

**Center for the Study of
Applied Legal Education (CSALE)**

***2025-26 Survey of
Applied Legal Education***

by

Robert R. Kuehn
Washington University in St. Louis

David A. Santacroce
University of Michigan

June T. Tai
University of Iowa

Sarah R. Boonin
Suffolk University

Research Assistance: Roshni P. Patel

The Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education Board of Directors:

Sarah Boonin, Suffolk University Law School
Bradford Colbert - Mitchell Hamline School of Law
Deborah Epstein - Georgetown University Law Center
Peter Joy - Washington University in St. Louis School of Law (Secretary)
Robert Kuehn - Washington University in St. Louis School of Law (Vice President)
David Santacroce - University of Michigan Law School (President)
Susan Schechter - University of California-Berkeley School of Law
June Tai – University of Iowa College of Law
Charles Weisselberg - University of California-Berkeley School of Law

© 2026 The Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education. Permission is granted to reprint all or part of this report, provided the use is not for profit and reference is made to this report. All other rights reserved.

For additional information or customized reports on CSALE data, please contact:

The Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education
University of Michigan Law School
801 Monroe Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
(734) 763-4319
administrator@csale.org
www.CSALE.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW	- 1 -
II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS, AND METHODOLOGY.....	- 2 -
The School Programs and Instructor Surveys.....	- 2 -
Survey Methodology	- 3 -
III. SURVEY OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS RESULTS	- 3 -
Respondent School Characteristics.....	- 3 -
Identifying Information (Program Oversight)	- 5 -
Law Clinic Courses.....	- 6 -
Field Placement Courses.....	- 9 -
Enrollment Policies	- 13 -
Student Demand.....	- 15 -
Experiential Education Program.....	- 17 -
Instructional Staffing.....	- 17 -
Promotion and Retention Standards.....	- 23 -
IV. INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS – LAW CLINICS.....	- 23 -
Instructor Profile.....	- 24 -
Clinic Focus and Structure.....	- 26 -
Case/Legal Work Component	- 28 -
Classroom Component.....	- 32 -
Additional Terms.....	- 34 -
Technology.....	- 34 -
Summer Law Clinic.....	- 35 -
Amount of Free Legal Assistance	- 35 -
V. INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS - FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES	- 36 -
Instructor Profile.....	- 36 -
Field Placement Course Structure and Focus	- 39 -
Credits	- 42 -
Fieldwork Component	- 43 -
Classroom/Reflection Component.....	- 44 -
Additional Term	- 45 -
Evaluation and Monitoring of Field Placement Offices.....	- 45 -
Summer Field Placements	- 47 -
VI. INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS – INSTRUCTOR PROFILE.....	- 48 -
Individual Characteristics	- 48 -

Employment Status/Term and Compensation	- 50 -
Governance and Other Responsibilities and Opportunities.....	- 54 -
Recruitment Process.....	- 58 -
PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS	- 60 -

Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education (CSALE)

2025-26 Survey of Applied Legal Education

I. OVERVIEW

This report summarizes the results of the Center for the Study of Applied Legal Education's (CSALE) *2025-26 Survey of Applied Legal Education*. The *2025-26 CSALE Survey* is CSALE's seventh triennial survey of law clinic and field placement (i.e., externship) courses and educators. The results provide insight into the state of experiential legal education in areas like program design, capacity, administration, funding, and pedagogy, and the role of clinic and field placement educators in the legal academy. Law schools, legal educators, scholars, and oversight agencies rely on CSALE's data. They do so with the summary results provided here, the [earlier reports](#) on CSALE's 2007-08, 2010-11, 2013-14, 2016-17, 2019-20, and 2022-23 surveys, and through hundreds of customized reports cross-tabulating aspects of the data that CSALE provides upon request. Information on obtaining a free, customized report is available at www.CSALE.org.

The *2025-26 CSALE Survey* is composed of two parts. A *Survey of School Programs* was directed to American Bar Association (ABA) accredited law schools through the person with oversight over, or greatest knowledge of, the clinic and field placement programs at each school (typically a director or associate dean). The respondent was, in turn, asked to provide email addresses for all full-time law school employees teaching in a law clinic or field placement course at their school, as well as any part-time employees/adjuncts who direct or have primary responsibility for a clinic or field placement course.¹ Each of those persons was invited by email to fill out the *Survey of Instructors* that asked about their clinic and field placement courses and employment relationship with the law school. The survey instruments are available at <https://www.csale.org/#csale-survey>.

The CSALE surveys have evolved over their seven iterations. This survey, like prior iterations, was designed to maintain consistency to track changes in responses over time but also updated where necessary to capture changes in legal education. Because of these changes, differences in responses to some questions across surveys may not perfectly correlate. Also, where there have been changes in answer percentages worth noting in this summary format, we provide comparisons to prior survey responses. The results from

1. The Survey does not include any person primarily employed by a host office outside the law school who supervises field placement student fieldwork, nor any person who is primarily a podium/doctrinal teacher who may oversee a few clinic or field placement students or help teach some clinic or field placement class sessions. The Survey also does not include part-time/adjunct faculty who assist in teaching a clinic or field placement but do not direct or have primary responsibility over the clinic or field placement course.

prior surveys are available in similar reports under “[Survey Results](#)” on the [CSALE website](#) and, with some limitations, in raw format from CSALE directly.

The results reported here are made possible by the more than 1,200 survey participants. CSALE and the many who rely on this data are indebted to each of them. Finally, much of CSALE’s work is made possible by the generosity of the University of Michigan Law School, Washington University in St. Louis School of Law, University of Iowa College of Law, Suffolk University Law School, and charitable donations from schools and legal educators who utilize CSALE’s data.

II. SURVEY STRUCTURE, FOCUS, AND METHODOLOGY

THE SCHOOL PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTOR SURVEYS

The *2025-26 CSALE Survey* is divided into two parts. The first is the *Survey of School Programs*, which was sent to the person at ABA accredited law schools with primary responsibility for the law clinic and field placement program at the school.² Ninety-four percent of law schools responded (a list of those schools appears at the end of this report). The *Survey of School Programs* gathered information about each school’s clinic and field placement programs, instructional staffing, and hiring and retention practices for clinic and field placement instructors.³

The second part of the *Survey*, the *Survey of Instructors*, was answered by more than 1,200 law clinic and field placement instructors at 95% of law schools. The *Survey of Instructors* collected information on 700 law clinics and 175 field placement programs and biographical and employment information from persons teaching full-time in law clinic and field placement courses.

2. The survey does not include law schools in Puerto Rico.

3. “Law Clinic” is defined in the survey as: A credit-bearing course under ABA Standard 304(c) that provides a substantial lawyering experience that involves advising or representing one or more actual clients or serving as a third-party neutral, with direct supervision of the student’s performance by a faculty member and a classroom instructional component (includes “hybrids” if your school reports them to ABA as law clinics). “Field Placement” is defined as: A distinct credit-bearing course separately listed in the school’s course directory/catalogue under ABA Standard 304(d) that provides a substantial lawyering experience that is reasonably similar to the experience of a lawyer advising or representing a client or engaging in other lawyering tasks in a setting outside a law clinic under the supervision of a faculty member and under the supervision of a licensed attorney or an individual otherwise qualified to supervise. It may or may not include a classroom instructional component but does require some means of ongoing, contemporaneous, faculty-guided reflection.

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey responses were collected online through the Qualtrics survey platform. Invitations to complete the *Survey of School Programs* were sent to a representative at each school in September 2025, asking questions about the 2025-26 academic year. Email invitations to participate in the *Survey of Instructors* were sent to law clinic and field placement instructors in February 2026. Multiple reminders were sent to non-responders during each survey administration. The survey closed in late May. The next CSALE survey will be conducted during the 2028-29 academic year.

III. SURVEY OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS RESULTS

The *Survey of School Programs* grouped questions about law clinics and field placement courses and staffing into eight sections: Identifying Information (Program Oversight); Law Clinic Program; Field Placement Program; Enrollment Policies; Student Demand; Experiential Education Program; Instructional Staffing; and Promotion and Retention Standards. The results are summarized below.

RESPONDENT SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

School and Location

Of the 94% of law schools that responded to the *Survey of School Programs*, 56% are private schools; the balance are public.⁴ The locations of survey respondents, and the percentage of the ABA-accredited schools in the region, are:

TABLE 1

<i>Region</i>	<i>Region Definition</i>	<i>Number Survey Respondents vs. Schools in Region</i>	<i>Respondents as Percent of All Schools in Region</i>
Region I	Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	28 of 29	97
Region II	Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	7 of 7	100
Region III	Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	27 of 28	96
Region IV	Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	31 of 33	94

4. The respondents mirror the profile of all ABA accredited law schools. See https://www.americanbar.org/groups/legal_education/resources/aba_approved_law_schools.

Region	Region Definition	Number Survey Respondents vs. Schools in Region	Respondents as Percent of All Schools in Region
Region V	Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV)	26 of 29	90
Region VI	Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	31 of 36	86
Region VII	Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (not NY City & Long Island), RI, VT)	20 of 20	100
Region VIII	New York City and Long Island	10 of 10	100

J.D. Graduate Size

The numbers of 2025 J.D. graduates among responding schools and the corresponding percentage of ABA-accredited schools are:

TABLE 2

Number of J.D. Graduates	Percent of ABA Accredited Schools	Percent of Survey Respondents
1 – 100	13	11
101 - 150	30	30
151 - 200	23	22
201 - 250	16	17
251 - 300	8	9
301 - 350	4	4
351 - 400	3	3
401 - 450	2	2
451 or more	2	2

Law School Rankings

Many users of CSALE's data seek information on comparable groups of law schools, often determined using commercial law school rankings. *CSALE does not endorse any system of law school ranking and does not provide its data for use in any rankings efforts or*

calculations. It nonetheless provides this ranking metric for possible use when comparing responses and as a check on the representativeness of schools that participated in the survey. The 2026 *U.S. News* law school rankings for the *Survey* respondents, and the percentage within ranking ranges that responded to the *Survey*, are:

TABLE 3

<i>School Ranking</i>	<i>Percent of Survey Respondents within Rank Range</i>	<i>Percent of All Survey Respondents</i>
1 – 25	96 (24 of 25 schools)	13
26 - 50	92 (24 of 26)	13
51 - 75	100 (26 of 26)	14
76 - 100	93 (25 of 27)	14
101-125	96 (22 of 23)	12
126-150	96 (23 of 24)	13
151-171	100 (23 of 23)	13
175-194	71 (12 of 17)	7
Unranked	100 (1 of 1)	1

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION (PROGRAM OVERSIGHT)

Questions A.2a-e: Oversight/Management of Entire Program

Fifty-six percent of schools have one person with oversight/management responsibility for all law clinics and field placement courses at the school (i.e., the clinical education program). This is down from 62% in 2022-23 and 58% in 2019-20 but higher than in the first two surveys, 53% (2016-17) and 45% (2013-14).

Of those with oversight/management of both the clinic and field placement programs, 70% have the word “dean” in their job title, the same as the 2022-23 survey but up from 60% in the 2019-20 survey, 49% in 2016-17, 47% in 2013-14, and 30% in 2010-11. Eighty-five percent of those with oversight of the clinic and field placement programs report directly to the law school dean (compared to 81% and 77% in the last two surveys), while 12% report directly to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs.

Sixty-three percent of those responsible for oversight/management of both law clinic and field placement programs also have oversight/management responsibility for law school courses or programs in addition to their clinic or field placement courses (a decrease from 71% in 2022-23). The most common additional responsibilities are

simulation courses (for 58% of the those who reported additional responsibilities), followed by moot court program (36%), trial advocacy and pro bono programs (both 31%), and 1L legal writing/practice (25%).

Questions A.2f-h: Oversight/Management of Only All Law Clinics

At 42% of schools there is a single individual with oversight/management responsibility for *only all law clinics*. This is an increase from 37%, 33%, and 31% of schools in the three previous surveys but a decrease from 58% in 2010-11.

Of those with oversight/management of *only all law clinics*, 55% report directly to the law school dean (compared to 63% in the 2022-23 survey), 17% to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs, and 22% to the experiential/clinical program dean or director (compared to 12% in 2022-23). The title of “Director” (at 76% of schools) continues to be the most common for this position, but 16% have titles that include the word “dean.”

Questions A.2i-k: Oversight of Only All Field Placement Courses

At 72% of schools there is one person with oversight/management responsibility for *only all field placement* courses, an increase from 70% in 2022-23, 66% in 2019-20, 59% in 2016-17, 55% in 2013-14, and 54% in 2010-11. Among this 72%, 36% report directly to the law school dean, 31% to the experiential/clinical program dean or director, and 21% to the vice/associate dean for academic affairs. At 5% of schools the person reports to the head of career services.

LAW CLINIC COURSES

Questions B.1-2a: Number and Focus of Law Clinics

Schools in the *Survey of School Programs* reported a total of 1,556 distinct law clinics offered during the 2025-26 academic year (with clinics offered more than a single term during the year counting as one). All but two responding schools offer at least one law clinic. The median number of law clinics is seven per school, unchanged from the last four surveys. Note that the number of clinics offered at a school is often related to the size of the school or the credit hours offered and does not reflect the number of students enrolled in a particular clinic or the availability of a law clinic experience to students.

Respondents were asked to identify the general substantive focus of each of their school’s clinics as best described in the menu of subject areas in the following table. Respondents were asked to choose the primary focus for each clinic:

TABLE 4

<i>Substantive Focus of Clinic</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Offering</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Immigration/Asylum/Refugee	46	47	63	60	66
Criminal Defense	54	47	58	54	54
Entrepreneurship/Small Business	—	29	37	42	46
Family Law	24	34	31	40	44
Children & the Law/Children's Rights	38	39	38	36	37
Intellectual Property/Technology	21	23	37	36	36
Housing	21	16	20	30	36
Transactional	26	22	22	25	34
Civil Litigation/General Civil	39	36	38	34	31
Innocence	21	21	22	26	31
Alternative Dispute Resolution/Mediation	35	32	32	30	30
Appellate	27	30	26	26	29
Environmental/Natural Resources	26	24	27	25	28
Tax	18	29	26	26	26
Veterans	10	18	22	22	26
Domestic Violence	26	20	28	25	25
Human Rights	20	21	23	19	25
Health/Medical Legal Partnership	14	15	20	20	24
Community/Economic Development	30	23	26	22	23
Criminal Prosecution	18	17	20	18	22
Civil Rights	18	18	17	21	21
Community Justice/Lawyering	—	11	15	15	21
Disability/Special Education	12	12	16	16	20
Prisoner Reentry/Post-Release	—	—	—	13	18
Civil & Criminal Litigation/General Litigation	9	11	8	8	18
Legislative/Public Policy	11	12	13	16	17
Death Penalty/Post Conviction	7	6	13	15	16
Wills/Trusts/Estates	9	7	8	13	16
Employment/Labor Law	14	8	13	11	15
Consumer Law	13	11	12	9	12

<i>Substantive Focus of Clinic</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Offering</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
First Amendment	–	–	–	9	12
Prisoner Rights	11	9	10	8	12
Elder Law	18	15	13	10	11
Indian/Native American	6	8	7	9	11
Bankruptcy	9	8	8	8	10
Administrative Law	8	8	9	7	8
Constitutional Law	5	4	6	3	6
Securities	9	7	7	4	4
Animal Law	–	–	–	3	4
Other	33	31	24	18	9

Question B.2b: *Types of Legal Work*

Schools estimated the percentage of types of legal work practiced across all their law clinics. Fifty-eight percent of the work of students in clinics is focused on litigation/appellate/alternative dispute resolution matters, 20% on transactional, 11% on regulatory/administrative law, 7% on legislative/policy, and 2% on other practice types.

Clinics with a litigation/appellate/alternative dispute resolution focus are offered at 95% of schools, transactional clinic focus at 85%, regulatory/administrative law at 62%, and legislative/policy at 57%.

Question B.3: *Major Challenges*

From a menu of choices, schools were asked to identify up to three major challenges their law clinics face:

TABLE 5

<i>Major Challenges to Clinics</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Insufficient funding	64	56	53	55	54
Other demands on instructors' time	47	46	53	51	52
Insufficient administrative/ secretarial support	26	29	22	27	32

Major Challenges to Clinics	Percent of Schools Reporting				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Insufficient number of instructors	40	26	22	34	31
Insufficient faculty status	—	24	33	27	31
Insufficient physical/office space	37	18	20	23	27
Insufficient support among podium/doctrinal faculty	25	14	10	11	12
Insufficient student demand	11	11	12	8	12
Insufficient support from administration	17	11	7	11	11

Question B.4: Enrollment Eligibility

Schools were asked if the following groups of students are permitted to enroll in their law clinics for academic credit. Some of the restrictions are a product of state student practice rules.

1st Year J.D. students: Only 4% of schools permit enrollment of 1st year students.

2nd year, first semester/term J.D. students: Eighty percent of schools permit enrollment of 2nd year, first semester/term students, similar to prior surveys.

2nd year, second semester/term J.D. students: Ninety-three percent of schools permit enrollment of 2nd year, second semester/term students.

LL.M. students: Fifty percent of schools permit LL.M. students to enroll. Of the schools that do not permit LL.M. students to enroll, 55% do not enroll any LL.M. students at their school; 17% do not enroll LL.M.s because of a student practice rule limitation; 1% because of visa limitations; and 26% for some other reason.

FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES

Question C.1a: Settings of Field Placements

Schools were asked whether they placed students in the following settings during the 2025-26 academic year:

TABLE 6

<i>Settings of Field Placement</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Offering</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Non-profit/public interest	92	97	98
Judicial	95	96	97
Other Government	96	95	95
Prosecutor	95	95	95
Public Defender	95	96	94
For-profit in-house counsel	63	69	73
Legislative	71	63	63
Private law firms and solo	–	51	58
Outside the U.S.	51	28	24

Question C.1b: Practice Types Offered

Schools also reported the percentage of their field placements during a typical term where the student's work is primarily focused on certain types of legal practice. Forty-three percent of field placement students are placed in offices with a primary focus on litigation/appellate/alternative dispute resolution, 19% with a focus on judicial, 13% transactional, 8% regulatory/administrative law, and 6% legislative/policy.

Litigation/alternative dispute resolution continues to be the most common type of practice at field placements offered by schools:

TABLE 7

<i>Percent of Schools Offering Practice Type in Field Placement Courses</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Offering</i>
	2025-26
Litigation/appellate/ADR	90
Judicial	87
Transactional	80
Regulatory/Administrative Law	72
Legislative/policy	64

Slots offered to students in non-litigation placements are often limited — 31% of schools place 5% or fewer of their field placement students in transactional settings, 48% place 5% or fewer in regulatory settings, and 68% place 5% or fewer in legislative/policy practice settings.

Question C.2: Full-Time/High-Credit Externship

Forty-seven percent of schools allow “full time” externships (10 or more academic credits), compared to 50% in the 2022-23 survey, 54% in 2019-20, and 58% in 2016-17. Of those schools with full-time externships, 73% allow full-time placements in the vicinity of the law school and 87% allow them outside the vicinity. Of those allowing outside the vicinity, 87% of schools allow a placement wherever the student has identified an eligible placement, while 31% allow only in specific cities where the school has relationships or a designated program. Forty-six percent of schools with full-time externships allow full-time placements in other countries.

Question C.3: Placement Setting Restrictions

Fifty-three percent of schools have restrictions on the practice setting or type of law office where students in field placement courses may be placed, similar to the 2022-23 survey. Forty-three percent of these schools exclude law firm work in some manner, with 34% excluding all law firm work and 9% excluding firm work that is fee-generating (e.g., work on pro bono matters is permissible). Thirty-four percent of schools exclude placements with in-house counsel at for-profit entities and 9% of schools exclude other types of placement settings.

Question C.4: Compensation

Forty-five percent of schools allow students to receive compensation for field placements in addition to academic credit (beyond reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred for working at the placement site) while another 15% allow compensation but with conditions or limits.

Of those 15% of schools with conditions or limitations on student compensation: 58% limit compensation to certain types of placement offices (e.g., only government or non-profit); 19% limit it to a source other than the externship site/office (e.g., fellowship or stipend); 8% allow tuition reimbursement or a scholarship from a source other than the school; and 38% place other conditions or limits on compensation.

Question C.5: Major Challenges

From a menu of choices, schools were asked to identify up to three major challenges their field-placement courses face:

TABLE 8

<i>Major Challenges to Field Placement Courses</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Other demands on instructors' time	47	42	45	52	49
Insufficient administrative/secretarial support	36	44	37	42	37
Insufficient number of faculty/directors	52	36	35	26	33
Insufficient faculty status	—	24	24	26	33
Insufficient funding	23	22	21	26	27
Insufficient support from administration	10	10	7	7	12
Insufficient support among podium/doctrinal faculty	14	10	8	11	11
Insufficient student demand	10	12	10	6	5

Question C.6: Enrollment Eligibility

Schools were asked if the following groups of students are permitted to enroll in field placement courses for academic credit.

1st Year J.D. students: Only 5% of schools permit enrollment of 1st year students;

2nd year, first semester/term J.D. students: Ninety percent of schools permit enrollment of 2nd year, first semester/term students;

2nd year, second semester/term J.D. students: Ninety-seven percent of schools permit enrollment of 2nd year, second semester/term students.

LL.M. students: Forty-nine percent of schools permit enrollment of LL.M. students. Among the schools that do not permit LL.M. enrollment, 59% do not enroll any LL.M. students at their school; 2% cite visa limitations; 1% cite student practice rule limitations; and 37% cite some other reason.

ENROLLMENT POLICIES

Questions D.1: Clinical Experience Requirement

Thirty percent of schools require J.D. students to participate in a law clinic *or* field placement course as a condition of graduation, an increase from 24% in the 2022-23 survey. Among these schools, 13% require participation in a clinic, 4% require a field placement course, and 83% require a clinic or field placement course.

Question D.2a: Participation in Law Clinic

In the table below, schools estimated the percentage of their J.D. students that participate in a law clinic before graduation. The median estimated participation rate for clinics is 31-40%. In the 2022-23 survey, the median participation rate also was 31-40%, but was 41-50% in 2019-20; 46-50% in 2016-17, and 41-45% in 2013-14.

TABLE 9

<i>Law Clinic Participation Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
0%	4	1	1
1 - 10%	2	2	3
11 - 20%	7	10	13
21 - 30%	12	23	16
31 - 40%	19	14	20
41 - 50%	19	16	14
51 - 60%	14	11	13
61 - 70%	8	8	9
71 - 80%	9	7	4
81 - 90%	2	2	4
91 - 99%	0	2	0
100%	4	3	4

Question D.2b: Participation in Field Placement Course

The table below shows the estimated percentage of J.D. students who participate in a field placement course before graduation. The median estimated participation rate for

field placements is 51-60%, comparable to the 2022-23, 2019-20, 2016-17, and 2013-14 surveys.

TABLE 10

Field Placement Participation Ranges	Percent of Respondents in Range		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
1 - 10%	4	2	3
11 - 20%	7	11	5
21 - 30%	14	12	9
31 - 40%	10	14	10
41 - 50%	15	16	16
51 - 60%	14	12	16
61 - 70%	12	13	18
71 - 80%	15	13	14
81 - 90%	7	5	5
91 - 99%	1	1	2
100%	2	2	2

*Question D.2c: Participation in Law Clinic **or** Field Placement Course*

The median estimated percentage of J.D. students who participate in either a clinic **or** field placement course prior to graduation is 81-90%. In the 2022-23 and 2019-20 surveys the median also was 81-90%; in 2016-17, 76-80%; and in 2013-14, 71-75%.

TABLE 11

Law Clinic or Field Placement Participation Ranges	Percent of Respondents in Range		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
1 - 10%	0	0	0
11 - 20%	2	0	1

<i>Law Clinic or Field Placement Participation Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
21 - 30%	2	1	1
31 - 40%	2	4	4
41 - 50%	5	7	6
51 - 60%	6	7	5
61 - 70%	9	13	10
71 - 80%	19	15	15
81 - 90%	21	19	19
91 - 99%	10	9	10
100	23	25	28

Question D.3: Clinical Experience Guarantee

Twenty-four percent of schools have a published guarantee promising any J.D. student enrollment in a clinic or field placement course prior to graduation. Among these schools, 29% guarantee participation in a clinic, 2% in a field placement course, and 69% in a law clinic or field placement course. In the 2016-17 survey, only 13% of schools guaranteed a law clinic or field placement course.

Question D.4-5: Credit Limits

Fifty-eight percent of schools limit in some way the number of law clinic or field placement course credits a student may apply towards graduation. Six percent of all schools only limit law clinic credits (with a median limit of 12 credits); 29% of schools only limit field placement credits (median limit of 12); and 30% of schools have a limit on combined clinic and field placement credits (median limit of 15).

STUDENT DEMAND

Question E.1: Law Clinic Demand

Schools were asked whether student demand for clinic courses had increased, remained constant, or decreased in the three years since the last survey in 2022-23:

TABLE 12

<i>Demand Over Past 3 Years</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>					
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Increased	80	54	38	46	51	40
Constant	19	34	43	45	42	53
Decreased	1	12	19	10	7	7

Schools were asked for the factors they believe contributed to the increase or decrease. Among schools reporting an *increase* in demand, the most common reasons were: students believe clinics improve skills and increased interest in areas of practice within clinics offered (both at 71% of those schools); students believe clinics improve employment opportunities (67%); increased support and promotion by law school (49%); larger student body (40%); non-clinical faculty promoting clinics/encouraging students to enroll (31%); school now requires participation in a clinic or field placement course and students believe it will help prepare them for the NextGen bar exam (both 9% schools).

Among the 7% of schools reporting a *decrease*, the most common reasons were: students believe their time should be spent on bar subject courses (67% of schools); time commitment too high (42%); smaller student body (33%); lack of support and promotion by law school and students do not believe clinics improve employment opportunities (both 25%); decreased interest in clinic practice areas, decrease in number or types of clinics offered, non-clinical faculty discourage students from taking, and school has increased the required number of non-clinical courses (all 17%).

Question E.2: Field Placement Course Demand

Schools were asked to report whether overall student demand for their field placement courses had increased, remained constant, or decreased in the three years since the last survey in 2022-23:

TABLE 13

<i>Demand Over Past 3 Years</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Reporting</i>					
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Increased	76	60	42	47	50	45
Constant	20	31	43	46	40	50
Decreased	1	9	15	7	10	5

Among the 45% of schools reporting an increase, the most common reasons believed for the increase were: students believe field placement courses improve employment opportunities (74% of schools); students believe field placements improve skills (58%); increased interest in placement practice areas or new types of placements (57%); opportunities for remote/virtual fieldwork (49%); larger student body (43%); increased support and promotion by school and school now permits paid externships for credit (both 32%); non-clinical faculty or staff promote field placements/encourage students to enroll (29%); school now requires participation in a clinic or field placement course (11%); and students believe it will help them prepare for the NextGen bar exam (5%).

Among the 5% of schools reporting a decrease, the most common reasons were: decreased interest in placement practice areas, lack of support and promotion by law school, and non-clinical faculty or staff discourage students from taking field placement courses (all 33%); time commitment too high, cost of participation (travel, expenses, relocation) too high, students believe their time should be spent on bar exam subject courses, and smaller student body (all 22%); and school has increased required number of non-clinical courses (11%).

EXPERIENTIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Question F.1: Experiential Credits

Fifteen percent of respondent schools now require more experiential credits than the ABA mandated six-credit minimum, an increase from 14% in the 2022-23 and 12% 2019-20 surveys.

Questions F.2: First-Year Curriculum

Thirteen percent of schools require an experiential course in the first year, while 6% offer a first year experiential course elective. Among the schools that offer or require an experiential course in the first year, 76% offer or require a simulation course, 24% offer or require a clinic, and 6% offer or require a field placement course.

INSTRUCTIONAL STAFFING

Question G.1a: Total Law Clinic and Field Placement Instructors

Schools reported 3,173 people teaching full- or part-time in a clinic or field placement course during the 2025-26 academic year (including adjuncts, staff attorneys, fellows, visitors, etc.). Seventy-five percent teach primarily in law clinics and 25% in field placement courses. The median number of instructors (clinic and field placement) per

school is 12. The median was 11 in the 2022-23 survey, 12 in 2019-20, 11 in 2016-17 and 2013-14, and 9 in 2010-11.

In the latest survey, 62% of those teaching in a clinic or field placement course are employed full time by the school.⁵ The percentage of full-time faculty was 65% in the 2022-23 and 2019-20 surveys, 72% in 2016-17, 78% in 2013-14, and 82% in 2010-11.

Question G.2: Instructional Staff Changes

Schools were asked whether, over the three years since the last survey in 2022-23, the total number of full-time people teaching in their clinic and field placement courses had changed. At 38% of schools, the total number of instructors at the school increased (compared to 44% in the 2022-23 survey and 38% in the 2019-20 survey), at 50% of schools it remained constant (compared to 39% and 50% in the two previous surveys), and at 12% of schools it decreased (compared to 17% and 12% in the two previous surveys).

Where schools reported an increase, the most common reasons were: addition of new clinic or field placement courses (at 72% of schools); availability of additional funding (68%); expansion of existing clinic or field placement courses (35%); and increased student interest in law clinic or field placement courses (29%).

Where schools reported a decrease, the most common reasons were: voluntary departure or death of instructor without a replacement (at 73% of schools); faculty layoffs/reductions directed by the school (5%), reduced faculty for other reasons (14%), loss of funding for clinic (9%), and decreased student interest in clinic or field placement courses (5%).

Question G.3a: Employment Status/Term

The employment status or term of those teaching full time in a law clinic or field placement course is:

5. Full-time employee is defined in the survey as working the equivalent of at least 80% of the law school's normal teaching/administrative hours or loads (i.e., at least .8 FTE employee).

TABLE 14

<i>Employment Status/Term</i>	<i>Percent of All Full-Time Instructors</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Tenured (Unitary/Traditional)	21	18	17	13	13
On Tenure Track (Unitary/Traditional)	7	5	4	5	6
Clinical Tenured ⁶	7	7	6	9	8
On Clinical Tenure Track	3	2	2	4	4
Long-Term Presumptively Renewable Contract ⁷	32	30	27	29	30
Short-Term Probationary Contract ⁸	5	6	6	6	8
Other Short-Term Contract or At-Will	19	20	23	21	19
Fellow	8	7	8	9	9
Other Employment Terms	—	6	7	5	4

Questions G.4a & b: Clinical Tenure Track Hiring

Twenty-two percent of schools have a Clinical Tenure Track. Among the schools with that track, the methods of hiring new full-time Clinical Tenure Track faculty are:

6. “Clinical Tenure” (aka “Programmatic Tenure”) is defined in the survey as: A separate tenure system for persons teaching in a law clinic or field placement course that differs from the traditional tenure provided most podium/doctrinal faculty on governance rights and/or standards for hiring and/or promotion. It results in a continuing appointment that is not periodically renewed, unlike long-term contract status.

7. “Long-Term Contract” is defined in the survey as: A contract of at least 5 years duration (or lesser duration acquiesced to by the ABA for a school). “Presumption of Renewal” tracks ABA Accreditation Standard 405 and defines presumptively renewable contracts as those that include a presumption they will be renewed at the end of each contract term and are generally only subject to termination/non-renewal for good cause.

8. “Short-Term Probationary Contract” is defined in the survey as: A contract of fewer than 5 years that typically mimics the “pre-tenure” employment status of a traditional tenure-track professor, i.e., a contract that places the employee on a track under which the person will ultimately be considered for a longer-term presumptively renewable contract).

TABLE 15

<i>Process for Hiring of Clinical Tenure Track Faculty</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Faculty upon committee recommendation	66
Faculty without committee recommendation	8
Law school dean upon committee recommendation	24
Other	3

Where a committee is involved in clinical tenure track hiring, the composition of that committee is:

TABLE 16

<i>Clinical Tenure Track Hiring Committee Composition</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Mix of clinical and non-clinical faculty where anyone may chair	84
Mix of clinical and non-clinical faculty but only clinical faculty may chair	3
Mix of clinical and non-clinical faculty but only podium/doctrinal faculty may chair	10
Committee without clinical faculty	3

Question G.4c: Clinical Tenure Track Standards

Where a school has a Clinical Tenure Track, differences in promotion, tenure, or retention standards for the faculty on that track compared to the standards for podium/doctrinal faculty on the traditional tenure track are:

TABLE 17

<i>Clinical Tenure Track Differences from Podium/Doctrinal Tenure Standards</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Greater emphasis on the quality of teaching	70
Community involvement, bar activities, public advisory committee/commission participation, or teaching continuing professional education are considered	61
Greater acceptance of applied scholarship	58
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered	48
Fewer publications are required	48
Publications are not required	42
Participation in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy is considered	42
Greater emphasis on administration skills	21
Ability to raise funds to support program is considered	18

Questions G.5a & b: Long-Term Contract Track Hiring

Seventy percent of schools have a Long-Term Contract Track. Among the schools with that track, the methods of hiring new full-time Long-Term Contract Track faculty are:

TABLE 18

<i>Hiring of Long-Term Contract Track Faculty by</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Faculty upon committee recommendation	53
Faculty vote without committee recommendation	8
Law school dean upon committee recommendation	25
Law school dean without committee recommendation	9
Committee (without later faculty vote)	6

Where a committee is involved in hiring, the composition of that committee is:

TABLE 19

<i>Clinical Tenure Track Hiring Committee Composition</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Mix of clinical and non-clinical faculty where anyone can chair	67
Mix of clinical and non-clinical faculty but only clinical faculty may chair	12
Mix of clinical and non-clinical faculty but only podium/doctrinal faculty can chair	12
Committee without clinical faculty	4
Committee without podium/doctrinal faculty	3
Other	1

Question G.5c: Long-Term Contract Standards

Where the school has a Long-Term Contract Track, differences in standards for promotion and retention on that track compared to the standards for podium/doctrinal faculty on the traditional tenure track are:

TABLE 20

<i>Long-Term Contract Track Differences from Podium/Doctrinal Tenure Standards</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Publications are not required	86
Fewer publications are required	13
Greater emphasis on teaching	64
Community involvement, bar activities, public advisory committee/commission participation, or teaching professional education are considered	56
Briefs and similar works authored primarily by clinical faculty are considered	25
Greater acceptance of applied scholarship	25

<i>Long-Term Contract Track Differences from Podium/Doctrinal Tenure Standards</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
Greater emphasis on administration skills	24
Participation in litigation or other activities that raise important questions of public policy is considered	20
Ability to raise funds to support programs is considered	19

PROMOTION AND RETENTION STANDARDS

Question H.1: Written Promotion, Tenure, or Retention Standards

Eighty-seven percent of schools have written standards for the promotion, tenure, or retention of law clinic or field placement faculty, the same as in the 2022-23 survey but an increase from 82% in 2019-20. Respondents were asked to submit copies of their standards to CSALE, which are available at <https://www.csale.org/#promotion-standards>.

Question H.2: Change to Clinical Instructor Status

Schools were asked if there had been consideration at their school about changing the employment status or governance rights for law clinic or field placement instructors over the past three years. Thirty-three percent reported that there had been consideration of changes, compared to 48% in the 2022-23 survey.

Where there were discussions, at 56% of schools the discussions were about changing the status or rights for law clinic instructors only, at 11% for field placement instructors only, and at 33% for both clinic and field placement instructors.

Where the school had considered and made a change, at 18% it led to an option to move to an improved employment track or status, at 14% to increased governance or participation rights, at 11% to enhanced employment status or terms, and at 5% to a change in hiring or promotion standards. Where the consideration had not led to a change, at 60% there was no change because the discussion was ongoing, while at 14% the proposal rejected.

IV. INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS – LAW CLINICS

In the law clinics portion of the *Survey of Instructors*, full-time law school employees with an instructional role in a law clinic were asked to provide information on their position. If the respondent directed a clinic, they were also asked for details about their

clinic. Respondents who were part-time school employees and directors of a clinic were only asked for details about their clinic (other part-time employees were not asked to complete the survey).

Approximately 1,100 law clinic instructors responded to the survey, with clinic directors providing information on over 700 clinics. The data reported in this section summarize their responses.

INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

Questions B.1-2: Instructor's Role in Clinic

Clinic instructors were asked to identify the category that best fits their role in the clinic (some respondents reported multiple roles).

TABLE 21

<i>Role in Law Clinic</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
Oversee both clinic and field placement programs	8
Oversee all school's clinics	9
Direct/co-direct distinct clinic(s)	76
Assistant director of distinct clinic(s)	4
Staff/supervising attorney of clinic(s)	18
Fellow of clinic(s)	4

Ninety-seven percent of clinic instructors teach both the classroom and case/legal work components of the clinic, 2% teach only case/legal work component, and 1% teach only the classroom.

Questions B.3-4: Number of Students Taught and Total Credits Earned

On average, clinic instructors teach or supervise on average a total of 17 students in all their clinics during the academic year (excluding any summer term). The median and average number of total credits students typically earn in their clinic over the academic year (excluding any summer term) is 6.

Where the instructor also teaches a clinic in a summer term, instructors teach or

supervise on average 5 students in their summer clinic, with students earning on average 3 credits.

Questions A.2 & E.1: Person in Charge

The following table shows the employment status/contract term of clinic directors who are employed *full time* by the law school. These figures do not include part-time employees or those who also have a concurrent director role in a field placement course (i.e., it includes only those who are primarily a law clinic director):

TABLE 22

<i>Employment Status/Term — Law Clinic Director</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Tenured (Unitary/Traditional)	18	17	16
On Tenure track	8	8	9
Clinical tenured	10	12	10
On Clinical tenure track	4	4	5
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	36	36	36
Other long-term contract (e.g., not presumptively renewable)	—	—	3
Short-term probationary contract	7	7	8
Other short-term contract or at will	13	12	11
Administrative position w/ faculty title	1	≤ 1	1
Administrative position w/out faculty title	1	≤ 1	1
Other employment term	1	3	1

Question B.5: Time Allocation

Almost all clinic directors who are full-time law school employees have responsibilities in addition to teaching their law clinic course(s). The percentages of time they spend on their various law school responsibilities are, on average:

TABLE 23

<i>Law School Responsibilities</i>	<i>Percent of Time Spent</i>
Teach law clinic program or course(s)	66
Teach field placement program or course(s)	2
Other skills/simulation program or course(s)	3
Non-experiential courses (i.e., podium/doctrinal)	9
Non-experiential programs, offices, or centers (e.g., pro bono, career advising))	2
Research and scholarship	8
Committee/school service activity	9
Other responsibilities	2

CLINIC FOCUS AND STRUCTURE

Question H.3: Type of Legal Practice

Fifty percent of clinic work is primarily focused on litigation, 15% transactional, 13% regulatory/administrative law, 9% community lawyering/education, 7% legislative or policy work, 5% alternative dispute resolution, and 2% other legal types.

Questions H.4-5: Length and Terms of Enrollment

The mandatory term of enrollment for most clinics is one semester/trimester /quarter (depending on the length of the school's academic term). Seventy-eight percent of clinics require students to enroll for one term and 21% require two terms. In the 2022-23 survey, 79% of clinics were for one term; in 2019-20, 78%; in 2016-17, 75%; in 2013-14, 74%; and in 2010-11, 64%.

Sixty-eight percent of clinics are offered twice during the academic year (e.g., fall and spring semester), with 24% offered once and 8% offered three times (e.g., fall, spring, and summer, including trimester schools). In the 2022-23, 65% were offered twice per academic year, 21% were offered once, and 12% were offered three times.

Questions H.6-7: Typical Enrollment and Demand

The typical enrollments in a law clinic each term are set out below. The median and most common enrollment each term is 8 students, the same as in the previous four surveys.

TABLE 24

<i>Clinic Enrollment Ranges</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents in Range</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
1 - 2	1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
3 - 4	5	6	4	3	3
5 - 6	14	17	15	14	13
7 - 8	31	34	34	39	41
9 - 10	16	14	15	16	18
11 - 12	13	12	11	13	10
13 - 14	4	4	3	3	4
15 - 16	8	7	8	6	5
17 - 18	4	3	2	1	1
19 - 20	1	1	2	2	2
21 - 24	1	1	< 1	1	1
≥ 25	2	1	3	2	2

Directors were asked whether student demand for their clinic over the three years since the 2022-23 survey exceeded, matched, or was fewer than the number of slots/positions available for enrollment:

TABLE 25

<i>Demand for Clinic Over Past 3 Years</i>	<i>Percent of Clinics Reporting</i>					
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Exceeded available slots	75	59	53	57	69	64
Matched	21	32	34	32	24	28
Did not fill up slots	4	9	13	11	7	7

Question H.8-9: Eligibility

At schools with part-time J.D. students, 83% of their clinics permit part-time students to participate, the same percentage as in the 2022-23 survey. In the 2019-20 survey, 88% of clinics in schools with part-time programs allowed part-time students to participate; in 2016-17, 79%; in 2013-14, 81%; and in 2010-11, 70%. Where part-time

students are permitted to participate, 53% of clinics enrolled a part-time student(s) during the 2025-26 academic year, compared to 42% in 2022-23.

At schools with LL.M. students, 58% of their clinics permit LL.M. students to enroll in clinics. Where LL.M. students are permitted to participate, 33% of clinics enrolled at least one LL.M. student during the 2025-26 academic year.

Question H.10: Hybrid Clinics

Four percent of clinics operate as a hybrid, one that is located off campus in a host office that is not operated by the school. In 76% of hybrid clinics, the legal matters students work on are primarily the responsibility of the off-campus office or its attorneys, while in the remaining 24% of clinics the matters are primarily the responsibility of the school.

In 44% of hybrid clinics, student legal work is primarily supervised by a full-time law school faculty member; in 28% the work is primarily supervised by a lawyer(s) from the off-campus host office; and in 28% supervision is shared between the faculty member and the host office attorney(s).

In 50% of hybrid clinics, the supervising lawyer in the host office is an adjunct faculty member with at least some compensation from the school; at 29% the person is not an adjunct and receives no compensation from the school; and at 21% the school and host office have some other arrangement.

CASE/LEGAL WORK COMPONENT

Questions H.11-12: Case/Legal Work Supervision

Fifty-three percent of law clinics have one person supervising the students' case/legal work, 29% have two, 11% have three, and 7% have four or more.

Eighty percent of those who supervise clinic student case/legal work are full-time employees of the law school, similar to the 2022-23 survey.

Questions H.13-14: Case/Legal Work Student-Teacher Ratio

The most common and median student-teacher ratio for case/legal work supervision (i.e., number of students supervised per instructor) is 8 to 1, the same as the five prior surveys. Eighty-five percent of clinics have casework ratios of 8 to 1 or fewer, similar to the four prior surveys. Only 9 clinics reported ratios higher than 12:1 and none higher than 16:1.

TABLE 26

Student-Teacher Ratio	Percent Reporting				
	2013-14	2015-16	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
< 4 to 1	7	11	11	11	10
4 to 1	12	10	11	11	12
5 to 1	6	7	7	6	7
6 to 1	18	15	15	14	15
7 to 1	4	3	4	3	4
8 to 1	35	37	36	38	37
9 to 1	3	3	3	3	3
10 to 1	11	9	8	8	9
11 to 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
12 to 1	2	3	2	4	3
≥ 13 to 1	1	3	2	2	2

Questions H.15-16: Total Credit Hours for Case/Legal Work and Classroom Component

The median number of credits a student receives for the combined case/legal work and classroom component of a clinic is 5 per semester.⁹

TABLE 27

Total Combined Credits	Percent Reporting			
	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
≤2	6	3	4	4
3	19	17	18	15
4	23	21	21	21
5	12	11	9	10
6	24	27	27	31
7	9	7	9	6
8	3	4	5	4

9. For courses with different/variable credits, respondents were asked to choose the most common number of credits students receive.

Total Combined Credits	Percent Reporting			
	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
9	< 1	1	1	2
10	< 1	1	2	2
11	0	< 1	< 1	1
≥ 12	5	6	3	4

Eighty-three percent of students receive a fixed number of academic credits for their case/legal work, rather than a variable number based on the amount of time spent on their work. In the 2022-23 survey, 82% of clinics awarded a fixed number of credits; in 2019-20, 80%; in 2016-17, 83%; and in 2013-14, 86%.

Fixed: The table below indicates the number of credits a student receives for case/legal work where the number of credits is fixed.¹⁰ The most common number of fixed case/legal work credits is 3 per semester, the same as the previous four surveys. Six percent of clinics award 8 or more fixed credits for casework.

TABLE 28

Number of Fixed Credits	Percent Reporting				
	2013-14	2015-16	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
1	7	7	4	3	2
2	23	25	15	15	16
3	30	31	30	31	29
4	25	23	23	25	24
5	5	5	8	6	6
6	6	5	12	13	16
7	< 1	< 1	2	2	2
8	2	1	3	2	2
9	1	1	< 1	1	1
≥ 10	1	1	3	3	3

Variable: Where the credits for casework are variable, the most frequent *minimum* numbers of credits a student may receive are 3/term (31%), 2/term (25%), 1/term (17%) and 4/term (14%).

10. If credits are not formally divided between the case/legal work and classroom components, respondents were asked to apportion the total credits between the two components.

The most frequent *maximum* numbers of variable credits a student may receive are 6/term (30% of clinics), 4/term (25%), 3/term (13%), and 5/term (13%). Twenty-one percent of clinics with variable credits allow students to receive more than 6 credits; 6% allow students to earn 10 or more credits.

Question H.17: Grading the Case/Legal Work Component

Seventy-two percent of clinics award mandatory letter/number grades for casework, 23% awarded mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 3% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades, and 3% give students the option of a pass/fail or letter/number grade. These percentages are consistent with prior surveys.

Among clinics that grade with letters or numbers, 29% grade on a curve. In the 2022-23 and 2019-20 surveys, 32% graded on a curve; in 2016-17, 27%; and in 2013-14, 29%. Of those clinics graded on a curve, 47% have a curve similar to or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses, 23% have a curve similar to or the same as that used by the school for all courses, and 29% have a more flexible or higher curve than the curve used in other courses.

Question H.18: Interdisciplinary Clinics

Fifteen percent of clinics operate on an interdisciplinary basis with students, faculty, or practitioners from disciplines other than law contributing non-legal expertise. The most common non-law disciplines are social work (64% of interdisciplinary clinics), health care (22%), psychology/psychiatry (19%), and environmental/natural resources (11%).

Among interdisciplinary clinics, 70% enroll students from non-law disciplines for academic credit; 8% permit students in non-law disciplines to participate but they are paid and do not receive credit; 15% allow students in non-law disciplines to participate as unpaid volunteers without academic credit; and 18% do not allow non-law students to participate.

The staffing in these clinics varies. At 30%, faculty from non-law disciplines assist with case/legal matters; at 32%, non-faculty practitioners from non-law disciplines assist; at 15%, clinic-paid staff from non-law disciplines assist; and 33% have no non-law instructors assisting with case/legal matter instruction.

CLASSROOM COMPONENT

Question H.19: Classroom Component Instructors

Sixty-four percent of clinics have one person teaching the classroom component, 25% have two, and 11% have three or more. Eighty-seven percent of those who teach in the classroom component are full-time employees of the school, compared to 84% in the 2022-23 survey, 80% in 2019-20, and 84% in 2016-17 and 2013-14.

Question H.20: Classroom Student-Teacher Ratio

The median and most common ratio for the classroom component of clinics (i.e., number of classroom students per instructor) in the current and prior surveys is 8 to 1. In the latest survey, 7% of clinics have classroom student-teacher ratios greater than 10 to 1, a decrease from 10% in the 2022-23 survey.

TABLE 29

Student-Teacher Ratio	Percent Reporting				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
≤ 2 to 1	2	3	2	2	2
3 to 1	3	3	4	3	4
4 to 1	10	10	11	9	10
5 to 1	5	6	5	5	5
6 to 1	19	16	14	13	14
7 to 1	4	3	4	3	3
8 to 1	36	39	36	39	40
9 to 1	4	2	2	4	4
10 to 1	11	9	9	10	10
11 to 1	< 1	< 1	1	< 1	< 1
12 to 1	3	4	4	6	4
13 to 1	0	0	< 1	< 1	< 1
14 to 1	< 1	2	1	< 1	< 1
15 to 1	< 1	< 1	1	< 1	1
≥ 16 to 1	2	4	4	3	0

Question H.21: Classroom Component Credits

The number of credits per term for just the classroom component is shown below. The most common number of credits is 2 per term in the latest and two prior surveys:

TABLE 30

Classroom Credits	Percent Reporting	
	2022-23	2025-26
≤ 1	24	24
2	39	40
3	22	20
4	8	8
5	2	2
≥ 6	5	6

Question H.22: Grading the Classroom Component

Most clinics (73%) grade the classroom component with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 21% give mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 3% give optional pass/fail, and 2% give mixed pass/fail and letter/number. These percentages are similar to prior surveys.

Where classroom grading is by letters or numbers, 29% grade on a curve, compared to 33% in the 2022-23 and 2019-20 surveys, 28% in 2016-17, and 30% in 2013-14. Where graded on a curve, 46% of clinics have a curve similar to or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses, 28% have a curve more flexible or higher than in similar courses, and 25% apply a curve similar to or the same as that used by the school for all courses.

Question H.23: Classroom Curriculum

For the first time in this CSALE survey, respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time spend on various subjects during the classroom component of the clinic on a scale from 1 (none) to 4 (extensive). On average, the greatest amount of classroom time is spent on skills instruction (3.3), followed by fieldwork discussion/rounds (3.0), substantive law (2.9), professional identity formation (2.7), bias/cross-cultural competency/racism (2.6), procedural rules/law (2.6), professional responsibility/ethics (2.6), simulation (2.5), and career development (2.1). Almost every clinic spends some time on skills instruction and professional responsibility/ethics, while 18% spend no time on career development and 62% spend little time.

ADDITIONAL TERMS

Question H.24: Repeat Enrollment

Sixty-seven percent of clinics permit students to enroll for an additional term(s) beyond the mandatory term of enrollment, typically for three credits (27% of clinics), two credits (27%), or four (19%). The median percentage of students taking a clinic for an additional term is 25%, the same as in the 2022-23 survey but an increase from the 2019-20 (20%) and 2013-14 surveys (11-15%).

Sixty-four percent of clinics grade students taking the clinic for an additional term with a mandatory letter or number grade, while 29% give mandatory pass/fail grades (including systems with “high/low pass”), 4% give optional pass/fail, and 24% have mixed pass/fail and letter/number.

TECHNOLOGY

Questions H.25-27: Technology & AI Use

Remote File Access:

All but 2% of clinics provide their students with remote access to client files when they are not in the clinic office. Of those clinics providing access, the most common way is through a cloud-based case management software such as CLIO (82% of schools), followed by access through a cloud-based generic document sharing tool such as Dropbox or Google Drive (59%), remote desktop/Virtual Desktop Interface (20%), emailing case files/client information to themselves (9%), and saving case files/client information to their personal computers (9%).

Data Security & Technology Use:

All but 2% of clinics educate or train their students explicitly on data security and appropriate use of technology to protect client data. Of those 98% of programs that provide education or training, 84% provide training by faculty or staff; 83% provide students with written policies; and 48% do case-by-case/individualized student instruction.

Generative AI Applications:

For the first time in a CSALE survey, respondents were asked to indicate how often they, as clinic directors, are using generative AI (GAI) in their clinic seminars, legal/case work, and administrative tasks using a scale of 1 (not at all), 2 (sometimes) or 3 (often). For the clinic seminar, 29% of respondents used GAI to help identify class materials/resources, 27% used GAI to generate course content, and 14% used GAI to run/assist with simulations/skills practice. For legal/case work, half of respondents used AI for legal research using a legal practice specific tool (Lexis+), 30% used it for legal research using a general-purpose tool (e.g., ChatGPT), 20% for editing/revising documents, 15% to

summarize/index case-specific documents; and 13% to generate draft pleadings or other case-related documents. Twenty-five percent of respondents use GAI to assist with administrative tasks for the clinic. Only 3% percent or fewer respondents reported using GAI “often” for any of the functions listed above, except for the use of a legal practice specific tool such as Lexis+ in case work (8% stating they use the AI tool “often”).

Respondents were also asked how they educate their students about the appropriate use of GAI in clinic legal work. Seventy-nine percent of respondents instruct their students on the legal ethics implications of the use of GAI, 71% on best practices for maintaining client confidentiality/data security, 31% on policy implications (such as systemic bias, environmental impacts), 25% on related local practice rules, and 20% on “prompt engineering” (how to effectively guide GAI tools). Fifty-six percent of respondents have a written policy that allows the use of GAI, while 18% have a written policy prohibiting its use.

SUMMER LAW CLINIC

Question H.28: Summer Clinic

Fourteen of clinics run as a student-enrolled, for-credit course during the summer term. In 88% of those summer clinics, the person who directs the clinic during the fall/spring terms also is responsible for teaching and supervising the summer clinic students, while in 12% someone else assumes responsibility, a decrease from 13% in the 2022-23 survey, 14% in 2019-20 and 20% in 2016-17.

AMOUNT OF FREE LEGAL ASSISTANCE

Question H.29: Total Hours of Free Legal Assistance

Civil: Five hundred twenty-three clinics estimated their students provided a total of 1,340,000 hours of free *civil* legal assistance during the previous 2024-25 academic year to individuals, governmental entities, or organizations, or approximately 2,550 hours per clinic.

Criminal: One hundred thirty-three clinics estimated their students provided a total of 270,000 hours of free *criminal* legal services during the 2018-19 academic year, or approximately 2,100 hours per clinic.

Extrapolating to all clinics at ABA-accredited law schools, students in clinics provided an estimated 4.1 million total hours of free civil or criminal legal assistance during the 2024-25 academic year.¹¹

11. This estimate is calculated by multiplying the average number of civil plus criminal hours per clinic (2,650) by the total number of clinics reported by schools in the *Survey of School Programs* (1,556) =

Question 29: Total Number of Clients Assisted

Civil: Five hundred twelve clinics estimated their students represented a total of over 58,000 *civil* clients during the 2024-25 academic year (organizational clients or serving as a third-party neutral count as 1), or an average of approximately 113 clients per clinic.

Criminal: One hundred thirty clinics estimated their students represented a total of 7,700 *criminal* clients during the 2024-25 academic year, or an average of approximately 59 clients per clinic.

Extrapolating to all clinics at ABA-accredited law schools, students in clinics provided free civil or criminal legal assistance to an estimated 166,500 clients during the 2024-25 academic year.¹²

V. INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS - FIELD PLACEMENT COURSES

In the Field Placement Courses portion of the *Survey of Instructors*, full-time law school employees with instructional roles in field placement courses were asked to provide information on their positions. If the respondent directed a field placement course(s), they were also asked details about their schools' field placement program. Over 250 field placement instructors responded to the survey. The data reported in this section summarize their responses.

INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

Questions C.1: Role in Field Placement

Seventy-nine percent of those who teach in a field placement course either direct the school's overall field placement program or direct a distinct field placement course, or are the assistant for those positions.

4,123,400. The estimate does not include the student hours provided by the eleven schools that did not respond to the *Survey of School Programs* invitation.

12. This estimate is calculated by multiplying the average number of civil plus criminal clients per clinic (107) by the total number of clinics reported by schools in the *Survey of School Programs*: (1,556) = 166,500. The estimate does not include the clients assisted by the eleven schools that did not respond to the *Survey of School Programs* invitation.

Questions C.2: Scope of Duties

The scope of the duties handled by field placement instructors include:

TABLE 31

<i>Duties</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>
Monitoring student fieldwork	85
Guided reflection	83
Program design and compliance	82
Counseling/placement of students	79
Host office/field supervisor relations	79
Overseeing other placement instructors	43

Questions C.3: Number of Students Taught

The median number of students that field placement instructors teach or supervise in all their field placement courses during the academic year (excluding any summer term) is 36 students. Eighteen percent of instructors teach or supervise 100 or more students.

Where the instructor teaches in a summer term, the median number of students in their summer field placement courses is 24, with students generally earning 3 or 4 credits for the combined fieldwork and classroom component.

Questions C.4: Classroom Component Sections

Of those who teach a classroom component of a field placement course, the median number of sections taught is one. The average classroom size is 17 students, with the median 13 students.

Question C.5: Law School Responsibilities

Ninety-three percent of field placement course directors who are full-time law school employees have responsibilities in addition to their field placement course teaching/oversight. The percentage of time directors spend on their various school responsibilities are on average:

TABLE 32

<i>Law School Responsibilities</i>	<i>Percent of Time Spent</i>
	2025-26
Field placement program or course(s)	52
Law clinic program or course(s)	10
Other skills/simulation program or course(s)	8
Non-experiential course(s) (i.e., podium/doctrinal)	6
Non-experiential programs, offices, or centers (e.g., pro bono, academic success)	5
Research and scholarship	4
Work in student or career services office	5
Committee/school service activity	8
Other responsibilities	3

Questions A.2 & E.1: Person in Charge

The following table shows the frequency of the employment status/term of a field placement director employed full time by the school. This does not include those who also have a concurrent director role in a law clinic (i.e., it includes only those who are primarily a field placement course director).

TABLE 33

<i>Employment Status/Term — Field Placement Director</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Tenured (Unitary/Traditional)	15	8	4
On Tenure track	1	3	2
Clinical tenured	5	1	6
On Clinical tenure track	3	1	2
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	27	32	34

Employment Status/Term — Field Placement Director	Percent Reporting		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Other long-term contract (e.g., not presumptively renewable)	—	—	3
Short-term probationary contract	4	4	8
Other short-term contract or at will	11	19	11
Administrative position w/ faculty title	22	16	10
Administrative position w/out faculty title	10	13	17
Other employment term	1	1	4

FIELD PLACEMENT COURSE STRUCTURE AND FOCUS

Section I of the *Survey of Instructors* sought information on the school's field placement program for the 2025-26 academic year. This was a change from prior surveys that sought information on individual courses. Where details varied between courses, respondents were asked to provide the approach for the majority of the school's field placement courses. At schools where there is no director of the overall field placement program, instructors provided responses for individual courses that were later aggregated into an overall response for the school.

Question I.1: Terms Offered and Total Program Enrollment

Ninety-nine percent of schools offer field placement courses during the fall/winter/spring terms. The average total enrollment in all of a school's field placement courses during the 2024-25 academic year was:

TABLE 34

Number of J.D. Graduates	Average Total Enrollment
1 – 100	78
101 - 150	85
151 - 200	84

<i>Number of J.D. Graduates</i>	<i>Average Total Enrollment</i>
201 - 250	113
251 - 300	155
301 - 350	239
351 - 400	–
401 - 450	271

Question I.2: Allocation of Responsibility

Respondents were asked to identify the person with principal responsibility for core elements of their field placement program at their school (not necessarily exclusive responsibility). The persons with principal responsibility for core elements are:

TABLE 35

<i>Task</i>	<i>Percent of Schools Indicating Person with Principal Responsibility for Task</i>				
	Field placement program director	Administrative assistant	Career services, public interest or pro bono staff	Field placement classroom instructor	Other
Counseling/place-ment of students	68	8	16	8	1
Host office/field supervisor relations	86	4	3	9	0
Guided reflection	50	0	0	48	1
Overseeing other instructors	91	0	1	2	4
Grading assessment	51	0	1	2	4
Program design & compliance	93	0	0	6	2
Monitoring student experience	71	3	0	25	0

Question I.3: Staffing

Respondents were asked to report the number of persons in the school's field placement program who serve in certain positions. The ratios of the total combined fall/winter/spring term enrollment per position are:

TABLE 36

<i>Position</i>	<i>Ratio Enrolled Students per Position</i>
Field placement program director	82:1
Director of individual course	66:1
Reflective component Instructor - full-time faculty	69:1
Reflective component Instructor - adjunct	21:1
Program coordinator/administrative assistant	80:1

Questions I.4: Fieldwork Settings and Types of Legal Work

The percent of schools placing students in various fieldwork settings are:

TABLE 37

<i>Fieldwork Settings</i>	<i>Percent of Schools</i>
	2025-26
Prosecution	96
Public Defender	96
Nonprofit public interest organization	96
Government	95
Judicial	95
In-house counsel – nonprofit	87
In-house counsel – for-profit	75
Legislative	71

Fieldwork Settings	Percent of Schools
	2025-26
Private practice (i.e., law firm)	54
International NGO or government agencies only (outside US)	27
International at any type of organization (outside US)	22

The greatest percentage of students are placed within offices that have a litigation or dispute resolution focus (44%), followed by judicial (22%) transactional (16%), regulatory (9%), legislative or policy (6%), and other (2%).

Questions C.4 & I.5: Compensation

In the *Survey of School Programs*, 45% of schools reported that they allow students to receive compensation in addition to academic credit (beyond reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred for working at the placement site) and 15% allow compensation but with conditions or limits. At 34% of schools where compensation is allowed, less than 10% of field placement students received compensation during the 2024-25 academic year; at 27% of schools where compensation is allowed, 11-25% of students received compensation; at 25% of such schools, 25-50% of students received it; at 9% of such schools, 51-75% of students received it, and at 5% of schools allowing compensation, more than 75% of students received it.

CREDITS

Questions I.6-7: Credits Awarded

Fifty-four percent of programs combine their fieldwork and reflection components into a single course in the school's course catalog/directory, while 46% identify the fieldwork and reflection components as two separate courses. The most common number of credits for just the reflection portion of the course is 1 (47% of school programs), less than 1 credit (21%), 2 credit (19%), and 3 or more (13%). The median number of credits for just the reflection portion of the course is 1 credit.¹³

For the fieldwork component, 65% of field placement courses offer variable credits based on the hours students work, while 42% require a fixed number of credits for all

13. To determine the number of credits awarded for just the reflection component, respondents were asked to apportion the credits between the fieldwork and reflection components whether or not they are formally divided into separate courses.

students. In the 2022-23 survey, 58% offered variable credits; in the 2019-20 survey, 53%; in 2016-17, 58%; and in 2013-14, 52%.

Variable: Where the number of credits for fieldwork is variable, the most common *minimum* number of variable credits is 2 per term (47% of programs), 1 per term (24%), and 3 per term (21%). The most common *maximum* numbers of variable credits is greater than 10 (33% of programs), 10 per term (18%), 6 per term (14%), and 3 per term (11%)

Fixed: Where the number of credits for fieldwork is fixed, the most common number of credits is 3 per term (50% of programs), 2 per term (33%), and ≥ 4 per term (18%). The median number of fixed fieldwork credits is 3.

FIELDWORK COMPONENT

Question I.8: Fieldwork Placement Format

Sixty-nine percent of students in field placement courses perform their fieldwork on-site/in-person, 9% perform it virtually, and 22% perform some on-site/some virtual (hybrid).

The most common factors considered in deciding to approve a fully virtual placement are: quality of the work available (at 85% of programs); uniqueness of placement/practice area (79%); whether other employees and externs are working remotely (79%); opportunities to participate in “out of office” activities through videoconferencing technology (61%); whether the student can visit the office in person (53%); prior experience with virtual remote supervision at the placement (50%); outside commuting distance (44%); and number of credits sought (22%).

Question I.9: Hours of Fieldwork per Credit

The most common number of hours a student must work during the term for each fieldwork credit earned is 42.5-45 hours/credit (49% of courses), followed by 46-50 hours/credit (23%), 56-60 hours/credit (14%), and 51-55 hours/credit (8%). Six percent of field placement courses require more than 60 hours of fieldwork per credit.

Question I.10: Time Reporting

Virtually all (98%) programs require students to report their fieldwork hours. Fifty-two percent require time reporting weekly, 23% bi-weekly, 11% at the mid- and end-of-term, and 10% monthly. Of those requiring time reporting, 46% require that time logs be reviewed or approved by the on-site supervisor, compared to 52% in the 2022-23 survey.

Question I.11: Fieldwork Grading

Eighty-seven percent of programs give mandatory pass/fail grades for student fieldwork, 7% give mandatory letter or number grades, 5% mixed pass/fail, and 5% letter/number grade. Among programs that grade with letters or numbers, only 8% grade on a curve.

CLASSROOM/REFLECTION COMPONENT

Question I.12a-b: Reflection Component Approach

Seventy-eight percent of programs primarily meet the ABA requirement for “a classroom instructional component, regularly scheduled tutorials, or other means of ongoing, contemporaneous, faculty-guided reflection” through a classroom instructional component (i.e., related seminar). Twenty-two percent of schools meet the standard through regularly scheduled tutorials and 26% through other means of faculty-guided reflection indicating that some schools use a mix of approaches.

Where there is a classroom component, 83% hold in-person meetings, 47% use synchronous virtual meetings (e.g., via Zoom, Teams), and 11% use asynchronous virtual methods. Fifty-two percent of students are enrolled in general or mixed classroom components where students are from a variety of placements, while 48% are in classroom components organized around a practice area or type of law (e.g., criminal justice, judicial).

Question I.12c: Classroom/Instructional Curriculum

For the first time in this CSALE survey, respondents were asked to estimate the amount of time spent on various classroom/instructional subjects on a scale from 1 (none) to 4 (extensive). On average, the greatest amount of classroom time is spent on professional identity formation (3.4), followed by fieldwork discussion/rounds (3.3), professional responsibility/ethics (3.0), career development (2.8), skills instruction (2.6), bias/cross-cultural competency/racism (2.6), simulation (2.0), procedural rules/law (1.9), and substantive law (1.7).

Every program spends some time on skills instruction and professional responsibility/ethics and professional identity formation, while 36% spend no time on simulations and 38% spend little.

Question I.13: Assignments

The most common assignment for students, irrespective of whether the field placement has a classroom component, is some type of reflective writing/journal, whether shared or not with site supervisors (96% of programs). Eighty-three percent of programs require a self-assessment by the student, 77% a learning agenda or plan, 55% an oral

presentation, 34% a skills exercise, 31% participation in a discussion board, 23% redacted work product or writing samples from fieldwork, 16% a simulated drafting assignment and 7% a research paper.

Question I.14: Classroom/Reflection Component Grading

The most common reflection component grading method is mandatory pass/fail grades (54% of programs), followed by mandatory letter or number grades (35%), and mixed pass/fail and letter/number grades (10), similar to the results from 2022-23 and 2019-22 surveys. In contrast, in the 2016-17 survey, 55% of courses awarded mandatory letter or number grades and 38% mandatory pass/fail grades.

Among programs that grade with letters or numbers, 29% grade on a curve. Of those graded on a curve, 50% have a curve similar to or the same as the curve used by the school in other low enrollment courses, 30% have a curve similar to or the same as that used by the school for all courses, and 20% have a more flexible or higher curve than the curve used in other courses

ADDITIONAL TERM

Question I.15: Repeat Enrollment

Sixty-three percent of schools permit students to enroll more than once in the same field placement course, the same as the 2022-23 survey but an increase from 50% in 2019-20 and 55% in 2016-17. Among those permitting additional terms, 80% allow students to continue in the same placement office with conditions, 16% allow students to continue in the same office without conditions, and 4% require students to work in a placement office different from the prior enrollment.

Of the schools allowing enrollment in more than one field placement course, the reflection component for repeat enrollments is most often handled by other means of ongoing, contemporaneous faculty-guided reflection (48%), followed by a classroom component (39%) (perhaps with modifications such as different content, assignments, or attendance rules), and 11% through regularly scheduled tutorials.

EVALUATION AND MONITORING OF FIELD PLACEMENT OFFICES

Question I.16: Student Placement Selection

The most common way students are paired with placements for their fieldwork is by finding their own placements and then seeking approval by the school (40%). In 24% of programs, students meet with faculty/staff and then apply to suitable placements, in 18% students find their own placements from a list of pre-approved offices, and in 10% students are matched to placements by school staff/faculty.

Question I.17: Field Placement Site Oversight

Schools were asked to indicate the methods used to monitor/evaluate the legal offices where students are placed, as set forth below:

TABLE 38

Placement Oversight Method	Percent of Schools Reporting
	2025-26
Student evaluation of office/site supervisor; other student discussion	97
Email communication with site supervisors	93
Review of student timesheets	86
Telephone/videoconference with site supervisor	76
Site visit(s) to office	50

Question I.18: Placement Site Visits

Site visits to the placement office are conducted in 71% of field placement programs, with 52% done on site and 64% now done virtually. Where visits are done, 47% of programs visit sites irregularly/occasionally, 44% visit in semesters when a student is placed at the office, 23% limit visits to new host offices or site supervisors, 12% visit each term, and 12% visit annually.

Question I.19: Site Supervisor Training

The most common methods of training field placement supervising attorneys are through written materials (94%) and individual discussions with supervisors (75%). Twenty-nine percent of programs conduct live training-online, 18% provide video training (not live), and 17% hold in person training. In the 2019-20 survey (distributed before COVID-19), only 8% of courses used online training, while 23% used in-person training.

Question I.20: Total Fieldwork Hours During Academic Year

Eighty-three field placement programs estimated their students provided a total of over 1,325,000 hours of free legal services during the 2024-25 fall/winter/spring terms to nonprofit organizations, governmental offices, and judicial chambers (compensated or

uncompensated), not including hours spent working in for-profit placements. This amounts to almost 16,000 hours of free legal services per field placement program.

Extrapolating to all ABA-accredited law schools, students in field placement courses provided an estimated 3 million total hours of free legal assistance during the 2024-25 non-summer academic year to nonprofit organizations, governmental offices, and judicial chambers.

SUMMER FIELD PLACEMENTS

Questions I.1: Summer Enrollment

Seventy-seven percent of schools offer summer field placement courses. The median enrollment in summer field placement courses is 25 students, similar to the 2022-23 survey. Twenty-one percent of summer courses enroll more than 50 students; 8% enroll 5 or fewer.

Question I.21: Summer Course Structure

Respondents were asked describe if and how their summer externship course differs from their academic-year program. Two thirds of summer courses use a classroom/reflective component delivery method that differs significantly from that used in the fall/winter/spring terms, while 40% offer different academic credits, and 9% only allow certain groups of students to enroll (e.g., international students, part-time JD students).

Question I.22: Summer Credits

The median number of credits a student receives per summer term for the combined fieldwork and reflection components is 3 credits.

Thirty-five percent of summer field placement programs offer students fixed credits for fieldwork and sixty-five offer variable credits. Where a summer program offers variable credits, the median minimum number of credits is 2 and the maximum is 6.

Question I.23: Summer Classroom/Reflection Component Approach

Seventy-six percent of summer field placement courses meet the ABA reflection component requirement through a classroom instructional component, while 22% meet the requirement through regularly scheduled faculty tutorials, and 34% through other means of faculty-guided reflection.

Question I.24: Summer Classroom Approach

Where there is a summer classroom component, in 65% of programs the classroom is run similarly to non-summer classes in terms of frequency and instructional methods. In 39% the summer component is taught online (unlike non-summer terms), in 17% the summer component meets less frequently, and in 9% it is front-loaded (e.g., on-site orientation before students leave).

Question I.25: Total Summer Fieldwork Hours

Fifty-nine field placement programs estimated their students provided a total of 303,700 hours of free legal services during the 2025 summer terms to nonprofit organizations, governmental offices, and judicial chambers (compensated or uncompensated, but not hours working in for-profit placements), or almost 5,150 hours per summer field placement program.

Extrapolating to all ABA-accredited schools that offer summer field placement programs, students in summer field placement courses provided an estimated 750,000 total hours of free legal assistance during the 2025 summer term to nonprofit organizations, governmental offices, and judicial chambers.¹⁴

VI. INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESULTS – INSTRUCTOR PROFILE

More than 1,100 full-time law clinic or field placement course instructors provided information on their teaching position. The data are below.

INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

Question D.1: Years of Clinic/Field Placement Teaching

The number of years of teaching in a clinic or field placement course as the respondent's primary occupation range from fewer than 1 to 52 years. The median years of clinical teaching experience is 9, similar to prior surveys.

14. This estimate is calculated by multiplying the average number of summer hours per program (5,150) by the total number of schools with summer field placement programs (per Question I.1a, 77% of the 192 ABA schools or 147) = 757,000.

Question D.2: Years of Law Practice Prior to Teaching

The number of years of law practice prior to entering teaching range from fewer than 1 to 40 years. The median number of years of prior practice is 8, the same as the four previous surveys.

Questions D.3-4: Gender and Race/Ethnicity

Law clinic and field placement instructors are increasingly female. The composition of instructors is 69% female, 30% male, and 1% genderqueer/non-binary. In the 2022-23 and 2019-20 surveys, 67% were female; in 2016-17, 65%; in 2013-14, 63%; and in 2010-11, 60%. Within teaching areas, 67% of those who teach law clinic courses and 75% of those who teach field placement courses are female (excluding fellows).¹⁵

CSALE surveys use the American Bar Association categories of race/ethnicity, which have changed over time. The current U.S. Census protocol allows respondents to select more than one category if appropriate, which the current and two prior CSALE surveys also allowed. The race/ethnicity of full-time instructors were:

TABLE 39

Race/Ethnicity	Percent Reporting					
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
American Indian or Alaska Native	< 1	< 1	< 1	1	1	1
Asian	—	—	6	8	9	10
Asian Indian	2	3	—	—	—	—
Black or African American	5	5	7	9	9	9
Chinese	1	< 1	—	—	—	—
Filipino	0	< 1	—		—	—
Hispanics of Any Race	2	3	5	6	6	7
Japanese	< 1	< 1	—	—	—	—
Korean	< 1	< 1	—	—	—	—

15. Because fellows are short-term, limited employment positions, they are excluded from a number of the following tables to ensure a more accurate portrayal of the employment conditions for permanent clinic and field placement course instructors. More detailed information on fellows is available by request to administrator@csale.org.

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>					
	2010-11	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	< 1	0	< 1	< 1	< 1	< 1
Vietnamese	0	< 1	—	—	—	—
Samoan	0	< 1	—	—	—	—
White	84	84	79	81	79	76
Two or more races	—	—	3	—	3	5
Other	3	2	—	—	—	2

Within clinical teaching areas, 76% of those who teach law clinic courses and 76% of those who teach field placement courses are white (excluding fellows).

EMPLOYMENT STATUS/TERM AND COMPENSATION

Question E.1: Employment Status/Term

Respondents who are full-time employees of the school and serve as directors or in other instructional roles for clinic or field placement courses were asked to describe their employment status/contract terms.¹⁶ Grouping by types of appointment, the results are:

All Respondents — Law Clinic and Field Placement Course Instructors

TABLE 40

<i>Employment Status/Term — All Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Tenured (Unitary/Traditional)	21	18	16	14	13
On Tenure track	6	7	5	6	7
Clinical tenured	6	7	8	9	8
On Clinical tenure track	3	3	4	3	4
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	—	—	31	32	33

16. The definitions of the types of employment status/terms are set out in footnotes 6-8 of the report.

<i>Employment Status/Term — All Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>				
	2013-14	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Other long-term contract (e.g., not presumptively renewable)	—	—	—	—	4
≥ 5-year contract	22	25	—	—	—
≤ 4-year contract	31	28	—	—	—
Short-term probationary contract	—	—	6	7	8
Other short-term contract or at will	—	—	13	16	14
Fellow	4	3	5	5	4
Administrative position w/ faculty title	—	3	4	3	2
Administrative position w/out faculty title	—	2	2	3	3
Other employment term	6	4	6	5	2

Law Clinic Instructors

The table below shows the employment status for full-time school employees with an instructional role in a clinic (as opposed to the combined clinic and field placement data above). This data includes clinic instructors who may have also taught in a field placement course, but not as the director for the field placement course (i.e., this data only includes those who primarily teach in clinics).

TABLE 41

<i>Employment Status Term — Law Clinic Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Tenured (Unitary/Traditional)	16	15	13
On tenure track	6	6	7
Clinical tenured	8	10	8
Clinical tenure track	4	3	4

<i>Employment Status Term — Law Clinic Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	31	33	33
Other long-term contract (e.g., not presumptively renewable)	—	—	4
Short-term probationary contract	6	7	8
Other short-term contract or at will	14	16	15
Fellow	5	7	4
Administrative position w/ faculty title	4	1	1
Administrative position w/out faculty title	2	1	1
Other employment term	5	2	2

Field Placement Course Instructors

The following table shows the employment status/term for full-time employees with an instructional role in a field placement course. This data includes field placement instructors who may have also taught in a clinic, but not as the director for the clinic (i.e., this data only includes those who primarily teach in field placements).

TABLE 42

<i>Employment Status Term — Field Placement Course Instructors</i>	<i>Percent Reporting</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Tenured (Unitary/Traditional)	15	9	6
On Tenure track	< 1	3	1
Clinical tenured	4	1	5
On Clinical tenure track	3	2	3
Long-term presumptively renewable contract	26	31	32
Other long-term contract (e.g., not presumptively renewable)	—	—	5

Employment Status Term — Field Placement Course Instructors	Percent Reporting		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Short-term probationary contract leading to long-term	4	3	7
Other short-term contract or at will	11	19	12
Fellow	2	2	1
Administrative position w/ faculty title	18	15	9
Administrative position w/out faculty title	9	12	15
Other employment term	6	2	4

Questions E.2-5: Compensation

Approximately 1,100 law clinic and field placement instructors provided their annual base compensation in a series of fixed ranges (exclusive of supplements for summer or administrative duties). The table below displays the 25th, median, and 75th percentile annual salaries for groups of instructors, excluding fellows. Upon request to administrator@csale.org, salary ranges can be provided for other groupings (e.g., discipline (law clinic or field placement), geographic region, peer schools). Salary data, however, will not be provided in any form that might tie salaries to any respondents.

TABLE 43

Instructors	Annual Salary		
	25th percentile	Median	75th Percentile
Law clinic <u>and</u> field placement instructors	110,000-119,999	130,000-139,999	170,000-179,999
Law clinic instructors ¹⁷	110,000-119,999	130,000-139,999	170,000-179,999
Field placement instructors ¹⁸	95,000-104,999	115,000-124,999	140,000-149,999
Teaching 3 years or fewer	90,000-99,999	115,000-124,999	130,000-139,999

17. Law clinic instructors who also direct a field placement course are excluded.

18. Field placement instructors who also direct a law clinic are excluded.

Typical salaries vary between regions of the country:

TABLE 44

<i>School's Region</i>	<i>Median Annual Salary</i>
Far West (AZ, CA, HI, NV, OR, UT, WA)	155,000-164,999
Northwest & Great Plains (ID, MT, NE, ND, SD, WY)	110,000-119,999
Southwest & South Central (AR, CO, KS, LA, MO, NM, OK, TX)	115,000-124,999
Great Lakes/Upper Midwest (IL, IN, IA, MI, MN, OH, WI)	135,000-144,999
Southeast (AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, TN, WV)	125,000-134,999
Mid Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, NJ, NC, PA, SC, VA)	140,000-149,999
Northeastern (CT, MA, ME, NH, NY (not NY City & Long Island), RI, VT)	125,000-134,999
New York City and Long Island	175,000-185,000

The sources of salaries for instructors are: "hard money" (tuition, endowment income, or, at a public institution, state subsidies) (77%); "soft money" (grants or other external funding) (10%); and a mix of "hard" and "soft" money (13%). These percentages are similar to the three prior surveys.

The base salary for 67% of respondents covers a 12-month period, for 27% a 9-month period, and for 4% a 10-month period, similar to prior surveys.

For those whose base salary covers less than a 12-month period, 78% can apply for a summer salary supplement, compared to 89% in the 2022-23 survey, 75% in the 2019-20 survey, and 58% in the 2016-17 survey. Where summer funding is available, respondents were asked to provide the amount of the funding as a percentage of their base annual salary. The median summary salary supplement is 11%, similar to the three prior surveys.

GOVERNANCE AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Question F.1: Voting Rights

Voting rights for instructors (excluding fellows) teaching in law clinics and field placement courses are:

TABLE 45

<i>Faculty Meeting Participation</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents Entitled to Vote</i>			
	2016-17	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
Vote on all faculty matters	28	27	34	26
Vote on all except podium/doctrinal faculty hiring, promotion, and/or tenure	41	45	35	48
Vote on administrative matters only	4	2	2	2
Not vote but can generally attend meetings	16	17	18	18
Not permitted to attend meetings	5	7	8	7

As with employment status, there are differences in faculty meeting participation rights between law clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows and those with a director role in the other type of course to focus on their primary teaching role):

TABLE 46

<i>Faculty Meeting Participation</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents Entitled to Vote</i>	
	Law Clinic	Field Placement
Vote on all faculty matters	27	15
Vote on all except podium/doctrinal faculty hiring, promotion, and/or tenure	48	41
Vote on administrative matters only	1	4
Not vote but can generally attend meetings	16	30
Not permitted to attend meetings	7	10

Question F.2: Committee Participation

The chart below displays various law school committees and the percentage of respondents entitled to participate in and vote on the committee (excluding fellows).

TABLE 47

<i>Participation in Types of Committees Addressing</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents Allowed to Participate</i>		
	2019-20	2022-23	2025-26
All committees	44	45	38
All committees except those addressing podium/doctrinal faculty hiring, promotion and/or tenure	45	47	39
Committees addressing clinical faculty hiring and promotion	71	72	79
Can participate in some but not vote on any	8	6	9
Cannot participate or vote on any committee	10	12	11

Question F.3: Additional Program Management Positions

In addition to their role in a clinic or field placement course, 28% of instructors (excluding fellows) hold additional management positions within the school's clinic/field placement program. Twenty-seven percent of those who have an additional program management position receive a reduction in their normal teaching load, with 30% the median amount of any teaching load reduction. Fifty-six percent receive a stipend or increase in their base salary for the additional program position, with 10% the median amount of any stipend or increase. Thirty-five percent of those who have an additional program position receive neither a teaching load reduction nor a stipend or salary increase for the additional management duties.

Question F.4: Teaching Additional Course

Only 5% of full-time clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) are precluded, whether by rule or practice, by their school from also teaching podium/doctrinal courses. Nineteen percent are required to teach those courses as part of their normal teaching loads, 62% are allowed to teach those courses though not part of their normal loads, and 14% are unsure if they are allowed or prohibited. Of those for whom it is allowed but not required as a part of their normal teaching load, 41% taught a doctrinal/podium course over the three previous years.

Only 2% of full-time clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) are precluded, by rule or practice, by their school from teaching simulation/skills courses. Seven percent are required to teach those courses as part of their normal loads, and 76%

are allowed to teach those courses though not required as part of their normal teaching loads, and 15% are unsure if they are allowed or prohibited. Of those for whom it is allowed but not part of their normal teaching load, 21% taught a simulation/skills course over the three previous years.

Of those who taught either a doctrinal or simulation/skills course, but who were not required to do so as a part of their normal teaching load, 22% were relieved (fully or partially) of their clinic or field placement teaching obligations while teaching the course, and 38% received additional compensation for the course. Forty-four percent of those for whom the course was in addition to their normal teaching load, were neither relieved of their clinic or field placement teaching obligations nor received additional compensation for teaching the additional courses.

Question F.5: Professional Development Support

Ninety-six percent of clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) receive funds from their school for their professional development (e.g., attend conferences, research assistance, membership dues, book purchases, etc.). The amount provided is similar to that provided to podium/doctrinal faculty for 54% of those respondents; for 14% it is less than the amount provided to podium/doctrinal faculty, for 1% the amount is more, and 30% do not know the amount podium/doctrinal faculty at their school receive.

Question F.6: Scholarship

Twenty-eight percent of clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) are required to produce scholarship as part of their jobs; for 53% scholarship is beneficial to their position but is not required; and for 19% scholarship is neither required nor beneficial to the instructor's position within the school.

Of those for whom scholarship is required for their position, 97% can obtain support for research assistance with their scholarship and 32% have their teaching obligations reduced for scholarship. Of those for whom scholarship is beneficial but not required, 76% are able to obtain research assistance and 10% have their teaching obligations reduced for scholarship.

Question F.7: Sabbatical/Developmental Leave

Paid sabbaticals/developmental leaves are available to 48% of clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows). For 80%, the length of time of the sabbatical/development leave is the same as the length provided to podium/doctrinal faculty, while for 3% it is different (17% of respondents did not know if it is the same or different).

Sabbaticals are available for 79% of those for whom scholarship is required for their position, and available for 31% of those for whom scholarship is beneficial but not required.

RECRUITMENT PROCESS

Question G.1-2: Prior Employment Position

Twenty-two percent of law clinic and field placement instructors (excluding fellows) have been teaching in a clinic or field placement course three years or fewer. Their employment types immediately prior to their current positions are:

TABLE 48

<i>Prior Employment</i>	<i>Percent of Respondents</i>
Law firm	21
Legal Services	16
Other nonprofit	12
Clinical fellow	12
Public Defender	11
Other government	11
For-profit/corporate	4
Prosecutor	2
Other	12

Question G.3: Recruitment Methods

New teachers learned about available clinic or field placement teaching positions in a variety of ways: 49% were told about available positions; 35% learned about them from school job postings or announcements; 19% were contacted by the schools; 15% were already working with the schools; 14% learned from the Clinical Legal Education Association (CLEA) job listings; 11% through the AALS Faculty Recruitment Service; 11% from the law clinic or externship listserv; and 3% by other means.

Question G.4: Hiring Process

For 73% of new teachers, the hiring process involved an onsite visit for face-to-face interviews; for 10% face-to-face interviews in a place other than at the school; and for 67% telephone or video interview. Sixty-three percent had informal meetings with groups of faculty as part of the hiring process, while 54% gave a “job talk” to faculty.

Question G.5: Hiring Negotiations

New clinic and field placement teachers were asked which, if any, aspects of their employment they were able to negotiate and change from the original job offer made by their school. Sixty-one percent of new teachers were able to change the original offer made by their school.

Of all new teachers, 40% were able to negotiate their salaries from the original offer, 19% negotiated help with relocation, 15% the course(s) to be taught, 14% a term off to prepare or ramp up for teaching, 12% support for professional development, 11% their titles, 9% their teaching loads (either the number of courses or number of students in courses) or the length of their employment term, and 7% support for scholarship (either financial or release time/reduced teaching).

PARTICIPATING LAW SCHOOLS
(Survey of School Programs)

Albany Law School
American University
Arizona State University
Atlanta's John Marshall Law School
Ave Maria School of Law
Barry University
Baylor University
Belmont University
Boston College
Boston University
Brigham Young University
Brooklyn Law School
California Western School of Law
Campbell University
Capital University
Case Western Reserve University
Catholic University
Chapman University
Charleston School of Law
Chicago-Kent College of Law
City University of New York
Cleveland State University
Columbia University
Cornell University
Creighton University
DePaul University
Drake University
Drexel University
Duke University
Duquesne University
Elon University
Emory University
Faulkner University
Florida A & M University
Florida State University
Fordham University
Georgetown University
George Washington University

Georgia State University
Gonzaga University
Harvard University
Hofstra University
Howard University
Indiana University - Bloomington
Indiana University – Indianapolis
Lewis and Clark Law School
Louisiana State University
Loyola University - Chicago
Loyola University - Los Angeles
Loyola University - New Orleans
Marquette University
Mercer University
Michigan State University
Mississippi College of Law
Mitchell Hamline
New England Law | Boston
New York Law School
New York University
North Carolina Central University
Northeastern University
Northern Illinois University
Northern Kentucky University
Northwestern University
Nova Southeastern University
Ohio Northern University
Ohio State University
Oklahoma City University
Pace University
Pennsylvania State Dickinson Law
Pepperdine University
Quinnipiac University
Regent University
Roger Williams University
Rutgers Law School
Santa Clara University
Seattle University
Seton Hall University
South Texas College of Law Houston
Southern Methodist University
Southern University

Southwestern University
St. John's University
St. Louis University
St. Mary's University
St. Thomas University - Florida
Stanford University
Stetson University
Suffolk University
Syracuse University
Temple University
Texas A&M University
Texas Southern University
Texas Tech University
Touro University
Tulane University
Univ. at Buffalo
Univ. of Akron
Univ. of Alabama
Univ of Arizona
Univ. of Arkansas
Univ. of Arkansas at Little Rock
Univ. of Baltimore
Univ. of California - Berkeley
Univ. of California College of Law, San Francisco
Univ. of California - Davis
Univ. of California - Irvine
Univ. of California – Los Angeles
Univ. of Chicago
Univ. of Cincinnati
Univ. of Colorado
Univ. of Connecticut
Univ. of Dayton
Univ. of Denver
Univ. of Detroit Mercy
Univ. of District of Columbia
Univ. of Florida
Univ. of Georgia
Univ. of Hawaii
Univ. of Houston
Univ. of Idaho
Univ. of Illinois
Univ. of Illinois Chicago

Univ. of Iowa
Univ. of Kansas
Univ. of Kentucky
Univ. of Louisville
Univ. of Maine
Univ. of Maryland
Univ. of Massachusetts
Univ. of Memphis
Univ. of Miami
Univ. of Michigan
Univ. of Minnesota
Univ. of Mississippi
Univ. of Missouri - Columbia
Univ. of Missouri - Kansas City
Univ. of Montana
Univ. of Nebraska
Univ. of Nevada Las Vegas
Univ. of New Hampshire
Univ. of New Mexico
Univ. of North Carolina
Univ. of North Dakota
Univ. of North Texas - Dallas
Univ. of Oklahoma
Univ. of Oregon
Univ. of Pacific - McGeorge
Univ. of Pennsylvania
Univ. of Pittsburgh
Univ. of Richmond
Univ. of San Diego
Univ. of San Francisco
Univ. of South Carolina
Univ. of South Dakota
Univ. of Southern California
Univ. of St. Thomas - Minneapolis
Univ. of Tennessee
Univ. of Texas
Univ. of Toledo
Univ. of Tulsa
Univ. of Utah
Univ. of Virginia
Univ. of Washington
Univ. of Wisconsin

Univ. of Wyoming
Vanderbilt University
Vermont Law & Graduate School
Villanova University
Wake Forest University
Washburn University
Washington University in St. Louis
Wayne State University
West Virginia University
Western Michigan University - Cooley
Western New England School of Law
Widener University - Commonwealth
Widener University - Delaware
Willamette University
William & Mary
Wilmington University
Yale University
Yeshiva University - Cardozo