



**THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN
LAWYERS®**

the voice of women in the law™

A NAWL REPORT

**NATIONAL SURVEY ON
RETENTION AND PROMOTION OF
WOMEN IN LAW FIRMS**

NOVEMBER 2007

Copyright 2007. All rights reserved.
For additional information, call (312) 988-6186
or e-mail nawl@nawl.org.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN LAWYERS®

2007 Survey of the Status of Women in Law Firms¹

The National Association of Women Lawyers (“NAWL”) is pleased to present the results of its second annual National Survey on the Status of Women in Law Firms (“Survey”).

The impetus for the Survey stems from the relatively slow progress of women lawyers into the upper reaches of private practice. For almost three decades, women have graduated from law schools and begun their legal careers in private law firms at about the same rate as men. But women advance into the upper levels of law firms with only a fraction of the success enjoyed by their male classmates.² The reasons why have been the subject of some research and much commentary³ although not a good deal of objective data about how firms advance women into senior roles.⁴

The NAWL Survey is the only national study that annually tracks the professional progress of women in law firms by providing a comparative view of the careers of men and women lawyers at all levels of private practice, including senior roles as equity partners and law firm leaders, and compensation. By compiling objective data in an annual Survey sampling the nation’s largest 200 firms⁵, NAWL aims to provide (a) an empirical picture of how women forge long-term careers in firms and what progress is being made in reaching the highest positions in firms, (b) benchmarking statistics for firms to use in measuring their progress, and (c) over a multi-year period, longitudinal data for cause and effect analyses of the factors that enhance or impede the progress of women in firms. NAWL also encourages state and local bar associations to take up the

mantle of this Survey, and NAWL would be pleased to work with such organizations to extend the Survey to local arenas.

Snapshot of the 2007 Survey Results

- Women do not enter the room in large numbers where law firm partners meet. Women lawyers account for only about 16% of equity partners – those lawyers who own shares in their firms and occupy the most prestigious, powerful and best paid-positions. Put another way, for every 100 equity partners in the average large firm, 84 of them are men.
- There are decided differences in promotion to equity partner depending on when women graduated from law school. In the most senior partner classes, those graduating before 1980 when many fewer women were admitted to law school, fewer than 10% of equity partners are women. In classes graduating between 10 to 25 years ago, when classes were 40% to 50% female, the percentage of women equity partners increases to about 20% – higher but still not close to the proportion of female lawyers in those classes who started their careers as law firm associates. While these findings suggest that almost three decades of consistently high numbers of women graduates has been a factor for advancing women into senior positions, the high number alone has not been enough to achieve the rates of law firm advancement that are enjoyed by men.
- Women have yet to break into the leadership ranks of large firms in meaningful numbers. A small minority of managing partners are women, fewer than 10%. Women fill a minority of the seats on the highest governing

committees of large firms. On average, only about 15% of the seats on a firm's governing committee are filled by women. A remarkable 15% of firms report *no* women at all on their highest committee.

- There is a continuing income disparity between men and women lawyers at each rung up the partnership ladder. While 2007 compensation for associates is roughly parallel between men and women lawyers, in the average firm male of-counsels earn roughly \$20,000 more than females, male non-equity partners earn roughly \$27,000 more than females, and male equity partners earn almost \$90,000 more than female equity partners.
- Women working in firms with higher hours requirements have no better chance of progressing into senior partner positions than women working in firms with lower hours or no hours requirements. Hard work does, however, have a financial pay-off, especially for men. At firms that either have no hours requirement or are below the median on required hours for partners, male equity partners earn, respectively, \$73,000 and \$51,000 more than female equity partners. At firms with high hours requirements, men who are equity partners earn a whopping \$140,000 more than women in the same position.
- Women lawyers work part-time in much greater numbers than their male counterparts. In the average firm, one in 50 male lawyers is working part-time, while close to 1 in 8 female lawyers is working part-time. The timing of part-time work also differs by gender: for the most part, women tend to work

part-time early in their careers, while men work part-time only after spending many years in practice.

- The vast majority of firms – 93% – have implemented women’s initiatives, to assist women in developing the skills and connections needed to sustain a long-term legal career. It has become the rare large firm that does not have some type of program for developing careers for their women lawyers.

We now turn to specific results and more detailed analyses.

What Positions Women Occupy in Law Firms

We asked firms to identify the breakdown of lawyer positions by gender for junior and senior associates, of-counsels, non-equity partners⁶ and equity partners. In the average one-tier firm, about 55% of the lawyers are associates, about 8% are of-counsel and about 36% are equity partners. In two-tier firms, there is a steeper structure: about 43% of lawyers in the average two-tier firm are associates, 7% are of-counsel, 19% are non-equity partners and 30% are equity partners. For the largest 100 firms, there is even a smaller ratio of equity partners – 25% of the firm’s lawyers in two-tier firms and 33% in one-tier firms. These smaller numbers at the top are offset by a greater number of associates.

Representation of women in professional positions decreases at each level of promotion. Promotion at levels from junior to senior associate is not especially a problem. Women constitute 49% of first- and second-year associates, 47% of mid-level associates, and 43% of 7th-year associates.⁷ Beyond the associate level, however, there is a fall-off of women lawyers at each level of the partnership. Women go from 47% of associates to 30% of of-counsels to 26% of non-equity partners to 16% of equity partners.

Thus, almost one out of two law firm associates is a woman, which approximates the law school population but at the highest level of law firm practice, equity partner, in the average firm only one out of six equity partners is a woman.⁸

Some progress appears to have been made. For the relatively small number of women lawyers graduating before 1980, only 9% have become equity partners. The picture changes for those graduating in the past 25 years, a time when women made up a generous proportion of law school classes. Overall in the average firm, roughly 20% of equity partners who graduated from law school from between 1980 and 1995 are women. But the rates of women equity partners from these classes are not comparable to the roughly even ratio of female to male attorneys who entered firms as associates.

We also found that the rate of women equity partners differed in firms with a one-tier versus a two-tier partnership structure – 17% and 15%, respectively. While the actual difference is not large, the difference is statistically significant, because the one-tier firms consistently have a greater percentage of women equity partners than the two-tier firms. Whether these findings mean that a two-tier firm is less conducive to the advancement of women lawyers within law firms is a difficult issue. One-tier firms have a greater percentage of women equity partners but two-tier firms have a healthy cadre of non-equity women partners (26% in the average one-tier firm), at least some of whom are presumably on track for equity partnership. On the other hand, anecdotally, the non-equity tier has been a traditional repository of female lawyers who advance to the equity level much less frequently than their male peers.

We observe generally that the difference between the substantial number of women at associate levels and the marked reduction in women in the equity ranks may

have serious implications for whether and how firms can achieve gender balance. At the bottom end, newly minted lawyers – male and female alike – see few women reaching the top of the profession within their organization. There are fewer successful women role models; fewer opportunities for men and women alike to work with senior women lawyers; and fewer women to mentor more junior lawyers, male or female. The danger is also that these numbers create a self-reinforcing culture of negative expectations, that women will not proceed in large numbers into senior positions. Those women lawyers who do achieve the position of equity partner frequently find themselves in gender-imbalanced groups, which may further limit their opportunities to advance themselves and others.

The of-counsel position also warrants a closer look. Some seven percent of all lawyers in the average firm are of-counsels, and women lawyers are well-represented in this category. Looking at lawyers graduating from law school in 1980 or later, the average firm counts some 40% to 45% of its of-counsel lawyers as women, with minimal variation by year of graduation. In contrast, the average firm counts 13% of its most senior “of counsel” lawyers – those who graduated from law school before 1980 – as female. The low number probably reflects the absence of many women at all in this cohort.

Historically, the of-counsel position has been reserved for a small number of senior lawyers transitioning to retirement. With women lawyers, however, the numbers go in the opposite direction. Many firms market their of-counsel lawyers as similar in skills, experience and ability as young partners – and that similarity may exist. But these numbers raise a question about whether the of-counsel position is a detour for women

lawyers who have moved off the traditional partnership track with no “on-ramp” back from a lower-paying and lower-prestige law firm rank.⁹

Are Women in Law Firm Leadership?

The Survey identified the gender composition of the highest governing committees of firms as well as the gender of managing partners. Firms reported an average of 11-12 members on their highest committee. Women comprise an average of 15% of the membership of the highest governing committee, a ratio that is the same for both one-tier and two-tier firms. We note that the overall gender ratio for membership in governing committees is roughly the same as the overall ratio of women who are equity partners (16%).

There is a significant range to these results. About 10% of firms report that a quarter or more of members of their highest governing committee are female. At the other end of the spectrum, 25% of firms report that their governing committees are composed of 10% or fewer women members. And, a striking 15% of firms – roughly one in seven of the nation’s 200 largest firms – report *no* women members on their highest governing committees.

The position of managing partner shows a similar picture. Ninety-seven percent of firms report the position of managing partner. But, women make up only 8% of all managing partners – a much lower ratio than their numbers as equity partners would predict. There appears to be an effect associated with law firm structure. At one-tier firms, women hold 6% of the managing partner positions and at two-tier firms, the statistic is 9%.¹⁰

In short, women members of law firm governing committees are rarer than women equity partners. The percentage of women managing partners shows an even greater gender disparity. Alone or together, these statistics show that women are not advancing to the highest levels of firm management in numbers equal to their representation at the equity partnership level, much less their representation at other levels of the firm.

The Continuing Compensation Gap between Female and Male Attorneys

As in its 2006 Survey, NAWL asked a number of questions about partner compensation.¹¹ With respect to gender of their highest paid lawyer, men continue to be overwhelmingly at the top of law firm compensation: a male partner is the highest compensated partner in 90% of the responding firms.¹²

NAWL also asked firms to report the median compensation level for men and women lawyers at all levels. Associate compensation is roughly equal between men and women, a relatively expected result given the lock-step approach used by most large firms to compensate associates. Further up the partnership ranks, and as expected in this population of the nation's largest firms, lawyers earn a good income. Beyond the associate level, however, women fared worse than men. The average median compensation for male of counsels in all firms is \$208,000 in contrast to \$188,000 for females of counsels. The average median compensation for male non-equity partners is \$263,000 compared to \$236,000 for females at that level. The average median compensation for male equity partners is \$625,000 in contrast to \$537,000 for female equity partners.

In combination with earlier data from the 2006 Survey, these results show a continuing trend of income disparity between men and women lawyers. While 2007 compensation for associates is roughly parallel between men and women lawyers, male of counsels earn roughly \$20,000 more than females, male non-equity partners earn roughly \$27,000 more than females, and male equity partners earn almost \$90,000 more than female equity partners.¹³

These differences are troubling. At least at the equity partner level, the explanation for income disparity may be partially attributed to the substantially greater number of senior male equity partners compared to senior women equity partners.¹⁴ However, the gaps at the non-equity and of-counsel levels suggest that women may be generally under-compensated for their contributions to their firms. The data certainly raise questions (although they do not answer them) about whether women lawyers are given as many choice assignments, introductions to key firm clients and other opportunities to grow their own practices in ways valued by their firms, to the same extent as men. Further, with the lack of appreciable growth over many years time in the percentage of women equity partners, we would anticipate that women partners in law firms will continue to struggle to gain income parity with men. That is one reason why we would look increasingly to law firms policies and practices to provide the proper context and support for women lawyers. We also encourage firms to evaluate their criteria for equity partnership, and how changes in law firm policies and practices may enhance the prospects for promoting women.

The Impact of Firm Policies Aimed at Retaining Women Lawyers

The problem of women advancing in private practice has been the subject of much commentary,¹⁵ and prominent among the criticisms have been excessive hours requirements, lack of meaningful part-time work policies, and poor attention to helping women develop the business skills and business opportunities that impact career success. While individual women lawyers have been aware of these problems for a number of years, it has only been recently that law firms have begun to focus on their role in possible solutions.

NAWL's position is that individual lawyers on their own cannot overcome these structural barriers. It is essential for law firms to provide the policies and programs needed to draw women into long-term careers in firms. Otherwise, firms will continue to be overwhelmingly male enclaves without meaningful gender diversity, with all that such a culture lacks for retaining talented lawyers generally and developing corporate business.

Against that background, it is appropriate to ask, what are the nation's leading law firms doing to address the situation? For the first time in the 2007 Survey, we asked questions aimed at determining the extent to which firms are implementing policies to enhance the retention and promotion of women lawyers. Over time, we expect to determine the extent to which such policies demonstrably affect women's success in law firm practice.¹⁶

Minimum Hours Requirements

Law firms, and especially the larger firms, are viewed as requiring their lawyers to work an inordinately large number of hours. Many believe that ever-increasing hours have a disproportionate impact on women attorneys because of the tensions between the time required for work and family responsibilities. In searching for useful background information, we determined that there is very little hard data about what firms actually require with respect to minimum hours and thus a paucity of objective facts about law firm expectations and the impact of billable hours on the retention of women lawyers. As a result, we added questions on this topic to the 2007 Survey. We asked firms whether they impose minimum hours requirements on associates, counsel, non-equity partners and equity partners and, if so, what those requirements are.¹⁷

With respect to imposing a minimum hours requirement, 79% of firms reported that they prescribe a fixed number of minimum hours at least for associates.¹⁸ Firm structure made a significant difference, with two-tier firms being much more likely to have minimum hours than one-tier firms.¹⁹ Twenty-one percent of firms with a one-tier partnership structure impose minimum hours requirements at all levels, compared to 51% of two-tiered firms. The Survey suggests that two-tier firms are more demanding of their lawyers' time at every level of the partnership, and that movement into upper levels of firms does not provide much relief.

We also note that the absence of formal hours requirements may not mean that lawyers in such firms work fewer hours than others. Our data suggest that firms with no formal level of required hours enjoy higher levels of profits per partner than those firms below the median on required hours. This result may be a function of a "floor meets

ceiling” effect in firms with lower hours requirements, that once an individual lawyer reaches the required level of hours, there is little incentive to exceed it. In firms without hours requirements, internal competition and the lack of knowing ‘what is enough?’ may push lawyers to take on more work, at a level comparable to firms with required hours, thus increasing the average revenue per lawyer and profits per partner.

With respect to the *number* of hours required of lawyers, firms varied substantially. The range of reported minimum hours required of associates varied from a low of 1750 to a high of 2100. Among firms that reported hours requirements, the median hours requirement for associates is 1925, while a substantial minority of firms, 22%, require their associates to work 2000 or more hours. The requirements for of-counsels and partners (whether equity or non-equity) are somewhat less onerous. The overall median hours requirement for of-counsels was roughly 1900, the median requirement for non-equity partners was 1825 hours, and the requirement for equity partners generally was 1800 hours.²⁰

With these data in mind, we examined whether hours requirements had an observable relation to the percentages of women associates, counsels, and partners. We found that women working under various hours requirements have no greater or lesser chance of progressing into senior positions.

We also looked at whether higher required hours, even if they reduce the time available for family and non-work activities, at least provide a greater career benefit. Firms with higher hours requirements have the same percentage of women equity partners – overall 16% – as firms with lower or no hours requirements. Satisfying the hours requirements of your firm may be a prerequisite to promotion but choosing a firm

that requires more hours has no apparent effect on the odds of promotion to equity partner. With respect to compensation, higher hours requirements do translate into substantially higher compensation for equity partners, but that is especially so for men. While male equity partners earn on average almost \$90,000 more than female equity partners, in firms with higher hours requirements, men equity partners earn a whopping \$140,000 more than women in the same position. Equity male partners in firms with no hours requirements earn \$73,000 more than women at that level; and equity male partners in firms with lower hours requirements earn an average \$51,000 more than their female counterparts.²¹

Part-Time Schedules

Firms were asked whether any of their attorneys were working on a less than full-time basis, defined as less than 80% of full-time practice, with breakdowns by gender and seniority.

One hundred percent of responding firms reported that they had at least one attorney working on a part-time basis. Women are about six times more likely than men to work part-time. Among all firms, a median of under 2% of male attorneys work part-time while a median of 13% female attorneys work part time. In other words, in the average firm, one in 50 male lawyers is working part-time, while one in eight women is working part-time.

When we examined the relative seniority of male and female attorneys who work a part-time schedule, a distinct pattern emerged. Women work part-time early in their careers, while men work part-time after spending many years in practice. Although there are some differences between one- and two-tier firms, the pattern holds true across the

board: women who graduated after 1995 and men who graduated before 1976 form the largest share of attorneys who work part-time.²²

Most women practicing fewer than twenty years are still in their childbearing/child-rearing years and it is these women, by and large, who are opting for a part-time schedule. But the marked decrease in the number of women lawyers generally beyond 10 years in practice also suggests there are substantial obstacles to women returning either to full-time or part-time practice in their potentially most experienced years. Whatever factors influence the frequency of part-time work for women in earlier years appears to have no meaningful effect on men. For men, part-time work is most strongly associated with approaching retirement.

If women are so much more likely than men to work on a part-time basis, there is a question about whether firms are devising part-time work policies that allow a lawyer to progress into higher levels of the firm, even if progress is not necessarily at the same rate as full-time lawyers. Questions about level of commitment may lead firms to limit their investment in women who are working part-time: for example, by denying them choice assignments, or excluding them from client development activities. If part-time work is not to become a dead-end rut that disproportionately affects junior women attorneys, firms must devise coherent policies that define part-time work as one temporary stage in the context of a full legal career. Such policies would recognize the value of investing in attorneys working part-time including participation in mentoring and professional development activities, which will help them transition back to full-time practice at the appropriate time.

Women's Initiatives

The 2007 Survey also asked, for the first time, questions about the presence and functioning of women's initiatives. We defined a women's initiative as a program directed specifically to the firm's women lawyers which includes professional development activities, social networking events or a formal mentoring program. There is growing interest throughout the business sector in using these kinds of activities to prepare high-potential women for leadership roles and improve rates of retention and advancement.

Ninety-five percent of firms reported sponsoring a women's initiative.²³ Thus, one may reasonably infer that almost all firms perceive an advantage in such programs, for recruiting, retention or otherwise. We also asked about the types of activities that are encompassed within women's initiatives, and there the responses became more diverse. The data show that 94% of firms include social networking as part of their women's initiatives; 90% report professional development as part of their women's initiatives; and 59% report a formal mentoring program as part of their women's initiative.²⁴

These statistics beg a more fundamental question: whether such activities have any demonstrable effect on women's success within the firm environment. From a business perspective, we found the presence of social networking events to be positively correlated with profits per equity partner. This may simply suggest that the most profitable firms are disproportionately including social networking activities within their women's initiatives; however, an intriguing possibility is that firms which groom their women (and probably also men) attorneys to be rainmakers and relationship managers are on to something which translates into higher per-partner profitability. While it is too

early to expect measurable cause and effect relationships, there appears to be no downside, for firms or women lawyers, to sponsoring or participating in a women's initiative. In fact, a firm without such an initiative is in the distinct minority.

Conclusion

NAWL conducts its annual Survey to provide reliable benchmarks about the status of women in private firms and the factors that impede or advance the retention and promotion of women lawyers in private practice. We know from our experiences in collaborating on diversity programs with private law firms around the country that there is a desire to implement meaningful, concrete steps that proactively increase the number of women lawyers at the more senior levels. We thank all of the firms who participated in the Survey, and we also thank our Law Firm Members and Sponsors for their interest in initiatives like the NAWL Survey and their cooperative efforts to enhance the role of women in the profession.

Appendix on Survey Methodology

The NAWL Survey was sent in late Winter 2007 to the 200 largest firms in the U.S. as reported by *American Lawyer*.²⁵ Although most private practitioners work in smaller settings, we chose to focus on these larger firms because they compose an easily defined sample on a national basis and their results would be viewed as benchmarks for the larger profession.

The Survey solicited information about each firm, as a whole, as of March 1, 2007, regarding the firm's U.S.-based lawyers. The questionnaire asked about total law firm size; number of male and female associates, of-counsel, non-equity and equity partners; whether the firm was a one-tier or two-tier partnership; median compensation and highest compensation by gender; representation on the firm's highest governing committee; and gender of the managing partner. There were additional breakdowns by level of seniority as defined by year of graduation from law school. In 2007, the Survey also asked about various types of professional development programs, women's initiatives, required billable hours and part-time status.

As part of the Survey, NAWL committed not to publish individual law firm data, which was secondary to our goals of finding out how women were doing in the aggregate and setting overall benchmarks. The Survey was developed and administered by NAWL. The analysis was assisted by Navigant Consulting, Inc.²⁶, which generously contributed its time and resources to this project in validating the statistical calculations. It should be noted that the analyses, conclusions and opinions expressed in this report are solely the views of NAWL.

Response Rates

A total of 112 firms responded to the Survey. In the 2007 Survey, responding firms were significantly larger than non-responding firms in terms of gross revenue, net operating income, and number of lawyers. Responding and non-responding firms had similar revenue per lawyer, profits per equity partner, gross revenue growth rates, and regional distribution.

The Survey's compensation questions obtained a lower response rate than any other portion of the Survey, with 55 firms responding. Responding and non-responding firms did not differ with respect to number of lawyers, percent female lawyers at all levels, and growth rate of gross revenue. Responding firms did show significantly lower gross revenues, lower revenue per lawyer, lower net operating income, and lower profits per equity partner. As a result, we are comfortable that the compensation data are valid for all sizes of firms within the 200 largest firms and regardless of the ration of female lawyers within the firm. It is unclear the extent to which the compensation analyses apply equally to the most profitable firms in the population of large firms although we have no basis to believe the analysis would differ.

¹ Copyright 2007, all rights reserved. The NAWL National Survey of the Status of Women in Law Firms is copyrighted by the National Association of Women Lawyers and may not be used or duplicated without written permission. This report was authored by members of the NAWL Survey Committee, including Stephanie A. Scharf, Chair, Schoeman, Updike, Kaufman & Scharf; Sharon L. Caffrey, Duane Morris LLP; Alexander Cavallo, University of Chicago; Barbara Flom, Jenner & Block LLP; Lorraine Koc, DebShops, Inc.; and Cheryl Tama Oblander, Winston & Strawn LLP. Other members of the Survey Committee who provided substantial assistance and advice in the course of implementing and analyzing the Survey include Alicia Harrison, Starnes & Atchison LLP and Kathleen Russo, Hughes, Hubbard & Reed.

² See data provided by NALP, the National Association for Law Placement, at www.nalp.org.

³ See, e.g., L. Blohm and A. Riveria, *Presumed Equal: What America's Top Women Lawyers Really Think About Their Firms*, (Authorhouse 2006); American Bar Association Commission on Women in the Profession, *Visible Invisibility: Women of Color in Law Firms* (September 2006); L.S. Rikleem, *Ending the*

Gauntlet: Removing Barriers to Women's Success in the Law (Glasser Legalworks 2006); T. O'Brien, *Why Do So Few Women Reach the Top of Big Law Firms?* New York Times, March 10 2006; Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia, *Creating Pathways to Success*, May 16, 2006; H. English, *Gender on Trial* (ALM Media, Inc. 2003); M. Harrington and H. His, *Women Lawyers and Obstacles to Leadership* (MIT Workplace Center 2007); J. Pigott and S. Jones, *Walking the Talk: Creative a Law Firm Culture Where Women Succeed* (ABA Commission on Women 2004).

⁴ Existing surveys focus disproportionately on the retention of women associates, too frequently homogenize the important distinction between non-equity and equity levels of partnership, largely ignore the role of women in the upper reaches of law firm governance and compensation and do not take consistent measures of law firms as a whole.

⁵ As compiled by American Lawyer. ALM Research makes available the AMLAW 100 and AMLAW 200 databases in electronic format.

⁶ Non-equity partner in a position largely associated with two-tier partnerships. The one-tier firms we surveyed had fewer than 5 % non-equity partners in its partnership. In this report, statistics about non-equity partners refer to two-tier firms.

⁷ There are some differences between one- and two-tier firms, with one-tier firms counting about 55% of their lawyers in the associate ranks and two-tier firms counting about 43% of their lawyers in the associate ranks. Of course, two-tier firms have a far greater percentage of non-equity partners, some 19% compared to fewer than 5% for one-tier firms.

⁸ There is a range among firms in the percentage of women who are equity partners, the highest reported percentage is 28%, and the lowest reported percentage is 6%.

⁹ Joan C. Williams, Jessica Manvell & Stephanie Bornstein, *"Opt Out" or Pushed Out?: How the Press Covers Work/Family Conflict*, Center for WorkLife Law, U.C. Hastings College of the Law (2006), pp. 2, 6, 8, 23-25, 40, 48-49 available at <http://www.worklifelaw.org/pubs/OptOutPushedOut.pdf>.

¹⁰ Several two-tier firms responded that a man and a women together hold the managing partner position.

¹¹ Not surprisingly, the questions on compensation generated a lower response rate than any other question. However, there was a sufficiently robust response rate – and almost double the response rate in the previous survey – for us to draw conclusions from the data. Of those firms responding, roughly 80% were two-tiered firms.

¹² Eighty percent of the responding one-tier firms report that their highest compensated partner is male; and 92% of the two-tier firms report a male is their highest compensated partner.

¹³ In the 2006 Survey, male of counsel earned \$202,000 while female of counsel earned \$184,000, representing an \$18,000 difference; male non-equity partners earned \$239,000 to \$207,400 for female non-equity partners, or a difference of \$31,600; and male equity partners earned \$510,000 to \$429,000 for female equity partners, or a difference of \$81,000.

¹⁴ We did not have enough data to review statistical comparisons by seniority – whether women and male equity partners who are relatively recent graduates are closer in income than those partners who are among the most senior members of firms.

¹⁵ See, e.g., *supra* note 3.

¹⁶ As we move forward with successive years of the Survey, we plan to rotate in and out of the Survey these and other questions measuring aspects of law firm policies that have a potentially meaningful impact on retention and promotion of women lawyers.

¹⁷ A number of firms reported that the minimum hours required for attorneys varied. Since these firms responded affirmatively that minimum hours were required, we consider them to have minimum hours requirements.

¹⁸ The questions about minimum hours did not distinguish between work performed for paying clients or pro bono clients. The focus was on whether a firm required its attorneys to work a certain number of hours, not the nature of the work that was required. In addition, some firms reported minimum hours requirements but stated that the requirements varied by individual. We classified these firms as having minimum hours requirements.

¹⁹ Among two-tier firms, the large majority (92%) require associates to meet an hours standard while about half of the one-tier firms (52%) impose an hours standard.

²⁰ Minimum hours required of of-counsels ranged from 1400 to 2000, minimum hours required of non-equity partners ranged from 1600 to 2100; and minimum hours for equity partners ranged from 1550 to 2100. An annual standard of at least 2000 hours was not common above the level of associate. Interestingly, there were substantially fewer responses from firms regarding how many hours are required of those in of counsel positions, and several firms responded simply that the requirements varied. We expect that is because counsel positions are generally occupied by lawyers who have a variety of work arrangements even within a single firm. That standard was required of of-counsels by only 12% of firms, of non-equity partners by only 9% of firms, and of equity partners by only 10% of firms.

²¹ While these statistics are based on data from about half the Survey sample, they are consistent with data from the 2006 Survey.

²² On average, men who graduated in 1975 or earlier represented 43% of part-time male attorneys. Males graduating in 1976 or later consistently account for a little more than 10% of part time lawyers. The opposite trend occurs for women lawyers. The large majority of part-time women, over 80%, graduated less than 20 years ago, with about one-half of all part-time women graduating in 1996 or later. A very small percent of part-time women lawyers are from more senior law school classes, less than 5%.

²³ The percentages were nearly identical for one-tier firms (95%) and two-tier firms (97%).

²⁴ We also invited respondents to describe “Other” activities. Although the responses were too few and diverse to permit analysis, they suggest that firms are approaching retention issues creatively. A dozen firms reported that they provide mentoring programs for men as well as women. Two firms indicated that they are currently developing a structured mentoring program. Six firms reported that they have client development events specifically for their women lawyers, while three firms sponsor community service, charitable or public interest activities for women lawyers. Three firms described holding retreats specifically for women lawyers.

²⁵ The list of the largest 200 firms was published by *American Lawyer* in 2006 and was the basis for the population of firms surveyed in early Winter 2007. Other data about these firms was obtained from lists published in “The AmLaw 100”, *American Lawyer* May 2007, and “The AmLaw 200”, *American Lawyer* June 2007.

²⁶ Navigant Consulting, Inc., an international firm that provides dispute, financial, regulatory and operational advisory services to public and private sector clients, may be found at www.navigantconsulting.com.