MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 28, 2012

TO: Nicole A. Vikan, NALP Board Liaison, Public Service Section

FROM: Leeor Neta, NALP Chair, Public Service Section

RE: NALP Public Service Section Board Report

CC: Meghan Grenda, NALP Member Services Coordinator
Fred Thrasher, NALP Deputy Director

_________________________________________________________________________________________________________

Please find below a report of the Public Service Section’s activities during the first quarter of the 2012-2013 NALP year.

Summary

The Public Service Section has had an incredibly active quarter. I have had one-on-one conference calls with every Vice Chair and held the Section’s first quarterly conference call last month. Each of the work groups has already established its goals for the year. The Vice Chairs have also provided me with quarterly benchmarks so that I may easily evaluate their progress. An impressive number of Section members have volunteered with work groups and most of the work groups have conducted their first conference calls. The Section submitted 14 program proposals for next year’s Annual Conference and has collected a full slate of Bulletin articles.

Working Group Updates

Shortly after returning from the NALP Annual Education Conference in Austin, I arranged one-on-one conference calls with each of the Section’s Vice Chairs. During each call, I explored the Vice Chair’s vision for the work group and obtained benchmarks for determining the work group’s progress throughout the year. I also encouraged them to engage with and explained how to use NALPconnect. These calls took place in early May.

The Section’s first quarterly conference call took place on Tuesday, May 15. Subsequent calls have been scheduled for Tuesday, August 14; Thursday, January 24; and Thursday, March 28. The calls have been posted as events on NALPconnect.
1. **ABA Accreditation Revision Process**  
   Vice Chair: Keeley Mitchell, University of Pittsburgh School of Law

   Last year, this work group reviewed the ABA’s proposed changes and explored how those changes might affect public interest programs for purposes of performance and accreditation. Keeley is interested in asking law schools under ABA review if the ABA asks about public interest and pro bono programs and, if so, what it asks. Representatives from NALP recommended that the work group conduct targeted outreach calls, rather than survey all law schools. I expressed interest in seeing an external article on how ABA changes affect public interest and pro bono programs. The work group held its first conference call on Tuesday, June 19.

2. **Diversity in Public Service Employment Sector**  
   Vice Chair: Matt Gewolb, Columbia Law School

   Matt is interested in exploring how groups other than NALP promote diversity, what schools are doing to encourage diverse students to pursue public interest opportunities, and what diversity preferences are prevalent among public interest employers. Matt suggested that his work group could conduct research on one or more of these questions over the summer and plan a forum on the subject for the NALP Mini-Conference. One other idea is to publish an article advising counselors on how they can encourage diverse students to pursue public interest opportunities. Steve Grumm expressed interest in the issue of how diverse students can afford public interest careers.

   During the summer, the work group plans to:
   
   - Take steps to determine NALP’s role in encouraging diversity in public interest legal practice;
   - Gather information on law school best practices relating to encouraging diversity in public interest legal practice; and
   - Consider what other stakeholders should be included in such efforts and conduct appropriate outreach.

   The work group will hold its first conference call on Wednesday, June 27.

3. **Government Career Resources**  
   Vice Chair: Kim Bart, Duke Law

   Last year, this work group revised and updated the Federal Government Resources page on PSLawNet. Another update might be needed. Last year’s work group had also planned to produce a handout on state-by-state government hiring procedures. A questionnaire was created and each work group volunteer agreed to research a few states. The work group was unable to proceed past this point. I suggested that this year’s volunteers might be willing to work on it this summer under Kim’s leadership. Kim indicated that Dean Bauman may have spearheaded a similar project at one time. She
agreed to contact Dena about this project. We also discussed how the work group could create a short handout on the OPM’s changes to its internship and employment programs, and a handout on changes to the PMF.

The work group has scheduled its first conference call on Monday, July 9. Members of group will brainstorm goals for the year.

4. **Loan Repayment Assistance Programs**  
   **Vice Chair:** Kirsten Hill, UC Davis School of Law

   Kirsten and I are both intrigued by the idea of collecting substantive but anonymous data about different LRAP programs. One idea is to create a best practices guide for schools that are creating or growing LRAPs or coordinating LRAPs with the College Cost Reduction and Access Act. We also discussed potential articles for the NALP Bulletin and other outlets.

   The work group held its first conference call on Thursday, June 14. Kirsten solicited research assistance in support of the LRAP best practices guide. The group created a list of schools to target and issues faced by schools attempting to establish or grow their LRAPs. The group decided to hold monthly calls on the second Thursday of each month.

5. **NALPconnect**  
   **Vice Chair:** Jessica Kitson, Rutgers School of Law - Newark

   The NALPconnect work group is a new addition. During our one-on-one call, Jessica and I discussed how the work group could persuade listserv members to join NALPconnect, how we should suggest that Vice Chairs interface with NALPconnect, and how our Section could generate regular discussions and announcements.

   Jessica and I agreed that every Vice Chair should post a bio and a picture. We also agreed to encourage the Vice Chairs to post their conference calls as events on NALPconnect, and to post resources and other work group product to NALPconnect. I communicated this message to the other Vice Chairs during our one-on-one conference calls.

   Jessica and I also agreed that the Section should post regular discussions and announcements. Jessica would like to host weekly discussions that post Monday. I agreed to ask Vice Chairs to brainstorm an initial list of discussion topics. Steve and I will review and prioritize these, and Jessica’s work group will post them. If needed, the work group can turn to Steve’s bulletin for discussion topics.

   On Wednesday, May 2, Jessica sent a message to the Section through NALPconnect. The message served as a NALPconnect cheat sheet. She immediately followed this with a message on the listserv that pointed out what listserv members may have missed. Going forward, this work group will compare the list of NALPconnect section members with listserv recipients and send targeted emails. Due in part to these efforts, the Section now has 210 members.
The work group held its first conference call on Wednesday, June 6. The work group began to identify possible NALPconnect discussion topics. John Chen encouraged the group to focus more on open-ended discussion item questions and less on factual information (fellowship deadlines, regional job fairs, etc.), which doesn’t lend itself well to open dialogue.

6. **Annual Education Conference Program Proposals**  
   Vice Chair: Andrew Chapin, Fordham University School of Law

   During my one-on-one conference calls and the first quarterly conference call, Andrew and I encouraged as many Section members as possible to submit proposals. Ultimately, the work group submitted 14 presentation proposals and two plenary suggestions.

7. **NALP/PSLawNet Public Service Mini-Conference Planning**  
   Vice Chair: Danielle Sorken, Brooklyn Law School  
   Vice Chair: Nicole Vikan, Georgetown Law School

   The 2012 NALP Public Service Mini-Conference will take place on Thursday, October 25, 2012, in Washington, DC (with Public Interest 101 on October 24). The work group held its first conference call on Tuesday, June 5, and its second call on Wednesday, June 20.

   The work group has created a schedule for the conference that includes a welcome and introductions, a Section meeting, a town hall discussion, PSJD updates, the Pro Bono Publico Award presentation, three breakout sessions, a plenary, and an evening reception with government recruiters

   For the plenary, the work group is exploring a session on individualized student assessment and coaching. The work group is considering a NALP member with experience in these areas to serve as the facilitator. Another idea is to host a plenary on the changing legal landscape and how to get public interest work experience, e.g., funding, bridge programs, in-house, etc.

   In terms of topics for the breakout sessions, the work group is considering the following:

   - How to support public interest students who feel lost in a private sector law school environment
   - How to administer mandatory pro bono programs, best practices in pro bono, how to use pro bono to bring students into one’s office, etc.
   - How to network in the public interest
   - Updates on bridge-to-practice fellowships, e.g., alternative hosts and funding
   - Beyond the Government Honors Programs
• Advanced session on public interest resumes
• Judicial clerkships as a route to public interest
• Technology for the public interest job search

The work will glean other program ideas from the list of our Section’s Annual Conference proposals.

8. Publications
   Vice Chair: Samantha Z. Kasmarek, Syracuse University College of Law

   Sam is committed to expanding the audience for our section’s work product. She has created an initial list of potential publication outlets. I am very supportive and have encouraged Sam to consider a manageable target number of external publications so that the work group has a goal. I suggested two external publications in the coming year.

   Sam and I have asked as many Vice Chairs as possible to author articles on their work group’s activities. As of last week, Sam collected enough article proposals to nearly fill the Bulletin for the entire year. She needs to collect only two more proposals.

   Sam has also persuaded NALP member Teresa Schmiedler to author a piece in the fall issue of the ABA’s Government and Public Service Section’s newsletter. The piece will explore how to maximize the experience of one’s interns.

   Vice Chair: Philip A. Guzman, North Carolina Central University School of Law

   This work group is primarily responsible for administering and analyzing findings from the Public Interest Employment Trends survey. This year, NALP is committing greater resources to this work group. Steve has reviewed the survey and believes it needs no revision. Phil is reviewing the survey this week, and will then pass it on the other work group volunteers for comment.

   The survey will be launched after Labor Day and will remain open through the first week in October. Phil is planning to present on the survey’s preliminary findings at the Mini-Conference. The work group will aim to publish a final report in the January Bulletin.

   Environmental Scanning

   Through the weekly PSLawNet Bulletin, Steve Grumm performs weekly environmental scanning of public service issues. Two issues that have received considerable attention during this quarter:

   • The chief judge of New York State, Jonathan Lippman, announced at a Law Day ceremony on May 1 that, starting next year, aspiring lawyers must perform 50 pro bono service hours before joining the state bar.
• The Department of Labor (DOL) is contemplating forbidding the use by law firms of law students on pro bono projects without compensation.

Potential New Work Groups

1. **Experiential Learning**

   Meg Reuter at New York Law School has been working closely with Sandee MaglioZZi at Santa Clara Law on a survey that evaluates the importance of experiential learning. This survey of junior lawyers was conducted under NALP auspices. Meg and Sandee have reviewed the data and are now exploring next steps. This includes an evaluation of how the survey data informs proposed changes to legal education and public interest programs at NALP member schools. It is also contemplated that the survey will be conducted on a semi-regular basis. Meg and I are interested in creating a new work group that is either housed under the Public Service Section or run jointly by the Public Service Section and the Law Student Professional Development Section.

2. **Law Student Pro Bono**

   One of the Section’s members has proposed a new work group addressing law student pro bono. Since the New York State Judiciary imposed a mandatory pro bono requirement for admission to practice, Danielle Sorken has been researching best practices for administering law school pro bono programs. Most of the resources she has identified pertain to lawyers, not law students. Steve Grumm and I are exploring whether it makes sense to create a work group dedicated to creating best practices for law students in pro bono. The work group could potentially create a clearinghouse of paperwork from different law school’s pro bono programs.