Findings from the NALP Workplace Questionnaire

by Judith N. Collins, Director of Research

The NALP Workplace Questionnaire (WQ) is designed to provide information about some of the policies and practices of legal employers that contribute to the quality of life and the atmosphere of the workplace. While some version of the WQ has been in place since 1990, until recently it was not possible to use WQ information to benchmark law firm practices across the industry.

Now, however, NALP is able to provide a tabulation of most of the items on the WQ, based on the 637 offices that had completed the WQ online as of mid-June 2005.

Some background and methodological notes should be kept in mind when reviewing these findings.

- Although a few schools require completion of the WQ in order to interview on campus, the WQ has been and remains a largely optional informational piece that legal employers can choose to complete and file with schools at which they interview and/or as part of their listing on *www.nalpdirectory.com*. Employers completing the form tend to be larger firms, often with multiple offices.
- An online version of the WQ first became available in August 2002. (If an employer has completed an online WQ, it can be accessed from their listing in *www.nalpdirectory.com*.) The information presented here is based on WQs

completed since that time. Approximately 40% of the offices included in the 2005 results completed the form prior to 2005, and therefore some information may not be current. However, it should be noted that employers are not required to resubmit this information every year but are instead encouraged to update their WQs when information changes. Thus information provided prior to 2005 is not necessarily stale, as it may not have changed.

The findings presented here are based on private law offices only. WQs completed by corporate, government, and public interest organizations are excluded.

The information presented here provides a useful benchmark against which to compare an individual office's response, as well as an assessment of practices at these firms on a variety of programs and policies. However, whether the information captured on the WQ represents the most meaningful lines of inquiry is a question that can be debated, and one that NALP's Recruitment Practices Committee continues to weigh. In addition, while an organization's WQ provides a useful starting point from which to learn about a firm, it cannot adequately capture the many intangibles, unwritten policies, or specifics of written policies that contribute to a workplace environment. Additional research on specific policies and programs of interest is always appropriate.

NALP Workplace Questionnaire

(percentages based on 637 law offices unless otherwise noted)

Size of Office Completing Ques (Figures based on 614 offices)	tionnaire
2-10 lawyers	2.3%
11-25 lawyers	7.6
26-50 lawyers	11.2
51-100 lawyers	15.2
101-250 lawyers	20.5
251-500 lawyers	15.0
501+ lawyers	28.2

Associate Training, Development, and Diversity

What types of training and professional development opportunities does your organization offer? In-house training programs 96.9% External firm-paid seminars 95.8 CLE 99.2 Organized/formal mentor program 86.0 Trial advocacy training 79.1 Observation opportunities 93.2 Practice group training 90.1 Retreats 75.7 What roles do partners/senior attorneys play in the training of attorneys? Presenters 93.1% Develop/design training programs 90.7 Mentoring 96.9 99.2 Supervise projects One-on-one training 91.7 **Did Not Answer** Yes No (DNA) Does your organization have a formal evaluation program in place? 96.7% 2.8% 0.5% Program described as: 73.9% Annual Semi-annual 42.7 Top down 62.6 Bottom up 11.3 Attorney self-evaluation 54.3 Peer review 8.0 Partner review 57.6 360 Degree 6.8 Activities to increase presence and retention of under-represented groups: Participation in minority job fairs 79.0% Outreach to law student groups 71.7 Directed mentoring efforts 49.0 Recruitment at schools with large minority enrollment 63.6 Participation in bar-sponsored programs 74.1 Involvement of employer committees 58.9

Associate Compensation and Benefits

A set lock-step system		42.8%		
A combination lock-step and merit system		28.7		
A lock-step system with variable component		16.1		
A merit system		8.4		
If not strictly a lock-step system, what criteria are salaries? (Figures based on 359 offices that checked of				
Hours billed	90.3%			
Quality of work	83.5			
Overall contribution		82.1		
Pro bono hours		65.3		
Business development		64.5		
	Yes	No	DNA	
Has your organization offered annual bonuses to eligible associates in the past five years?	97.2%	1.7%	1.1%	
		ate 5 bonas.	•	
		87.6%		
(Figures based on 619 offices that indicated "yes" above				
(Figures based on 619 offices that indicated "yes" above Hours billed		87.6%		
Quality of work		87.6% 83.5		
(Figures based on 619 offices that indicated "yes" above Hours billed Quality of work Overall contribution		87.6% 83.5 82.1		
(Figures based on 619 offices that indicated "yes" above Hours billed Quality of work Overall contribution Pro bono hours		87.6% 83.5 82.1 65.3	DNA	
(Figures based on 619 offices that indicated "yes" above Hours billed Quality of work Overall contribution Pro bono hours	e)	87.6% 83.5 82.1 65.3 64.5		

Parental Leave/Family Care (Benefits in Addition to Those Provided by FMLA)

	Yes	No	DNA
Does your organization have a written parental leave or family care policy?	86.5%	12.4%	1.1%
Have one or more attorneys made use of your policy in the past 12 months?*	94.9	4.5	0.5
Are attorneys currently using this benefit?*	92.0	7.4	0.5
Does your policy include adoptions?*	90.7	6.7	2.5
Does your policy cover children/dependents of:			
Same sex domestic partners?*	74.2	18.3	7.4
Opposite sex domestic partners?*	66.4	26.7	6.9

* Figures based on 551 offices that reported having a written policy.

	Yes	No	NA or DNA
Does your organization offer a flexible spendir	ng account for	:	
Dependent care	91.2%	5.3%	3.5%
Health care	92.2	4.2	3.6
Does your organization offer use of a childcare facility?	45.7%	52.0%	2.3%
Of those who said yes (291):			
Is facility for emergency use only?	87.3	12.0	0.7
Is facility on-site?	19.6	77.0	3.4

Alternative Work Options

		Yes	No	DNA
Does your organization have a written alterna	tive			
work option policy?		71.3%	25.3%	3.4%
			Case-by-	
	Yes	No	Case	DNA
Does your organization allow:				
Job sharing	1.6%	73.3%	18.4%	6.7%
Flex-time	28.3	27.3	38.6	5.8
Telecommuting	32.0	25.9	36.0	6.1
Part-time schedule	70.6	2.5	25.6	1.3
What determines eligibility for alternative wor (Figures based on 624 offices that offer at least one o		ve)		
Case-by-case			96.5%	
Minimum time with employer			19.2	
Level of legal experience			8.5	
			Case-by-	
	Yes	No	Case	DNA
schedule either affirmatively or on a case-by-case basis) Are attorneys who work part-time and exceed their agreed upon part-time hours compensated in some manner for the	28.1%	22.3%	45.2%	4.4%
additional hours? (Figures based on 613 offices)	54.6	5.2	33.8	6.4
	ed on			
If so, how are they compensated? (Figures bases 542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co		n)		
		n)	33.09	%
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co		n)	33.09 61.4	%
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co Salary adjustment		n) No		
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co Salary adjustment	Yes Yes	No nus consid	61.4 Case-by- Case deration?	DNA
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co Salary adjustment Bonus consideration Are attorneys who work alternative schedules (Figures based on offices that allow the alternative of	Yes Yes	No nus consid	61.4 Case-by- Case deration?	DNA
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co Salary adjustment Bonus consideration Are attorneys who work alternative schedules (Figures based on offices that allow the alternative of Number of offices is shown in parentheses.)	Yes Yes given bor	No nus consid ative and c	61.4 Case-by- Case deration?	DNA e basis.
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co Salary adjustment Bonus consideration Are attorneys who work alternative schedules (Figures based on offices that allow the alternative of Number of offices is shown in parentheses.) Job sharing (127)	Yes given bor n an affirm: 17.3%	No nus consid ative and c 3.9%	61.4 Case-by- Case deration? case-by-case 58.3%	DNA e basis. 20.5%
542 offices that said yes or case-by-case to co Salary adjustment Bonus consideration Are attorneys who work alternative schedules (Figures based on offices that allow the alternative of Number of offices is shown in parentheses.) Job sharing (127) Flex-time (426)	Yes given bor n an affirma 17.3% 50.0	No nus considerative and considerative and considerative and consideration of the second state of the seco	61.4 Case-by- Case deration? case-by-case 58.3% 27.7	DNA e basis. 20.5% 18.8

60.6%

17.3%

17.1%

5.0%

In the past 5 years, have attorneys made partner who have worked or are currently

working an alternative schedule?

(Figures based on 624 offices offering at least

one option: job sharing, telecommuting, flex-time, or part-time work)

Pro Bono Policies and Practices

pro bono cases?	about and/	or are assig	gned
Circulated memorandum		38.0%	
Circulated e-mail		68.4	
Pro bono coordinator		71.1	
Pro bono committee		56.8	
Random assignment		27.6	
	Yes	No	DNA
If an associate is interested in a particular kind of pro bono in which your organization is not	10	NO	
•	96.4%	0.9%	2.7%
of pro bono in which your organization is not currently engaged, is the associate free to bring in the work for consideration for possible			
of pro bono in which your organization is not currently engaged, is the associate free to bring in the work for consideration for possible	96.4%	0.9%	2.7%
of pro bono in which your organization is not currently engaged, is the associate free to bring in the work for consideration for possible representation by the firm?	96.4% Yes	0.9% No	2.7% NA or DNA