - the small practitioner - but The Florida Bar and ABA are destroying us in favor of the sweat shop model/ticket clinic.

In Favor of Nonlawyer Licensing and Authorization – 47 Responses

* Although I think many of my colleagues are always against nonlawyer licensing, I believe that the proper use of nonlawyers is an excellent method to bring in more clients, rather than to lose them. In some ways, I think it is necessary for the legal profession to think outside the box and to get away from strictly traditional methods of practicing law. People have shown that they are willing to risk obtaining poor legal advice, through such things as form factories, to obtain a cheaper alternative to traditional law. In many of those areas, attorneys and law firms need to be ready to change their practice to meet the needs, or perceived needs of the customer. Many of us still have issues, as I do myself, with the ethical duties and obligations that we have that others may not have. Those can pose problems for many of us in how far or how willing we are as attorneys in supplying what we believe might be an inferior product. That is where the perception needs to change and where perhaps the Bar as a whole needs to be more aggressive in supplying information to the general public where such bulk documentation fails. Unfortunately, due to our own ethics, we usually can't provide such information to others, thus helping to assist the problem to be even worse. Many of us see mistakes by both the nonlawyer, as well as the lawyer, on a daily basis but we either can't or won't comment on the legal services being provided. The same often holds true where attorneys are overcharging their clients. Such overcharging helps to add to the perception that legal services cannot be obtained. It may be that law firms can create additional profit centers to address the issues of those that they may not normally be able to service through the use of licensed nonlawyer staff.

* Although my practice is primarily a commercial transaction practice, I see a need for some basic services to be provided by nonlawyers, provided that there is lawyer supervision. In Real Estate transactions, there are many closings handled by "title agents" who are not lawyers. Such transactions can certainly be handled and ARE being handled by Real Estate paralegals, particularly to the extent that this requires filling in non-negotiable forms. However, a title policy is only as good as the coverage it provides. If there are exceptions (and there always are exceptions) a lawyer needs to review (or supervise paralegal review) those exceptions to determine if there are exceptions that are not acceptable. I have seen exceptions for a golf course easement under a townhouse, a utility easement under a shopping center and for an estate Tax lien on a residential home policy. The title agent that delivered the policy did not worry about removing those exceptions or working to remedy the problem. So, while there is certainly a significant role for non-professionals, the supervising attorney has to have the ultimate responsibility to the client to confirm that the client understands and accepts the legal consequences of a transaction.
* Consumer choice should be given broad scope. False claims of being a member of the Bar should be punished strongly. Fully disclosed representation by a nonlawyer should not be punished.

* Extreme care and consideration would need to be given, obviously, to this decision. Perhaps within carefully regulated and selected areas this could work, but I still would use caution as there would easily be room for abusing this and relegating nonlawyers to "quasi-attorneys" which is certainly not a good idea.

* Good experienced paralegals should be the ones considered but need a lawyer to be available to assist if needed.

* I approve of nonlawyer licensing as long as they are supervised by lawyers, go through a rigorous background check and are subject to rigorous disciplinary safeguards, and are bonded. They must not be allowed to self-regulate: this must be done by the Bar or by some independent and consumer-responsible entity.

* I believe it may be a way of providing legal services to needy individuals, so long as proper safeguards and oversight are implemented.

* I believe that nonlawyers who may provide services must be regulated, licensed, and perhaps pass a test involving the services they are permitted to render. They should also be required to stay up to date on topics of importance to their field through continuing education courses approved by The Florida Bar or similar body.

* I believe that there is a place for paraprofessionals, but still feel the need for attorney supervision.

* I don't know about the paralegal program that was mentioned in this survey, but I think it should include (if it doesn't) required courses at a school that is accredited by The Florida Bar, with an exam at the end that touches on standard areas of law plus ethics. I think there should be a background check that is less stringent than the one for attorneys but still with the goal of having people who are honest and trustworthy. I think a paralegal school could likely be entirely online, with exams being taken at a central location.

* I don't know enough about the program but certainly think there are some tasks that lawyers attend to that are routine enough that if a nonlawyer was to receive specific training to complete that task they could competently do so.

* I think certified paralegals should be able to become paralegal members of the Bar and all should be regulated by the Bar. I think eventually all certified paralegals should be required to be members of the Bar or other regulatory agency, especially if they become eligible for performing restricted legal services with the supervision of an attorney.

* I think it should be explored.

* I think it's an area worth exploring, but I am also concerned about the impact on the thousands of attorneys entering the workforce and their ability to obtain jobs.
I think paralegals can be a great advantage to deal with the mundane things that take up a lot of the attorney's time.

I think regulating and allowing nonlawyers to assist with form completion and submission is fine and could go a little farther than it does now, but for the protection of the clients, there should be a bar number and malpractice policy on the line for anything significant.

I think the key is working under a competent lawyer and having the requisite experience.

I think we should move to a medical model. We should limit the number of lawyers being graduated by more tightly controlling the number of law schools. We should have a more robust certification of paralegals with certification in certain areas like Real Estate and divorce so they are more like nurse practitioners. This would create a more cost effective delivery model so that the legal system is not out of reach for the majority of the public.

I worry about diluting the quality of legal services available to consumers, but I am also mindful that the vast majority of consumers who have legal needs are unable to afford lawyer assistance. I tend to think some degree of nonlawyer licensing would be a good move for the profession, but licensing and authorization would have to be fairly strict in order to protect the public.

If allowed, these nonlawyers should have some period of hands-on internship in the specific area of law they will serve.

If an effective educational system that would train and regulate nonlawyers to assist the public which would not require a full law school education, I would favor such a system in order to better meet the needs of the public that cannot afford the services of a lawyer. However, any such system would need to have background checks to keep people with criminal records from entering such work. The system should also have a disciplinary system that would weed out incompetence and bad actors.

I'm not sure of the status of efforts regarding nonlawyer licensing, but I would favor requiring all such paraprofessionals to work under the supervision of a licensed attorney.

I'm sure this will further bring the demise of the general practitioner, as well as 'bread and butter' work for some lawyers, but if the need is not being met, I understand the goals.

It needs to be tasks that do not require in-depth legal analysis that only a lawyer can perform.

It needs to be very closely monitored to ensure that proper legal advice is being provided. The last thing we want is someone giving advice that can result in harm to the person seeking the advice.

It should be permitted but supervised by an attorney.

Let the paralegals take over. They can't damage the system any more than the glut of attorneys that you have allowed to practice have already.
Licensing of paralegals to provide services under the close supervision of an attorney is appropriate. Licensing of paralegals to provide services without the supervision of an attorney is not.

Medical model could be looked at in easy matters under direct lawyer supervision.

More competition would help law. Attorneys are too expensive to use regularly.

Nonlawyer licensing, after some training and under supervision of a lawyer, would be acceptable. Most professions require training and licensure, the law, misapplied, can do great harm, second perhaps only to the Medical profession.

Nonlawyers, but no non-citizens (illegal immigrants) should become licensed here.

Nonlawyers can be effective advocates in reemployment assistance matters, both for claimants and for employers. This example should be studied and the model applied in other appropriate areas.

Nonlawyers might be of help in very defined instances such as preparing approved forms, filling out simple wills and deeds or other simple documents.

Paralegals are fine but their advice giving should be very limited. In my practice, I have seen what paralegals have done and how they have messed up someone's Real Estate chain of title or prevented them from getting benefits of some sort by leading the customer in the wrong direction. The trouble with giving advice is determining what is "too much" advice or what is wrong advice. It would take a lot of case law and malpractice suits to sort that all out.

People are using online legal forms because they are cheaper, which is dangerous. Providing paralegal or other trained nonlawyers ensures legal needs are met because they can spot when the basic forms and agreements will not suffice and can call in lawyer assistance as needed.

Restrict numbers of lawyers like the medical profession does.

That should only be allowed if under the supervision of a lawyer.

The future of law practice will undergo great change and the profession must change to meet those demands.

The way of the world is to do more with less. Lawyers need to focus on complex, high value matters leaving legal professionals to handle more routine activities. This will enhance the ability of the profession to reach more people while keeping services affordable and service levels high.

There are a number of excellent paralegal training and certification programs. A well trained and certified paralegal is an invaluable member of any firm's legal team. Registration was a good initial step. Registration should be mandatory with tighter requirements for CLE and certification of skills.
* There are certain routine, static elements of the practice which can and are routinely handled by nonlawyer staff, but they should never be allowed to work outside the supervision of a lawyer. The analogy to medicine is apt. They use an array of paraprofessionals, but all of them are supervised by physicians. A licensed professional must always be ultimately responsible for the delivery of professional services.

* There are several areas where a trained nonlawyer might provide economic and competent service. Title examination, forms and pleadings for no-assets, no children marriage dissolution, bar approved real property contracts if the buyer or purchaser is required to read, understand and accept them. Many companies commonly use brokers, agents, title companies and the like to represent them in simple acquisitions and non-controversial issues.

* There are some basic skills that could be handled effectively by certified, regulated paralegals under the supervision/direction of attorneys.

* Throughout the history of legal practice attorneys have used the services of skilled staff (secretaries) to handle and fund large parts of their practice - wills, deeds, basic divorce cases for example. I think it is appropriate for legal staff with the training and experience to handle certain legal matters and to receive the recognition and pay commensurate with their skill level.

* To the extent that nonlawyers (such as paralegals) are given expanded responsibilities, those responsibilities should be closely regulated. I do not consider programs other than formal law school attendance adequate for the practice of law. I believe it could be a disservice to the public to have clients relying on such nonlawyer "legal" representation.

* While nonlawyers and paralegals can and do provide assistance to attorneys, it should always be under the supervision and responsibility on an attorney. In the medical field, a Physician Assistant or Nurse Practitioner can only perform certain functions under the supervision of a Physician. If there are tasks which can be done without lawyer supervision then it really should not be classified as practicing law.
34. Do you favor or oppose allowing some form of admission by motion in Florida?  
(Total Number of Responses – 232)

In Favor of Admission by Motion – 145 Responses

* After a certain number of years of practice, I don't think that re-taking the Bar Exam is necessary or that it serves a valid purpose. Perhaps an ethics exam would be a good requirement.

* All the Bar Exam does is prove that someone can study a variety of subjects and get a passing score. At the end of the day, it does not measure how well someone will practice law in a given field. There are plenty of people who fail the Bar Exam who are intelligently qualified in a certain area, whereas there are plenty of people who pass The Bar Exam who should not have a bar license. The test is completely arbitrary. If a person can pass one state's Bar Exam (all of which contain the same multi-state portion) why should they have to take that state's exam for the certain individualized subjects. If we really want to measure proficiency, let's require certification in the subject matter that the person desires to practice in.

* An attorney should be able to easily adapt to practicing in any state.

* An attorney with many years of practice and no history of ethical violations should not have to take yet another bar exam. However, I believe there should be research into the attorney's history with the other state's bar to insure they have no issues that would bar them from practice here.

* As long as the individual seeking admittance in the foreign jurisdiction was required to take a competency test with regard to procedural rules.

* As more and more business becomes "global" reciprocity is becoming very important.

* As the world changes, so should The Florida Bar.

* Assuming already licensed in another state, I believe all states should allow admission into the state bar w/o taking the bar exam, as long as certain criteria are met (i.e., no pending disciplinary actions, etc.).

* Assuming the lawyer has practiced in another state for a sufficient number of years (I suggest 7 as most colleagues I know didn't feel comfortable as lead counsel until year 5) without a disciplinary action, attorneys should be free to practice in other states so long as they agree to be subject to Florida Bar Rules.

* Bar exams pose a significant barrier to entry, which prevents attorneys from migrating to states where lawyers are in demand, or away from states with an excess of attorneys.

* Barriers to choice should be as low as possible.
* Because Florida is such a transient state, it would greatly benefit Florida lawyers to be able to have reciprocity with other states for licensing purposes.

* Because I want the same option if I ever have to relocate to another state, it seems only fair that Florida allow the same. But perhaps it should be conditioned on some type of minimum residency in Florida requirement to avoid having out of state lawyers being admitted who have no intention to actually reside and practice in Florida.

* Believe it could work as long as they should have to show by a test, or otherwise knowledge of Florida law and procedures.

* Coming from a different state and having to take the bar with over 20 years experience and a member in good standing in two states with no history of discipline was incomprehensible. I think having to take a Florida statute/law test would have been acceptable. Taking the MBE and general essays was useless and a waste of my time.

* Competition is good for the profession.

* Competition opens the marketplace. The marketplace of action and ideas. I will retain the clients that see me delivering value and lose those that do not. What is wrong with that? I expect that the visiting lawyer will not be able to navigate the Florida waters as well as the native, just as I will not understand the particulars of Texas law. But so be it.

* Currently, I am "stuck" in Florida. If I want to move to another state, I have to re-take the bar exam despite 17 years of legal practice and experience. That is stupid.

* Do not have a strong basis to oppose.

* Every attorney in every state has to undergo similar rigorous requirements to practice law and maintain their license. There is no compelling reason not to allow experienced attorneys to waive into Florida, and in effect, allow Florida attorneys to waive into other states. The lack of reciprocity unduly restricts otherwise experience lawyers from making geographic moves to other states.

* Every lawyer practicing law in a particular jurisdiction is charged with knowing the laws in the area that they have chosen to practice in. Besides, while there are differences from state to state, the practice of law is grounded in Legal Research and common sense, which is needed in every State of the Union.

* Favor to the extent is for one particular case involving litigation opposed to broad, complete rights to practice law in Florida.

* Florida does not have as much of an influx problem as it used to, or at least it doesn't seem to.

* Florida has become isolated in an interdependent nation. Especially as one of the "Big Four" (CA, NY, TX and Florida) it is somewhat dated and embarrassing that Florida will not allow reciprocity. And the result, of course, is that Florida receives none in return.
Florida is inter-connected with many other states - it makes sense to allow some form of admission by motion.

Florida is well known for creating barriers for its homegrown work force. I can appreciate the sentiment, but it simply increases the cost of the delivery of services without protecting jobs. In the corporate space, these barriers make no sense. You can look up the laws. Even without this "permission", many multi-state law firms are employing lawyers in offices in other states to produce work "authorized" for delivery in Florida by admitted Florida partners. They generate work product in low wage rate states for delivery to high billing states- effectively arbitraging the performance at services to the greatest profit. The next step, which is already here, is using multi-national firms to draw on the skills of U.S. trained foreign lawyers to do the same thing. The thing is- this process works because the wage rates of lawyers in major U.S. cities are too high. At the same time, just like major international banks, people still want to do business with people not e-mail accounts. So there is sufficient pressure to ensure lawyers have jobs here- that offices stay open here and people do business here. In Ada, Oklahoma, perhaps the same dynamic might not work. Local court processes are a different story. You want to enable the courts to run effectively, so it helps to have people know the rules in the locale. At the same time, I am unclear why one county or city needs to have different rules than another. A stupid anachronism designed to maintain local control and home team advantage. We need to get rid of this.

Florida makes it very difficult for an attorney that has practiced in another state to gain admittance to The Florida Bar. The level of detail in the application is daunting and causes many to just "skip it". Making it a bit easier while not making it so easy that Florida becomes the place for practicing attorney's to enter semi-retirement would be a good thing.

Florida's self imposed "isolation" is archaic and unresponsive to unification of the 50 states in other matters prompted in part by the explosion of the internet and technical interrelations.

Given the increasingly global nature of practicing, it can help a client if we (as Florida lawyers) can assist the client in their issue regardless of the location. Many times, business disputes or other legal issues may take place in multiple venues and allowing reciprocity would allow lawyers to help their clients (whom they have a previous relationship with) regardless of where the incident occurred.

Gives you freedom to move. At present time your liberty is compromised.

I am a member of the Colorado Bar and was received there prior to the Colorado rule change that banned reciprocity with Florida due to Florida's ban on reciprocity.

I am fully in favor of unlimited reciprocity.

I am licensed in TX, as well as Florida. TX has reciprocity. It should have some type of requirements, not just a simple motion. It should be on years of practice, etc.
I am licensed to practice in four states, the most recent one being Florida. When we moved due to my husband's job, I had to take The Florida Bar after not taking a bar for 9 years. I think that my past work history and license in 3 other states should have been sufficient to allow me to practice law in this state. Especially when you consider how much I had to spend to just sit for The Florida Bar. That is the most I've had to pay to sit for an exam. I wouldn't mind spending $1000+ if I didn't have to sit for the exam but to pay that much and still have to sit for the exam and pay for the study materials; that was outrageous.

I believe there should be less restrictive measures between states so as to allow an otherwise qualified attorney to move to another state and practice without having to take a bar exam. To my knowledge, there are only a few states where I, as a licensed Florida attorney, can be admitted by motion.

I do not believe that all existing lawyers should be required to take a Bar Exam to move from one state to another. Of course, those who can obtain motion admission must be able to establish competence.

I don't know how we can continue to prevent it. So, we should regulate it to ensure adequate representation. Example: homestead as it relates to estate planning and death. It always gets messed up by out of state attorneys and non-specialized attorneys.

I don't think out of state attorneys should have to comply with all of the requirements of a new attorney but some competence in local law matters should be established.

I feel a lawyer should be able to seek admission by motion so long as the lawyer associates with a lawyer who is licensed to practice law in the State of Florida who has passed The Florida Bar. The key issue is that someone knows the specific differences in Florida law, but that a competent lawyer from another jurisdiction should not be totally barred from practice in the State of Florida.

I generally favor limited reciprocity. It is important for a lawyer to demonstrate knowledge of a specific state's laws, especially if they differ from what is tested on the MBE or the general trend adopted in other states. I would favor some form of assessment of knowledge of Florida state law. I believe Georgia will allow an attorney admission licensed in another state to gain admission into the Georgia Bar if the attorney takes the Georgia only portion of The Bar Exam.

I have appeared in other state's courts by admission pro hac vice and believe Florida has too strict an admission/access policy. It could be lessened and become a source of revenue.

I have no issue with reciprocity, but it should be based upon more than meeting character and fitness requirements. I was a practicing attorney in New York for almost 20 years, before moving to Florida. While I had the legal knowledge to be able to pass the bar, I admit that I did not have the specific knowledge of Florida's laws to be able to practice here, without some form of mentoring. I was lucky to work for an attorney who was able to help me recognize and understand Florida specifics. I think that before someone is
allowed to practice after admission by motion in Florida, they should be required to take a certain amount and type of education classes.

* I have no objection to limited admission for a particular matter, as long as the person meets certain requirements.

* I have taken the bar exams in 3 states. I have never thought that passing the Bar means a person will not make a good lawyer nor that failing the Bar means that person is unqualified to make a good lawyer. I think a law school graduate should be allowed to become a member of any bar in any state by motion. Practicing law, disciplinary rules & procedures, CLE, required mentors and legal malpractice lawsuits, will take care of the rest.

* I have thought on many occasions how ridiculous it is to not allow a Florida attorney to waive into another state's Bar. Naturally, that attorney would have to educate herself on the law of that state.

* I only favor it in special circumstances where a case requires the attorney to do work here, but I don't want every retiree or NY lawyer trying to get waived into Florida.

* I recently had to take the bar exam in Florida after practicing in another state for 10 years. I feel that it was unnecessary. After practicing for that length of time I had demonstrated the ability to practice in Florida.

* I still think you have to be able to show that you know the basic laws of the other state you are applying to become a member. Although, I do believe it is unnecessary to actually have to sit and take that States bar exam.

* I think an experienced lawyer could practice in any state as long as they reviewed the local rules.

* I think Florida makes it far too difficult for people to relocate in or out of the state. I don't need someone to take a bar exam in Florida to work here if they passed a bar exam that is similar to this one, or they have many years of experience and a review of their body of work and what their peers think can satisfy this state that the attorney is ethical and knowledgeable. There are plenty of people who are good at taking tests and pass the Florida Bar, but aren't necessarily good attorneys. People move to Florida for many reasons; a spouse is being relocated through his/her job, health of that person or a family member, or just a desire to be in a warmer climate. If Florida had reciprocity with other states, especially ones in proximity to Florida or ones that are destination states (like California or New York) it would make it easier for Floridians who were exemplary members of this state's bar to relocate to other areas for better opportunities for their spouses or families.

* I think if I have 20+ years of experience practicing law and am in good standing, there shouldn't be much impediment to me practicing in another state.

* I think if there is a lawyer who has experience (over 2-3 years) and wants to move his practice to Florida we shouldn't make it so hard for him/her to do so. The Bar Exam is not
offered very often and it could be an undue hardship and deter people from moving her because of the process. If the lawyer is newly practicing I don't think it would be as big of deal to have them take the bar.

* I think it is an antiquated idea that Florida should not give reciprocity because Florida will be overrun with out of state lawyers. I think Florida needs to get in the 21st century. People are more mobile and lawyers should have the flexibility to move around like anybody else. Plus, there will be a benefit to Florida attorneys because they can practice elsewhere as well if Florida gave reciprocity.

* I think it makes sense to allow free movement of lawyers across state lines in today's environment.

* I think it would be a good idea, so long as politics did not get involved.

* I think lack of reciprocity is only in place to reduce the number of practicing lawyers in Florida and we should think strongly about admitting lawyers who have achieved a minimum score on the MBE and PRE, along with the fundamentals of Florida law examination. Having said that, I should admit I am winding down my practice and don't have a concern for how much competition there is for legal work, and my wife was admitted for decades in CA & TN and we both suffered through her having to take The Florida Bar Exam.

* I think the marketplace will self-regulate. People will go to where the jobs are. There aren't many left in Florida.

* I truly do think Florida's laws, especially around items like homestead, are unique, difficult, and often misunderstood by attorney from other states. So, I do think it should be more difficult to become a member of The Florida Bar than in other states. However, if an attorney has been practicing for a long time (e.g., over 10 years), is a member of multiple jurisdictions, is in good standing with no ethical violations, has references from peers in the legal community, etc., then I do not why he/she should be prohibited from waiving in. I do agree the requirements should be pretty stringent and handled on a case-by-case basis.

* I understand concerns about overloading Florida with attorneys from other states, especially when we have so many recent graduates struggling to find jobs. On the other hand, our closed stance on reciprocity means that attorneys admitted here cannot go anywhere else without re-taking the bar, which is problematic for anyone considering a move.

* I understand the concern The Florida Bar has (along with California) of retiring lawyers from other states coming to Florida to practice law, but given the way the legal practice operates, many lawyers practice across state lines at this point anyway, and so it should not negatively impact Florida lawyers if some semi-retired lawyers from other states join The Florida Bar. They (or others) can often do work for Florida residents from outside the state, and it is a complete anachronism that state Bar associations like Florida and California, hold onto these antiquated notions in the 21st century when, with the click of
a button, anyone can consult with a lawyer in any state in the US, or any country in the world.

* I was first licensed in Georgia, where I went to law school (Emory) and where I had been able to get a job out of school. When I moved back to my home state of Florida, nothing transferred at all, not even the MBE. I had to take the entire exam again, years out of school and while working. I feel this is unfair to trained, experienced attorneys. I would not have been opposed to having to take some kind of exam on Florida law, but I felt that requiring me to take the entire exam as if I were just out of law school was an undue burden.

* I was not offered any reciprocity and had to take The Florida Bar over ten years after graduating from New York Law School and I passed the first time ONLY because I did nothing but study for four months leading up to the exam. I still do not practice law even though admitted.

* I would accept with a requirement that the newly admitted lawyer take CLE or other specific courses to familiarize the admitted with Florida law in his/her field of practice (i.e. if the field is Family Law, Family Law specific courses). I would only offer reciprocity to a lawyer from a state that also offers reciprocity to Florida lawyers. I am not in favor of admission by motion if that means that Florida cannot impose some basic requirements for admission regarding ethical conduct and post admission CLE requirements.

* I would be able to accept this if there were some additional requirements.

* I would like to see Florida go the route of other states who allow reciprocity. I believe the concern was, in the past, about part-time retirees dotting the Florida map and siphoning business. If that is still the case, there are ways, other than prohibition, to make it expensive or unattractive to do so.

* I would only recommend reciprocity with very strict requirements, such as having been a member in good standing of another state bar for 10 consecutive years without any disciplinary history.

* I would require them to take the Florida portion of the Bar, but not have to repeat the MBE portion, as I did.

* I would want to ensure that the prospective member was familiar with the local rules and procedures.

* If a client and his/her out-of-state attorney believe the attorney could effectively represent the client in a Florida court, then that should be allowed by motion to the court. There should probably be some way to demonstrate competency in Florida law if Florida law controls the subject matter of the representation.

* If a lawyer is admitted by another state, unless that state has very low standards, that person should be admitted by motion, maybe with a certificate of good standing from the home state, without having to take The Florida Bar Exam.
* If a subject matter expert licensed in another state wants to relocate to Florida, then that is probably OK inasmuch as the years of experience and practice in his area of concentration should also have gained him the wisdom to collaborate with a Florida practitioner on matters outside his area of knowledge and competence.

* If competency has been proven in another state, and an attorney is familiar with the law and rules of procedure in Florida, it is illogical to make an experienced attorney sit for a separate bar exam.

* If Florida offered some form of admission without taking the Bar Exam, Florida attorneys would have more opportunity to receive the same from other states.

* If one has passed a bar exam in one state, it should be good for all.

* If qualifications are met, it should be done in the least cumbersome manner.

* If someone has been in good standing for five years or more with another state, they should be allowed to practice here. That is simply fair.

* If someone has been practicing for at least 7 or 8 years and has no ethical issues or other bar grievances, then I see no problem in letting them practice in Florida.

* If the attorney has several years of experience as a practicing lawyer, has demonstrated that he or she is competent and, and that he or she has a basic understanding of the peculiarities of Florida law, then that attorney should not have to go through a full length Bar Exam in order to become a member of The Florida Bar.

* If they meet the criteria there is no need to take another Bar Exam.

* In certain situations I think a lawyer who is not admitted in Florida may be the best person to handle a matter and should be allowed to.

* In favor of most open process available.

* In my practice, it has occasionally become efficient and practical to admit a foreign lawyer to act with me in a matter involving Florida law or interpreting applicable foreign law or presenting evidence with which he or she is more familiar.

* In order to attract the best talent, especially experienced lawyers, it would be helpful to waive the Bar Exam for seasoned attorneys.

* In this age of multistate and international law firms, there should be a mechanism for an experienced lawyer and member of the bar of another state to practice in Florida. The Florida Bar exam is not that difficult and I believe the lack of reciprocity is founded on fear of an unwanted influx of lawyers. Creating a method of allowing competent, experienced lawyers to practice in Florida by motion should exist. That person should not have to go back to taking a block of time studying for a bar exam when practicing at the same time. Pro hac vice practice is extensive (I use it often) and believe it works well for
the bench, bar and public. The additional step to allow full time practice should be made available.

* It makes no sense to require an experienced attorney to take another Bar Exam.

* It must be done in a way in that assures that the "foreign" attorney understands Florida procedures and the essence of the substantive law in his field of practice. The public must be protected from attorneys entering the state to extend business without first becoming familiar with Florida law/procedures.

* It only makes sense. Many states such as Vermont permit it now. There is no reason a lawyer who passes the background and experience check should not be licensed on motion. It appears to me the Bar is limiting the number of lawyers by making it so hard to get licensed here.

* It will bring more economy to this state.

* It works well in other states. I was considering becoming a member of the State Bar of Texas because I could then obtain admission in a number of other states.

* It's ridiculous that you can be a Florida Bar member and it counts for nothing in any other state. And if other states are going to allow Florida Bar members to become members of their state bars without taking an exam, Florida should allow members of their state bars to become Florida Bar members without taking an exam.

* It's the future.

* Just admit if the attorney is in good standing.

* Lawyers should be allowed to move from state to state.

* Lawyers with good records should be allowed to move to another state on occasion without having to start from scratch.

* Let’s try it, because it is the fair and honest thing to do.

* Many areas of practice involve principles that are common across state lines. Many attorneys practice in firms that cross state lines. If an attorney has a AV or similar rating in an area that does not involve substantially unique issues of a given state, the attorney's experience should be sufficient to justify admission.

* Many matters are federal, for which practice areas are readily transferable from state to state; the ease of interstate travel and interstate commerce result in a strong nexus with other states in legal matters.

* Multi state exams are everywhere except Louisiana (that may have changed), and we share common law, except Louisiana.

* Need admission for individual cases.
* Need more mobility for multi-state work.

* No one should have to spend thousands to take the Bar Exam in Florida when they have practiced without incident elsewhere for years. After practicing 5+ years elsewhere, I had to pay Florida more than $2,000, complete a mound of paperwork, waste a month of my life relearning Criminal Law and other things I don't use day to day or have any use for in my practice, spend a few days of my life in Tampa spitting out rote, temporarily memorized crap and then wait months for results and the ability to attempt to earn a living in this state. Completely ridiculous. If someone can practice law in another state for years, they can certainly practice in Florida.

* No one who is proud of their skills fears competition.

* No reason not to allow a lawyer in good standing to be admitted other than to protect the financials.

* Not allowing reciprocity can seriously limit the ability of a trained attorney to move out of state and engage in any sort of income-earning profession related to his or her area of practice.

* Obviously, it’s better for me to have fewer Florida lawyers but, in order to allow reciprocity with other states, Florida is going to have to permit admission by motion, etc.

* OK here if qualified.

* Okay by motion or pro hac vice for a particular action.

* Once an individual has demonstrated the minimum level of competence to be allowed to practice through the passage of the Bar Exam, they should be able to go forward in all jurisdictions. We must presume that attorneys are capable of reading and studying the applicable law where they are to practice law. My recollection is that most of the Bar Exam was involving general application of legal principles. This would allow for mobility in our profession similar to what others enjoy. The nature of the economy makes this even more needed than before.

* Open platforms are the future. Embrace them.

* Other than having a minimum level of practice in the other state, say for 5 years, I have no objection.

* Our society is increasingly mobile and we should accommodate for that reality.

* Reciprocity is fine if the candidate still shows an understanding of Florida law, and of course, is interviewed in person by a qualified member(s) of The Florida Bar.

* Relocation of families is quite common now, due to change of jobs or loss of employment by one spouse. Dual income families are more common as well. Allowing transfer of licensing from one state to another is reasonable. At the very least, the multi-
state portion of the Bar Exam could be waived for incoming transfer applicants. Availability of reciprocity is important for Florida lawyers as well, for the same reasons.

* Requiring lawyers from other states to pass another bar exam is a waste of time and money, and it then limits Florida lawyers’ opportunities in moving to other states without having to take their exams.

* Responsible lawyers will make themselves proficient in the law of any forum they practice in.

* Since I generally am philosophically opposed to the requirement of belonging to the Bar in order to practice law, I am in favor of letting any competent professional gain admission.

* So many other states allow this. I just don’t see the cons.

* South Florida has many multistate law firms with many highly competent lawyers who are not members of the Florida Bar. These individuals should be allowed to appear by motion.

* The bar exam is highly overrated in terms of its ability to predict quality in the legal profession. In my opinion, it is nothing more than a hazing for new initiates into our profession. For example, why does the multi-state criminal law section still test common law from the 1700s? That is an anachronism and all a bar passing score means is that you successfully learned how to take a bar exam. Limiting already practicing lawyers to states where they can sit for and pass a bar exam only stifles mobility of lawyers in moving from state to state.

* The current system is archaic. If I practiced somewhere else, I could move freely and become a lawyer elsewhere. Now I'm stuck in Florida or stuck taking another bar exam in my mid 30's. People move more frequently now and the ability to move for jobs is important. Florida is stifling that ability.

* The decision to allow foreign lawyers to practice in Florida should depend on quality and ability to provide legal services, not on "turf." The practical problem with such allowance, however, is determining whether the foreign lawyer has the quality and ability to practice in Florida.

* The inability to obtain licensure in another state without taking another bar exam over areas of law that I have not touched upon since law school has adversely affected my family's ability to leave the state for my husband's career. It is an improper form of protectionism that is completely inappropriate and anachronistic.

* The lack of reciprocity is nothing but a trade barrier. It is akin to the preposterous licensing requirements for barbers and interior decorators. Do away with it.

* The other requirements should be familiarity with the policies and procedures of the court system, if they want to go before the court. Similar to getting certified in a Federal Court.
The practice of law has become increasingly national, and that should be encouraged. Protectionism does not work in today's world.

The practice of law is no longer provincial. A good lawyer should be able to practice in any jurisdiction.

The taking of the Bar Exam after many years of practice is not practical and it restricts the ability to relocate for any reason including necessity.

The transactional practice of law is now very much multijurisdictional. It does not make economic sense to not allow one lawyer to handle a transaction which crosses state lines. The lawyer who does so naturally recognizes the malpractice risk. For litigation, the requirement to have a local counsel for pro hac vice is silly and expensive. The local lawyer does not add much to the legal representation.

There needs to be some form of test or legal requirement beyond a simple motion.

There should be some mechanism other than bar exams but it should be more than motion practice. At least high minimum number of years practicing, etc.

Think you need some tight parameters but if done right, probably a good thing. Problem in Florida is that everybody wants to move/retire here so must have very tight control over such admissions. Just because you practiced in XX state does not mean you automatically get to practice here. Background check ought to be as stringent as, or more so, than our present background investigation.

This is appropriate, with guidelines.

Today's society/culture is very mobile with spousal job transfers, families spread out, etc. and having to sit for another bar exam outside of Florida if one wanted to is very problematic, costly, time-consuming, and generally and inhibitor or freedom of movement from one state to another.

Uniform standards should be in place.

We are the United States of America. One of the basic tenets of our democracy is the concept of full faith and credit. All attorneys have to take the same MPRE. It does not make sense that once you become an attorney, the concept of full faith and credit does not apply.

We live in a global society where people travel constantly and do business throughout the world and should not have to find a new attorney simply because a different state has jurisdiction over their case.

We live in a global world and these sorts of regulations are a vestige of a different era where protectionism prevailed I did note with interest that 75% of the out of state lawyers taking the bar exam passed, which was higher than a number of Florida based law schools. If Legal Zoom can sell documents nationwide at a significant profit, lawyers
should be able to ply their craft across state borders consistent with adherence to the rules regulating the profession in that state.

* We need reciprocity so we can get the hell out of here. The practice in Florida is becoming a zoo because of what the Bar allows. You have no idea of the incompetent and unethical crooks running around South Florida. I would advise that any State receiving a Florida lawyer however, do a strong background check before admitting that lawyer, as The Florida Bar does not have very high standards, it is nearly impossible to get disbarred - even a judge can keep her license to practice after taking bribes.

* While understanding that business often crosses state and national borders, we need to consider more flexibility in licensure balanced against protecting the public from unethical or incompetent practitioners. Attestation of character by a current member of the Bar and a test of basic Florida law that is less extensive that the Bar exam (perhaps coupled with passage of the multi-state or a unified bar exam in another state within a specified time frame prior to seeking admission) is one thing to consider.

* Why not, as long as they are in good standing in their state and pass a general knowledge test on local rules - whether it is for federal or state court.

* With appropriate safeguards, I believe that reciprocity should be extended in Florida to qualified candidates in good standing for those states that employ comparable bar examinations to Florida.

* With certain requirements met, I would not oppose.

* With increasing globalization and the advent long ago of firms that do business across state lines and national lines, it is foolish to restrict a Florida lawyer's ability to compete.

* With reciprocity, I may want to get out of this state if it continues to decline legally, politically, socially and economically.

* With technology and communication, it is very important for attorneys to be allowed to practice in other states. Sending emails and letters out of state may even qualify as practicing law out of state. Attorneys should be able to get admitted into other states as needed as long as they pass the other requirements without having to take the bar exam. I had to sit for the Georgia Bar. It took a lot of time to study and take the bar, and it took time away from my job and clients that needed me. Lawyers who have been practicing may not know the answer, but they know where to look and how to get the answer, that is what is important, not what someone can remember on the day of the examination and then forget months later.
In Opposition to Admission by Motion – 87 Responses

* Too many attorneys already in Florida. (3 Responses)

* A level of experience and training in Florida law is necessary to maintain efficiency and consistency in court proceedings. The courtroom should not be the training ground for lawyers.

* Admission to the bar of a state is unique to that state.

* As a destination state, Florida should continue to ensure the competence of its members.

* At this point, I am licensed in 2 other states that have reciprocity between themselves. I had to take the Florida bar exam and so I do not now think the gates should be opened to every other attorney in the country who may want to dabble a bit here and there in law while semi retired. I work in Real Estate and am shocked on a daily basis at how little understanding of our homestead laws Florida trained and licensed attorneys actually possess. I can only imagine the havoc that could be created by a Massachusetts attorney choosing to draft a deed into a trust or creating a trust in Florida can provide. Not to pick on MA attorneys; it is just an example. I was already licensed in 2 states before I came here. I had absolutely no knowledge of homestead law or other Florida peculiarities. Simply allowing me to practice based on reciprocity would have been wrong.

* Attorneys can currently appear pro hac. That is sufficient for specific matters. The original policy against reciprocity was predicated on preventing out of state attorneys from "retiring" to Florida to practice law here. Our state is a magnet destination for folks to re-locate and allowing reciprocity will only increase the number of attorneys. While it would be nice to have reciprocity for admission to other states, it is not worth the downside of allowing attorneys from other jurisdictions to practice here without formal admission. Reciprocity would almost certainly create a tidal wave of attorneys coming into our state.

* Because Florida is a retirement destination, attorneys from other states that move to Florida and have part time practices would make it difficult for younger full time attorneys to attract and maintain sufficient clients.

* Certain states are attractive to practice in, at some point in ones career. As such, Florida could be inundated with retired or older lawyers from other states who want to move here. It could create fewer opportunities to recent graduates.

* Every retiring lawyer from up North will come down and practice "in their retirement years."

* Florida has a unique geographic and economic environment that is conducive for "part time" citizens. If lawyers were permitted to be admitted by motion, we would be flooded with lawyers from other states that would take advantage of being able to practice here...
when it was convenient. This would diminish the economics of practice to the detriment of full time admitted Florida lawyers.

* Florida has so many retirees from other states that we would probably get overwhelmed by retired out state lawyers deciding to hang a shingle to supplement their retirement even though they are not properly trained in Florida law.

* Florida has too many retirees that will come to take the jobs away from those that live here.

* Florida is a destination state. People want to move here far more often than people want to leave Florida for another state. I don't think we should make it easier for other attorneys from other states to relocate to Florida and compete with existing Florida attorneys for jobs and clients. To the extent we should allow it, I would limit it to our border states (Georgia and Alabama) and perhaps other warm weather states (Texas, Arizona.) We don't need every 55 year old attorney deciding to semi-retire to Florida and compete with our homegrown attorneys.

* Florida is a popular retirement destination. Requiring out-of-state attorneys to take The Florida Bar Exam limits the number of people retiring from practice elsewhere and moving to Florida and setting up shop.

* Florida law is different than other states. I live out west and their whole water law is completely different. Lawyers need to be trained in the area in which they practice, including various jurisdictions.

* Florida law is not the same as in other states and clients do not understand this.

* Florida lawyers are under enough threat of having the practice destroyed without having all of New York and New Jersey lawyers invading.

* Florida would be flooded with lawyers who want to practice here part of the year. The market is already saturated.

* Florida's Bar exam is one of the hardest in the country. To allow lawyers to appear by motion in isolated cases is much better than allowing them to completely circumvent The Florida Bar exam, but has the potential to be used as a stepping stone to becoming a member without taking our bar exam.

* Florida's tradition of non reciprocity is important to maintain because we are a vacation and retirement destination that would be flooded with new lawyers who aren't well versed on Florida law.

* Given that The Florida Bar's standards of admission are higher than many, but certainly not all other states, allowing attorneys to gain admission to The Florida Bar may well lower the standards of practice. Additionally, the issue of lawyers retiring to Florida and continuing to practice without having taken and passed the bar exam, thereby further bloating the otherwise bloated Bar is worrisome.
I am a member of two State Bars and was required to take two separate Bar Examinations. The differences in the state specific laws between the two states was drastic to say the least. There is no way that I would have been adequately prepared to practice in either state (at least substantively speaking) without having put in the time and energy in studying for each examination.

I believe a lawyer needs to, at the very least, pass the state law section of the bar exam to be admitted in such state.

I favor pro hac vice admission in litigation matters on the same basis now provided by Florida courts. I do not otherwise favor admission by motion in Florida.

I favor the pro hac vice process as it currently exists.

I feel that the current procedure for becoming admitted to The Florida Bar should remain as it is.

I have concerns about an individual lacking even rudimentary knowledge of the laws of the state in which they seek to practice. This applies to individuals seeking to practice in Florida, as well as myself, if I were inclined to practice in another state. While I have a comprehensive understanding of the laws here in Florida, and while certain laws here may be similar to those in another state, my knowledge and skills learned here simply do not translate elsewhere. I need to demonstrate that I have learned and understand the laws of the state in which I seek admission.

I have tried a number of major civil cases and find that pro hac vice attorneys are not well behaved at all. I had to ask a pro hac vice attorney from New York to approach and advise him that if he continued violating my rulings I would have to withdraw his permission to continue to sit at counsel table. That was only one of the most memorable experiences. Others range from the incompetent to the inconsiderate.

I need more information to formulate an opinion. Obviously, the person would need to be licensed in another state.

I think everyone should be required to learn about the law where that person is going to practice. Laws vary greatly from state to state. Water Law in Arizona has no relationship to Condo Law in Florida. Too many people want to retire in Florida. Without some forms of testing their competency, out of state lawyers will not truly bother to learn Florida law and yet practice here. The large number of both the elderly and the different languages that are spoken, as well as the substantial differences in practice styles throughout Florida are all hurdles to be overcome by licensed attorneys in Florida. Those who do not learn substantive Florida law will probably create additional hurdles for the clients who they represent. In criminal law, because constitutional principles are so close from state to state, there appears to be an opportunity for allowing non-Florida lawyers to practice.

I think it is helpful for people to demonstrate some Florida law proficiency (other than just a single case appearance).
* I think it should remain on a case-by-case basis as it is.

* I want them to suffer as I did! I know that isn't fair, but I had to take bar exams in two states, and immigration law a topic wasn't on either.

* I was licensed originally in California (and still am licensed in that bar. Therefore, know that there are some areas in which Florida has unique law and/or rules of procedure. While there is considerable overlap, the differences are significant enough, such that I would prefer that other attorneys not be admitted by motion.

* I would oppose any system that does not require such an individual to demonstrate familiarity with Florida’s laws and procedures because to allow someone to immediately practice in the state without this background is to subject our residents to potential incompetence through ignorance.

* If allowed in by motion, I believe the state would be inundated with 'retired' lawyers who are not up on Florida law and not highly motivated to know it to the level required to provide good representation.

* If the system used the current system of pro hac vice and supervised, I would somewhat favor the concept. Otherwise, I am not in favor.

* If we had reciprocity, 90% of the attorneys retiring in Florida will be practicing part-time.

* I'm not totally sure what admission by motion involves, but if it reduces the oversight by The Florida Bar before the applicant is admitted, I'm not sure that I would favor it.

* Is The Florida Bar trying to make a living even more difficult? Let's make it easier for thousands of out of state lawyers to take away business!

* It all depends on the competence of the out of state lawyer. With the multi-state Bar Exam the issue is not about knowing enough to pass the exam; it is about the skills, ethics and abilities of the lawyer. As noted above, Florida has too many lawyers in relation to the needs of the public, which is not good for the lawyers or the public. Adding more lawyers is not a positive alternative; however, on a case by case representation basis there are many out of state lawyers who are competent to represent clients in Florida. The Bar Exam is not much of a limiting factor to a competent lawyer.

* It just adds to chaos in our legal system. Besides, we already have too many lawyers in Florida. Supposedly, they are all better qualified to provide a just outcome to a Florida proceeding. I guess it boils down to whether you really believe in Florida lawyers.

* It would result in a further glut of lawyers.

* It's a slippery slope, and I have dealt with some pretty shady characters who were admitted pro hac vice.

* My concern is every lawyer would have a satellite office in Florida. This is not good for Florida lawyers or the public.
My only real issue is with the differences in state laws that we see all of the time in dealing with our clients. Many of the attorneys who come to Florida already, and provide legal advice to "clients", in my case, most often associations or owners in an association, I see that they are giving bad legal advice for Florida, based upon what they know from their state. I used to be more in favor of reciprocity. However, throughout the years, as I have seen northern attorneys providing opinions on Florida condominium or real estate law, I have grown to disfavor reciprocity. Many out of state attorneys have given owners very bad advice that have cost the owners thousands of dollars in expenses and attorney fees because of the failure of the out of state attorney to understand Florida law. My fear is that with straight reciprocity, there will be much room for error. At least with the requirement of taking the bar, the out of state attorney needs to make sure that he is familiar with Florida law, and that understanding might help him, and his client, in the future.

Only admission for case on case-by-case request for pro hoc vice "admission."

Only pro hac. There are 96,500 attorneys in the State of Florida. Beginning attorneys who are licensed in Florida have trouble obtaining jobs so why would we promote several thousand more attorneys coming into the State who have never studied Florida law? Again, you would be opening the door to poor representation, and you would see a proliferation of 1-800 law firms who could then not even have to refer cases to Florida attorneys but could just have reciprocity rights to practice in Florida. This would make the Bar Exam and regulation of those attorneys a joke. The ultimate victims will be the citizens of Florida.

Oppose because people want to retire to Florida so this could cause the Floodgates to open.

Our problem is that we are a state where more people move in retirement. The question is do we need more lawyers to service our current population. If we don't then we shouldn't create an easy way to join.

Our society is more mobile and the present lack of reciprocity does not protect Florida residents from incompetent lawyers, but instead prevents lawyers from being able to seek employment freely in other states without having to undergo great expense and time studying to pass another bar while working full time and meeting familial obligations.

Pro hac vice should not be a problem for a specific case, if the person can demonstrate competency in Florida law. We do things differently here, as I've learned from all my clients saying "but in NY I'd only get..." etc. Obviously, every state has its idiosyncrasies, so the client shouldn't suffer because the attorney didn't know our "nuances."

Pro hac vice with restraints ok.

Quite frankly, I'm selfish. Florida is such a retirement state that many, many lawyers from other jurisdictions retire here. If they could open doors to practice, there would be too many lawyers floating around.
Reciprocity or admission by motion in a retirement state like Florida could dramatically increase the number of admitted lawyers.

Some form of testing on Florida law should be required.

Temporary admission pro hac vice is adequate.

The current rule for allowing appearance pro hac vice is a good rule.

The issue of providing for authorized interstate commerce in legal services beyond the state of initial (or sole) professional licensure should be nuanced. Purely local services dependent on unique knowledge of sovereign powers or specialized laws, should require attestation of such knowledge or association with a practitioner in the jurisdiction to better assure the public is protected from incompetence, or is informed of any conditional or implied permission to practice.

The last thing we need in this state is more competition.

The present limited pro hac admission system is all anyone needs.

The State of Florida already has 90,000 lawyers, a saturated market that appears to be challenging for the Bar to regulate as-is. An embarrassingly low percentage of the Florida-licensed lawyers (2%?) do pro bono work, by the way. Making it easier for any random lawyer to practice in Florida would further reduce or water down the quality of lawyers and legal services provided.

There are enough lawyers here, perhaps even too many, to meet the demand. Given Florida’s climate, that would be inviting every lawyer of retirement age to either relocate here or take up "snowbird" residency, providing less clientele for bona fide Florida resident lawyers.

There are presently enough Laurier’s in Florida to meet the legal needs of the population.

There are sufficient procedures to allow an attorney to participate in a particular trial, etc. They should not to become a member of the Bar.

There are too many lawyers in this state already. Frequently, I will get a call from a lawyer adverse to my client. Once they hear the facts, the good lawyer will not pursue the case, but the plaintiff will find another lesser lawyer willing to take the case even if it has no merit because the second lawyer is desperate and has little knowledge of the law.

There are way too many lawyers and way too many law schools. The business of legal education has co-opted the practice of law by flooding the market. It has resulted in a loss of respect for the profession making us ubiquitous and fungible. There is no dignity.

There is so much competition in Florida for legal jobs, if you could become a member of the bar by motion only I believe there would be an influx of new members.

There isn't enough work for the graduates that are coming out of school as it is.
There would be a huge influx of out-of-state lawyers practicing in Florida only part-time, competing for legal work that would likely otherwise go to full-time practitioners, residing in Florida. This, after all, is the Sunshine State.

This sort of intrusion in Florida should be carefully controlled.

This would make it too easy for out-of-state lawyers to practice here, and they would be able to do so without being familiar with any of the differences between their state laws and ours.

To be a lawyer in Florida you must pass the Bar Exam and other requirements! The purpose of The Bar is to provide some threshold of measurable knowledge! Some law schools in our state have woefully low standards and the Bar Exam is essential to make certain that we have a level of quality and some standards beyond 6 semesters of class attendance!

Too loose of a criteria.

Too many attorneys want to reside here in later years to avoid income tax laws of other states and if so, then they should pass the bar and be on equal footing with local lawyers.

Too subjective.

Unlike any other state, there are two types of people in Florida: locals and tourists. Don’t give the tourists a license.

Until standards are uniform in all states and territories, Florida should rely on its own standards, and strive to keep them high for competence and ethics.

We are flooded with lawyers as it is and for someone who just comes in by motion without knowing Florida’s specific laws and rules while those of us already in Florida have to know something about Florida law before practice makes it unfair.

We are overrun with lawyers now. Do we really need to add more to the pool, particularly with those who have not met the requirements that I had to meet?

We have enough lawyers already due to the ABA allowing almost any institution to become an accredited law school. We do not need more lawyers simply waiving in to Florida.

We have enough lawyers, and a bunch of retirees who passed the Bar in 1962 do no one any service competing with people who are working today.

We have pro hac vice for the occasional admission. If you are regularly practicing in Florida (or any other state) you need to be admitted, whether by taking the Bar Exam or waiving in. Most lawyers with experience are good candidates to waive in. Perhaps a rule should be considered that a lawyer with x years of experience can waive in, subject to meeting the other requirements and a background check.
* We have too many lawyers as it is. If you want to practice in a state, you should care enough to be able to pass their Bar Exam. I am licensed in three states and had to successfully complete the exam process for each one.

* Why are we continually making it easier for people to practice law in Florida?
36. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding admission by motion/reciprocity for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission:

(Total Number of Responses – 155)

In Favor of Admission by Motion/Reciprocity – 97 Responses

* Do it! (5 Responses)

* A minimum number of years of practice, no disciplinary history and a certificate of good standing from another Bar, of which the applicant is a member, should be sufficient.

* Admission on motion/reciprocity should require all of the background information required by regular admission; the only difference would be membership in good standing in the Bar of another state would excuse passing a bar exam.

* After approximately 20 years of successful practice as a New York lawyer, I was required to take The Florida Bar Exam, including the MPRE. I thought that was a bit much. If a lawyer is in good standing, has had no disciplinary activity, passed the multi-state portion of the exam and MPRE and has practiced for a certain number of years (10?), I would consider requiring only a Florida-specific test in order to familiarize the applicant with Florida law.

* Again, I think the most important aspect is that they understand Florida law and the differences that there are between Florida law and the out of state attorneys home state.

* Any admission has to be subject to thorough investigation. Our citizens deserve to be protected.

* As a Florida Bar member, I want to be able to get reciprocity in other states.

* As I understand it, the main reason Florida did not enter into reciprocity with other states is because as a retirement haven, it did not want lawyers from all over the country retiring to Florida or moving to Florida to practice law before retirement. Florida was seeking to avoid a glut of lawyers. I think it has a glut of lawyers without reciprocity, so it probably does not matter too much.

* As long as the attorney seeking reciprocity has been practicing for at least 5 years in another jurisdiction without any sanctions on his/her record, no issue with reciprocity. Do not think that having an experience attorney that has not been to law school in years, take The Florida Bar Exam has any bearing whether that attorney would be qualified to practice in Florida.

* Better that we have out of state qualified attorneys representing Floridians than non-trained persons who will surely bring more (late night) comedy to Florida and more harm to Floridians.
* Character is more important than smarts, as is accountability.

* Florida has to stop the isolationist approach based on fear that other big lawyers will retire here from other states and take the clients from attorneys in Florida. It is up to the client to decide who will be the better lawyer to represent them not to a lawyer organization.

* Florida needs reciprocity in some form, i.e. one exam everyone takes and then only state specific portion for state that you want to practice in.

* Florida needs to at the very least modernize and arrange for reciprocity, particularly with the other BIG states (CA, NY. and TX) and also perhaps a regional reciprocity (GA, SC, FL, AL etc).

* Florida should allow attorneys from other states to practice in Florida if they have a certain number of years of legal practice and good standing in their home state, and seek equivalent reciprocity from other states.

* Florida should allow reciprocity.

* Florida should consider reciprocity but make it very difficult.

* Florida should have reciprocity available to other states that will extend same to Florida lawyers.

* Florida's intransigence with respect to reciprocity is absolutely ridiculous.

* Florida's lack of reciprocity acts as a deterrent for lawyers who want to leave the state because so many people don't want to deal with the hassle of studying for a Bar Exam again.

* Frankly, the Bar's continuing refusal to adopt reciprocity is arrogant, unjustified, and protectionist. "Keeping up with California" is not a decent reason for ANY endeavor.

* Generally in favor of reciprocity, however, there are already too many lawyers in Florida and there are probably many out-of-state lawyers who would like to come to Florida, whereas Florida lawyers want to stay.

* Good idea if other jurisdiction has high standards.

* Having taken 2 bar exams, they are so nearly identical that it is meaningless to make someone do it more than once. The bar exam has no relationship to one's ability to practice law in the real world.

* I am admitted in another state which gives me reciprocity in other states, so, for me personally, these changes would have no effect.

* I believe that once a bar exam is passed, an attorney should be able to move from state to state freely by making an application, certifying that they have read the statutes and other
laws of the new jurisdiction (as required by that jurisdiction's authority), and showing the appropriate character and fitness to practice. At most, a short form exam on state law rather than general law should be required.

* I can't be too opposed because that is how I was admitted in New York State.

* I completely support unlimited reciprocity. We all take the same multi state exam. Florida's position on this issue is anti-competitive.

* I do agree that the standards should be slightly relaxed, as the full exam is a bit cumbersome for outside practitioners. There should be a hybrid exam which requires knowledge of Florida specifics, but relaxes the requirements for non-state specific knowledge of the law.

* I don't think someone who has taken and passed the Multi-State should have to take it again, even if it has been 15 years. I'm not sure anybody should have to take it at all. You don't get multiple-choice options when you actually practice.

* I have appeared in other states and have never had a problem practicing law there.

* I have no idea why Florida would not do this and I never have.

* I have no problem with Admission on Motion/Reciprocity. I don't even see why we don't have it.

* I strongly favor reciprocity so long as an attorney from another state can establish some familiarity with Florida Rules of Procedure and Ethics. I do not suggest a difficult exam; however, I feel an incoming attorney could make a serious mistake if he or she is not familiar with procedural time limitations and other basic rules. A lack of basic familiarity could cause serious harm to a client and adversely affect the reputation of lawyers in general if mistakes are made more frequently.

* I think it makes sense to allow practicing attorneys with some level of actual experience in their previous state (such as a minimum of 5 years), to obtain reciprocity from states that have qualifications that are very similar or exceed Florida's.

* I think it's a great idea, but not likely to happen since the old "distinguished" firms that have carved out their fiefdoms of influence peddling, favored judges and legislative influence would be put out of business by the large, multinational law firms who can deliver services across so many different platforms.

* I think that there is no reason why at least the results of the MBE test should not have reciprocity in all States that use the same test.

* I think this is a worthwhile area of practice that to consider.

* I think this would be a huge benefit to all Florida lawyers. For one, it would allow some Florida lawyers to leave the state to practice elsewhere. It would also allow multi-state
firms to have more Flexibility in staffing. And it would remove artificial barriers to a nationwide practice.

* I think you need some tight parameters but if done right, it is probably a good thing. The problem in Florida is that everybody wants to move/retire here so must have VERY tight control over such admissions. Just because you practiced in XX state does NOT mean you automatically get to practice here. Background check ought to be as stringent as, or more so, than our present background investigation.

* I was admitted to the California Bar following law school in 1979. Since then, I law clerked for judges, prosecuted traffic violations, prosecuted lawyers in disciplinary actions, represented personal injury plaintiffs, represented major insurance carriers insurance defense, taught CLE and trial techniques to younger lawyers and was a Judge Pro Tem in small claims court. I failed The Florida Bar exam two times before passing it on the 3rd. I've had nearly 200 trials in my career, been Martindale-Hubbell "AV" rated over 25 years and a Florida Super Lawyer, yet failed the Florida Civil Trials board certification exam twice. I had to specially qualify by hearing in order to even sit for The Florida Bar because, notwithstanding my extraordinary experience, skill & ethics for 30 years, my law school was not ABA accredited. Yes, I agree with admission on motion IF other experience qualifications have been met.

* I would be a member of the NY State Bar, but for Florida's non-reciprocity position.

* I would love to practice law in another state, as it would allow me to move. I feel like I am stuck in Florida, because I will not take another bar exam.

* I would suggest that any admission on motion program require the out of state attorney to maintain a local co-counsel.

* I would support admission on reciprocity to the extent that it would open my ability to continue the practice of law should I choose to move out of Florida. At the moment, I obviously don’t have that choice.

* If a lawyer has gone to an accredited law school, passed a bar exam and is admitted to a state's bar assuming all other requirements have been properly satisfied, he or she should be able to practice in any American state. Ethical requirements of the new, admitting state will or should require him/her to associate with another lawyer and/or law firm in areas unfamiliar to the new lawyer. The era of lawyer to lawyer protectionism or exclusion should be over.

* If Florida is considering incremental steps regarding initiation of motion/reciprocity, then starting with our neighboring states would likely be a good pilot.

* If Florida would elect to have reciprocity, I would leave Florida in a New York minute.

* In this day and age, it is ridiculous to try to restrict lawyers state-by-state when many people's practices cross state (and country) lines, and clients are all over the world. Preventing experienced lawyers from setting up physically in Florida is not going to ensure that in-state lawyers receive the work they would have otherwise gotten, and the
tighter that state bar associations try to restrict the practice of law, the more likely it is at some point in the near future that there will be a more radical solution implemented outside of the Association's control.

* In today's economy with spouses moving for jobs, it puts Florida lawyers at a disadvantage. We are not mobile without taking another bar and doing so is time consuming. It is simply not reasonable.

* It absolutely should be done.

* It is a good idea. Will bring diversity and new ideas.

* It is an old idea that lawyers must take a bar in each state. The world is more mobile and Florida needs to catch up with it with regard to the bar.

* It is an unreasonable restriction on new Florida lawyers and makes them less competitive in the national and global legal market. You lose many of the best students in the nation, both in law school (they go elsewhere) and also those leaving the state to take the Bar elsewhere upon graduation. What you save in protecting the local practitioners by deterring relocating retirees from practicing law is far less than what is lost for the new lawyers entering the profession. I believe Florida is the last state without any reciprocity - even that other bastion of retirement, Arizona, has eliminated the barriers for greater mobility to and from that state. Florida is not unique and is holding itself back.

* It is arrogant to believe an attorney who passed another state's bar exam and has had a clean disciplinary record for a number of years is not fit for practicing in Florida without sitting for our bar exam. If over 40 states have some form of reciprocity, what does Florida know that they don't? Or is our practice of a higher level?

* It is holding a lot of attorneys back not having reciprocity as technology advances.

* It is long overdue and should be seriously considered by The Florida Bar. Yes, attorneys want to move here and retire, but I do not believe they will seriously jeopardize the existing job market for those of us currently living in the State. As in-house counsel, I work with a number of non-Florida licensed attorneys, and they are all very capable individuals who bring a wealth of experience to our company by virtue of having worked in legal departments of large out-of-state companies.

* It is RIDICULOUS that Florida does not have reciprocity with any other state. I desperately want to move, but there are only a handful of states which will admit me on motion. My professional opportunities would be greatly enhanced if I could practice in another state without having to take an additional bar exam.

* It should be allowed in rare cases and for limited purposes.

* It should be approved using the Vermont Rules as a model.

* It was a huge cost and I am not sure it was worth the hassle and interruption to my life. I've been licensed and in good standing in NY for 16 years before I moved here.
Shouldn't that mean something? The bar exam is a little ridiculous and just seems like a money grab.

* It would seem that if you can meet the CLE requirements of our state or other state, and are in good standing, admission makes sense to other jurisdictions. Perhaps, year by year, might mean a differing level of CLE, but that would demonstrate a willingness to meet minimal standards.

* Make the process fair and realistic.

* Obviously, it’s better for me to have fewer Florida lawyers but in order to allow reciprocity with other states Florida is going to have to permit admission by motion, etc.

* Once a person has begun their legal practice in one state, it is very difficult to incur the time and expense of taking a bar exam in a different state. It may involve leaving one's current job, having no income for several months while studying for the new state's bar exam, and simply hoping to find a job in the new state after incurring the above risks and costs. This makes it very difficult for attorneys to relocate to other states. Each state has different laws, and attorneys should become acquainted with those differences before practicing in another state. However, having to take another bar exam seems excessive, particularly since bar exams tend to cover basic principles in every area of law rather than focusing on the relevant differences in the attorney's practice area. Perhaps requiring an out-of-state attorney to obtain a certain number of CLE credits within their intended practice area in the new state would be preferable to sitting for a Bar Exam.

* Only by simple motion in litigation matters with representation that has at least 5 years of litigation experience in the lawyer’s home state.

* Others States have been doing this for decades. Those states should be studied and the impact of such practice reviewed.

* Our state needs to be more fluid on this issue.

* Reciprocity benefits Florida Bar members. Many other states who have reciprocity will only grant reciprocity to people who are licensed in states who allow reciprocity to members of their state's Bar. By refusing to grant reciprocity to members of other states' Bars, we are foreclosing those states' reciprocity to our members.

* Reciprocity is needed, as are reciprocal CLE privileges.

* Reciprocity makes sense in a world where state boundaries are so easily crossed by clients and commerce. However, in granting reciprocity there should probably be some way an attorney must demonstrate competency in Florida law if Florida law controls in a particular practice area. Maybe it could be through CLE requirements.

* Reciprocity should be granted for attorneys with 10 years or more of experience.
Reciprocity will give Florida lawyers access to other markets. Conversely, legal competition in Florida will skyrocket if reciprocity were given to out of state lawyers, given the popularity of living in Florida.

Reciprocity with other states should be strongly considered.

Reciprocity would be alright with some states, but not all.

Reciprocity would be most valuable in multi-state areas of the law. Certain local laws could create pitfalls for the unwitting. There should be a "brief" exam on Florida law peculiarities.

Requiring someone who has, for example, practiced law in another state for more than 10 years to take The Florida Bar Exam is unreasonable as bar exams weigh heavily in favor of recent law school grads.

So long as there is a Florida portion of the bar exam, attorneys from other states should be required to take that portion of the bar exam.

Some showing of competency and familiarity with Florida law and the Rules of Procedure should be mandatory.

The assumption that all the lawyers want to come to Florida is unproven. Statistical data needs to be gained before we have enough knowledge to make a decision. I would love to be able to practice in another state and I think multi-state licensing is inevitable. We are a business not a profession. Thanks to the "Great Recession" there are no professions left. We're all terrified of losing our job, not having enough to retire, not finding meaningful work, etc. We have dumbed-down America and financial rewards are no longer based on merit or excellence when anyone can go to law school if they can get a loan or have a rich relative.

The Florida Bar should adopt the NBE Multistate Performance Test used in 37 states and numerous U.S. territories. This is the best examination for testing the necessary fundamental skills for a lawyer. The following jurisdictions currently administer the MPT: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District Columbia, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Northern Mariana Islands, Ohio, Oregon, Palau, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

The system in Florida would work. Many of my cases out of state lawyers are admitted to practice and there is no problem.

The value of obtaining a Florida legal education and pursuing licensing by The Florida Bar would be exponentially increased if law school graduates (and present practicing lawyers) could expand their practice in other states. The lack of reciprocity in Florida is
stifling. It is extremely onerous to have to go through the entire licensing process again to be admitted into another state.

* There is a tremendous need for legal services in Florida that is not being met. If attorneys from other states can help local citizens, that may help to fill the gap in services.

* This has been debated. Nothing changes unless someone can make some money, which is funny because allowing new lawyers into the state would increase competition leading to better services and more revenue.

* This is the one thing we should really establish. Practically speaking, there are far more dues to collect than allowing pro-hac vice.

* We are a ridiculously parochial state.

* We need reciprocity - plain and simple. Business is global, lawyers have expertise gained through practice and clients have the right to select their legal team as they wish. There is always the element of trust at play in any deal or engagement. Recognizing this fact takes no major insight.

* We need reciprocity to keep up with other states. The world is becoming smaller and more global every year. We are more competitive if we can fully help our clients in multiple locations.

* We need to get reciprocity.

* We should allow admission by reciprocity, provided that the state in which the lawyer "resides" provides for reciprocity. So, if the lawyer lives in NY, and is a member of the DC bar and the NY bar, but NY does not provide reciprocity admission, then Florida should not allow admission by reciprocity for this person, even though DC does allow for admission by reciprocity.

* We should definitely consider it.

* While any attorney purporting to practice in a state needs to be conversant in the state's law, I do not think that taking the bar exam again proves much. What use is a multiple choice section on constitutional law in determining whether a real estate attorney from Georgia can assist a client in Florida? The bar exam simply ceases to have relevancy in determining the skill of a practitioner after that practitioner has been in practice for years.

* While I understand there are differences in state laws, I believe the admissions process in most states (especially Florida) is parochial, outdated, and needs to be modified.
Opposed to Admission on Motion/Reciprocity – 58 Responses

* Do not do it! (10 Responses)

* Too many lawyers in Florida. (4 Responses)

* According to census data reported in the media, and based on personal contact with hundreds of lawyers a year for over twenty years as a mediator, it appears we have too many lawyers in Florida now.

* Allowing reciprocity would flood our state with lawyers who are not versed in Florida law causing harm to our citizens.

* Based on empirical data, as well as my own experience in discussing this with hundreds of lawyers, it is apparent that Florida already has too many lawyers, and not enough business to go around. As an unfortunate result, lawyers have resorted to massive repugnant advertising campaigns which, in my opinion, further lower our public perception such that now we are perceived as "used law salesmen." This situation would only be exacerbated by allowing reciprocity.

* Don’t add to the glut by making it easier to become a member of The Florida Bar. It should be difficult, and there is some evidence it is too easy to become a member.

* Florida has an effective way of handling this situation by requiring a Florida lawyer to take on the responsibility of the out of state lawyer.

* Florida has too many "quirks" for motion/reciprocity to work. Not to mention too many attorneys already.

* Florida has too many lawyers presently and there is no need to make it worse by making it easier for other states to also come here.

* Florida is a major retirement state. If Florida changes its stance on reciprocity, the current lawyers as well as the ever-increasing law school graduate pool will be competing not just with each other for employment but with individuals from all over the country, including those with decades of experience who wish to "retire" to Florida. If an individual is willing to put the energy, time and dedication into taking The Florida Bar Exam, then absolutely I have no problem whatsoever with someone practicing here after a lifelong practice out of state. But, I certainly did not have the opportunity to be admitted into either State without taking that state's bar exam. And for me, the experience of both state bar exams was quite valuable.

* Florida is already oversaturated with lawyers. We do not need non-resident practitioners.
Florida requires a bar exam. Only those who are truly interested take the bar exam. I know of several from Wisconsin who reviewed the Florida application and then decided not to take it. There are too many lawyers in Florida now. Admission by motion/reciprocity would only increase the number in a crowded market. I see no benefit to Florida.

Horrible idea. We will be filled with retired lawyers from up north and jackleg attorneys who tested into a simple state.

I am concerned about the integrity of the practice.

I believe admission on motion/reciprocity will hurt the ability of lawyers in Florida to maintain gainful employment. At a minimum, attorneys seeking admission in Florida should be required to sit for the MPRE and the Florida portion of the bar exam.

I believe that lawyers should be client-focused and that "I will see you next time I am in Florida" would diminish the professionalism of the Bar. If a lawyer wants to move to Florida and set up a practice here, he or she should take the exam and meet the other requirements, not view this as a handy, part-time way to transition to retirement. Clients, not lawyers, should always come first. That being said, I do believe that non-Florida lawyers should be able to participate in transactions with Florida corporations without having to be admitted. That is, a corporation should have the collective sophistication to assess the advantages and disadvantages of counsel who is admitted and familiar with the local legal landscape. We ought not to impose a similar burden on individuals.

I just went through attempting to become admitted in all the states with motions to admit. I disagree that this is what Florida needs; those states are searching for lawyers for their people to press the work of the legislatures. Florida has enough of that already.

I oppose reciprocity. More lawyers want to come here to practice than there are Florida lawyers wanting reciprocity in some other state. Florida loses in that situation.

I studied for and took the bar exam 15 years after being admitted to the New York Bar. I believe passing the Florida portion of the bar examination should be required for admission to practice in Florida as should retaking the MPRE. I do not feel that re-taking the multistate bar exam should have been required.

I took the CA Bar exam (it too does not have reciprocity) but I've used my DC license to waive into NY and the UK; it's made that license very valuable. On the flip side, Florida already has tons of "retiring" lawyers coming to the state. Also, one state (Wisconsin?) doesn't require a bar exam, just graduation from an accredited school to be licensed. I would not favor reciprocity by motion for those who did not go through the exam process. In their own state. I may also not favor reciprocity by motion for those who did not graduate from an accredited school.

I would like the opportunity to be admitted to another Bar on motion, but I think the negative effect of outside lawyers being admitted to Florida on motion outweighs that.
I would necessarily favor this, but would want the prospective member to have to complete a background check and show some familiarity with Florida rules of court.

If Florida allows reciprocity then we will lose a significant amount of business to lawyers from other states. Second, if lawyers do not routinely practice in Florida and know Florida law, malpractice actions will skyrocket as will the costs of providing service.

If Florida permitted reciprocal admissions, then we would be inundated by retired and semi-retired attorneys moving to Florida and setting up shop to practice law.

If you allow the mill model/paralegal practice of law that you are promoting to continue, it is not a good idea because lawyers from other states will form huge firms, spend millions and hire paralegals to do the work. The lawyer should have to reside here and practice here, and not have a practice in the other state. The paralegal program should not be expanded and they should not be able to provide any kind of legal service, they should be an assistant to a lawyer only, and they should not be able to assist a lawyer who resides out of state. Lawyers from Florida should be heavily vetted before being permitted to possibly wreak havoc in another state.

It is dangerous. It puts our citizens at risk of receiving less competent representation from lawyers who are not well-versed in Florida law.

Leave it the way it is. We have more than enough lawyers in Florida now. It makes no sense to make it easier for others (especially old lawyers who want to retire and write an occasional will) to become members of our Bar.

Look at why the present situation was put in place. Many people, including attorneys, want to come to Florida for many reasons. If attorneys in other states (which perhaps have lower admission standards than Florida) could easily move to Florida and practice, many would. We Florida attorneys would be swamped with out of state practitioners re-locating to Florida. They would not know Florida law, to the detriment of their clients. The Florida Bar is a union - act like it. A union protects its members, and is not afraid to admit it. From the questions in this survey, The Florida Bar apparently is considering many things to make legal and economic life difficult for its members, and which will hurt the public.

Most of the states I am admitted to that have reciprocity accept the ethics and multi-state portions of the bar exam taken within a time frame from another state. Florida did not have reciprocity and as such I was forced to take the entire exam which while already working was somewhat of a challenge. Now that I am practicing it is in my best interest for Florida to continue to require the full exam to be taken and to deny reciprocity and motion admittance because the more attorneys there are the greater the competition for work.

My understanding is that many people retire in Florida, and I don't want an out-of-state retiree doing a bit of side work without knowing Florida law and procedure.
Non-reciprocity has worked well in keeping unqualified lawyers from invading the Florida legal practice.

Other states, such as Washington and Oregon, seem to be moving away from reciprocity. It makes little sense for Florida to move towards it.

Reciprocity for experienced lawyers after passing all the other requirements, as well as a current background check, by motion is not enough; pro hac vice should suffice.

Reciprocity is not a good idea given the baby boomer retirement in Florida of those from other states.

Selfishly, I would not want a flood of more lawyers relocating/retiring to Florida because they do not have to take another bar exam. Competition is high as it is. If out of state lawyers were going to relocate here to do pro bono work or serve the needs of the poor, I would be supportive of reciprocity. The reality, however, is most people want to retire to Florida for the weather, lack of state income tax, high standard of living and other factors not related to serving the poor!

Some practices are national in scope, perhaps with an overlay of local rules or procedures, while other areas of law practice may be state-based or local ordinance-based. This distinction should not deal with as conterminous. Consequently, different threshold determinations may be needed to preclude unfettered transnational practice that could cause ramifications of distrust, unjustified disdain for the legal profession, and a public relations nightmare for TFB.

Stay out of politics.

The legal profession cannot be compared to the medical profession. The medical profession has done an excellent job of controlling the number of doctors admitted to practice which has helped keep wages stable and has helped to make sure that qualified practitioners are admitted. In addition, the medical profession has protected the reputation of doctors and has aggressively combated the unlicensed practice of medicine. It should also be noted that the medical profession benefits from the existence of both public and private insurance which makes payment much more certain. Finally, the medical profession has been very effective at creating an environment where even basic medical care cannot be obtained without seeing a licensed professional (how many times have you seen a doctor for three minutes only to be given a prescription for antibiotic that you knew you would be getting before you saw the doctor and yet you can't get it without the doctor) It is not the same for lawyers. We simply do not need more competition and to compare the professions is to compare apples and oranges. Anyone can file anything in a court house. No one can pick up an antibiotic without a prescription written by a doctor. The addition of P.A. does not directly threaten the livelihood of a doctor. In addition, not only must they work for a doctor, they themselves have received graduate level training which legal assistants and paralegals do not and will not receive.
The privilege to practice law and serve our community should remain such as only those who truly want to earn that privilege apply. Easy or accommodating will not serve our community well.

The reason I have always understood to be part of the lack of reciprocity is to prevent attorneys from northern states from buying a "vacation home" in Florida & then doing a tax write off, claiming they practice in Florida. I think the most important reason is that the laws in each state are very different in very different ways (although likely similar in different ways too). But, to maintain the highest quality of legal representation in our state, someone should have to study Florida law enough to pass our Bar exam, period. I personally would not be comfortable taking a case in California, Texas or New York and expect to understand their "nuances" enough to obtain the best result for the client, which should always be our primary goal.

There are too many lawyers in Miami and, I’m sure, in other areas as well.

Very strict requirements to preserve the integrity of the profession (although that integrity has already been eroded significantly the last 10-20 years.)

We don't need it. Thousands of the lawyers we have are sorely lacking in experience and training as it is.

We have too many lawyers coming out of too many pathetic law schools that allow unqualified individuals admittance. Why make it easier for lawyers from other states, many of whom also went to pathetic law schools that allow unqualified individuals admittance, to be admitted to The Florida Bar?

We should keep our current policy to limit the carpetbaggers.

While I would not support out of state licensed attorneys being forced to take the entire bar exam, I think they must take the Florida laws portion of same.
The Uniform Bar Examination (UBE) is prepared and coordinated by the National Conference of Bar Examiners to test knowledge and skills that every lawyer should be able to demonstrate prior to becoming licensed to practice law.

It is composed of the Multistate Essay Examination (MEE), two Multistate Performance Test (MPT) tasks, and the Multistate Bar Examination (MBE).

It is uniformly administered, graded, and scored by user jurisdictions and results in a portable score that may be transferred for a limited time period to another UBE jurisdiction without re-taking the bar examination. Jurisdictions that use the UBE continue to decide who may sit for the bar exam, who will be admitted to practice, determine underlying educational requirements, and make all character and fitness decisions.

Jurisdictions that adopt the UBE may require candidates to also complete a jurisdiction-specific educational component and/or pass a test on jurisdiction-specific law in addition to passing the UBE.

Some advantages of having a uniform bar exam might be that it alleviates expense of a bar exam in a second jurisdiction; eliminates duplication of effort; reduces delay in gaining admission to a second jurisdiction; recognizes the effects of globalization and the need to cross state lines; moves the country towards a uniform bar examination; and the current bar admission procedures become less restricted.

Some disadvantages of having a uniform bar exam might be that there are already too many lawyers in Florida; all lawyers should take the Florida bar examination; Florida could lose control of the subjects tested by the exam; there are distinctions between Florida law and general law; and an ability to test on Florida specific components could be lost.

After considering all of the above, to what degree do you favor or oppose Florida adopting the Uniform Bar Examination?

If in favor or opposition to, please briefly explain:

In Favor of the Uniform Bar Examination – 99 Responses

* A Uniform Bar Exam appears to be geared toward assuring only qualified individuals will be allowed to practice, regardless of the state.

* Advantages seem to outweigh disadvantages.

* After having had the opportunity to practice in other states and seeing a general move towards adoption of many consistent Federal rules of procedure and practice, I think it is time to have a more consistent approach to a multi-state level of testing.
All states, except Louisiana, follow the common law. Thus, a uniform bar exam would apply to 49 states.

Although the UBE may be a useful and practical tool (I remember taking the MPT, I believe, as part of the GA Bar Exam), I would still think Florida would want to test on jurisdiction-specific distinctions in the law. My experience with the Florida portion of the bar exam (granted I took it over 10 years ago) was that the multiple choice portion did not seem particularly well written. I'd much rather be tested on my knowledge of the distinctions in Florida law through an essay.

As long as provision is made for the state to require jurisdiction-specific examination, and any other reasonable requirement for fitness to practice, it is probably wisest to adopt the UBE and broaden Florida's candidate pool.

As long as there is also a Florida law testing component, I don't see why a uniform bar exam is not helpful.

As long as we continue to test on the Florida specific law.

As long as we keep the Florida-specific portion.

At the Bar admission stage, a uniform approach is adequate. Specific Florida law applications can be learned through practice

At the end of the day, an attorney is going to be sitting at a desk across from a client listening to a story and a request for help. I still think the written essay and oral exam can best determine the preparedness of the candidate. Perhaps there has been follow-up over the years linking "multistate" test scores to success or career satisfaction, I just do not know. Perhaps the Commission can check into this. Also, check into the percentage of bar complaints, suspensions and disbarment proceedings over the last 40 years, etc., versus prior to the multi-state exam. I expect all these statistics are out there and could give insight as to effectiveness of current law school training and paralegal expansion.

Attorneys would be better-rounded.

Being able to pass The Florida Bar Exam requires the attainment of skills that are entirely unrelated to the practice of law and to legal competency. All the lawyers I know soon forgot everything they memorized for the bar exam. In other words, simply because you can answer some questions about Florida law does not mean the present bar exam better prepares you to be a lawyer in Florida. Since that is the case, then Florida might as well offer its law school graduates and new lawyers the flexibility, options and savings cost to admittance in other jurisdictions

Do you really think that because you take a Florida portion of the bar exam and pass, then you are prepared to represent somebody in court the next day? It is insulting that you even put as a disadvantage of the uniform bar exam that "there are already too many lawyers in Florida." Have you heard about competition and free access to the market which also includes legal services? If too many lawyers is the problem, are you going to
limit the number of years an experienced lawyer can work, so the new attorney may have a better job opportunity? Stop this irrational system.

* Every attorney needs the basic law concepts, but will research and become familiar with the laws of the state in which he practices.

* Everyone in Florida is playing to lose. The truth is Florida is one of the most popular destinations for travel and business in the world. Its net gain opening doors to others will be huge. No matter the firm, it’s all about the people on the ground. And if people want to be in Florida to do business, they want people on the ground to be able to help them. Having multi-national firms come to Florida will only add to the opportunities we now have to grow the economy. If we were Kansas I wouldn't be advocating this approach because the net import of jobs and opportunities would be negative.

* Favor a standardized test for general legal concepts but would want state specific tests for practice in state. I just like the alleviation of some of the expense associated with Bar Examine in another state.

* Favor, but think current attorneys should have same advantage and a time limit may be too restrictive.

* Florida is not the only state with too many lawyers. Adopting the UBE isn't going to solve that problem anywhere.

* Florida lawyers should meet requirements that are basic to being qualified to practice law. It should not be easier or harder to meet requirements in South Dakota than in Florida.

* Florida should not be so parochial/protective by continuing to have different bar exam requirements. I understand at least 40 states use the UBE.

* Florida would still need to require a Florida-specific test, in addition to the UBE. There would need to be a provision giving current members of The Florida Bar the same limited time frame to seek admission to other state bars, as if they had taken and passed the UBE. The adoption of the UBE should not create another hurdle for existing members to seek admission in other states.

* Florida's position on this issue is dated and doesn't reflect business models.

* Generally, for the reasons you list above. The practice of law in Florida is not so specialized that an attorney with the ability to pass all portions of the UBE would be unfit to practice in Florida.

* Having some Florida specific components will be important.

* I agree that Florida could lose control of the subjects tested by the exam but Florida law is not that different in many areas that are tested in the essay portion of the exam. The real education comes from practice in a chosen area of the law.
I am in favor of anything that makes bar admission to different states easier and more streamlined. However, some degree of state-specific knowledge should be required, as state laws differ.

I am in favor of UBE but believe there should be some way to demonstrate competency in the particular subject matter of the law of the state in which you want to practice. For example, if you want to practice property law in Florida, you should be tested on and take CLE courses in Florida property law, but should not have to become proficient in Florida Criminal Law, Florida Criminal Procedure, Florida Family Law or other areas of Florida law in which you do not plan to practice.

I am in favor. The fact that there are too many lawyers in Florida does not mean that there are too many good lawyers in Florida. Lawyers from other states are not any worse. If the profession is saturated, people will begin leaving the legal profession or will not apply to law school.

I am skeptical of the ability of any exam to distinguish between those who will be good lawyers and those who will not.

I believe a multistate test with some level of portability is efficient. However, there must always be a jurisdiction-specific component for admission to Florida.

I believe that a great deal of law is or should be uniform throughout the nation and the UBE would be an appropriate measure of competence across the board. So long as Florida and other states have their own diverse Rules of Civil and Criminal Procedure and other laws that are substantially not uniform with the rest of the nation, I believe that a Florida specific test should be required. That test should not duplicate the material covered on the UBE, but only the Florida-related differences to that which is covered on the UBE.

I believe the trend will to be towards a blending of jurisdictional differences and away from parochialism.

I don't see the difference between this and the multistate other than it is a different test.

I favor the UBE, with the caveat that Florida should still test for Florida related law issues (Florida Constitutional Law, Florida Criminal Procedure, Florida Criminal Procedure.), particularly where they are different from the majority law view that may control the subjects tested under the UBE.

I have taken 3 different jurisdictions' bar exams in whole or in part and, beyond the first one, I found them to be expensive (exam and bar review fees), time consuming and a great waste of time and effort since most of the areas of law tested were irrelevant to my area of practice and experience. In short, they were by and large exercises in memorization.

I like this approach.

I see no risk if Florida mandates a jurisdiction-specific bar exam component.
* I think admission to another state should be limited in time from the date of the UBE. For example, 5 years.

* I think it is a great idea to have some sort of uniform bar exam as long as it has a jurisdiction specific testing segment as well.

* I think the ability of a new lawyer to take the Bar once, but then move anywhere he/she gets a job offer and not be limited to one area is priceless.

* I think the ability to pass The Florida Bar is not a good indicator of a person's ability to practice law in the state of Florida in the first place. I would rather see probationary admission where any lawyer not educated in Florida would have to associate with a Florida lawyer for their first six months of practice.

* I think the bar exam has very little to do with the actual legal profession and more to do with eliminating candidates that may be qualified but can't take tests. I think the bar exam is a bit of absurdity, and we'd be better off going to a general exam and then requiring an apprenticeship/clerkship program to get the Florida law specifics.

* I think the positives of uniformity outweigh the negatives of uniformity.

* I think there should be a UBE but there should also be a section specifically for the state that you are applying to. If you want to practice in that state, you will have to pass the UBE and the specific state to which you are requesting a license.

* I was sure glad that I did not have to retake the multi-state portion of The Florida Bar after having taken and passed same in Georgia.

* I would add a Florida specific section that focuses on Civil and Criminal Procedure, as those are the subjects that most clearly vary from state to state and need to be carefully considered. Beyond that, I would try to identify key components of Florida law that are markedly different from other jurisdictions, but not too many. The number of subjects currently covered is overwhelming and many do not have that many significant distinctions from other jurisdictions.

* I would be in favor of this type of testing if it was also accompanied by a test specifically on Florida law.

* I would favor adopting the UBE if other states granted reciprocity for those passing it.

* I would have to know more specifics but am very open to considering it.

* If Florida decides to use the UBE, there should still be a Florida component for admission of first-time lawyers. Meaning graduating law students should take the UBE and a Florida test.

* If there is an option to test on jurisdiction-specific law, then the last three disadvantages listed above are alleviated. I am not worried about creating barriers to the marketplace, so the first does not concern me; and the second is ad hominem argument. I believe that any
UBE type system would streamline the examination process and reduce the cost of administration.

* If there were a state-specific component to the Florida bar exam, the UBE would be fine. On its own, I do not believe it is sufficient.

* In favor with a Florida component.

* In order to take the bar exam, you need to have graduated from an accredited school in the U.S.A. That exam is not a measure of the actual practice of law but it sets a minimum standard. It is on the actual practice and case by case basis that we need the knowledge of any local law. Legal research and co-counsels can cover the gap. Furthermore, a local co-counsel or mentor requirement for newly admitted members can address the local concerns.

* In the current economy, attorneys need to be able to go to areas where there is a demonstrated need for lawyers. Many attorneys take the bar exams in their "home" states because that is where they are from and that is comfortable for them, only to find that attorneys are not as needed there as perhaps in other places. With the law school debt many are carrying, this is important.

* It appears to be more comprehensive and a better test of the ability to practice law.

* It depends on the experience level of the attorney and what jurisdiction specific educational or test component is added by the state to the UBE process.

* It goes hand in hand with reciprocity.

* It is a global world.

* It is a reasonable means to measure the individual's preparedness.

* It is a waste of time in this day and age where legal systems are similar (except LA) in every state to have each state write its own exam, especially if you went to law school in a different state.

* It is just the test. The existing Florida Bar Exam seems to have little to do with actual practice. If Florida would continue to control who may sit for the bar exam, who will be admitted to practice, etc., then whichever test is administered matters little.

* It is only fair. A well trained lawyer can learn Florida law as needed. Supposedly Ivy League trained lawyers can go and do well anywhere.

* It is too time consuming and difficult to take another bar exam 25 years after the last one. If I have a case in another state and believe I can function, I should not be required to take another bar exam.

* It makes no sense to also test on Florida specific matters because both tests already consist of questions you can readily research the answers to. As to there already being too
many lawyers in Florida, this works both ways as reciprocity would allow Florida lawyers to seek work in states that have a greater need for more lawyers.

* It will happen regardless of what position we take. Not worth fighting over if the outcome is apparent and irreversible.

* It would appear to be more efficient and less expensive in the long run.

* Makes sense, especially with the addition of a Florida specific test.

* Many practicing lawyers in Florida do not handle Florida-specific matters. Since my first day as a lawyer in Florida, the legal work I have done is federal or multi-state in nature, and the subjects on the Florida portion of the bar exam were the last time I ever had to consider those practice areas. As noted previously, we should not fear "too many lawyers in Florida", and do not need to impose artificial knowledge of Florida law on lawyers who may very well not ever need to know Florida-specific law. This is an anachronism from another era, long since passed and never to return.

* More consistent.

* Most State jurisprudence is very similar, the distinctions and variations are learned as you go not necessarily taught at law school level.

* Much of what lawyers do doesn’t change from state to state, so there should be an element of uniformity. Then each state should be able to add its own special educational approach, such as Florida with its required basic CLE.

* Only in conjunction with a substantial Florida component and only if we could later opt out if it got to point of "politically correct admissions" vs. admissions based on competency. I think The Florida Bar is inching somewhat toward the politically correct vs. competency/ethically correct (do not see how someone in the U.S. illegally can be ethically suited to practice law).

* Please, it is self-evident.

* Reciprocity works both ways.

* Seems to make common sense.

* Should Florida adopt the UBE, jurisdiction-specific testing must be mandatory and Florida developed and administered. Topics should include at a minimum Florida Constitutional Law, Criminal Law, aspects of criminal and civil procedure not covered by uniform acts adopted in Florida and possibly state and local government and taxation and environmental and land use elements that are unique to Florida.

* Should Florida adopt the UBE, passing a jurisdiction specific component should be required.
So long as Florida can continue to test state specific issues, I do not see an issue with homogenizing the general subject matter portion of the exam.

Substantive law is always changing. The purpose of the bar exam should be to establish an ability to understand basic concepts and issue spotting. In the practice of law, what the law in fact is always has to be checked. A jurisdictional specific component could be added to ensure that major differences in Florida law are known generally.

The advantages of reduced burdens on the supplier and increased choice to the consumer far outweigh the disadvantage of possible lack of familiarity with legal idiosyncrasies. "Too many lawyers" is just economic protectionism and is not a legitimate reason to impose barriers.

The fact you test on Florida's unique areas of law has very little to do with whether that person is qualified to practice law. In many instances, the subjects tested are not the areas that person will practice in. the bar exam gives the public a false sense of competency of a lawyer in every area. I think the Board Specialization movement is how to verify to the public whether a person is competent in a particular area.

The Florida Bar should not be in the position of protecting its members from outside competition; that is not in the best interest of clients. Any notion that we are protecting Florida from unqualified attorneys is bogus and is better handled by the market. Winners and losers will sort themselves out. Clients can choose Florida attorneys based on longevity of "on the ground" Florida practice, reputation and skill. All of these are determinable by a basic Google search at this point.

The law changes often and attorneys often focus in a specific area of law. A future Florida attorney may only practice in an area that represents a small fraction of a Florida specific bar exam and that fraction of law will be changing. I don't see the relevance of a Florida specific bar exam when many of the questions may be outdated within 10 years. A Florida Bar Exam is an anti-competitive, closed-shop mentality that ultimately hurts clients.

The mass communication and technology, there should be a more uniformed exam that can be transferred to another jurisdiction.

The UBE could replace the multi-state portion of The Florida Bar exam. Then, the candidate would need only to take a Florida specific exam. I think there is a benefit to all attorneys having at least the same level of skill as demonstrated by passing a single test required of all attorneys without regard to the state of admittance.

The world is getting smaller. Florida no longer exists in isolation. It would behoove Florida to move forward with the rest of the world.

The world is very mobile, so we should not have too many barriers to people being free to move from state to state as they establish themselves in practice. There are many subject areas that can be tested on a uniform basis. Opposition to the UBE seems to throw up unnecessary barriers for no apparent gain to the regulating jurisdiction.
* There are too many laws unique to each jurisdiction. I would be in favor of the UBE if a Florida component was required.

* There would need to be some portion of the testing related to Florida Law, but the idea seems alright as far as multi-state law.

* This concept makes perfect sense. We shouldn't be concerned about having too many lawyers. Ideally, an oversaturation of the legal profession should eventually weed out the attorneys who aren't as skilled in the law. They will become solo practitioners and not get enough business to stay open. It might be harsh but it goes back to Darwin's concept of survival of the fittest. Also, knowledge of specific subject matter issues will come from on the job experience not broad ideas on a test.

* Uniformity among the states would benefit everybody, including lawyers and would-be lawyers in Florida.

* Uniformity to a certain extent is good, as long as there were arrangements to test or otherwise demonstrate knowledge of Florida subjects.

* Uniformity would be a positive, and the jurisdiction-specific option gives states the necessary flexibility to test the grasp of the law peculiar to or important in a particular state.

* We have to ensure accountability. It is the wrong reason to be motivated by turf or too many lawyers. That squelches future growth of the profession.

* We live in a new world of information. After passing a Uniform Bar Examination, one should be able to work in any state.

* What law students learn and is tested on an exam is theory. The actual practice once you get into real world situation has no relationship to law school or the exam. If anyone say otherwise it is simply not true. Lawyers need to be able to have a portable license which does not require them to spend unreasonable sums of money, time, energy and effort to obtain licensure in another state. After law school, attorneys specialize in a specific area of the law.

* Yes. There is no reason we cannot have one test that saves the bars as well as the applicants time and money.

**In Opposition to the Uniform Bar Examination – 74 Responses**

* Do not do it. (10 Responses)

* A Florida attorney must know Florida law.

* Agree with all the disadvantages listed, which far outweigh benefits, if any.
* Already too many attorneys in Florida and to practice here you need to be able to pass a Florida specific bar exam.

* As I recall, the MBE portion of the exam was not very practical and forced test takers to choose the "least worst" of the wrong options. This is actually how the (very) expensive review course was taught. So unless it has become more relevant over the years, this particular segment shouldn't appear on the UBE or the state exam. As a nation, anything that unites us is better than anything that does not. Sweden doesn't give a different bar exam for the northern end of the country than the southern. Perhaps, globalization and the need to cross state lines refers just as much as a way to continue to think about law and learning over the years, than just remembering specifics for an exhausting three day ordeal. Just as there are those who wish to come here, there are many who would leave Florida for another jurisdiction but for having only a single state license-with huge expenses and time looming to take another bar. I do not for a moment believe that there are so many lawyers in Florida that we should, as with illegal immigrants, close the borders to the state. The subjects being tested by the exam are already presumably serving well and serving the needs of the states that use the UBE, so perhaps we can look to them for example of how they may have "lost" some control, and what steps they take to make sure the lawyers admitted after the examination receive the information and training needed in whatever specific area might arise.

* Despite my strong opinion on reciprocity, I am firmly committed to Florida's right to control its own testing of its own applicants. And although I am unfamiliar with the proposed structure of a "UBE," it sounds particularly unwieldy.

* Florida has too many lawyers as it is. Lawyers are not retiring and newly admitted attorneys are un- or underemployed; as are lawyers with 7-10 years experience. I'm not in favor of lessening bar admission requirements. Florida law may differ significantly from other states so a Florida-law section should be required. Attorneys have a bad reputation in the general public. The UBE could hurt that reputation even further by lessening admission requirements. Requiring all attorneys to take a Florida-specific exam, controls the quality of admitted attorneys.

* Florida has very unique laws and is overly saturated with attorneys. Florida should retain the advantage of having the power to customize its bar exam. I would actually like to see the bar exam more like California's, where the essays require even more critical thinking, as well as adding a performance section (in California, you are given a mock file and have to write a legal memorandum, pleading, letter to the client, or other such practical document, using the materials provided)

* Florida law is Florida law, and a prospective attorney should be versed in the law of the state she is going to practice in.

* Florida law is unique and it is important to have an understanding of the nuances of the laws of the state.

* Florida now has set the "gold standard" for bar exams and bar admittance. Why screw it up?
Florida part is important.

Florida should adopt a state-specific bar exam which features only a minor component of "standardized" testing.

For exactly the reasons cited as "disadvantages."

I believe in uniformity when it really doesn't affect Florida practice, but would like to maintain stringent requirements when it comes to Florida practice.

I believe it is appropriate for The Florida Bar Exam to focus, in part, on the law of the State of Florida, because the purpose of The Florida Bar Exam is to determine whether a candidate is qualified for admission to the Bar of our State, not some other State. I believe that The Florida Bar needs to have complete control of its own bar exam, to make sure that it appropriately tests candidates on their knowledge of the law of our State.

I believe that the differences between Florida law and the law of other jurisdictions (whether based on common law or statutory) are significant enough such that a Florida Bar Exam is required.

I believe there are too many lawyers in Florida. The structure should be set up so that fewer practice law in the state per capita. If that means allowing them to go elsewhere through reciprocity rules or by maintaining a Florida specific bar exam, that should be the Bar's goal: streamline the lawyer population and maintain quality.

I believe there should be some component of specific Florida law.

I don't have a problem with the way The Florida Bar Exam is set up right now. It's half MBE and half Florida law. The Florida law component should be kept in the bar exam.

I don't see how an applicant would be thoroughly knowledgeable in Florida law.

I don't understand why this is better than the MBE and state bar portion on the current exam.

I feel that the current system is best for Florida's needs.

I feel that the details of Florida Law should be the focus upon which any examination of prospective applicants should be centered.

I prefer Florida Bar candidates to show proficiency in Florida law.

I strongly believe that lawyers seeking admission to The Florida Bar need to take some form of assessment to demonstrate their knowledge of Florida law.

I think it is important for Florida lawyers to have specific knowledge on Florida Law. I also am opposed to "federalizing" and centralizing another aspect of our lives.
I think that the current format, using the multistate exam one day and Florida specific exam on a second day, works fine.

I think the current Florida Bar Exam is adequate to judge a person's preparedness and ability to practice law in the state of Florida.

I think the disadvantages outweigh the advantages.

I think the Florida specific components of the bar exam serve a legitimate purpose.

I would be concerned with the lack of Florida based knowledge, unless there was a jurisdiction-specific component to the testing.

If you intend to practice in Florida, you should be tested (and knowledgeable) on Florida law. If Florida adopts the UBE, all Florida law schools will revise their curriculum to ensure their students pass the UBE, which means that new lawyers may have very little understanding/knowledge of Florida law (when it differs from the general).

Law candidates need to know the specifics of Florida law as well. Multistate is too general.

Laws are different in every state. Perhaps the multi-state portion of the bar exam should be transferable, subject to Florida's determination of a passing score, but no out of state applicant should be admitted without passing the Florida section.

Laws differ in most jurisdictions and we would lose the ability to determine the ability of a law student to know Florida law. Having said that, there could be a uniform portion of the exam (part 2) that concerns laws that are the same in most, if not all, jurisdictions. This could allow for multi-jurisdictional reciprocal approvals.

Loss of control makes it easier to become a lawyer in another state. We need to make admissions harder not easier.

May not apply to Florida.

Some disadvantages of having a uniform bar exam might be that there are already too many lawyers in Florida; all lawyers should take the Florida bar exam; Florida could lose control of the subjects tested by the exam; there are distinctions between Florida law and general law; and an ability to test on Florida specific components could be lost.

Testing a litany of Florida specific subjects is useless. I've never practiced Criminal or Family Law or Probate or Trusts and Estates, and yet I was tested on all of them. The bar exam is memorization with a knowledge dump.

The current exam, which includes essays on Florida law and a multi-state multiple choice test, has worked well for years. The only change that is warranted is to make it more difficult so that the pass rate declines to where it used to be.

The differences in state law are too great to be covered in one exam process.
The disadvantages already noted above.

The distinctions between Florida law and, say, Texas law are significant. For example, I would think that Texas should routinely test on oil/gas law whereas Florida should routinely test on property rights and estate issues.

The problem, from my perspective, is that an intelligent graduate of a law school should be able to pass the examination; however, that person may not be competent to represent the public after passing the exam, no matter where the exam was given. That is why there needs to be a practice requirement added to the admission requirements.

The reasons for opposition which you gave above, out-weigh the "advantages."

The stated advantages are far, far outweighed by the stated disadvantages.

The unique factors of Florida law need to be observed, maintained and subject to competency testing. Perhaps each participating state could mandatorily supplement the UBE with a 2-4 hour test segment and applicants could select the state supplements for those states for which they desire to be tested/potentially admitted to practice. This should not be an option for Florida applicants. The Bar should make it MANDATORY for Florida Bar applicants AND the State Supreme Court should implement it by rule change and it should be required in a State Constitutional Amendment.

There are already too many lawyers in Florida. I don't think we need to make it any easier to practice in Florida.

There are already too many lawyers in Florida. I would like to go the other direction especially given the fact that Florida is considering permitting more competition by nonlawyers.

There are already too many lawyers in Florida. If all lawyers took the Florida bar exam; Florida could lose control of the subjects tested by the exam; there are distinctions between Florida law and general law; and an ability to test on Florida specific components could be lost.

There are simply too many lawyers who are in Florida now.

There should always be a state-law specific portion of the bar.

They should keep the bar exam as it is now with multistate and Florida law exams.

This is disguised reciprocity, which I oppose.

Unique aspects of Florida law (e.g. homestead exemption from creditors, restrictions on descent and devise) require state specific knowledge.

Way too many Florida attorneys.
We have too many law schools in Florida and too many lawyers. The last thing we need to do is to make it easier for out of state residents to become lawyers in Florida.

What good is a Uniform Bar Exam without uniform state laws?

Why would I hire an attorney to represent me in one State when they may have no knowledge or specific training about the laws of that State? I would oppose that. This is not medicine that translates across State lines. This is the practice of law that is specific to each State. Florida should strive to keep the best attorneys who are specifically (not casually) familiar with the laws of the State of Florida. Do not discount that experience of the lawyer in dealing with the local administrative procedures, customs of judges, judicial assistants, interaction with local attorneys, expert witnesses, etc. are vital to the best representation. A bar exam is about minimum proficiency to practice in that State; I want the attorney who has not only passed the bar exam of his/her State, but has also practiced there and trained specifically for that State.

Why would we adopt a test that will bring in more attorneys when there is already a glut of lawyers as it is?

Without knowing the specific provisions of this proposal, I can only comment on its principle, not its content. Certainly, all elements of commerce and the disciplines associated with its orderly survival have become universal, which would indicate a need to universalize legal practice to recognize other laws and practices. However, whenever I needed to learn the laws of a foreign jurisdiction, I simply studied them and, if required, I retained local counsel to assist me. I would not subscribe to any system which provided a short cut to practice law.

You need knowledge of Florida statutes/practices to effectively represent clients in Florida! No more short cuts! If there are too many lawyers that issue can be dealt with by other means not keeping high standards as an effort to eliminate the competition is a terrible unethical idea! People's rights, their property, their freedoms, etc. are too essential to be tossed aside in an effort to lower the knowledge and qualifications of lawyers! How can the standard be too high if we are upholding the rule of law?

You said it. Every Tom, Dick and Harry will be able to practice law in Florida. People retire to Florida. We don't need them coming down and "dabbling" in practice.

You will increase competition until no lawyer can make a decent living.
38. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding the Uniform Bar Exam for the Vision 2016 Commission:

In Favor of the Uniform Bar Exam – 30 Responses

* Do it. (3 Responses)

* Florida should participate in a Uniform Bar Exam.

* Frankly, I would like to be able to become a member of another state's bar without taking another bar exam, but admission to Florida's Bar should be within a few years of taking the UBE, if allowed.

* Having an additional jurisdiction-specific component to the education and/or exam would be important.

* I am in favor of UBE but believe there should be some way to demonstrate competency in the particular subject matter of the law of the state in which you want to practice. For example, if you want to practice property law in Florida, you should be tested on and take CLE courses in Florida property law, but should not have to become proficient in Florida Criminal Law, Florida Criminal Procedure, Florida Family Law or other areas of Florida law in which you do not plan to practice.

* I am not opposed to anything that would eliminate the Florida specific part. It would be nice if a law school would have actually taught more than 10% of it, but Florida law students should learn Florida law and The Florida Bar should test on Florida law as a requirement to practicing in Florida.

* I believe the most important issues to consider are ensuring the quality of the service clients receive and the professional standards of attorneys are both maintained and not compromised or adversely affected by allowing a reciprocity program.

* I believe we should accept the results of a multi-state bar exam for up to three years from the date the exam was taken and only require applicants to complete the "Florida" portion of the bar exam during such period.

* I do not favor the MBE portion. As I recall, it was expensive and approached questions and subject matter in a very obtuse way. Financially, the UBE makes sense. By allowing students to take a qualifying score to more than one state, they save so much time and money. The nitty-gritty specifics of Florida law, or any other state, are really learned on the job, whether sole practitioner or a member of a larger firm. A Florida specific exam can be very limiting of course, as in any other state where no reciprocity exists, but it need not be. In addition, lawyers from other states who have taken The Florida Bar and gained admission may have no more specific knowledge than a recent graduate, but the point is when they come down for a single case, or to move the practice, they must also (re) learn, refresh, and come up to date on Florida law.
* I do not think that glossing over the various state differences in law is a good idea when testing applicants.

* I have been of the opinion for quite some time that attorneys should be able to take any bar exam (state or UBE, etc) in the location of their home state, either online or proctored. If I live in Florida, and wish to take the Alaska state bar exam, why do I have to travel to Alaska? Why can't Alaska send the exam here, and I either take it online or take it in a proctored setting? I think the UBE should be the same way.

* I hope we adopt it.

* I think the UBE would be helpful in a general way. I would not want Florida to just agree to the UBE and not have a Florida component. I think that would be a disservice to the citizens of Florida.

* I would really have liked a Uniform Bar Exam when I was getting admitted to multiple states.

* If adopted, add passage of a Florida specific test as a requirement for admission in Florida.

* If it is implemented, there should definitely be a Florida based supplementary exam.

* It might make sense to offer specialization examinations at the time of admittance. Upon graduation I was going to become whatever type of lawyer I was able to find employment rather than have had the ability to "major" by way of examination to assist my job hunt.

* Let every lawyer who has practiced at least five years but who is younger than 40 years old make the call on these issues. They are old enough to have earned their stripes, but not so arrogant to think Florida controls its own world. The true reality of an interconnected global economy is only now being felt and the implications of future technology on the professional should be determined by those who grew up with it, warts and all and who will need to live with it going forward.

* Only in conjunction with a substantial Florida component and only if we could later opt out if it got to point of "politically correct admissions" vs. admissions based on competency. I think The Florida Bar is inching somewhat toward the politically correct vs. competency/ethically correct (do not see how someone in the U.S. illegally can be ethically suited to practice law).

* Our state is tough and to maintain respectable overall competence should get tougher. Law school admissions are no longer selective. Unfortunately, the bar admission process needs to no longer assume that the admissions process of any school is geared towards only selecting the best or even the capable.

* Require a reasonable "Florida specific" minimum qualifications exam that is not like The Florida Bar exam, but similar to specialization exams in terms of specific knowledge requirements. Some statutes, but not many, but application of Florida common law and constitution.
* So make them take a Florida part. Or only let lawyers from other jurisdictions who have practiced somewhere else apply to be a Florida lawyer after 5 years of practicing somewhere else.

* State government at least would have an easier time recruiting attorneys, especially those with esoteric skills like capital litigation, if those attorneys did not have to waste time preparing for and taking The Florida Bar years after having taken and passed the bar exam in their home state many years earlier. I suppose the lack of reciprocity in Florida stems from a concern that retirees would flood the market or some such. But it would be nice if a law degree were more portable than it has been in the past. The fifty states are, after all, supposed to be one country, with free commerce between the various states.

* The Florida Bar should not be in the position of protecting its members from outside competition; that is not in the best interest of clients. Any notion that we are protecting Florida from unqualified attorneys is bogus and is better handled by the market. Winners and losers will sort themselves out. Clients can choose Florida attorneys based on longevity of "on the ground" Florida practice, reputation and skill. All of these are determinable by a basic Google search at this point.

* The practice of law should not be an inhibitor to lawyers being able to move and continue practicing in a different state or jurisdiction. We live in a global, mobile society. The practice of law must keep up with the changing time.

* This is an idea whose time has come and should be implemented in Florida and every other exclusionary state.

* Uniformity is inevitable.

* We should consider going to it, either as the sole admitting test, or accompanied by a state rules and law exam.

In Opposition of the Uniform Bar Exam – 20 Responses

* Do not go with the UBE. (7 Responses)

* Every state has something peculiar to that state. A Uniform Bar Exam might be okay for general subjects in which all states would agree. However, I believe if you want to practice in Florida, you should know Florida law before being admitted.

* Florida needs to lead the nation in lawyer competency and not allow lawyers untrained in Florida law.

* Florida, California, and New York were once considered the best places to practice law and, therefore, they were reputed to have the toughest bar exams to pass. I am not sure Florida should relinquish that reputation. I also think a UBE would end up being more multiple choice in nature and would cause law schools to "teach to the test" rather than to
teach what is required to be a successful Florida lawyer or to gravitate toward a more practical curriculum. Schools would start to compete by passing rates rather than by placements and success stories of their graduates.

* I think some Florida specific exam needs to be kept as part of the bar exam.

* I think The Florida Bar is on an ideologically motivated, economically powered mission to destroy the practice as we know it.

* It is a nice theory, but it ignores the practicalities of this state. We want professionals who are dedicated to this state, not a bunch of carpetbaggers.

* It may be in our future, but I feel Florida should keep the current system.

* It's a bad idea.

* Many of the things which you listed as advantages simply aren't relevant. For example, it would be ridiculous to sacrifice a necessary component of the legal profession simply to make it less expensive. That's throwing the baby out with the bathwater and is a mindset of weak professionals. Also, what on earth does globalization have to do with this issue? Yes, we want to have globalization, but that isn't in any way relevant to whether an attorney is qualified to practice law in Florida. It has nothing to do with it.

* Might result in too many snake oil salesmen.

* Sounds like a reasonable idea for the northeast, where the next state is 30 minutes away--then it makes perfect sense. For areas like Florida, California, Texas and other large jurisdictions, it makes far less sense. My understanding is that corporate attorneys do not have to be members of The Florida Bar anyway, so that may be true in other states (Harris Corporation corporate lawyers are not required to have passed the Florida bar exam). So that takes care of "interstate commerce" as it relates to corporations. If the businesses are smaller, then all the more reason that a practitioner from the home state and the "other state" should both be involved. That’s the cost of doing business!

* The laws of each state are different and may conflict in different areas.

* The present system is fair enough.

Miscellaneous – 4 Responses

* Dump the Essay. It is not reflective of how a lawyer does analysis. It would be unethical for a lawyer to render an opinion to a client in 3 hours on multiple subjects without considering the current state of the law.

* More and more lawyers have to find jobs outside law because the job market is thin. Salaries are going down in the civil firms; criminal attorneys are slashing fees just to get the client in the door and then can't pay their bills. Instead of focusing on bringing people
in from other states, or allowing online law classes, why not focus problems impacting practicing attorneys so they can keep their jobs and pay back their student loans? Put a cap on the number of attorneys admitted each year or raise the score to pass the bar. Longer practicing and experienced attorneys are being "downsized" only to be replaced a few months later with a new law school graduate. Experience doesn't mean what it used to. The quality of service has taken a backseat to profit. I understand that it is all business but not when the client suffers. Sadly, the client is none the wiser but it's those of use that have seen this change over time that are

* Whatever you do, admit a smaller percentage of lawyers to practice in Florida. The passage rate is excessive.

* Whatever you do, please make it as politically correct an examination as possible!
39. Some countries, as well as the United States District of Columbia, have relaxed their rules restricting nonlawyer ownership, partnership or participation in the delivery of legal services and now allow for some form of an “alternative business structure” for the provision of legal services. This could allow for fee-sharing and profit-sharing with nonlawyers. Do The Florida Bar's current ethics rules prohibiting any degree of nonlawyer ownership and participation in law firm profits prevent you from operating in a way you would like? If “Yes”, please explain:

General Comments – 27 Responses

* Dangerous. Independence and conflict situations are bound to arise.

* Entities such as "411 Pain"; and "1800 Need Help" are supposed lawyer referral services. But in reality, are nothing more than rich chiropractors and chiropractic clinics usurping consumers of legal services for a fee. They engage licensed attorneys to send them their clients and in return they send the attorney a patient/client. This is another way of obtaining a "referral fee" or illegal compensation. Such practices only cheapens our profession, and really hurt a lot of legitimate, licensed attorneys, who all worked so hard to realize their dream of gaining a profession and supporting their families and communities - something neither of those above-mentioned groups do. They appear to be owned by foreign individuals and/or entities taking the money outside our jurisdiction. There is no need for any attorney referral service other than that provided by The Florida Bar!

* I don't practice right now, but The Florida Bar has its head in the sand when it comes to advanced models for delivery of legal services and closely related services across many different platforms for different clients. Client needs to not fit inside a simple "legal" niche. Large firms are tacitly ignoring this prohibition.

* I support any business model that fosters competition and free enterprise.

* I think if a business is strictly a law firm, then nonlawyer ownership should be prohibited. But, if a business is to provide legal services with other business consulting practices, then an alternative business structure should be allowed to allow for profit-sharing with nonlawyers. For instance, I do Estate Planning; it would be great if I could partner with a CPA, Financial and Tax Advisor to offer a full array of services to my clients.

* I think this should only be allowed for licensed professionals that are actively engaged in the overall business enterprise. I don't think it should be permitted for passive investors. For instance, if a personal injury firm employed a doctor or nurse and wanted to have them as an owner/partner sharing in profits I think that should be allowed. I think the same holds true for accountants or other employees of that type.

* If no control of lawyer opinions, I think association with non-lawyers should be allowed.
It is a good rule and allowing nonlawyers to own law firms promotes corporate greed and lack of professionalism and ethics.

Lawyers are specially trained in law, not management, finance, marketing. From a business perspective, law is merely a service just like carpet cleaning. To the extent the public could be better served by more effective and efficient law firms, ownership rules could be relaxed.

Multidisciplinary makes sense.

Neither The Florida Bar, nor any other bar, should relax or eliminate rules prohibiting fee-sharing with nonlawyers - ever.

None. Attorneys should NOT be allowed to have any ownership interest in a law firm. I do not even like it when insurance companies have "affiliated offices".

None. Lawyers should never be allowed to control or be part of owning the practice of law. How many times have we heard individuals badmouth our profession and later discover that they themselves wanted to be lawyers but were not admitted or lack the grades? Why should we provide a back door to enter our sanctuary? Dangerous course. Already many businesses have included in-house counsel to provide the legal service to affluent clients for free as an additional service? Such practice is circumventing the unauthorized practice of law and we are doing nothing. To allow this to continue by permitting nonlawyers to own and be part of our profession is handing over the key to our profession and any power we may have left to direct our destiny. Shame on us!

Nonlawyer exclusion hampers business development, financing and expansion of operations, etc.

Not yet, but it could. Balance between commerce and ethics are important. As the world continues to shrink, the business model needs to be rethought. Law is both a profession and a business, the latter too often lost on many. No matter how good a lawyer is, that lawyer cannot perform unless the lawyer can earn a living commensurate with the investment in education and considering alternatives forms of business. We don't want to lose lawyers because they can make significantly higher profits in the pure business world, where legal abilities to think and analyze are financially rewarded.

Only lawyers should practice law. When you answer to a corporation's shareholders or make legal decisions based on profit you have debased the profession even further.

The 19th Century model of doing business is not only obsolete, it goes against an integral offer of services that a lawyer may provide to better protect a client's interest. As long as there are no hidden fees or it adversely affects the interest of the client, why is anybody's business how is that an attorney decides to structure his/her business operation?

The ethical requirements, including the prohibition against fee sharing with a nonlawyer, must be maintained for the sanctity of the profession. Otherwise it will no longer be a profession, but just a business.
* There are both Tax and personal liability reasons for permitting nonlawyer ownership in some circumstances, as well as creating opportunities for dynamic, cost-effective delivery of services. As long as rules concerning conflicts, disclosure, and unauthorized practice remain carefully enforced re: licensed attorneys, the Bar should consider this option.

* There are ways that could work, prohibited by the rules, besides sharing fees and nonlawyer ownership.

* This is an archaic rule which restricts free enterprise and retards needed economic growth and employment opportunities for young lawyers. It should be abolished.

* Times have changed and we need to think outside the box and allow situations like accountant-lawyer partnership. We need to be open to a profession-sharing partnership.

* Unlike other professions, lawyers are very restricted in business partnerships.

* UPL.

* We cannot let nonlawyers take our profits away from us; the model would be a corporate model which would destroy our competence, ethics and turn us into a sweat shop. They would use paralegals to do the work. The small practitioner would not benefit from this, while the large mill owned by nonlawyers would function for share holders only which means they would no ethics or duty to the public. Internet advertising is already skewing the profession. Internet marketing owned by nonlawyers which lawyers must pay to have visibility in the market. Think of what would happen if law firms had to compete even more with large corporations for business. The quality, and humanity, of services would decline greatly. Why do you see the practice of law as a corporate commodity only?

* We need to remain lawyers first.

* Working with out of state lawyers is a thorny problem with fee sharing.

**Example(s) Listed – 25 Responses**

* Commercial Real Estate firms should be allowed to have in-house attorneys that provide legal services to clients regarding the negotiation and drafting of commercial Real Estate Contracts. "Fee sharing," should continue to be prohibited but this should not be considered fee sharing in this setting.

* Current economic business situations are not adequately covered by the rules regulating. Trial costs are prohibitive for sole, small practitioners. Mechanisms needed to reduce risk of expensive trial losses.

* Employing professions such as a medical doctor in PI practice or a CPA in Tax practice.

* Estate planning for lawyers is rather frustrating because there is no direct way for a non-attorney spouse to own the practice while an inventory attorney finds the right referrals
and/or a buyer for the practice. The probate estate is not a lawyer either, but "owns" the practice for a time.

* I am a lawyer. I want to practice law. A nonlawyer taking care of running the business will allow me to do what I like.

* I don't think it provides a proper way to compensate other members of a firm that bring in business or refer business if they are not an attorney.

* I would like my staff to share in the profits. They deserve it and knowing you will get a percent of profits is a great motivator.

* I would like the freedom to practice law in a profitable business structure. Fewer restrictions allow for innovation and imagination. Both are mainstays of small business.

* I would like to join a business with a physician to provide medical-legal consulting services. The Ethics rules bar me from this.

* I would love to be able to (a) partner with another financial professional (my practice is estate planning/settlement), and (b) partner with a nonlawyer business development professional who could be compensated on a percentage of revenue.

* I would love to do fee splitting with nonlawyers. Specifically, I had previously wanted to hire nonlawyers to do administrative hearings for a flat per hearing rate, have the client pay flat rate for representation, and have me do the appeal to the district court if needed. The flat rate structure would let me get the numbers right to make money, but I can't do that because of prohibitions on fee splitting. To do flat rate pay to someone else, that person has to be a lawyer, otherwise it is fee splitting.

* If a shareholder/partner dies and payments are due for that estate for a considerable period of time, this creates a problem.

* If I had a choice, I would make the paralegal who has worked with me for many years a partner or shareholder in the firm and I would leave her my practice at my retirement or death. Although I have children and spouses of children with law degrees, none have demonstrated the enthusiasm and interest in my firm that this paralegal has. If I had my way, I would like to see her have the ability to own the firm and hire lawyers. She is more ethical, more intelligent, and knows more law than many of the lawyers I know.

* It restricts my ability to accept cases that require expensive preparation. If the rules were relaxed, I could consider more profitable cases that require more time to resolve.

* Marketing and rewarding other professionals for their contributions.

* Nonlawyers should be able to finance law practices like non doctors are able to finance medical businesses.
One example: I compete with title insurance agencies that do primarily the same thing that I do in that area of my practice. They can partner with others for skill sets and expertise, investment money, and other factors that make it hard to compete against.

Real Estate: Not able to offer one stop shopping for closing services, i.e., surveying home inspection, appraisal, mortgage brokering etc. Health Care: Not able to collaborate with business professionals or health planners to provide comprehensive business solutions and planning with the legal requirements. Investment banking/capital: Raising services together with legal services.

The practice of fee-sharing and profit-sharing with others not directly a member of that club/profession has worked in accounting and should be permissible in law.

The practice of medicine permits medical services to be delivered by licensed professionals who are owned and controlled, in some instances, by non-licensed medical professionals who are regulated by the State. As long as oversight is maintained of the ethical rules, and there is an ability of the State to regulate the delivery of services, then non-attorney ownership of firms should be permitted provided the owners apply for and are granted a license. I am a technology lawyer. Having a practice with a Ph.D. in Life Sciences or Computer Science would provide me with a valuable advantage to reach clients who are cutting edge and who need legal solutions that are tempered with practical experience in a given field. USPTO lawyers may have a science education but generally do not have state-of-the art knowledge, practical industry-specific work skills or industry contacts to help provide clients with what they want. Nonlawyers do. I want to work with these people to create an equitable means to operate a business. Big accounting firms have been skirting this rule for at least a decade by the ways in which they employ their cadre of lawyers in hand with business consultants. So a change to this rule would simply recognize what others have been doing without permission.

There have been business opportunities that would violate the current ownership requirements that I have had to turn away.

These laws may hinder others. The key isn't just in the ethics opinions but also in the case law where attorneys in such situations usually end up holding the bag based upon alleged legal advice they were stuck with, when there was no real legal advice provided. The current opinions do hinder many attorneys from entering into alternative business structures or having to try and create such a nightmare structure to avoid such violations that it almost makes it too difficult to operate such a business.

Title Company and profit sharing with employees.

Working with CPA's, Doctors and PA's would allow for more control over professionals working with the firm.

Would like to partner with my brother in entrepreneurial legal areas but am precluded from doing so.
42. Would changing the ethics rules to allow for some degree of nonlawyer ownership affect your clients? If yes, please describe how your clients might be affected:

**Negative Impact – 65 Responses**

* Creates a conflict of interest. *(4 Responses)*

* A negative impact. We would see more law firms that tarnish our profession like Morgan and Morgan and 1-800 Call Gary and they would take clients away from reputable firms.

* All clients would be harmed by any dilution of the present loose regulation of ethical practices.

* Because they would have legal decisions made by nonlawyers. Are we going to follow the doctor model and let major corporations run our practices? This is a terrible idea.

* But I believe it would erode the public's confidence and perception of integrity in lawyers and in the judicial system.

* Client confusion.

* Clients' best interests may be lost to a profit motive.

* Clients need professionals who are lawyers to help clients, not third parties trying to get in on a profitable gig.

* Clients want to know they are being represented by competent, experienced and licensed professionals.

* Clients would get what they pay for. Fees would decrease and good lawyering would decrease.

* Commercialize relationship.

* Ethical responsibilities and responsibilities to shareholders are naturally at odds.

* Having nonlawyers owning a firm opens the door to non-licensed persons controlling the actions of licensed professionals, and could change the dynamic of lawyers serving clients to lawyers meeting budgets, without the constraints of professional responsibility.

* I am concerned about confidentiality. I am concerned about business considerations being placed above the best interest of my client. Of course that already occurs in some firms, but I think it would be exacerbated by non-attorney ownership of firms.

* I am concerned that allowing some degree of nonlawyer ownership will create incentives for unethical behavior and further erode the reputation of lawyers overall.
I believe it would undermine the trust clients must have in their lawyer and would be one more step to a client believing all his/her lawyer is interested in is making money, not in providing service and assisting them.

I believe that attorneys are held to a very high and strict ethical standard. Most people do not understand this, nor do they understand that state bar associations regularly discipline attorney members. I believe that, by allowing nonlawyer ownership of law firms, would dilute our ethical standards, and that it is not necessary. I can see no reason why everyone is in a race to the bottom, to make practicing law no different from selling widgets. We should be proud of what we do, of our ethical standards and we should not allow nonlawyers to be in any sort of position to change this.

I don't think that nonlawyers are as sensitive to ethical issues as lawyers are. It would not be good for the profession if nonlawyers were able to dictate how lawyers fulfill their ethical obligations.

I feel strongly that, where this is permitted, the ability to act impartially becomes problematic.

I think that allowing nonlawyer ownership in firms would allow firms to think of the practice of law as a business rather than a profession. I think we have already gone too far down that road. Lawyers are not products to sell like soap or toothpaste. When we start thinking about ourselves that way, we lose sight of our ethical and professional responsibilities.

I think that having nonlawyer ownership of a law firm could affect the clients through the decisions of the "Board" operating the law firm. I would be concerned that decisions could be made by the nonlawyer group that might be for the benefit of the law firm and not the benefit of the client.

I think that it would affect the client because nonlawyers are not subject to the ethical and professional standards of attorneys, and their methods of handling cases may be based more on profit than on competent representation.

I think this would attract a lot of nonlawyers into the legal field who would then find ways to solicit clients that I represent to them.

I will probably have more clients that were preyed upon by nonlawyer ownership firms.

I will survive but such action will hamper my ability to controlling the kind of cases, fees allocator and flat fees will be higher.

In criminal practice, I am concerned that litigants would be unduly influenced by a bond company to hire certain lawyers if there is fee sharing. I also think that other professionals may not act in their client’s best interest if there was a motive to get referral fees. For example, mental health professionals and counselors may refer cases to lawyers.
* It affects everyone by changing who controls the practice of law from only lawyers to nonlawyers who lack the training that lawyers should have and frequently do, in areas such as ethics.

* It is the beginning of the end for the practice of law. I realize in the United Kingdom they permit this, but do they have a better system? I think not.

* It would allow lawyers to share fees with professionals to whom they refer their clients—thus motivating attorneys to refer people to professionals they may not need (for example, insurance policy brokers).

* It would certainly accommodate increased attorney-client disputes over money/fees to be substantially affected/control led by nonlawyer participants in the business model, thus diminishing the importance of the attorney-client relationship.

* It would increase the significance of profit resulting in a more cold blooded approach to billing.

* It would mean the lawyer on the other side has sold his soul to a business endeavor and cannot be trusted to be motivated by other ethical values.

* It would negatively affect the profession and competition within the profession, drive out small law firms and reduce client's ability to seek objective legal services as opposed to "marketed legal" services. Whether they need chiropractic services or not, such services will be requested when a chiropractor owns a law firm! Whether accounting services are needed or not, they will be required when an accounting firm owns a law firm. And on, and on it will go!

* It would not affect MY judgment, especially since I'm closing my practice to take the bench. But, having practiced in a somewhat small-town environment for 26 years, I've known some whose judgment may be affected, and a few whose judgment would be for sale to the highest bidder, unfortunately.

* Law firms would become mega-firms operated as subsidiaries of Fortune 500 companies. This will make it even more difficult for solo and small law firms to be competitive or even to keep their doors open.

* Lead to less professional services rendered.

* My clients are lawyers (I am a full-time Mediator). They would be killed by this (and end up employees of large corporations instead of independent professionals).

* My clients expect delivery of legal services. If I need business training, I get it.

* My practice is solely referral based. My referral sources could be unable to practice in such an environment.

* Negative effect on advice and counsel; profits should not affect the role of the lawyer.
Negatively.

New nonlawyer firms will open hiring inexperienced attorneys to provide service and low cost to firm but same cost to client and nonlawyer does not have his/her bar license on the line.

Nonlawyer equity owners could make profit the primary purpose of the law firm rather than the delivery of legal services. Nonlawyer equity owners could pose a problem as regards confidentiality and the attorney-client privilege.

Nonlawyer owners would only be interested in making money on their investment. It would be disastrous to client service if all law firms could be run like captive insurance company law departments focused on nothing but the bottom line.

Nonlawyer ownership would lead to large law firms consolidating with accounting firms, which may lead to weakened ethical restrictions on the practice of law. It would also make it more difficult for smaller law firms to compete with these mega-providers of multiple professional services.

Nonlawyers not bound by same ethical standards; may pressure lawyers to put profit before ethical considerations; lapse of ethics in business and banking have damaged their clients/shareholders.

Our clients look to lawyers, not entrepreneurs, to give them legal advice. Our clients know our lawyers are subject to ethical rules. If nonlawyers owned our firm or a part of it, they would not be subject to the Rules of Professional Responsibility.

Ownership could reduce client allegiance; you would become beholden to the owner.

Pressure from nonlawyer ownership will affect the quality of services and pricing.

Profit motive should not interfere with justice! Of course, everyone is allowed to make a living and we must deal with financial realities but money should not be the primary motivation for the practice of law!! No wonder we are the butt of some many jokes!

Profit would become even more of an issue.

Such a shift would change the practice of law from a profession to solely a profit driven business, which would further degrade the image and reality of the practice of law. Additionally, decisions would then have to be made to please shareholders and substantially short-change clients, otherwise known as cutting corners solely to reduce costs.

The deleterious effect of having a nonlawyer running the show.

The duty of loyalty to the client is paramount. With nonlawyers permitted in firm management and ownership opens the door to services that are at odds with the duty of loyalty. For example, with accountants comes investment advice. That area has a poor history for favoring the house and not the client or at the client's expense. I am sure there
are many other examples that open a lawyer to an inherent conflict. The dilution of the practice of law with nonlawyer owners is not good for the profession or the public.

* The gold rule. "The one who holds the gold, makes the rules." People with money, but not with the education or training, will be putting pressure on how a law firm is run as a business. I think it is already bad as it is and it will make the law profession less ethical and subject to more financial pressures. The ethical principles that govern the profession will be watered down as our legal opinions may be subject to the gold rule from nonlawyers who do not have the same ethical obligations than lawyers.

* The majority of my work is insurance defense work. Having nonlawyer ownership of firms would result insurance company owned law firms (different from in-house lawyers and carrier/employee firms) and would result in the destruction of the ethical obligations we now have to protect the insured rather than the carrier. If that happens, carriers will find ways to write policies that result in little, if any, actual coverage for their insured, despite charging more and more in premiums. Carriers are already finding ways to eliminate or reduce coverage for risks that have traditionally been covered under their policies. Examples: PIP, sinkhole, medical malpractice, nursing home negligence, etc.

* The nonlawyer ownership would be focused only on profits. Nonlawyer ownership would have no regard for anything other than the bottom line. No concern for ethical issues. No concern for the human interaction that attorneys have with clients. The concern of a nonlawyer owner would be that the attorney should deal with the client as quickly as possible, not caring about the real life "simpatico" that the attorney-client relationship requires.

* The practice is already too much of a business that adversely affects clients. Increasing the effect of business decisions will further erode the role of attorneys and adversely affect the client's ability to obtain competent representation as financial considerations play a greater role in the delivery of legal services.

* They would be victimized by those who place greed over ethics.

* They would seek law firms run like a fast food restaurant. The owners would amass wealth with little concern for law and ethics. If a nonlawyer pressures a lawyer to cut corners in order to make more money, how can that person be disciplined by the bar?

* They would want discounts and concessions in return for referring clients.

* Wall Street will own us.

**Positive Impact – 13 Responses**

* At minimum, a family member should be able to inherit the ownership interest.

* Clients could be better served if nonlawyer business professionals could have a larger role (stake) in the firm's success. Lawyers are specially trained in law, not management,
finance, marketing. From a business perspective, law is merely a service just like carpet cleaning. To the extent the public could be better served by more effective and efficient law firms, ownership rules could be relaxed.

* Duh! Clients are the ones who are driving this discussion and want this multi-disciplinary approach to the delivery of legal services and closely related legal services.

* Having a physician as a partner would bring more credibility to a company that I would like to develop.

* I think allowing nonlawyer owners would attract capital and successful business people to the law industry. It would also allow for gross receipt based rent and/or office equipment and technology fee arrangements. Better run offices would result in better service to clients. (Note: I am referring back to my private practice years, not government).

* I think they would be better served by the delivery of more precise and measured services performed by experienced people.

* I would think it would depend on the nonlawyers. It would drive the type of clients sought and assisted.

* I wouldn't have to outsource certain services, which would keep costs more competitive.

* It would allow me to offer them more and better service. Once my client has trust in me, if I can offer related services under the same umbrella by partnering with certain other professionals, my client would be thrilled.

* It would benefit them.

* Provide more services.

* They would have additional services, and services I offer may be less costly.

* Yes, to the extent of the disclosure aspects to the client. No different than a trust lawyer who recommends a life insurance trust as part of a bona fide estate plan, who also sells life insurance to the client. As long as the client is made aware the lawyer is acting in the lawyer's interest at the same time as the interests of the client. No one seems to question the lawyer's independent professional judgment; that trust is needed. The only issue seems to be that it is funded by insurance that the lawyer also sells.
45. Would allowing for sharing of law firm profits affect your clients? If yes, please describe how your clients might be affected:

**Negative Impact – 56 Responses**

* A lawyer with a nonlawyer business partner/associate would have a conflict: an ethical duty to her client and a fiduciary duty to her business partner/associate. Lawyers should not be placed in that position.

* A new factor would be presented in the legal representation- pleasing the nonlawyer owner, whose only interest is profits. The nonlawyer owner never took a course in legal ethics.

* Accountability.

* All depends upon the circumstances. If sharing were allowed, the potential for conflict would exist. Further, decisions on whether to take a client or advising a client could be influenced by the objective of the nonlawyer to make money.

* As a sole practitioner, I decide how much to bill. If nonlawyers were allowed ownership of a firm, I feel the pressure to make a profit would be further increased.

* As noted previously, it would confirm that the lawyers'/shareholders' interests are paramount, rather than the clients'.

* Clients would become commodities.

* Clients would compare rates based on advertisement/marketing of mega-firms. This will take business away from smaller and solo practices and make it impossible to compete or to keep the clients they presently have.

* Could create a conflict of interest.

* Decisions could be driven, at least in part, by those who have no ethical responsibility.

* Ethical responsibilities and responsibilities to shareholders are naturally at odds.

* I am concerned that allowing some degree of nonlawyer ownership will create incentives for unethical behavior. I foresee mills or clinics established where nonlawyer-owners feed work to the law firm. While some of this may be beneficial and ethical, I believe the risk for abuse is quite high. Once you open ownership to nonlawyers, I don't believe there could be dire consequences for our profession and you will ever be able to stuff the genie back into the bottle.

* I can picture individuals becoming "agents" for lawyers to drum up business for a cut of the profits.
I have had a criminal defense practice for 21 years (Assistant State Attorney for first five years), so I can't see how another professional could share profits with me, but I do understand that a Trusts & Estates practice may benefit from having a CPA as a "partner/fee-sharer," for example.

I think the profit sharing with nonlawyers will increase the number and types of potential conflicts.

I think this would attract a lot of nonlawyers into the legal field who would then find ways to solicit clients that I represent to them.

I think where the decision for the nonlawyer is not based upon the same ethical duties as the lawyer may have for the client could impact the client. I would not like to see sharing of law firm fees with others. However, I think the rules could be open to provide for other firms that the lawyer can be a part of where the profits from those businesses could be shared.

If a nonlawyer is a firm shareholder, the nonlawyer may want to take certain courses of action to maximize profits that would not be in the client's best interests. That could create an internal conflict and could also affect the services provided to the client. I don't think this would be a positive thing for clients.

If a nonlawyer stands to benefit from law firm profits, they may have a stake in how business decisions and professional responsibility decisions are implemented.

If my client were sued by a firm that had a pure profit motive in the outcome of a case, it may cause that firm to act differently in both litigation and settlement of matters. Only a lawyer has a fiduciary duty to his or her client. To let in persons to share fees that do not have a fiduciary duty would cause great disruption of how a firm handles a client's affairs. Consider, for example, the situation of the mortgage brokers and finance professionals that acted against their client's interests because they had no fiduciary duty in the last financial crisis. If these other professions had the same fiduciary responsibilities to their clients, we probably would not have had the financial crisis.

If nonlawyers were sharing in profits, their time would have to be billed, and there might be client resistance.

In the short-term, clients will get ripped off even more than they are getting ripped off today. In the long-term, though, we might see price competition, especially in personal injury, where clients will get lousy service and lawyers will get treated like dirt (picture Ask-Gary directly owning a large law firm).

It changes the motivation to provide the best legal advice, because the advice could affect the profits that a nonlawyer might get.

It could change the dynamic of lawyers serving clients to lawyers meeting budgets, without the constraints of professional responsibility.
It could, depending on the structure of the organization. Assume a partnership where the nonlawyer owns a significant percentage of the partnership. The nonlawyer partner could try to influence how a particular lawyer proceeds in a case that may be prohibited by the ethical rules, to which neither the client nor the nonlawyer are bound.

It would give my clients less choices as to ancillary services they may wish to obtain.

It would violate current conflict of interest rules.

Just like any other sponsorship, the fee is passed on to the client. The higher the nonlawyers fee, the higher costs to the client.

Money is the number one issue we are concerned about? Yes, the practice of law is a business but we still must be ethical!

My instinct is not to trust nonlawyer participation in profits. In the medical field we are seeing the pressures of non-medical persons setting profit-oriented standards and we are hearing that such practices can be questionable for the medical professionals and their patients. I would not want us to compromise our professional judgment.

My professional judgment would never be compromised by such an arrangement. But, without a doubt there are many lawyers whose less than stellar character would undoubtedly be influenced by such an arrangement.

Negative effects.

No, but if you allow that to happen, then you will open the door to patient brokering and Emergency Room runners.

Nonlawyer influences, by referrals or ownership (direct and indirect), will have some degree of influence. That influence, no matter how small it may be, will impact the legal services provided to the client. A good example is the insurance company that settles professional liability cases when the insured has not caused the liability that is claimed, but for economic reasons the case is settled as a practical matter.

Only to the extent of requiring disclosure. The business side of the practice really is the same whether being profitable in the current ownership structure of lawyers or ownership structure of nonlawyers, so long as the ethics of lawyers are not compromised. Financial pressure always exists irrespective of ownership makeup.

Perhaps decisions would be made to ensure profits rather than do what is best for the client. I see no problem in sharing law firm profits with staff and employees.

Possibly could cause conflict with nonlawyer putting pressures of money ahead of client interest and attorney's professional judgment.

Pressure from nonlawyers for profit could adversely affect independent professional judgment. Lawyers have a calling above the rules of the marketplace.
Sharing law firm profits has the potential to create the reality, if not the appearance, of nonlawyers attempting to impact the professional judgment of lawyers in an effort to impact the bottom line of the law firm.

Sharing profits with nonlawyer members of the firm makes it extremely difficult to supervise employees and maintain other ethical values. It would affect the client by allowing a non-Bar member to make decisions based on monetary gain rather than ethical values.

The ability of lawyers to act ethically would be placed in competition against need for corporate backing and corporate mentality. Gray areas in ethics would necessarily shift further toward profits over ethical behavior.

The main concern is independence of the lawyer. We just want to make sure there are reasonable restrictions to prevent that a business motive, on the part of the lawyer, does not color the advice they give to clients. However, these dangers exist now in a limited fashion because often the outcome of a matter dictates how well the attorney is compensated. Ideally, the fee structure lines up the interest of the lawyer with the best interests of the client, but in some cases it does not.

The secondary consequences of nonlawyer profit sharing are unknown, but simply cannot ultimately advance the best interests of clients.

There exists the chance to have professional judgments clouded by the opportunity to share profits with clients and nonlawyers. But ethics rules weigh in on the side of clients. And with regulated oversight of the nonlawyer partners, they also will be held to accountability. Where we run into issues is the payment of cash to non-licensed folks for client referrals. The Stark laws in medicine can provide a blueprint to avoid these issues.

There will be increased disputes between lawyers and the nonlawyers participating in the fee.

There would be more pressure to be profitable at the expense of providing client services to those who need lawyers but have limited means.

There would result an increase in emphasis on fee chasing, fee padding and gaining income over respect for fair outcomes in trials and transactions.

They are already inundated by advertising that is confusing and does not provide a good source of information.

They would have legal decisions made by nonlawyers. Are we going to follow the medical model and let major corporations run our practices? This is a terrible idea.

This series of questions is structured to allow such sharing but our foreclosure experiences and the proliferation of foreclosure firms should warn us of the dangers of setting up a law firm to be a entity reporting to nonlawyer boards who want to maximize profits and put pressure on members to generate profits. I operated in a law firm so I fully
realize the pressure is there but it is there to generate clients and new business and not to cut corners and reduce costs and take short cuts to generate profit.

* Those nonlawyers are not held to our professional code of ethics and same standards of accountability by our pears, profession at large, community and ultimate the regulators of our profession. In decisions that create an appearance of impropriety, it is the lawyer that will be holding the bag for superior knowledge (knew or should have known). Not to mention the malpractice coverage new impact. Who will be able to afford it?

* Treating a law firm like a corporation would create even more demands for "profit" returns which may adversely impact a lawyer’s professional duty to clients.

* Unless it is fee-sharing within the Rules of Professional Conduct and would assist a colleague; anything else might compromise the dwindling trust that the public has in our profession.

* While lawyering is a business, it is still a professional business and should stay that way.

* Would lead to an increase in the amount charged to clients.

* You are proposing a corporate model, which will become a mill staffed by paralegals and/or cheap, inexperienced and desperate associates. They will not serve clients well. They will put the traditional model of lawyer, who can serve them well, out of business. The small and mid-size law firms will have to sacrifice ethics and competence in order to gain investors because the investors will want it cheap and fast. Without the investors you won't be competitive. Those who don't have profit-sharing with a corporate investor will NOT be able to compete with those who do, and they will go out of business. There will be no more Atticus Finch in the courtroom. That would affect my clients, who are largely middle class, very badly.

**Positive Impact – 9 Responses**

* Benefitted by lower costs.

* Clients could be better served if nonlawyer business professionals could have a larger role (stake) in the firm's success. Lawyers are specially trained in law, not management, finance, marketing. From a business perspective, law is merely a service just like carpet cleaning. To the extent the public could be better served by more effective and efficient law firms, ownership rules could be relaxed.

* Clients could share in fees.

* I think allowing nonlawyer owners would attract capital and successful business people to the law industry. It would also allow for gross receipt based rent and/or office equipment and technology fee arrangements. This could lead to better service for clients.
I think that nonlawyer professionals could provide some input into related areas for businesses and individuals.

It would allow me to offer them more and better service. Once my client has trust in me, if I can offer related services under the same umbrella by partnering with certain other professionals, my client would be thrilled.

It would have a positive effect to the extent I could service more clients effectively.

Profit sharing may allow me to more closely involve third party professionals in representations. I note that profit sharing is not the same as "ownership". Your questions seem to confuse these issues and there are "huge" differences.

This would provide a broader range of client services under the attorney’s control/influence.
46. How would allowing for some degree of nonlawyer ownership either benefit or hinder your legal practice or law firm? If you feel it would either benefit or hinder your firm, please briefly explain:

**Hinder Practice/Firm – 82 Responses**

* Adding the needs of nonlawyer owners would add a complex dimension to an already complex organization.

* Another way for the banks to take over the delivery of services to clients.

* As I see it today, the competition would drive me out of business.

* Because I will never allow it to happen.

* Cause potential for over-billing by nonlawyers to meet financial goals.

* Clients would be represented by nonlawyer chiropractors like “Ask Gary” in my line of work and I would be out of business.

* Decisions forced by the nonlawyer could affect the sacred trust that the lawyer and client enjoy. Profit would drive a wedge between the parties.

* Hard enough to earn fee without sharing.

* Having nonlawyers owning a firm opens the door to non-licensed persons controlling the actions of licensed professionals, and could change the dynamic of lawyers serving clients to lawyers meeting budgets, without the constraints of professional responsibility.

* I already see too much of a "business of law" mentality.

* I am a full-time mediator and only in my wildest nightmares can I envision how horrible it would be to have to deal with "Ask Gary" in charge of the law firm handling a case I am mediating.

* I am not for it, but if I was able to share ownership with nonlawyers, I am sure I could increase business. But I fear the loss of the profession if it were allowed.

* I am not sure that it would affect my firm per se, but I can foresee large firms capitalized by a major client which care for nothing other than the profit in their practice.

* I believe it could cause additional ethical challenges and headaches that otherwise aren't present.

* I believe that it would force me to make decisions based upon monetary value, rather than based upon what is best for my client. We have already seen what happens when Wall Street influences other businesses. Banks made bad loans because Wall Street needed
those loans to be packaged and sold. Everyone looked the other way because everyone was making money. No one had the ethical obligation that an attorney would have to stand up and say, while this may be "legal," it is not ethical, and I cannot do it. Putting nonlawyers in a position to influence attorneys in this manner would not be a good thing.

* I believe that this would wrongly influence my opinion and practice.

* I do want any nonlawyer telling me what to do legally. If I disagree, then the nonlawyer can potentially engage in behavior which interferes with the delivery of legal services (i.e., taking clients to another firm without any need to comply with the rules which govern lawyers).

* I don't think it would impact this firm at all based upon the current partners and the current arrangements for the firm. My concern would always be the nonlawyer gaining some form of control that could then hinder the legal practice.

* I expect that it would create more competition for my firm than is already possible under the current ethic rules. I like the independence of the advisor both in appearance and in practice.

* I feel the practice of law is a profession, not a mere business enterprise. Permitting nonlawyers to be owners of a practice or a law firm potential injects the practice or firm with business principles and precepts that, in my opinion, would be at odds with principled, ethical practice of law

* I have my personal reputation and my Bar license on the line as do all members of the law firm. Nonlawyers would have profit motives with none of those risks or interests.

* I have trouble envisioning what nonlawyer would have ownership interest.

* I suspect it would lead to even greater competitive pressures to churn out legal work quickly without regard to quality.

* I suspect that it may hinder my current practice of insurance litigation or employment litigation.

* I think it would compromise your ability to objective handle matters where another nonlawyer that has an ownership interest may disagree with how something may be handled.

* I think it would make the focus on law firms more business based and less legal based.

* I think this would attract a lot of nonlawyers into the legal field who would then find ways to solicit clients that I represent.

* I won't be able to compete. I will go out of business. No one is going to invest in me without turning me into a corporate slave, so I would go out of business. These investors are not going to invest in all the lawyers, only the ones they can turn a profit on, which means young, cheap and not too ethical. I already cannot compete with the advertising.
* I would be working for someone who has little understanding of what being a lawyer is all about. His focus would be on the bottom line; not the welfare of his clients.

* I would have a master other than the best interests of my client.

* I would have to spend time making the owners happy, rather than focusing solely on the needs of the client. Anyone loses independence when someone else controls their purse strings.

* I would just be afraid that the chiropractor clinics currently running all the television advertisements that make people hate attorneys would get an even cozier relationship with the law firms and that could lead to clients getting less benefits.

* I would not like staff being supervised by a nonlawyer who is not subject to the rules of ethics or required to have the same knowledge as a licensed attorney. I believe it would result in conflicts of interest between the lawyer and nonlawyer.

* If, for example, a lawyer can share the profit of his firm with his spouse, what happens when they get divorced and the nonlawyer spouse, who does not have any commitment with the firm but the money, suddenly does not agree how the firm resources are being used just to maximize profit. What ethical principle applies to this person?

* Inhibit independent advice.

* It cannot be good for clients if a lawyer has to answer to a nonlawyer who is only interested in the business aspects of the practice. Providing legal services in the best interests of the client must be the sole consideration of the practice.

* It changes the ethics. Attorneys have high ethical standards that I do not see in other professions or in business.

* It lowers the ethical standard under which the lawyers would operate.

* It might cause nonlawyers to establish law firms and just hire grunt, limited experienced attorneys to churn out billable hours. Could be similar to the way hospitals take over medical practices.

* It might increase profits for the small group of equity partners, but it would harm associates, staff and clients.

* It should never be allowed under any circumstances, no more than a non-physician should be allowed to own a medical practice.

* It will cause an even greater public disdain towards lawyers and the practice of law.

* It would allow lawyers to go out and solicit work by using nonlawyers for that purpose. That in turn would further discredit the profession.
* "It would be more motivating to office employees to get involved in helping the office grow.

* "It would erode the ethical mindset.

* "It would hinder due to constraints placed by the nonlawyer.

* "It would hinder the entire profession because decisions would be centered on firm profits over client's best interests.

* "It would not change my practice, but other lawyers who are struggling to make ends meet might yield to temptation by sharing with nonlawyers.

* "It would permit non-attorneys to dictate the services offered by firms.

* "It would result in conflicting responsibilities, decrease pro bono work, and result in the extinction of small firms (like book stores).

* "Lawyers in different practice areas of my firm have little knowledge of what makes for good lawyering in my practice area. I cannot imagine having a nonlawyer trying to figure that out. I would be concerned that there would be too much emphasis on the bottom line rather than on good lawyering.

* "Motivation of the nonlawyer owner is to make money; motivation of a lawyer is to ethically serve the best interest of the client. If nonlawyer ownership is allowed, the legal profession would logically need to be regulated by the Florida Legislature. Nonlawyers are not subject to the Florida Supreme Court. A law firm would be just another business in the eyes of the legislature.

* "My clients depend on me as a real lawyer to represent them! A party whose interest is financial may compromise my clients as they have no ethical obligation as a lawyer!

* "My duty of loyalty would be negatively affected by my duty to make the most profit possible to my nonlawyer business partner.

* "Negative effect on advice and counsel; profits should not affect the role of the lawyer.

* "Nonlawyer ownership could affect internal decisions regarding client selection and case management. Not a positive effect.

* "Nonlawyers do not consider the legalities of things when structuring business, hiring, etc. My firm has enough problems because the partners do not go to court, so they make business decisions that may not work in actual practice. If we added nonlawyers, it would only get worse.

* "Nonlawyers have different considerations than lawyers and I could see some conflict in terms of business objectives and priorities."
Nonlawyers have no ethical duty to clients. Sharing of fees is a method which could allow law firm ownership by investors seeking returns on investment. This creates an inherent conflict between a lawyer’s professional duties and the marketplace demands.

Nonlawyers might attempt to change the manner in which I represent my clients. Nonlawyers would be telling me what to do. For-profit Law Schools are good examples of how this is bad.

Nonlawyers would increase pressure to make money rather than deliver quality services.

One possibility is nonlawyers funding cases, or places like medical clinics with a direct feed to law firms with whom they have a direct financial interest.

Only lawyers should make decisions involving a law firm.

Permitting nonlawyers to own a practice or share in fees would degrade the quality of legal services and ethical decisions.

Power structure would shift toward management beholden to profits rather than to the best interest of the client. How could this do anything but hinder a practice built upon honor, trust and goodwill?

The billing system is compliant at best. Offering nonlawyers a share of the billed fees would promote worse billing practices.

The fee structure would be bad for my "people"; most of whom are in the lower financial scales.

The focus of my practice would be less profession and even more business oriented than it is now. There would be pressures placed on profitability by those who are not constrained by the legal obligations of lawyers. This may well result in the intersection of business conflicts and ethical conflicts that should not be determined or weighed on by a nonlawyer.

The noise in the market place is already loud, adding the commercialization of investors who are not legal professionals and otherwise accountable dilutes the quality and reputation of the practice of law.

The personal injury business is sleazy enough. Adding nonlawyers would create havoc.

The professionalism of the practice could be compromised.

The profit motive for lawyers is tempered by his ethical duties including independence. It is a bad idea to have firm owners making decisions based on an unhampered profit motive. Law firms today are adept at getting good business advice and have high-ranking staff members. But the lawyers must retain control over the most important decisions.
The public wants to deal with licensed professionals. They would be leery in knowing that the people really running their legal affairs are other than licensed professionals.

The results would be more advertising. Advertising, which has ruined our professionalism, would only get worse and will eventually destroy the balance of professionalism we have left!

They would have legal decisions made by nonlawyers. Are we going to follow the medical model and let major corporations run our practices? This is a terrible idea.

They would try to take over elder law practices and they do not understand the ethics and rules we must abide by.

Think that it has more of a potential to hinder the practice than to help it. Yes, having a nonlawyer manager, for example, might make things more cost efficient or profitable, but it might also cause lawyers to be encouraged to engage in unethical billing practices or not to zealously represent a client is has less of an ability to pay.

This could create a conflict of interest.

This would result in the creation of more law firms owned by large companies. It would make it difficult to compete since these large companies could put small firms out of business. We would see the “Amazon” of law firms.

Too many legal decisions are necessary that a nonlawyer cannot competently make.

Who would control judgmental decisions for client's best interest? The lawyer or the co-owner who is not bound by the same ethical considerations and only interested in the bottom line; and how would the client feel when informed of this? A client has the absolute right to expect his lawyer to have final responsibility for representing him/her diligently, professionally, and for the client's best interests, not the firm owners if they’re not lawyers. You cannot serve 2 Master’s. If you are a professional your duty to your client [patient] must not be shared with a non-professional whose motive is profit!

**Benefit Practice/Firm – 33 Responses**

* Add accounting, property management, etc.

* Allow me to operate my cash flow on a more even manner.

* Allowing nonlawyers who are employees to participate in profits would incentivize employee productivity.

* Allowing profit sharing for an IT person, business manager, who isn't a lawyer, would allow a business to incentivize all team members which could result in better performance.
As a lawyer currently working for the government there is no impact, but I can foresee a need for capital to open and operate a law firm and a share v. loan would allow flexibility in financing. Also, it would be desirable to offer a one stop professional service center.

By being able to pay referral fees to nonlawyers, I could likely sign more clients.

Could provide better financial stability.

Easier to structure compensation arrangements.

Employee satisfaction.

From a business perspective, law is merely a service just like carpet cleaning. To the extent the public could be better served by more effective and efficient law firms, ownership rules could be relaxed.

Giving an employee an interest in a business gives that employee a stake in the success or failure of that business and encourages the employee to act accordingly.

I am in favor of allowing some level of estate planning devise. For a limited time, a surviving spouse could own a practice while working with an inventory attorney to either sell or refer out a practice. Then you would want the surviving spouse to be able to receive, in some limited way, referral fees or other compensation back to the referring firm that was owned by a decedent.

I believe there would be an economy of scale to benefit the lawyer and allow the lawyer to still remain contact with the client.

I could partner with others who provide compatible services to estate planning. For example, geriatric care managers, insurance agents, certified public accountants.

I would like to be able to tie my staff's bonuses directly to profits so they knew what they would be getting and did not always look to me for raises in bad times as well as good. I retain control. I give bonuses when things are good but, if I had a set ratio, that would help me manage my staff better.

I would like to have nonlawyer marketing and management to share in the firm's profits.

I would only consider an incentive % to current employees.

In my private practice, it would allow me to directly partner with a commercial Real Estate broker with whom I collaborate frequently.

It is called having a vested interest in building the business.

It may benefit my firm in that I would have the ability to find a money partner to fund projects, advertising or expansion rather than having to solely rely on personal credit and traditional funding.
It would allow law firms to begin to operate like actual businesses with a goal of client service, which is not necessarily the current model that affects profitability and service levels. The client's protection and rights must be paramount, however, and this must be understood by all parties.

It would allow me to offer them more and better service. Once my client has trust in me, if I can offer related services under the same umbrella by partnering with certain other professionals, my client would be thrilled.

It would allow for the raising of capital.

It would benefit my law firm by allowing us to partner with other business interests that are aligned with our goals.

It would benefit the law firm as the nonlawyers do not have to apply Florida Bar rules and therefore can generate more business by doing the things lawyers are not ethically allowed to do.

It would enable us to grow and adopt better leverage.

It would expand opportunities for business development and financing a law practice.

It would probably benefit by allowing more capital investment and the provision of more services like insurance, etc. It would still have to have ethical standards for the lawyers/law practice.

Like any other services business, the practice of law is governed by incentives. If there's an incentive to help, and the person accepts it as such, then the person helps. Trying to provide better services to clients requires a unique mix of skills. If you want to deliver that unique mix, then you need the people to deliver them. And if you cannot reward them at levels equal to or better than what they can get elsewhere, those services never get offered. We don't need artificial barriers to better services. What we need are better ways to constructively allow this to happen.

Many of the matters I deal with have interdisciplinary aspects to them, such as health planning, zoning and engineering work. The legal aspect is just one item. Not being in a coordinated organization sometimes results in communication and work flow issues. Also, not having a coordinated whole for the project is detrimental in many instances.

Opens up more opportunities to work with others.

Provides opportunities to grow the business base.

Would open up investment opportunities, which brings in needed capital for expansion and improvement of technologies, providing better and often more cost effective legal services to clients.
47. Are there client services that Florida lawyers and law firms should be permitted to offer, but are currently not permitted to offer due to the restrictions on sharing fees with nonlawyers? If “Yes”, please specify:

* Accounting. (8 Responses)
* Business Consulting. (5 Responses)
* Tax. (5 Responses)
* Financial Advising. (4 Responses)
* Insurance. (3 Responses)
* Real Estate. (3 Responses)
* Investigative. (2 Responses)
* Lobbying. (2 Responses)
* Risk management consulting. (2 Responses)
* Already ticked off that homeowner association nonlawyers are allowed to do what they jammed through our Legislature.
* Closing services, surveying and appraisal. For example, in mergers and acquisitions, many of the investment banking services cannot be offered by law firms. I think this is a tremendous opportunity being wasted. Investment banking and legal services should be allowed to be provided under one roof.
* High volume "standard" or "routine" legal matters that 90% of work/evaluation/pleading or document completion could be done by a paralegal or staff person, but must ultimately be reviewed and signed off on by the attorney.
* I help clients make money from intellectual property of all kinds, from life sciences to computer software to brands. The pace of change in technology is dynamic; what is relevant today is obsolete in three years. The patent process typically takes that long to even get started. The people who live in these industries are vital to helping lawyers ensure that strategies and tactics undertaken today will make sense in five years. And for situations where changes cannot be anticipated, that alternate strategies are undertaken in light of industry developments and norms. Even in-house lawyers cannot absorb all the ins and outs of these changes, and to amplify their ability to do so, they routinely rely on their industry colleagues to help them see where things are going and how to cope. As an outside lawyer, I would like the option to acquire similar expertise but need the leverage to be able to get them inside a hybrid law firm so that "my" financial incentives will match or exceed their industry financial opportunities.
* If I could share fees with a nonlawyer business development expert, I can practice law while he/she focuses on getting clients. Without fee sharing, I can't align my economic interests with such a person.

* Many legal matters require or could benefit from more than just legal advice. Having other professionals able to engage with clients who have such matters would better serve the clients. The ownership structure is one way to facilitate that. I would be concerned about investments in law firms purely for financial gain.

* Nonlawyer case funding companies should be allowed to share fees, especially in this current climate of institutional lenders imposing severe limitations on the availability of credit to finance law firms and cases.

* Owning a title company and offering legal services with other nonlawyer owners of the title company.

* Working with a CPA on a matter is sometimes complex due to double-billing. On the other hand, the CPA world is not as well-policed (or self-policed) as the Bar. I am in favor of multi-disciplinary practice, but not at the expense of losing the Bar's ability to regulate itself.

* You can make the argument that you can provide better entity creation advice and better transaction advice by including Tax professionals, but I have always found Tax professionals who I have been able to work out arrangements with to also represent my clients. Yes, you have to be careful to obtain the necessary consents to discuss the situation between two different professionals, but I have found that to be the best solution.
48. Do you feel that maintaining the present restrictions contained in Florida’s ethics rules impede Florida lawyers and law firms from participating on a level playing field in a global legal services marketplace that includes the increased use of one or more forms of alternative business structures? If yes, please specify:

* Advertising in Florida is too restrictive.
* Advertising rules are too strict.
* Banks and accountants are already offering legal strategy and planning services, and then hiring "pocket" attorneys to print the forms. If we are not allowed to partner with nonlawyers, we cannot effectively compete with that.
* Current rules hamper business development, practicing outside current locale, financing, fee sharing with out of state or out of country lawyers and nonlawyers.
* Enforce the Unauthorized Practice of Law Statutes, and we would not have this problem.
* Florida Lawyers should be more concerned with rendering ethical service than competing "on a level playing field". Highest ethics and work standards should "trump" trying to descend to a lower level "globally"
* Free enterprise will govern itself. If there is a need for nonlawyer fee sharing, the market should be allowed to participate.
* Funding from nonlawyers can assist the growth of a business and create an opportunity for symbiotic businesses to work together for mutual benefit.
* I do think that law firms should be able to offer ancillary but related services to their practice areas, such as consulting and brokering, and that whatever business structure makes sense to best provide those services should be allowed. However, I think it should be restricted to lawyers providing those services inside that structure, not nonlawyers.
* I often use international tax advisors who work for large accounting forms. Most of those individuals are both attorneys and CPA's. I prefer to use these advisors (rather than international attorneys) since the coverage is broader.
* I think heading in the direction of allowing any form of entity practice in the state would ultimately hurt the public's interests. Unless, and until, businesses have a fiduciary duty to their clients, the pure profit motive of the business world will not serve the best interests of the public.
* I think that it can hinder the Florida lawyers’ ability in some respects in other markets where work is obtained in a different manner than we see it in Florida. There are also restrictions on dealing and working together with different professions that restrict the attorneys’ ability to cleanly join with the participation of the nonlawyer.
Identifying the competition, as the world shrinks, Florida lawyers must compete not just with lawyers in other states, but lawyers in other countries. So far, the legal systems in countries where nonlawyers are permitted at the ownership level have not demonstrated a deterioration of legal services provided or a decline in ethical responsibilities.

Marketing of the firm should be allowed to merge on an incentive basis with the firm’s production and success.

Non law firm "consultants" essentially provide legal advice, but "law firms" cannot provide non-legal consulting services.

Not interested in the survival or fairness to mega firms. Small and sole practitioners are already at a sufficient/enormous disadvantage.

Object to the form of the question, assumes facts in evidence. For example, what evidence is there that the global legal services market is a "level playing field"- are you suggesting we compete with China or India? Our great country's Anglo-Saxon legal system goes back over a thousand (1,000) years. Are you suggesting we erase our borders and our culture and history to participate in the lawlessness that exists in non-western countries? Someday, The Florida Bar will be a call center in India. You're next if you allow this.

Obviously, whoever developed this question does not understand the audience. Regardless, in a global market the availability to attract investments is the key for market development, growth and better services.

Of course it does, but this does not mean that it is necessary or right. We should not allow something merely because others allow it. The risk to the profession outweighs any perceived unlevel playing field.

Open platforms are the future. Those who are not on board will lose competitive advantage.

Other "consultants" offer business related services viewed by clients to be fungible with some legal services

Our ethics rules should remain intact and are what, thankfully, sets our noble profession apart from other occupations.

The client population is seeking much more sophisticated services and coordinated delivery of services. In many instances they purchase these services on a third party vendor basis and project specific basis. The inability to provide these clients a complete package of services relegates the legal analysis to a second tier vendor position.

The law profession is a business, yes subject to more hurdles, but it is a business nevertheless; how can you be competitive with so many restrictions stopping young lawyers from using the expertise of other professionals in order to organize and run a business organization?
The profession of law is global and has grown both vertically and horizontally and the use of alternative business structures would serve the clients and the lawyers much better.

The rules are properly restrictive because the practice of law is associated with so much social and economic power that it should be strictly governed and disciplined, and discipline would suffer if extended to nonlawyers.

Theoretically yes, but I have not lost any business to a CPA/lawyer firm overseas. This is more relevant to a larger firm who may be courting international business clients.

There is certainly pressure from "one stop" shops that include accountants, administrative permitting specialists, nonlawyer lobbyists, etc. My concern is that human nature is such that the loss of additional business to be generated if a client completes a purchase or transaction or makes a particular choice, could affect the independent judgment of the lawyer counseling the client on the legal risks and benefits of such transaction.

There should be a wider ability of lawyers to provide consulting services, agent services, and management services to clients. As it stands, others that are not impeded by difficult ethical rules can provide such services. Although I think that attorneys should be able to provide such services, I also believe that they should continue to be subject to ethical requirements. What needs to be changed, however, are the arcane conflicts restrictions. They create artificial restrictions that are not imposed on other professions and are based on antiquated concepts relating to attorneys powers of persuasion.

We play in a global marketplace. The debate about hybrid law firms is thirty years old. Arnold and Porter had a hybrid law-consulting firm at least as far back as 1987. We still don't have them in Florida, though we compete against the Big 3, and we are ceding the future to forward thinking others with the vision to build a better platform from which to offer services to clients.

Well, there is a question phrased in such a way that it is obvious what answer you are seeking!

Yes, and that is the price that lawyers should pay for the ability to practice law. The restrictions may well impede Florida law firms, but at some point the idea of professionalism and the practice of a profession should triumph over monetary concerns.
49. What types of non-lawyer service providers (other than administrative assistants, paralegals, receptionists and support staff) currently assist you in serving your clients? (RESPONSES FROM THE “OTHER” CATEGORY)

* Expert Witnesses. (10 Responses)
* Financial Advisors/Planners. (8 Responses)
* Investigators. (8 Responses)
* Engineers. (7 Responses)
* Business Consultants. (4 Responses)
* Insurance Professionals. (4 Responses)
* Land Planners. (4 Responses)
* Real Estate Brokers. (4 Responses)
* Surveyors. (4 Responses)
* Environmental Consultants. (3 Responses)
* Human Resources. (3 Responses)
* Interpreters. (2 Responses)
* Investment Advisors. (2 Responses)
* Mitigation Specialist. (2 Responses)
* Social Workers. (2 Responses)

* As a criminal trial lawyer, I often used experts from many different fields, and regularly ran fact patterns and shared photos of crime scenes (especially homicides) with friends in the medical profession. I also consulted & retained accident reconstructionists for applicable cases.

* As one of the lawyers for a county, there are numerous county staff and departments which provide support as subject matter experts and as witnesses.

* Bankers, non-profit organizations, government entities, etc.

* Billing department.

* CAMs.

* Contract managers and administrators in state government.
* Contractors. FDOT has significant resources and responsibilities to serve its clients.
* Court reporter.
* Development Director (non-profit).
* Economists, Auditors.
* Guardian Ad Litem.
* Health Planning.
* I employed having a CPA full time to not only audit my accounts but assist me in estate and trust planning.
* I go to a PR firm, an accountant, a computer expert, etc., to get these services!
* If by "assist" you mean having a client employ one or more of the nonlawyer service providers enumerated then yes, I do, when it is in the best interests of my client, advise them to employ one or more of the nonlawyer service providers enumerated.
* Lobbyist is a lawyer.
* Managers and Talent Agencies.
* Municipal Lien searches.
* Patent artists, product design.
* Private counseling providers and providers of community services and housing.
* Receivers.
* Scientists; Experts in Foreign Manufacturing\Sourcing; Other Technologists (engineers; FDA regulatory folks) of all kinds.
* Title companies.
* Trust officers.
* Victim service professionals.
* Zoning compliance firms.
51. If you were permitted to have nonlawyer partners in your firm or legal office, would you do so? If yes, what types of nonlawyer partners would you hire? (RESPONSES FROM THE OTHER CATEGORY)

* Business Consultants. (6 Responses)
* Marketing Professionals. (6 Responses)
* Investment Consultants. (4 Responses)
* Real Estate Broker. (3 Responses)
* CEO/CFO. (2 Responses)
* Land Use Consultants. (2 Responses)
* Office Managers. (2 Responses)
* Paralegals. (2 Responses)
* Builder, developer and architect.
* City planners.
* CPA.
* Customs Brokers.
* I would still farm such services out to professionals, and have the client deal with another nonlawyer professional independently after the initial consultation.
* If I were, it would be title services.
* In order to stay competitive and survive the new wave I will be forced to reorganize and bring changes to include permissible nonlawyer partners from financial area.
* Insurance specialist.
* Investigators.
* Lobbyist.
* My brother for his business acumen and entrepreneurial skills.
* My spouse.
* Property Appraiser.
* Scientific or engineering advisers for environmental matters.
* Scientists; Experts in Foreign Manufacturing\Sourcing; Other Technologists (software, hardware, chemical engineers; electrical engineers, prototyping folks, FDA regulatory folks) of all kinds.

* Support staff.

* Surveying, health planning.
53. Please list any comments, suggestions or feedback regarding alternative business structures, nonlawyer ownership, or nonlawyer participation in law firms for The Florida Bar’s Vision 2016 Commission:

* Advertising has destroyed the professionalism of the law practice, therefore, remove all barriers and let the chips fall where they may.

* Allowing nonlawyers to participate in law firms is a slippery slope similar to the relaxation of restrictions on financial institutions. While it all sounds good in theory, it does not work well in the practical business world. Again, look to what happened in the financial world where deregulation led to the financial crisis. Greed would end up corrupting the ethical practice of law.

* Although I have answered #51, let's face it, how realistic are these statements to the potential practical application in the future? For example, in #51: "The lawyers who have a financial interest or managerial authority in the organization undertake to be responsible for the nonlawyer participants to the same extent as if nonlawyer participants were lawyers." OK, so that provides for discipline of those who are responsible for nonlawyers, but there does not seem to be any discipline for the nonlawyers directly. So, the nonlawyer may be able to escape, leaving the responsible lawyer taking it all alone. Please compare this to the now rampant corporate practice of medicine (prohibited in several states). The financial pressures were already great, but the addition of non-physicians as owners of medical practices has added pressure that, in my opinion, has decreased in many instances, the quality of services. For some of the non-physicians, either lack of knowledge of, or indifference to, practice issues has caused financial factors alone to be of primary importance. I believe that quality should also be of joint primary importance and the two must be balanced at an acceptable level for each case. Who would regulate the nonlawyers? They are not licensed by The Florida Bar, so where would the authority come from to regulate them? Too much in our world is becoming unstructured, as if certain items of importance over the years do not matter anymore. There are reasons nonlawyers are excluded. Those reasons have not changed. Only the desire of people to do what one cannot presently do has changed for some lawyers. I really do not care whether law firms can compete on a global level. Although I am solo, I know that there is already a great deal of pressure from other lawyers in large law firms on employed attorneys. I can only imagine the multiplication of this pressure by the addition of nonlawyers who are not regulated by The Florida Bar and thus may not share all of the risks involved resulting from their pressure.

* Always, follow the money. That's where the motivation is, except for a few altruistic people.

* Attorneys should maintain more than 50% control of firm.

* By considering having nonlawyers share in legal fees, you are going down the wrong road.

* How can a lawyer be responsible for monitoring, for example, an accountant? Isn't the point to assist lawyers in providing other types of services for competition reasons? Why
would I do so if I can get in trouble for the advice someone in another profession provides?

* I do not favor having nonlawyers hold ownership in a firm; however, I see no reason that lobbyists or a special skilled person cannot work in the firm.

* I express complete and total opposition to a mixed practice setting. Clients can be served in other ways, such as retaining experts, as needed.

* I feel that to allow nonlawyers to own a shareholder interest in a law practice would become a slippery slope, with non-professionals dictating the ethics and practice.


* I suppose I'm "old school." I referred folks to these other professionals, and engaged experts as needed. My feeling is that our legal judgment should not be in any way "impaired" or even influenced by whether another partner would "profit" from my telling the client to consult with that nonlawyer professional. I see a huge window for abuse here. Why wouldn't less than highly ethical attorneys tell their clients to "see the CPA down the hall" for their opinion? I can see it becoming the same as doctors ordering multiple tests that aren't totally necessary, or at all necessary, either for profit, or "in an abundance of caution." There's just too much room for abuse.

* I think allowing for nonlawyers to provide funding or bring to the table a necessary missing element such as accounting to an attorney who assists clients primarily with tax issues is forward thinking and with the right safeguards can only improve services that are offered.

* I think that if the sole purpose of the organization is to provide legal services, that profit sharing with nonlawyers should be disallowed.

* I think these concepts undermine the practice of law.

* I would hold the legal professionals responsible for the Rules of Professional Conduct. To the extent at which there are interdisciplinary services, those ethical rules need to be coordinated. I actually think that with many professionals all subject to ethical requirements that a higher level of ethical checks and balances will come about. Right now the ethical guidelines for lawyers are significantly out of step with the changes that have gone on in the world and are unnecessarily restrictive. The limitations imposed by the lawyer ethical standards are causing clients to seek services elsewhere.

* If an entity or organization needs legal counsel, it already can have a staff attorney, where the relationships are clearly defined. The alternative business structures, etc. put the lawyer in conflict if there is any advising of clients of the organization. The lawyer's duty is then to the organization, rather than to the client.

* If any portion of the "business" entity practices law, than the conduct of any employee or owner must be subject to the Rules of Professional Conduct for anything related to the actual practice of law.
If I die or become incapacitated, I would like to be able to have my spouse close out my firm and trust accounts, and close out my P.A.

If nonlawyers are permitted to participate in law firm ownership/management, they need to be bound by the same ethical code/rules of conduct that govern lawyers. I am concerned that inclusion of nonlawyers in some instances could erode the already precarious ethics in some firms.

If nonlawyers have an ownership interest, then lawyers need to be responsible for their activities. However, that is a very slippery slope, which will ultimately lead to the conversion of the legal profession to a business entity regulated by the legislature.

If there is malpractice by the nonlawyer, you can bet that the lawyer of the firm will be sued as that one would have the deepest pockets. I would not want to be responsible for some nonlawyer's malpractice.

In 51. Item 1. It really depends on how you define legal services. I think it encompasses the entire commercialization process. For example, in registering a patent for a person who is looking to profit from that idea, some people think legal services is the paper aspect of the patent process. I think it’s the entire commercialization process- idea to market and then some. The nonlawyer professionals brought into play could help in any part of this process. Are they doing business or practicing law? Item 3. If we create a system where nonlawyer professionals are regulated like Florida medical personnel, then a nonlawyer regulated person can be accountable on a stand-alone basis to the regulatory authority. If we create a system where everything a nonlawyer professional does is attributable to the lawyer, then it's the lawyer backing the process.

In my practice, we are often tied to accountants for the services that they provide during association turnovers and throughout the year. It would be strong for both if a formal partnership bond could be made and perhaps in some form be formally incorporated into a business arrangement, that would help to provide a greater benefit to the client and to the law firm.

It is obvious that the Bar has fallen under the influence of corporate lobbyists who want to take over the profession and set up huge corporate mills and wrest control of the profession from the actual lawyers.

It is only good in the context of a system that continues the same ethical standards that currently exist with nonlawyer ownership forbidden.

It is The Florida Bar that is unique in its governance as an arm of the Supreme Court of Florida via the Integration Rule. I feel that any dilution of the practice of law is contrary to public policy where we include others whose only motive is profit and are not bound by the same ethical obligations as lawyers. A move towards the dilution of law firm ownership might result in the political dissolution of The Florida Bar and subject the practice of law and its other partners to regulation under the Department of Professional Regulation like doctors, nurses and chiropractors. Lawyers, as Officers of the Court, have a special place in the third branch of government. Our historic responsibilities should not
be jettisoned, diluted or be allowed to be co-opted by any another profession for lucre. We must search for a way to modernize without endangering our profession's historic position.

* Law business needs to adapt to fluid marketplace. It should be about what we can do, not what we can’t do.

* Nonlawyer ownership in anything other than a passive position is extremely dangerous as there is no oversight of an unregulated individual.

* Nonlawyer ownership is a very bad idea. At best, it is being naively driven.

* Nonlawyer ownership of law firms will be the final death knell of professionalism and we will merely be Vendors like car salespeople.

* Nonlawyer ownership should not be allowed. Nonlawyer profit sharing in total profits, not on a per case basis, should be allowed.

* Nonlawyers should be employees only. Law firms should be law firms, not banking, accounting or financial advisors. If a lawyer wants to do something other than practice law, there are options. Accounting firms hire lawyers and banks hire lawyers- both for in-house non-legal positions. The lines are clear and should stay that way.

* Nonlawyers should never participate in any manner or, to any extent, in ownership or management of a law firm. Any such conduct will erode the integrity, ethics, professionalism, skill and independent judgment of the lawyer(s) which must never occur, as our present rules state.

* Nonlawyers should not be permitted to own interests in law firms.

* Other than fee sharing with nonlawyers in limited circumstances, no other nonlawyer participation or ownership should be permitted. There is too much of a risk of compromising an attorney's independent judgment.

* Please do not allow it.

* Reality is that if I am adding in non-attorneys, my "law firm" would change to a "business consulting" or "business solutions" company. That may very well be a good thing, but its primary function is no longer legal services. I can definitely see the appeal but I personally still would prefer to keep the law firm and the legal advice separated from the other parts of that company. I just see conflicts there.

* Seems odd that I could have a nonlawyer as a partner, but not an attorney who is a member of another bar unless that attorney takes the bar exam in Florida.

* Some limited nonlawyer involvement could be helpful, but watch out for big company takeovers of law firms like they have been doing with accounting firms.
That last question is highly deceptive. I am totally opposed to nonlawyer ownership of law firms. I am NOT going to say that I agree to some particular restrictions on nonlawyer owners or lawyer owners working with those nonlawyer owners. There should be no nonlawyer owners.

The legal profession exists to provide ethical legal services to clients. Structures should not be allowed to be diluted or bastardized to allow nonlawyers to have an interest in a law practice, for whatever reason.

There are undeniable business aspects to the practice of law, and many lawyers are not good business people. However, opening the door to nonlawyer owners in the name of business efficiency will move the practice towards business and away from professionalism. Most importantly it would move the profession farther out of the reach of most people.

There is a real balancing act between being able to offer certain services in bundles and allowing for the professional independence that is required of, particularly, attorneys and CPAs. I am in favor of multi-disciplinary practice, but I think you have to tread very carefully. The demise of the CPA firm Arthur Anderson is instructive. You have to know who your partners are and what they are doing. This may pose more issues in a multi-disciplinary setting. However, conflicts of interest are just as possible in a multi-area law firm (Family Lawyer feels compelled to take a frivolous case because his law partner represents the client in a variety of lucrative Real Estate matters).

There should be boundaries in place and confidentiality agreements regarding client information, as well as background checks on the nonlawyer participants, but holding an attorney responsible for non-attorneys who may not appear (on the face of things) to be acting under the direction or on behalf of attorneys would have a chilling effect on those attorneys even entering into this type of arrangement.

These ideas/restrictions are so aspirational as to be totally absurd! I took an oath and I do not want to be responsible for supervising a nonlawyer who has financial considerations as their first duty!

This is a hot topic in New York where international firms are expanding services and allegedly thereby getting a competitive advantage. Whether it serves clients or not, I don't know.

This should not even be on the table. It is outrageous.

Those nonlawyers should be held themselves responsible for their wrong doing as if lawyers since they are entering the business of law. To have the lawyer holding the bag is not only unfair but naive in this time and age. After all, the issue is only being discussed because to survive as a profession that is becoming powerless we need strength from adding other to our sanctuary. If a nonlawyer wants part of my business responsibility and accountability are part of the deal in an equal basis. Otherwise, keep them out.
Though I am not a "firm owner or partner" I believe ownership should be restricted to lawyers who are required to abide by the Florida rules of professional conduct. Allowing for nonlawyer owners can create issues, particularly where those individuals do not have to abide by those same rules. And, the idea of making the lawyer responsible for the nonlawyer is ludicrous, particularly where the nonlawyer may own a majority stake in the business. This creates a slippery slope where lawyers may be responsible for the actions of the majority shareholder in their firm, which seems to be problematic. If ownership is restricted to lawyers, then everybody is responsible for their own actions. I am, however, ok with a certain degree of fee splitting so long as there are regulations enacted to ensure that kickbacks are not occurring (see federal regulations regarding healthcare kickbacks, for a model).

Under no circumstances should nonlawyers be able to own or participate in the profits of a law firm. This is a dangerous step that, once taken, cannot be unwound. It would open the floodgates of major corporate takeovers of law firms and move legal services to the medical practice model where profits for the owners will override sound professional advice.

We are already "ambulance chasers" (regardless of your practice area) to the public. We do not need another degradation of the profession to make it easier to practice. If you don't want to run with the big dogs, go do something else.

We are losing professionalism to profit-making.