

OCS Weekly Bulletin

January 9, 2008

Announcements/Upcoming Events, 1L Jobs & Career-Related Articles

What's Inside

*Announcements/
Upcoming Events,
Page 1*

*Career-Related Ar-
ticles, Pages 2-6*

*OCS Staff Contact
Info, Page 7*

About OCS

The Office of Career Services (OCS) serves as a bridge between students, alumni and employers. The staff helps students and alumni to shape and realize their career goals. We also provide counseling, workshops and resources on judicial clerkships, international opportunities and non-law alternatives.

OCS is open Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. The office is located on the first floor in Room 143 in the Law School's office building on Nathan Abbott Way.

Announcements/Upcoming Events

2008 Spring OCI Orientation- January 10th, 12:45PM in Room 180

The mandatory Spring OCI Orientation will be held on Thursday, January 10th at 12:45PM in Room 180. We will be covering the general OCI procedures and topics, and answering any questions about the OCI process. All students who plan to participate must attend this orientation.

Spotlight Lunch with Judge Susan Illston- January 10th, 12:45PM, Room 79A

The Hon. Susan Illston, US District Court, Northern District of California, will be here on Thursday for a spotlight lunch with 2Ls and 3Ls. Space is limited and is first come, first served. You may sign up through Symplicity, under Events.

This is a great chance to meet and talk with a District Court Judge in a more intimate setting. Judge Illston is an SLS graduate and has been on the bench since 1995. Prior to that she had a private practice here in Northern California. If you have any questions, contact Lee Kite (lkite@law.stanford.edu) or Elizabeth Armand (earmand@law.stanford.edu).

Advanced Degree Mock Interviews- January 10th

If you are interested in participating, please let Maureen Krantz know via email at mkrantz@law.stanford.edu. Please let her know if you would like to participate but cannot attend on Thursday.

1L Mock Interviews- January 15th - 17th

1Ls should have received the invitation to join Google Docs for sign ups. If you did not, please contact Lee Kite at lkite@law.stanford.edu. Remember that these mocks are for those students who did not participate in either the November program or the Levin Center program.

(continued on next page)

Announcements/Upcoming Events (cont.)

Columbia Job Fair Prep Session- January 15th, 12:45PM in Room 185

This prep session is mandatory for students attending the Columbia Job Fair. If you cannot make it, please contact Maureen Krantz at mkrantz@law.stanford.edu.

1L Private Sector Job Postings

Just a reminder about 1L summer jobs-- in addition to Spring OCI as a job search option, don't forget to check 1L job opportunities listed in Symplicity. Applying for these jobs can be as simple as uploading your resume and attaching it to a job posting.

Below are some recently-added 1L job postings in Symplicity. You can check them out by going to:

<https://law-stanford-csm.symplicity.com/students>. For a quick search, enter the employer name or portion thereof in the "Keywords" field.

Job Title, Employer (Location):

Summer Associate- Corporate Department NYC, Boies Schiller & Flexner LLP (New York, NY)

Summer Associate, Covington & Burling (San Francisco, CA)

1L Summer Associate- Intellectual Property, Foley & Lardner (Los Angeles, CA)

Patent 1L Summer Associates, Morrison & Foerster LLP (Palo Alto & San Francisco, CA)

Oracle Summer Intern, Oracle Corporation (Redwood Shores, CA)

2008 1L Summer Associate Program, Weil Gotshal & Manges (New York, NY)

Career-Related Articles

• **Latham Ramps Up Parental Benefits; Will Other Firms Follow?**..... Page 3

Latham & Watkins has announced a new parental leave policy for associates that significantly ups the amount of time biological and adoptive parents can take leave while getting their full base salary. Observers say that, much like associate salaries, Latham's move -- and some by other firms -- could have ripple effects. "Any time a market leader makes a move that can be interpreted as a recruiting tool, other firms in the space will take a long, hard look," said a recruiter for Major, Lindsey & Africa.

• **Fighting the Subtler Side of Sexism**..... Pages 4-5

Lorelie Masters has her own theory about women's lack of progress in the legal profession. It isn't so much about telecommuting on Fridays or meeting draconian billable goals. The Jenner & Block litigator has a different beef -- with the subtle slights, hidden assumptions and veiled sexism that undercut many women in the corporate legal world. It's what some have called "the soft bigotry of low expectations." But Masters has some ideas about what attorneys and law firms can do to conquer this sexism.

• **Law Firms' Billing Rates Continue to Climb**.....Pages 5-6

Elite law firms charged an average of 7.7 percent more in 2007, and clients aren't happy about it.

Career-Related Articles

Latham Ramps Up Parental Benefits; Will Other Firms Follow?

Kellie Schmitt
The Recorder
12-14-2007

Latham & Watkins announced a new parental leave policy for associates this week that significantly ups the amount of time biological and adoptive parents can take leave while receiving their full base salary.

Some observers say that, much like associate salaries, Latham's move -- and some by other firms -- could have ripple effects.

"Any time a market leader makes a move that can be interpreted as a recruiting tool, other firms in the space will take a long, hard look," said Peter Ocko, a Los Angeles-based associate recruiter for Major, Lindsey & Africa.

Latham's new policy scraps one that provided 12 weeks for primary-caregiver birth mothers and four weeks for new fathers and adoptive parents. It replaces it with 18 weeks for birth mothers who are primary caregivers and adoptive parents who are primary caregivers. It also increases to 10 weeks the time other primary caregivers -- such as a biological father -- can take off.

The firm is also launching an option for associates to return on a reduced schedule for six months after their child's arrival without prior approval -- and without full-time billable-hour requirements.

Latham isn't the first firm to up the family benefits package -- Simpson Thacher & Bartlett made a similar move this summer, expanding its policy to 18 weeks, paid, for primary caregivers.

Such moves underscore just how important those benefits can be to new recruits, legal professionals say. They could be harbingers of industrywide improvements to family leave benefits.

"For many associates, whether or not they have families, it's an indication of flexibility," Ocko said. "Associates care about all that a firm offers."

Latham made the decision because of a groundswell from its associates committee suggesting the change, said Richard Bress, the chairman of that committee.

"It is an attempt to support associates, including those with new children,

and help them balance work and family," Bress said.

A POSITIVE RESPONSE

Leaders at other firms applauded the move.

After a year of employment, full-time Heller associates are entitled to take up to 16 weeks off to care for a newborn, newly adopted or foster child, according to the firm's Web site.

At Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, 16 weeks of paid leave for female associates -- as well as being flexible about individual needs such as working from home -- is important to retain talented women who may one day enter the partnership, said partner William Urquhart.

"I think all law firms are looking for ways to keep an incredible talent base not only for reasons of diversity but also to better serve clients," he said. "We, like every other forward-looking law firm, are looking for ways to accommodate women, particularly when they have kids."

A key segment of Latham's new policy is the option of returning on a reduced schedule, said Joan Williams, the director of the Center for WorkLife Law at Hastings College of the Law. Williams said she's aware of just a handful of other firms doing that, and will probably have the center adopt the idea as a "best practice." "I think law firms are trying very, very hard because they are truly alarmed about the rates of attrition among lawyers they want to keep," she said.

She also pointed out the importance of increased paternity leave, saying studies have linked early paternal care to a father's long-term involvement with a child.

Broadening the definition of primary caregivers represents a change in Latham's policy.

"Before, we didn't have the concept of a primary caregiver for the father," Bress said.

Under the policy, the firm will be open to hearing about someone's situation when

it comes to designations like "primary" or "non-primary," Bress said.

"You can't foresee all family situations," he said. "We're not going to go knock on people's doors." Generally speaking, within a couple, one person is designated primary caregiver under Latham's policy. But the new policy allows for all kinds of arrangements. For example, if a father stays at home to take care of a baby, he can become the primary caregiver -- earning 10 weeks off.

The firm also greatly expanded the benefits for adoptive parents.

"Families come in all shapes and sizes," Bress said. "We wanted to mirror what we're doing for the birth parents."

And that's important for lesbian and gay parents who choose to adopt children, said recruiter Claudia Trevisan, who works at L.A.-based Swan Legal Search.

"I find it's quite important to have these policies -- not just for female associates but also for fathers-to-be as well as gay and lesbian associates," she said. "When a firm isn't proactive about policies, that's what makes associates leave. It's great that Latham is stepping out in the forefront."

Career-Related Articles

Fighting the Subtler Side of Sexism

Debra Bruno

Legal Times

December 13, 2007

Lorelie Masters has her own theory about women's lack of progress in the legal profession. It isn't so much about telecommuting on Fridays or meeting draconian billable goals. The president of the Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia has a different beef -- with the subtle slights, hidden assumptions and veiled sexism that undercut many women in the corporate legal world. It's what some have called "the soft bigotry of low expectations."

It's far too easy for law firms today to shrug their shoulders when yet another woman departs, says Masters. They tell themselves: We tried, but there's nothing we really could have done -- she just wanted to spend more time with her family. That exculpates the firm and shifts the blame to the lawyer who's leaving.

Not so fast, Masters interjects. Maybe, just maybe, those women wanted to stay. Maybe -- despite assumptions -- they're just as ambitious as the men. But maybe they're also sick of being pushed to the side, of not getting invited to the client meetings or offered the second chair in a big lawsuit.

Consider the partner preparing for a trial in 12 months. Does he add the female associate to the team? No, he strikes her from his list because she has a young family, and he figures committing the time down the road would be too hard.

That's wrong, says Masters. "Ask first," she advises. "Don't make that determination" for the young woman.

Here's another example of the slights that, eventually, derail careers. A woman goes into a big meeting, says Masters, and she raises an idea. "The conversation continues. Suddenly, 10 minutes later, a guy raises that same idea," and everyone loves it.

"It's an accumulation of those kinds of incidents," Masters says. "It's the accumulated drip-drip-drip."

ONLY A FRACTION

Masters' point ties in with a report released just last month by the National Association of Women Lawyers. The group's

second annual survey on the status of women in law firms found (big surprise) that "women advance into the upper levels of law firms with only a fraction of the success enjoyed by their male classmates." Those fractions are well-known: The NAWL found, for instance, that an average of 16 percent of the firms' equity partners are women. Compare that with national numbers offered up by NALP (formerly the National Association for Legal Professionals) from 2005, when 48 percent of summer associates and 44 percent of first-year associates were women.

Even more interestingly, the NAWL survey (which questioned 200 of the country's largest firms and received responses from 112) found a significant salary gap as women advance through the ranks. Male and female associates, for the most part, make about the same amount. But male of counsel earn about \$20,000 more than female of counsel, male nonequity partners make about \$27,000 more than their female counterparts and male equity partners bring in almost \$90,000 more than female equity partners.

What gives? It goes back to the theory of assumptions and slights. The NAWL survey wonders "whether women lawyers are given as many choice assignments, introductions to key firm clients and other opportunities to grow their own practices" as the men.

Maybe that's because women aren't expected to succeed like the men do. And so the firm sees the women as the ones heading for flex-time and the "mommy track," not as future leaders to be encouraged.

Masters' own experience sheds some light. The insurance litigator now with the Washington, D.C., office of Jenner & Block is trying like mad not to point a finger, but what she told her former firm, Anderson Kill & Olick -- that she was "pursuing other opportunities" -- was really only part of the story. The truth is less flattering to the firm. "I did feel that at my old firm, the business that came in the door went to the guys," and that opportunities were not distributed evenly, she says.

Dawn Gertz, Anderson Kill's chief marketing officer, says that the firm is "delighted for Lorie" in her success and that, while the firm doesn't usually comment on attorneys who have moved on, "a good deal of time has passed since Lorelie left the firm." (Masters left Anderson Kill in 2000.)

Part of this is the fault of women themselves, acknowledges Masters. Women have bought into the myth of meritocracy. It's an instinct that served them well as students: Sit up front, take great notes and always do your homework. It translates badly, though, into a law office, where they still assume, "If I'm a good lawyer, that's enough," she says.

In fact, Masters says that she spent the first dozen or so years of law firm life thinking just that -- if she did the best job possible, success would come to her. "And then in 1994, I realized that no one is going to know who Lorie Masters is unless I take charge." And that meant, among other things, recognizing that the firm wasn't necessarily going to give her career the same support it gave the men's careers. Clients, as well, bear some blame: They weren't demanding any kind of diversity in their law firms in the same way they do today.

MIND THE MENTORS

Since becoming president of the D.C. Women's Bar Association in May 2006, Masters has stepped up to the bully pulpit for other women, too. She offers a number of concrete proposals for firms to consider.

Masters thinks that firms need to provide real mentoring of associates, not just a program that almost randomly assigns one partner to one associate and then requires little followthrough. For instance, mentors need to bring their associates into client pitch meetings and depositions, so that they can see successful lawyers in action.

Another suggestion she makes is to encourage senior male partners to mentor female associates. Granted, the idea could be interpreted as another form of old-fashioned paternalism, but Masters compares it

Career-Related Articles (cont.)

Fighting the Subtler Side of Sexism

(continued from page 4)

to the way that fathers provide role models to their daughters. She believes that those older partners can teach young associates important lessons about how to thrive in the profession. "People who get the best mentoring are those who work with people who are the most successful in the firm," she says. "But there are only so many of those people."

Associates with active, successful mentors get access to the kind of informal network that also introduces them to clients. But even then there has to be a way to socialize with clients beyond golf and football. "Maybe let's get away from the Redskins tickets -- that's just one example," says Masters.

And when women do leave anyway, law firms need to figure out a way to conduct exit interviews to get some honest assessments of what happened. Maybe, Masters suggests, outside consultants can conduct anonymous interviews to find out what went wrong without those details coming back to haunt the departing lawyer. Jenner & Block does do exit interviews using outside consultants, she says.

Finally, she says, it's necessary to talk about these things in larger settings. That's where the bar association comes in: "We can be the voice for people who don't want to burn those bridges."

SO MANY INITIATIVES

Obviously, law firms are giving some lip service to women's issues. The NAWL survey reports that a whopping 95 percent of the large firms say they have set up "women's initiatives" to help women develop their careers. Those initiatives include social networking, professional development and formal mentoring programs.

But the real question is whether these "initiatives" add up to anything or if they have about the same success as efforts to increase the number of African-American attorneys, which seem to have had little effect on overall retention. Most of these initiatives have been around for only a few years, so the argument could be made that this kind of cultural change takes time. But women have been patient for many years already. Masters says, "My fear is that if we don't address this, it's not really going to change."

A few large firms seem to be bucking the trend, incrementally. McGuireWoods, for instance, has 19.3 percent women equity partners -- and that will probably increase with the new partnership elections, says Kimberly Cacheris, the Charlotte, N.C.-based chair of McGuireWoods' Women's Leadership Forum.

But, tellingly, even the firm that was in some ways a pioneer in the women's department seems a little sluggish in the numbers arena. Houston-based Vinson & Elkins, which brags that in 2000 it was the first law firm in the country to create a comprehensive women's initiative and hire an outside consultant to make a formal assessment of firm policies, has just 17 percent women equity partners -- basically, the national average. It's also exactly the same percentage the firm reported in a June 2003 profile in *The American Lawyer*.

Even to Vinson & Elkins, it's a modest result after seven years. If those numbers were the result of a seven-year effort, one might ask: What would the numbers have been if Vinson & Elkins had not had a women's initiative?

Karen Hirschman, chairman of the initiative, acknowledges that the firm is making greater progress hiring and keeping women in its associate levels. As for its partnership ranks, "we're not at all satisfied with those statistics," Hirschman admits. "We are dedicated to improving it."

Law Firms' Billing Rates Continue to Climb

Leigh Jones

The National Law Journal

December 11, 2007

Attorney billing rates shot up in 2007, with approximately three-quarters of the law firms that participated in The National Law Journal's annual survey boosting the amounts they charged for partner and associate services.

At the same time, the average firm-wide billing rates, which included partner and associate rates, climbed by 7.7 percent, while the firmwide median rates rose by 7.1 percent, compared to the firms that reported billing data in 2006.

Despite grousing by clients about ever-higher lawyers' fees, 75.2 percent of the firms providing billing information this year and last charged more this year than

they did in 2006. The figure represents law firms that increased the high end of the billing range charged by their partners and associates.

This year's percentage of law firms increasing their high rates fell shy of last year's percentage of 79.3 percent. But the 2007 uptick, in addition to first-year associate raises to \$160,000 at elite firms, did not sit well with many clients.

"There's always been frustration. Now there's anger," said Susan Hackett, general counsel for the Association of Corporate Counsel.

This year, 119 law firms responded to questions about billing rates that were

included in the NLJ's 2007 survey of the nation's 250 largest law firms. The survey questions were asked of approximately 300 law firms. Last year, 139 firms answered questions about their billing rates, including 109 firms that responded this year.

Among those firms reporting average and median rates both this year and last year, the average of the average firmwide billing rate increased to \$348 per hour from \$321 in 2006, and the average of the median firmwide billing rate this year was \$347, compared to \$324 in 2006.

Two law firms reported charging

Career-Related Articles (cont.)

Law Firms' Billing Rates Continue to Climb

(continued from page 5)

clients \$1,000 an hour -- but one later insisted that its initial report was in error and that its actual top rates were considerably lower.

At Greenberg Traurig, the range for partners reported was between \$300 and \$1,000 an hour, with a partner billing average of \$490 and a median of \$500. In 2006, the billing rate for partners at Greenberg Traurig ranged from \$270 to \$850, with an average rate of \$460 and a median of \$475. When asked about its rates, however, a spokeswoman for the law firm said that it should have reported its highest billing rate in 2007 at \$850.

The other law firm reporting a \$1,000-an-hour rate was Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, where the partner billing range ran from \$475 to \$1,000. A spokeswoman for the firm declined to identify any partner who charged the top rate.

Only one firm among those surveyed reported a decrease both in its partner and associate fees. At Sutherland Asbill & Brennan last year, partners billed as much as \$845 an hour; this year, the high end of its partner billing range fell to \$715. The Atlanta firm reported the high end of its associate range at \$415, compared with \$530 in 2006. Again, the firm attributed the anomaly to a reporting error. A spokeswoman said that the high end of the firm's partner range actually was \$890, and that the high end for the associate range was \$515.

The vast majority of the law firms that answered questions about their billing

practices reported increasing their partner high rates, or at least leaving them the same as last year. A full 91.7 percent of the 109 firms that responded in both years raised their high partner rates, and among those firms, 7 percent left associate high rates the same as last year. In addition, 12 percent of the firms that boosted partner high rates reduced associate high rates at the same time.

The profession appeared to deepen its embrace of billing variations and alternatives. Of the 47 law firms that provided such data for this year and last, 34 percent increased the portion of their revenues earned through variations to their standard rates. The variations included discounts and blended rates that were relative to the firms' standard billable hour rates. Alternatives involved departures from billing by the hour, including fixed or flat fees, hybrid fees and contingency fees.

Some 31.9 percent of those firms reported the same portions of their revenues through variations and alternatives this year as they did in 2006, while 4.2 percent decreased the percentage of revenues they received through variations and alternatives.

Bruce Elvin, associate dean at Duke Law School, expects clients to increase their reliance on varied billing structures. Elvin, who teaches a course on the business and economics of law firm practice, added that smaller firms with lower overhead likely will benefit from the higher fees that big firms are charging.

In addition, clients will handle more of their legal work themselves.

"As rates go up, clients assess more closely the distribution of work and who's doing it," Elvin said.

The law firm with the highest associate rate was McKee Nelson, which reported a rate on the high end of \$595. Its associate range started at \$375. The firm's average billing rate was \$446; its mean was \$455.

McKee Nelson reported fielding 224 attorneys this year, representing a 30.2 percent growth rate for the law firm since 2006. In 2007, it added 32 associates. But in light of the slowdown in private-equity and structured-finance work, the firm recently initiated voluntary, temporary "sabbaticals" for associates.

Those cutbacks and the reassignments of other lawyers have affected about 29 associates, said McKee Nelson partner William Nelson.

Nelson said that the attorneys performing credit-market work billed by the project, not by the hour. "Rates are not an issue for us," he said. "Our clients wouldn't hire us if they didn't think our rates for services were fair."

That logic may hold true for some rates, but not for all, said Hackett of the Association of Corporate Counsel.

"The problem isn't the \$1,000-an-hour lawyer who's worth it," she said. "It's the \$450-per-hour associates who aren't."

Contact

Office of Career Services

Stanford Law School Administration Building Room 143
Crown Quadrangle
559 Nathan Abbott Way
Stanford, CA 94305-8610
ocs@law.stanford.edu
650 723.3924

Staff

Susan C. Robinson

Associate Dean for Career Services

susanr@law.stanford.edu

650 723.3925

Susan advises students and alumni on a wide range of issues involving career planning and job searches. She also works closely with employers to assist them in utilizing OCS resources to maximize the recruitment of SLS students and alumni.

Elizabeth C. Armand

Director of Judicial Clerkships

earmand@law.stanford.edu

650 723.0363

Elizabeth is responsible for all aspects of the judicial clerkship application process and manages the legal recruiting program for advanced degree students. She is available to counsel all students on career planning and job-search strategies for private sector as well as judicial clerkship and externship opportunities.

Lee Kite

Private Sector Counselor

lkite@law.stanford.edu

650 725.6786

Lee Kite is a Private Sector Counselor with more than 17 years of experience in legal recruiting and she advises students on private sector careers and options. She has reviewed thousands of resumes, interviewed and evaluated candidates, and served as an informal counselor to summer and new associates.

Maureen Krantz

Director of International and Advanced Degree Programs

mkrantz@law.stanford.edu

650 725.6786

Maureen advises students on international career strategy and development. She also oversees the legal recruiting program for foreign trained lawyers in the advanced degree programs and works with firms and organizations to expand international opportunities for Stanford students.

Melissa Leger

Associate Director of Career Services

melissa@law.stanford.edu

650 723.3924

Melissa Leger runs both the Fall and Spring Campus Interviewing Programs, and is the primary liaison between students and the employers who recruit them.

Renee Ritucci

Career Services Coordinator

rritucci@law.stanford.edu

650 723.3924

Renee is the primary contact for the office and works closely with employers who wish to recruit Stanford Law School students and alumni. She also provides technical assistance with the online jobs search database and helps coordinate the spring and fall Campus Interviewing Programs.