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DEDICATION

For the many people living in Chicago, Minneapolis, and New Orleans who needed legal assistance but also needed to know that someone cared enough to hear their stories. You inspired me never to accept the contrived expectations of this world.

For the women challenged in a pre-Katrina world and after Katrina faced mass confusion and desperate circumstances; often facing the challenges alone.

For the many women who were seeking services due to domestic abuse. We lost a client to bullets one day; one never forgets that kind of day.

For the many children told they would never be anything, do anything or contribute anything. You learned otherwise when offered the opportunity to demonstrate your incredible talents and abilities.

None of the people participating in our programs ever wanted handouts, none of them. They did seek assistance and they needed answers. The majority of those participants in New Orleans asked for jobs so they could rebuild and help family or neighbors; they were willing to work for assistance. Those that could not work, still offered. And with the confusion in the post-levee break world of New Orleans and the post-storm surge world of the Mississippi Coast, they needed understanding and validation of their circumstances.

For the women who were a significant part of my law school career, the other three founding members of the Journal for Social Justice. The work of publishing a new journal demonstrated the importance of integrity and conviction of purpose as well as the need to be compassionate towards those faced with challenging circumstances.

For the Women of the Women’s March Chicago. Their dedication to numerous issues is a never-ending effort; one that despite being pulled every which way, they remain steadfast in the mission to connect, protect and activate our communities.

For Dr. Helenan Robin, who received her Ph.D. with her young child on her hip at a time when such things “just were not done.” She always supported students, especially women. She encouraged us to achieve at a level far higher than what we expected of ourselves.

For all the women in my life, both known and unknown who affected my life in many ways. I wanted to especially thank all the women who came before me in my family, many of whom faced a ridiculous world that did not allow women to challenge their roles, use their abilities or achieve their full potential.

For the women of this challenging era, we have many opportunities and we need to seize them fully. Anything less would be a disservice to the sacrifices made by those who paved our way. We persist, protect and resist.
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**EPIGRAPH**

“Where justice is denied, where poverty is enforced, where ignorance prevails, and where any one class is made to feel that society is an organized conspiracy to oppress, rob, and degrade them, neither persons nor property will be safe.”

– Frederick Douglass (April 1886)

“True peace is not merely the absence of tension; it is the presence of justice.”

– Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (1955)

“Like slavery and apartheid, poverty is not natural. It is man-made and it can be overcome and eradicated by the actions of human beings.”

– Nelson Mandela, speaking at the launch of Britain’s Make Poverty History campaign. (February 2005)

“Lawyers have a license to practice law, a monopoly on certain services. But for that privilege and status, lawyers have an obligation to provide legal services to those without the wherewithal to pay, to respond to needs outside themselves, to help repair tears in their communities.”

– U.S. Supreme Court Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg (March 2014)

We must never confuse law and justice. What is legal is often not just. And what is just is often not at all legal. Social justice calls you to keep your eyes and your heart wide open in order to look at the difference between law and justice.

There is far too little about justice in law school curriculum or in the legal profession. You will have to learn most of this on your own.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AALL</td>
<td>American Association of Law Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABA</td>
<td>American Bar Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA</td>
<td>American Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLE</td>
<td>Continuing legal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSV</td>
<td>Comma-separated value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY</td>
<td>City University of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCC</td>
<td>Digital Curation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMP</td>
<td>Data management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>Directory of Law School Public Interest &amp; Pro Bono Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEALS</td>
<td>Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning and Scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Information retrieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KML</td>
<td>Keyhole Markup Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRAP</td>
<td>Loan Repayment Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB</td>
<td>Pro bono service,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF</td>
<td>Pro bono Service Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable document format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIF</td>
<td>Public Interest Law Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>Public interest law,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILS</td>
<td>PublicInterestLaw Indicator for Law Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>Red Green Blue color model that indicates the amount of light from each needed to create a color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHN</td>
<td>Student Hurricane Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIUC</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITA</td>
<td>Volunteer Income Tax Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vizzes</td>
<td>Visualization(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ADOBE READER DC
Functions used: Comments tools--highlighter and text editor, article capture, reading downloaded articles.

![Adobe Acrobat Reader DC](image)

Figure 2: Adobe Reader DC Version Information

THE DMP TOOL
Functions use: Account creation and template use using widget.

The DMP Tool provides five templates, the Digital Curation Centre (DCC) template provided direction and context as well as assisted with the development of data sets. This paper discusses the use of the DMP for the project and the effect on the project processes.

The current version of the DMP tool is available at: [https://dmptool.org/](https://dmptool.org/)

DOOGAL
Function used: Batch geocoding

Doogal is the website used to determine geocodes necessary for the data visualizations. The project utilized the batch geocoding feature.

The feature is found at: [https://www.doogal.co.uk/BatchGeocoding.php](https://www.doogal.co.uk/BatchGeocoding.php)
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MS OFFICE
MS Word-functions used: Custom Styles, Navigation, Zotero add-in, Grammarly add-in.
MS Excel-functions used: Data validation, Conditional formatting, Get data, Formulas
Version: 1804; Build: 9226.2156

OPENOFFICE
Calc and Writer: Version 4.1.5

OPEN REFINE
Functions used: Trim for leading and trailing blank space. Search for duplicates.
Works to clean up messy data. Given that extensive use of data validation occurred with the
data sets for this project, the concerns focused on null or extraneous values as well as outlier
values.
OpenRefine is located here: http://openrefine.org/
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Merge PDF, Split or Reorder Pages,
Convert PDF to Images, Scan Into Image or PDF.

Figure 3: PDFill Free PDF Tools Version Information
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Functions used: Screen Capture and subfunctions, graphic accessories including color picker, color palette, text markups for notations on png files.

Figure 4: PicPick Version Information

SNIPPING TOOL, WINDOWS
Functions used: Capture simple screenshots; ironically, Snipping Tool would not capture its own “About” screen.

Figure 5: Snipping Tool Version Information
TABLEAU DESKTOP & TABLEAU PUBLIC

Desktop version

Functions used: Map, Analysis, Data, Worksheet, Dashboard. See visualizations on Tableau Public, search for “UIUC,” “CAS,” “Indicator,” and “PILS.” The URL is: PILS-A CAS Project

VOYANT

Functions used: Corpus, Text, XML.

Voyant is a web-based tool used to read and analyze text.

Voyant can be found here: https://voyant-tools.org/

ZOTERO

Functions used: Add-Ons for MS Word and OpenOffice, Imported and Exported, Insert Bibliography
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ABSTRACT

What began as a known and understood weather phenomenon named Katrina, quickly became a symbol of injustice, racism, inadequacy, failure, and classism. Once the initial shock of New Orleans drowning turned into the relief effort, volunteers descended on the area, including over 5,000 law students of the Student Hurricane Network (SHN). Many of the students participating in the pro bono and community service efforts of SHN took their experiences back to their law school. They used those experiences to change legal education to include pro bono service activities, recognition for those performing an extraordinary amount of hours of services, and development of classes as well as extracurricular activities that addressed the needs for legal assistance. This research builds on the author's experience in a legal education embedded in public interest law and information science as well as time spent rebuilding the Gulf Coast as part of SHN.

The research project explores the information law schools provided the ABA and asked, so what does this information tell a reader? The project creates an indicator that shows the public interest law (PIL) and pro bono service (PB) opportunities offered at a law school compared to other schools. Typical rankings only show traditional criteria such as GPA and LSAT scores. By using content analysis of web-based documents listing the self-reported pro bono and public interest programming, the indicator covers 20 facets and uses a quintile ranking of a number calculated based on the type of information provided and the observed characteristics of each facet.

A snapshot of the information occurred on November 16, 2016. There are eight factors for the pro bono programming; 12 factors for the public interest law programming. Each factor consists of multiple subfactors and score on a range of 0 – 5 and the overall scale of 0 – 100. For the 202 law schools, the mode for pro bono, public interest law and the combination of the two all have modes of zero. One school scored over 80 for the combined score, Columbia University. Yeshiva, Cardozo, scored 74; Harvard, 69. Forty-six schools scored 50 or higher. Sixteen schools did not report any information in the Directory (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, n.d.). Ten schools scored ten or fewer points.

The idea of the indicator centers on users of the Directory, future law students, support service providers such as librarians in the law library and deans or administrators making decisions regarding programming and communications regarding programming. Ultimately, PILS (Public Interest Law Indicator for Law Schools) highlights the pro bono and public interest law programming information provided, not the quality or just the number of programs. The desired impact aims to emphasize that pro bono and public interest law programming remain an essential aspect of legal education.
DEVELOPMENT OF PROJECT

PROJECT HISTORY
After the initial project advisor left the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) to take a job out of state, the project shifted from that of developing a center to support non-profits and their needs for legal information to a scaled-down project. When a revised project failed to secure funding, the idea for a new project came from one of several brief discussions with Michelle Hook-Dewey, then Assistant Professor of Law at UIUC. The suggestion to look for existing documents on the web relating to legal education and pro bono service laid the foundation for this project. Given this author’s law school experiences with social justice, public interest law and pro bono service, the research topic provided focus and interest. When Hook-Dewey left UIUC for an out-of-state position, one more revision took place to simplify the project—the elimination of any multivariate analysis.

An informal search of the web produced one useful link to the American Bar Association’s (ABA) webpage for the Standing Committee on Pro Bono & Public Service (Committee). The Committee’s page, found two levels below the home page, offered a Resources section. In the Resources section, the Directory of Law School Public Interest & Pro Bono Programs (Directory) offered a comprehensive listing of over 20 descriptive parts and law-school reported information addressing each of the descriptive areas. The Directory provided the opportunity for analysis and became the object of study.

STUDENT HURRICANE NETWORK HISTORY
On Monday, August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina landed on the Gulf Coast. While the hurricane spared New Orleans total devastation, the related storm surge and subsequent levee system failures caused immeasurable damage. The water submerged the majority of the city and stranded thousands (“Hurricane Katrina Updates on NOLA.com: August. 29. 2005,” 2005). Over 1800 people lost their lives within 24 hours; thousands became part of a diaspora (see the following illustration, next page) that commanded the attention of the world (Theim, 2015).

What began as a known and understood weather phenomenon named Katrina, quickly became a symbol of injustice, racism, inadequacy, failure, and classism. Once the initial shock of New Orleans drowning turned into the relief effort, volunteers descended on the area. Volunteers included utility workers, first responders, and law students. One of the groups formed, the Student Hurricane Network, brought in well over 5,000 law students to the Gulf Coast region, where they assisted with cases and rebuilt communities.
Hurricane Katrina’s story is one of “disaster, chaos, institutional failure” (Student Hurricane Network, 2006, p. 5). The legal issues mounted as the legal professionals who would address many of the problems faced their challenges, loss of family, property, workplace, and community. Katrina created a crisis in the legal community, one that demanded an all-hands-on-board approach. Law students were among some of the first volunteers, some functioning as first responders and immediate relief providers. Law students created one of the larger all-volunteer, non-profit organizations to provide legal assistance and community service in the years following the 2005 hurricane season that left Gulf Coast communities in need.

In addition to Katrina, Rita made landfall at the southwestern part of Louisiana along the Texas border on September 24, 2005, less than a month after Katrina (Knabb, Brown, & Rhome, 2006, p. 2). SHN responded to the disaster across the Gulf Coast. Americans fully aware of the disaster in New Orleans that took place after the hurricane made landfall, often overlooked the devastation in other Gulf Coast states. Mississippi’s entire Gulf Coastline...
suffered over $1 billion in damage, the loss of thousands of homes and the loss of hundreds of residents (Allen, Bezdek, & Jopling, 2010, p. 97).

Several law school projects developed in the wake of the combined hit from Rita and Katrina. Tulane Law School created and staffed a national hotline and researched issues related to the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) disaster response (Student Hurricane Network, 2006, p. 5). Thousands of miles away, schools around the nation met to coordinate service trips. In October 2005, the Equal Justice Works Conference provided the opportunity to form a national organization with the focus of supporting those affected by Katrina (pp. 5–6). Winter break 2005-06 saw the first series of SHN coordinated service trips, which would then run for several years until the 2008-2009 board disbanded the organization (Student Hurricane Network, n.d.).

The following section covers relevant literature for this project. The topics covered include the need for legal services, the American Bar Association’s (ABA) involvement with pro bono service and legal education, content analysis and coding, and building the indicator
RELEVANT LITERATURE

MORE THAN ENOUGH NEED, NOT ENOUGH SUPPLY

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF LEGAL SERVICES

For two years, the Commission on the Future of Legal Services (Commission) explored the reasons for most Americans inability to secure legal services; they also examined delivery models, impacts to legal services delivery and offered recommendations for meeting the public’s need for legal services (Commission on the Future of Legal Services, 2016, p. 1). The 100 plus page report offers a thorough and captivating look at the legal services landscape and includes law schools in the content. Even with a detailed report, the Commission made use of a webpage (permalink: https://perma.cc/9JT7-JURD), additional links to other documents and footnotes to capture the extensive volume of their findings. Of note, the Commission compiled a listing of state access to justice efforts.

First, the Commission details the need for services and then spends an equal number of pages offering recommendations for meeting that need. Utilizing focus groups, surveys, community meetings and events, hearings, webinars, white papers and some other methods, the Commission identified three main issues regarding need (Commission on the Future of Legal Services, 2016, p. 10). One, even with ongoing efforts and programs targeting the public’s need for legal services, the need is far greater than supply. The Commission presents three significant findings. One, from moderate income persons to those living in poverty are not receiving the help they need. Two, technology and creative efforts change the access and delivery of legal services. Three, “bias, discrimination, complexity, and lack of resources” diminish the public’s view regarding legal services. (p. 6).

The first section addressing the unmet needs covers many impacts related to the inability of the legal profession to provide for the demand, too many to discuss here. One issue is that many lawyers, those recent graduates, are underemployed or unemployed as lawyers (p, 5). Also, many of those needing legal assistance lack sufficient finances to pay for service or knowledge to access the legal system. One effort to provide legal services is the Legal Services Corporation. The non-profit corporation established by Congress in 1974, provides legal aid to those with incomes at or below 125 percent of the federal poverty guideline (Legal Services Corporation, n.d.). Congress funds a fraction of the need for an estimated 63 million people qualified for the LSC’s services (Commission on the Future of Legal Services, 2016, p. 12). State efforts meet a similar fate, underfunding.

The Commission cites several states’ figures regarding civil legal aid programs turning away low-income people. As for criminal legal services, they differ from civil in that there is a constitutional right to representation. However, many of the service organizations that
provide these right guaranteed services continue to be victims of inadequate funding and over-utilized lawyers (p. 12).

In addressing the needs of moderate-income Americans, the Commission cites an ABA study conducted by Rebecca L. Sandefur (p. 14). In “Accessing Justice in the Contemporary USA,” Sandefur, states that 46% of those moderate-income individuals seeking assistance for civil issues navigate the system on their own. Also, of note from the study, those who did not seek legal aid often said they do not seek out legal help because they do not consider their problems as having a legal solution (p. 14). So, in addition to those not being able to afford or obtain free legal help, some Americans do not even realize their issue resolution comes under the auspices of the legal system. (See the permalink at https://perma.cc/QT6C-LPDR for the Sandefur study).

This Commission report is incredibly detailed and the resource is valuable for anyone seeking to understand the legal services environment in contemporary America. Exploring the depth of this report is out of scope for this research. Of the 12 recommendations and 17 sub-recommendations, two recommendations of the Commission specifically name law schools as playing a role in providing legal services.

Recommendation 7 states, “The legal profession should partner with other disciplines and the public for insights about innovating the delivery of legal services” (Commission on the Future of Legal Services, 2016, p. 6). In sub-recommendation 7.2, the Commission taps law schools to offer more continuing legal education and similar opportunities to the legal profession. Considering universities provide interdisciplinary studies, the Commission sees universities as a learning environment for skills that close the gap between needs and services. They cite entrepreneur skills as able to develop more efficient delivery models, matching clients with the lawyers most qualified to assist (p. 49). Universities could address those interdisciplinary needs lawyers face when advocating for their clients. The report states that “many who commit crimes suffer from mental illness,” and with targeted training on the health issues, lawyers are more able to assist (p. 49). The Commission supports the ABA Standard for Criminal Justice 7-1.3 that calls on law schools to “provide opportunity for all students...to become familiar with the issues involved in mental health” as well as provide continuing legal education regarding mental health issues lawyers confront in their practice (p. 50).

Recommendation 10 states, “Resources should be vastly expanded to support long-standing efforts that have proven successful in addressing the public’s unmet needs for legal services” (p. 54). The Commission states that law schools should be one of the entities offering public education regarding access to legal services (p. 55). Outside of offering some examples of outreach, there are no specifics that target law schools. The assumption being that a law school could provide educational materials to explain court procedures, partner with local bar associations to support educational programming or create online tutorials.
The Commission does give a brief nod to law schools as providing a place to encourage diversity in the profession. One of the subsections states that the legal profession does not reflect the demographics or experiences of those needing assistance. The resulting lack of ability to identify with the profession often fosters a suspect perception of what legal services can accomplish as well as the lawyers who provide those legal services (p. 4). The brief mention of diversity in law schools occurs in Recommendation 8; the legal profession should adopt methods, policies, standards, and practices to best advance diversity and inclusion (p. 50).

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION: GUIDE TO PRO BONO LEGAL SERVICES IN RURAL AREAS

An effort of the Standing Committee on Pro Bono & Public Service (Committee) and the Center for Pro Bono address the rural population and their needs for legal services. The report, Rural Pro Bono Delivery (Report), offers 80 pages of detailed statistics, research, and discussion regarding the strategies for delivery to these unique American communities. For the review here, the barriers to service delivery seem most appropriate.

Citing the Rural Poverty Research Institute, the poverty levels are highest in rural areas (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2003, p. 10). According to the Report, rural area poverty rates of 13.4 percent in 2000 were the lowest to date; however, this rate is much higher than the poverty rates in urban centers. Moreover, this 13.4 percent rate implies that about 6.9 million are living in rural areas, do so in poverty (p. 11). Given that this Report was published in 2003 and therefore did not address the Great Recession of five years later. In the book “Rural Poverty in the United States,” authors Weber and Miller state the national poverty rate decreased from 20 percent in 1960 to somewhere between 12-14 percent up until 2010, where the rate sat at 15 percent (Weber & Miller, 2017, p. 51).

Whether the area is the Alaskan communities accessible only via boat or the mountain communities of Appalachia, access to legal services is minimal (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2003, p. 10). Even while the country’s overall population keeps shifting to the urban centers, the Report states that “rural legal services programs and rural pro bono programs continue to report high service figures” (p. 13).

The simple fact is that most lawyers practice in urban areas. The Report cites a survey of 100,000 ABA lawyers that found only 20% or 20,000 lived in areas with populations less than 50,000 (p. 12). This 50,000 number comes from the U.S. Census Bureau definition of rural. The Bureau considers a place to be rural if it is not part of an urban cluster of 2,500 to 49,000 or an urbanized area with a population of 50,000 or more (Census Bureau. U.S. Commerce Department, n.d.-b). An urban cluster, a concept introduced with the 2000 Census, replaced the “urban places located outside urbanized areas (Census Bureau. U.S.
Although not addressed in this Report, the question then becomes, even at 50,000 or less, how skewed are the practices towards the higher end of this range? Therefore, in the rural community, pro bono programs constrained by limited availability of practicing lawyers, often do not meet the needs for services.

The Report finds that lawyers face several obstacles practicing in rural areas. Those obstacles include:

- Large areas covered with geographic barriers such as mountains or wetlands
- Conflicts of interest that arise due to few other lawyers
- Solo or very small person law firms that operate with the administrative assistance
- Large geographic areas often require multiple registration requirements and extensive travel requirements
- New and advanced technology support from high-speed internet and cell phone service often is problematic in rural areas
- No public transportation and unmarked addresses contribute to the phone-only status of client-lawyer relationships
- Rural lawyers often have to stretch into practice areas that require constant education (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2003, p. 12).

Additional challenges face lawyers serving tribal communities. Procedures and navigation through tribal courts, laws, and lack of institutions, all complicate the delivery of services. For example, child support collection takes much longer as reservations do not have centralized centers to receive and disburse payments like states (p. 14).

There appears to be no escape, the legal service needs of Americans living in many different communities remain unmet. While poverty rates have eased and the populations of America’s farmlands shifted to the urban centers, the need for assistance has not diminished. The need simply changes location. What happens when the “location” becomes a site of a natural, some would argue human-made, the disaster known as Katrina. The next section addresses the legal needs of those living in a post-Katrina world.

**Katrina Related Needs for Legal Services**

**ABA Responds to Hurricane Katrina**

In the report, “In the Wake of the Storm,” the ABA’s Task Force on Hurricane Katrina (Task Force) details the many activities undertaken in response to one of the more devastating hurricanes in our country’s history. The ABA provided much-needed organization, legal assistance, and information to those recovering and rebuilding. Two days after Katrina’s landfall, an ABA website clearinghouse for disaster-related information relating to making financial and service contributions (ABA Task Force on Hurricane Katrina, 2006, p. 11).
Within two months, the Task Force’s website hosted over 50,000 visitors and documented close to 2,000 offers of assistance (p. 12). Another program aided those in the military. The hurricane damaged Kessler Air Force Base and other locations as well; the ABA volunteers took on 2,200 office visits related to cases, powers of attorney, affidavits, wills, and many other legal services (p. 12). Many parts of the ABA organization involved themselves in the monumental task of recovery including the Center for Continuing Legal Education, Young Lawyers Division, Center for Pro Bono, Center on Children and the Law, Standing Committee on Law and National Security, and Section of State and Local Government Law (pp. 11-15).

With over 5,000 members of the ABA affected by Katrina, other lawyers stepped up to assist clients and the affected lawyers (p. 10). Although many law students were not yet licensed to practice law in their respective states, many students also dedicated thousands of hours to assist in reducing the tremendous amount of legal issues facing those of the Gulf Coast. Some states allow law students to practice law under specified conditions. In Illinois, a law student practices under a 711 license only if under an attorney’s supervision and for a 501(c)(3) organization. See Illinois Supreme Court Rule 711 at http://www.illinoiscourts.gov/SupremeCourt/Rules/Art_VII/artVII.htm#711 ). The next section presents the work of the Student Hurricane Network.

*Law Students Respond to Hurricane Katrina*

**SHN – Student Hurricane Network (2005-2009)**

SHN formed during an Equal Justice Works Conference in Washington D.C., Fall 2005. Comprised entirely of law students, no faculty or administrators, the student group organized and operated using free phone conferencing services (Student Hurricane Network, 2018). The first student trips began during the winter break 2005-2006 and reoccurred during spring breaks (Student Hurricane Network, 2008, p. 2). Spring 2006 brought 500 students in one week, all placed directly with community partners (p.2). In the next three years, over 4,500 students from over 120 law schools made the Gulf Coast their focus and social justice their mission via SHN (p. 2). See Appendix A for a listing of SHN schools as of February 2008. The coordinated trips stood as a demonstration of the students’ commitment to rebuilding the Gulf Coast and presented many opportunities to understand the barriers limiting many communities. The concerns for the many isms exposed by Katrina stared students straight in the face and in response, over 100 law school student groups integrated with the community of Mississippi and Louisiana to become a social justice organization.

These volunteer relief trips are an opportunity not only to service the people of the Gulf Coast but to also provide law students with the tools and skills to enable them to become better advocates and ultimately better people. Too often our
Students performed thousands of hours of service in the Gulf Coast such as the rebuilding of homes and rescue of community buildings. Also, pro bono service provided thousands of hours conducting research, court filings, interviews, court appearances and policy analysis. The next several paragraphs briefly describe some of the work accomplished during 2006.

**Project Triage.** New York SHN students joined the Tulane Law Clinic to account for and track pre-trial Orleans Parish Prison inmates. Given the chaos during and after Katrina, as well as substantial record loss, the students determined the pre-trial status of an inmate and identified critical cases for the clinic. Their database supported the Clinic and the Public Defender's office in providing representation (p.3).

**Katrina-Gideon Interview Project.** A follow-up or add-on to Project Triage, the Gideon project interviewed inmates with a pre-trial status in Orleans Parish Prison as well as prisons across the state. Over 150 students conducted the interviews in a matter of a couple of weeks and provided pre-trial information for the Public Defender’s Office. Because of these efforts, reviews of the collected materials secured an immediate release for a few inmates and many more inmates benefitted from fairer proceedings (pp. 3-4).

**Road Home.** This complicated program demanded a response and SHN students responded. Students assisted applicants with the process, tracked those applications and handled appeals. Students also networked with community organizations and other aid programs to help applicants unable to receive Road Home assistance (p. 4).

**Jena Six.** Racial tensions in Jena, Louisiana, inspired SHN students to document all local paper articles regarding the six black teenagers accused of second-degree murder. The high school students, ages 15-18, beat up a white classmate. The courts, media, and community debated the issues of racism, prejudicial court systems, the character of all those involved and many related concerns. To capture those debates and concerns, the law students cataloged the articles and created a searchable database of the materials (pp. 4-5). See *The New York Times* collection of stories and opinions regarding the Jena Six and issues of racism at https://www.nytimes.com/topic/destination/jena-la .

Other projects included panels, symposia, leadership conferences, FEMA Trailer Mapping, and continued trip support for service trips (pp. 5-10). The FEMA Trailer Mapping project consisted of in-depth interviews with residents to assess their many issues, legal and beyond. Another utilized resource, the SHN website supplied handbooks, reports, liaison contact information, regional organization information (some chapters joined together to
raise funds, create awareness, and pool resources), project summaries and conference call summaries.

Citing the shift in needs from the “large-scale, centrally-administered student trips” to “long-term work advancing social justice,” the National Advisory Board officially disbanded SHN in Fall of 2009 (Student Hurricane Network, n.d.). As of April 2018, the website resides with the Probono.net web presence and viewers will find much of the original website content. (see https://www.probono.net/shn_old/).

By the time the group disbanded, well over 5,500 law students had provided Gulf Coast residents thousands of hours of community rebuilding labor as well as legal services (Student Hurricane Network, n.d.). One of the remarkable aspects of the SHN efforts remains the effect on law students contributing to the rebuilding process. Erin Hittinger, then a law student at Indiana University, summed up the experience felt by many,

We will take our stories and pictures back to wherever we came from, and we can give a living testament to what it’s really like down here because so many people have absolutely no idea, and we can help keep the Gulf Coast in the forefront of their minds.

(Student Hurricane Network, 2006, p. Title)

MCJ – Mississippi Center for Justice
Law students took active roles in 22 community legal clinics throughout Mississippi, joining in with pro bono attorneys and faculty conducting research and client in-take, researching legal and policy topics and surveying the community on a variety of issues (Allen et al., 2010, p. 111). The student assistance enabled the Mississippi Center for Justice (MCJ) to assist over 1,000 clients and take on much-needed research tasks identifying a legal issue affecting many community members (p. 111). Students tackled the mass eviction issues; rents increased as much as 30 percent following the hurricane and landlords actively evicted tenants to get higher rental payments (p. 112). By the time many residents returned to their communities, many faced eviction court proceedings.

Another student project addressed the loss of rental housing because official damage estimated only included single family homes (p. 114). The student project found that Katrina destroyed 50% or more of the rental properties in two of the heaviest hit counties; one county suffered 37% damage. Given that many of the recovery programs targeted homeowners only, the survey enabled MCJ to advocate for relief money to rebuild rental properties (p. 115). The Proposed Inland Port Survey sought to document the affected neighborhoods of a project to develop the state port at Gulfport. The development negatively impacted residents of an African-American Community.
However, because Governor Barbour obtained waivers for Katrina Community Development Block Grant money, Barbour avoided holding hearings (p. 115). The MCJ project aimed to understand how the Port project impacted the communities; one of the first steps involved a block by block survey of residents. The impact of MCJ’s student-staffed project was notable, as the community opposition utilized the survey results to oppose the Inland Port development (p. 116). In addition to working on projects such as the Inland Port survey during semester breaks, they also participated as interns at MCJ conducting research, developing advocacy toolkits, and participating in advocacy for those denied FEMA assistance (p. 118).

ABA, PRO BONO SERVICE & LAW SCHOOLS

PRO BONO COMMITTEE

The ABA established a Standing Committee on Pro Bono & Public Service (Standing Committee) to oversee the development of programming for all the various entities that deliver legal services, including law schools. The Committee conducts research, provides statute monitoring, and publishes reports among many other activities, all to advocate for the availability of legal services to all in need.

Concerning pro bono service, the Standing Committee states that the phrase pro bono finds roots in the Latin phrase pro bono publico or for the public good” (Center for Pro Bono, 2010, p. 2). In a series of reports, the Standing Committee surveyed lawyers to identify what their commitment is to conducting pro bono (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2005, 2009, 2013b). The 2005 report surveyed 1,100 lawyers of a possible 1,104,766 lawyers in 2005 and asked about pro bono service performed from November 2003 to November 2004 (American Bar Association, 2017a; Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2005, p. 4). In the research methodology section, the authors state that the survey had a statistical accuracy of + / - 3% at a 95% confidence level (p. 9). The survey included a distribution over four different settings, private practice (81%), corporate (9%), government (8%) and academic (1%) (p. 9). As the intent was to capture pro bono work of practicing attorneys and judges, the survey design excluded inactive and retired lawyers (p.9). Results indicated that 66% of the lawyers reported performing some pro bono services for low-income persons or organization serving low-income populations (p.4). Forty-six percent of the lawyers met the ABA’s Model Rule 6.1 goal of 50 hours of service provided (p. 4).

The second report indicated that 73% of the surveyed lawyers provided pro bono services; 25% provided more than 50 hours (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2009, p. vii). The second survey utilized the same methodology; the distribution differed
little with the drop of an academic group (p. 6). The breakdown is as follows: private practice (83%), corporate counsel (9%) and government (8%) (p. 6).

Methodology changes occurred in the third survey conducted in 2012. The Standing Committee utilized directories to obtain lawyer email addresses to contact close to 380,000 lawyers; 2,876 completed surveys provided data for the third report (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2013b, p. 2). The survey addresses two types of pro bono service, services to those with limited incomes and services to any client (p.4). While the distribution broke down into the private practice, corporate counsel and government attorneys once again, the survey now identified subcategories for all three practice types (p.4). All three reports emphasize the commitment of the legal community to provide pro bono service and the opportunity to expand these services (2005, pp. 21-22; 2009, p. 28; 2013, p. viii).

In addition to monitoring the pro bono contributions of the legal profession, one of the more significant efforts of the Standing Committee involved crafting the Model Rule 6.1 that established guidelines for the licensed professional.

**MODEL RULE 6.1**

The Model Rules structure resulted from a six-year study started in 1977, the House of Delegates for the ABA adopted the rules in 1983. The majority of the states have adopted these Model Rules as the professional standards for lawyers licensed by their respective licensing structures (Center for Professional Responsibility, 2016b).

Model Rule 6.1 only discusses pro bono service. The rule states that lawyers should “aspire to render at least (50) hours of pro bono public legal services per year” (Center for Professional Responsibility, 2016a). The rule asserts that lawyers need to donate their services without expectation of remuneration or payment. Lawyers need to provide these services to persons of limited income or non-profit organizations that provide services to those with limited income.

If an attorney provides services beyond the 50 hours, these hours can bill at low or no cost to an individual or an organization. However, the organization should be “seeking to secure or protect civil rights, civil liberties or public rights, or charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental and educational organizations in matters in furtherance of their organizational purposes” (Center for Professional Responsibility, 2016a). A lawyer could also provide services to an individual or offer services to advance the profession, the legal system, and the law. The Rule goes on to state that “a lawyer should voluntarily contribute financial support to organizations that provide legal services to persons of limited means” (Center for Professional Responsibility, 2016a).

States can set a higher or lower number for the annual standard, according to the Comments section following the Model Rule. Other comments promote the idea that law firms should work to encourage all firm lawyers to provide pro bono services and when the provision of
services is not an option, a lawyer should give financial contributions to organizations that do provide services.

Note that the Model Rule only asks the lawyer “aspire to” provide these services. There is no disciplinary action or processes attached to the Model Rule, in other words, there are no ramifications if lawyers do not provide pro bono services. Surprisingly, the comments also mention the efforts of individual lawyers fail to meet the need for legal services, and therefore the government and professional organizations need the support of lawyers.

LEGAL EDUCATION

Clinics, Journals, and Student Groups often addressed the issues of access to justice for marginalized communities. And recently, the Standing Committee on Pro Bono & Public Service and the Center for Pro Bono discussed the accreditation standards for pro bono activities.

In a February 2010 publication, the Center for Pro Bono states 11 reasons why pro bono programming benefits students and seven benefits for law schools. The report only lists groups that benefit from these services, “those who could not otherwise afford legal representation” (Center for Pro Bono, 2010, p. 3). The emphasis of this publication, “Everything You Wanted to Know About Law School Pro Bono but Were Afraid to Ask...” addresses the operations, management, and processes of a pro bono program. The Center offered little regarding how to address the needs of the surrounding communities or how to engage with communities.

While the Standing Committee focuses on the entire legal profession, the Section for Legal Education addresses the operations of the nation’s law schools. One of the standards for law schools requires law schools to offer pro bono opportunities per the Standard discussed below.

Program of Legal Education:

Standard 303. Curriculum (b)(2): A law school shall provide substantial opportunities to students for student participation in pro bono legal services, including law-related public service activities. (Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, 2015, p. 16)

Section issues an interpretation of Standard 303, citing Model Rule 6.1 that encourages lawyers to engage in pro bono service to those with limited incomes and organizations that serve those with limited incomes, the ABA seeks similar service opportunities offered by law schools to law students. The interpretation goes on to say that the learning outcomes stated in an early Standard do not apply to pro bono service, this approach provides more flexibility concerning programming options (Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, American Bar Association, 2017).
NEW YORK RULE 520.6(A) (RULE)

In a discussion of New York’s 50-hour preadmission pro bono rule, the American Bar Association cited New York Chief Justice Jonathan Lipman as being the champion in the effort to address access to justice (Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2013a, p. 1). The only such rule in the United States requires that New York State bar applicants on and after January 1, 2015, “shall complete 50 hours of qualifying pro bono service before applying...” (p. 1). The key point is that those seeking to practice in New York must meet the requirement before applying, not after receiving a license within some amount of years. An applicant must come before the bar demonstrating that they met the requirement. However, the Rule’s definition of pro bono services is different from the ABA’s Model Rule 6.1, and this difference is problematic. The services must be law-related, “use of legal skills or law-related activities that are appropriate for lawyers-in-training not yet admitted to practice” (p. 4). The scope of what constitutes pro bono includes all government work, one could receive credit for law school clinic participation, and even some positions with small remunerations may qualify such as fellowship work. The ABA’s Model Rule 6.1 does not include any of New York’s definitions (pp. 4-5). Regardless of definitions, the New York Rule at least attempts to bridge that gap between need and services rendered and established early on in a lawyer’s career that the state considers service critical to providing justice.

OTHER RELATED STATE RULES

Bar Pre-Admission Pro Bono Requirements

New York, as noted above, is the first and only state to require pro bono services as a requirement for obtaining a license to practice law. Other states are or have been exploring similar rules. Per the Standing Committee reporting four other states addressed the need for legal services; California, Connecticut, Montana, and New Jersey. Montana is the only other state with an implemented policy; the State Bar must give applicants the opportunity to submit a statement of pro bono activities completed as of the date of application. New Jersey’s policy established by the Supreme Court met resistance from the State Bar, and Connecticut’s judicial branch decided not to develop a task force addressing the issue of service. California’s effort to follow New York’s 50-hour requirement ended when Governor Brown vetoed the mandate in Summer 2016(Standing Committee on Pro Bono and Public Service, 2016).

CLE in exchange for pro bono service

As of October 2017, 11 states provide Continuing Legal Education (CLE) credits when a lawyer takes on pro bono cases (American Bar Association, 2017b, p. 1). As states require a
varying number of CLE credits to remain licensed for practice, the number of hours also varies. Note that the maximum of pro bono hours is minimal, considering that criminal or civil cases may take months or years before achieving a resolution.

The mantra “it depends” applies to expectations for the time required to represent a client. While the CLE credits for pro bono work offers some value beyond doing good for the client, the exchange provided may not sufficiently incentivise lawyers to perform pro bono service. Instead, the rules provide some acknowledgment of those lawyers offering services as a matter of their existing practices.

The following table provides each state’s rules and indicates how many hours of legal work receive credit.

**TABLE 1: STATE RULES REGARDING CLE CREDIT FOR PRO BONO WORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>RULE</th>
<th>MAX. # OF HRS LEGAL WORK</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 3 Period: October 1 – September 30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Alabama State Bar Rules for Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Rule 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>5 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 5 Annually</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Supreme Court Rule 45(a)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>5 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 9 Every three years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Rules of Civil Procedure 260.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>6 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 6 Every two years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Rule for CLE 8(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>5 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max Credits = 3 Annually</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sup. Court Rule XXX, Rule 3, Reg 3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>6 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 6 Every three years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>State Board of CLE, Rule 6D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 10 Every two years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CLE Board Regs Section 3D (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PILS--A* INDICATOR OF PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>RULE</th>
<th>MAX. # OF HRS LEGAL WORK</th>
<th>CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>6 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max Credits = 3 Every three years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>CLE Policy 1.19 of Section 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>6 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 6 Every two years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sup Court Rule X, Section 5(H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2 pro bono hours = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 6 Every three years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rule 5.13(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>5 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credits = 3 Annually</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sup Court Rule 21, Section 4.07(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4 pro bono hrs. + 2 hrs. pro bono training = 1 CLE credit Annually</td>
<td>6 total</td>
<td>State Court Rule 11.2 (a)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>5 pro bono hrs. = 1 CLE credit Max. Credit = 6 Reporting Period (undefined)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>SCR Chapter 31.05(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>5 pro bono hours = 1 CLE credit Max. Credit = 3 Annually</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>CLE Rule 5(d)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(American Bar Association, 2017b, pp. 1–3).

## LEGAL SCHOLARS & PRO BONO SERVICE

*Cummings & Sandefur:* While the legal professional organizations continue to encourage pro bono service from law firms, private practitioners, and law schools, academics debate the concept of pro bono, need for pro bono services, delivery model, the need for reform in the profession, and the need to create a service-oriented profession.

Marginalized communities obtain legal services via a combination of public and private providers; government, institutions, and private practitioners. Who gets access, how much access and what does access look like all depend on these institutions delivering services. The Legal Services Corporation (LSC) in a 2005 report stated that pro bono services play a critical role in providing justice during times of financial crisis (Cummings & Sandefur, 2013, p. 83). Challenges remain from the Great Recession, austerity programs at various levels of government as well as the inconsistency of federal agencies’ policies create an even
more volatile environment for those needing legal services. While the provision of pro bono services rose substantially, firm hours rose by close to 80% from 1998 to 2005 and then increased another 50% between 2005 and 2008, we know little about how effective the donated hours are (pp. 84-85). “We have little information to answer the question of whether pro bono is an effective or efficient way to provide legal aid or access to justice” (p. 85).

The bulk of the article addresses a “New Measurement” paradigm that focuses on evaluating quality, cost, and social impact of civil legal services (p. 85). The comprehensive article examines the role of pro bono service in the legal profession, the delivery model of services from the private and public organizations, impacts of pro bono services, missings aspects from the discussions on pro bono services and recommendations regarding creating services and policies (p. 86).

Cummings and Sandefur state that the role of law schools as providing a “life-long habit of service” is untested in academic literature. They cite one study that found no significant difference in lawyers who, as students, were subject to or free from mandatory pro bono service (p. 93). However, this is the end of the discussion, even though this concept of service in law school for a life of service creates intriguing research possibilities.

In their conclusion, the authors note that that pro bono services declined during the Great Recession, dropping over 12% between 2008 and 2011 (pp. 109-110). At a time when Americans needed services the most due to unlawful evictions and foreclosures, far fewer lawyers were available to meet the need. This absence of service, when needed most, is an issue of concern for the authors. If the delivery model fails during the times when assistance is most needed, is the current model of delivery appropriate. As an ending statement, the authors suggest that “for those Americans suffering the ravages of poverty and marginalization, the profession needs to do a better job of addressing the model and the means of services so that “efforts to ‘do good’ are ultimately done better” (p. 111).

Beyond Elite Law is a collection of essays regarding the movement of the profession from the elite practice of law to the provision of access to justice by meeting the needs of those attempting to navigate the legal systems that surround them. Edited by Samuel Estreicher and Joy Radice, the judges, lawyers, and academics offer insights, examples, and recommendations for how the law can service those needing service the most (2016). The collection contains 50 different articles that address some facet of pro bono services, including the work of law schools such as CUNY (City University of New York) that is known for creating a law school curriculum that meets community needs. There are too many articles to discuss; however, the book warrants a mention as a valuable, insightful look at pro bono services and how the concept works in our country.

Critical Legal Studies: None of the ABA resources used for this project mention critical legal studies (CLS); however, this area of research is worth a brief mention here because of the
impact of CLS and the more contemporary theories, such as Critical Race Theory, playing a role in developing legal education curricula. While multiple authors offer insights regarding critical legal studies, for this project, one article provides a sufficient summary. Neacsu provides an overview of this discipline in “CLS Stands for Critical Legal Studies If Anyone Remembers.”

In brief, the theory defines the law as comprised of the relationship between the economic base and systems of law; specifically, the relationship between social structures and distribution of rights. CLS centers on the concept that laws and legal institutions maintain the social and legal constructs that reinforce the marginalization of groups. The movement’s roots are decidedly Left; however, Neacsu states that many “self-inflicted injuries” contributed to a somewhat fluid construction of this perspective (2000, pp. 415–416). Neacsu’s footnotes offer a substantive list of works discussing CLS and this list is the primary reason for including the article. However, a detailed discussion of any potential role CLS plays in the development of pro bono service and public interest law programming remains with the CLS scholars. This project’s focus remains on exploring the information offered in the ABA Directory and saves the pedagogical arguments for scholarly discourse at a different time.

**CONTENT ANALYSIS & CODING**

This project design includes content analysis of the ABA’s Directory and incorporates the concepts of coding as well. Elements from Krippendorff’s “Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology” and Saldaña’s “The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers” created principles that provided the foundation for design and decision-making through the research period. The following sections provide more details about the specific use of content analysis for this project’s design.

**CONTENT ANALYSIS**

Krippendorff says that content analysis offers social scientists an essential research tool; one that analyzes information in the manner in which users view the information (2013, pp. vii, xii). The contemporary content analysis methods consist of three distinctive characteristics. One, content analysis is based on empirical methods and approaches the research process in an investigative nature (p. 1). Two, the methodology looks beyond the conventional examinations of “symbols, content and intents” (p. 2). Three, Krippendorff states that content analysis developed its methods that facilitate analysis regardless of the results (p. 4).

This research project centers on the availability of the ABA’s Directory, a text document presented using web pages. There is no indication that the report appears in print. The text-driven content analysis approach motivated the question, what does the Directory information tell a viewer about pro bono and public interest law programming? In execution, hundreds of items informed this first inquiry. While Krippendorff compares text-
driven content analysis to “fishing expeditions” (p. 355), this project functioned more like an archeological dig, unearthing specific features and uniquely describing those features.

Part of content analysis necessitates defining and identifying the relevant units in the texts (p. 364). In this project, all the Directory content is relevant. However, the ABA presented the information in two ways; one, by the law school and two, by feature or what is a Factor in this project. Reviewing the information by law school was rejected for one reason: the idea of the project focuses on comparing the data of the law schools, so viewing the to-be-coded information in isolation worked against the goal of comparing information. The entire content of the Directory serves as the object of analysis and eventually focused questions provide a roadmap for wending through the content.

In respect to incorporating a team to assist with the analyses, the lack of funding eliminated the best practice of utilizing additional ‘eyes on the page’ to analyze large volumes of texts (p. 366). Audits of the data sets addressed the one coder issue; by examining the content and checking the coded data set, the content check provided some assurance of consistency. Codebooks also contributed consistency; the codebooks were written after the initial read of the content. See Appendix B for the complete set of codebooks.

CODING
This project also relies on coding to facilitate meaningful analysis by capturing program features the text presents. According to Saldaña, a code consists of a word, sometimes a short phrase, that designates a “summative, salient, essence-capturing, or evocative attribute” for a segment of data (Saldaña, 2015, p. 4). In qualitative data analysis, the researcher generates a representation that preserves the data in a meaningful and concise form and enables the researcher to examine the codes later for study such as categorization or pattern detection (p. 4). The act of coding categorizes information in a logical presentation that allows for incorporation into a system or classification (p. 9). According to Saldaña, coding enables the data to be parsed, reorganized, and then connected to create understanding regarding the data by creating explanations and establishing the significance of the data (p. 9).

In addition to coding, the research design took advantage of another one of Saldaña’s suggestions to pre-code data with highlighting or some other method of indicating significant words and phrases (p. 20). Then two types of coding concepts, magnitude, and structural coding, served as the means of exploring the Directory’s information. Magnitude coding adds to existing codes an indication of a scalar or directional characteristic (pp. 86-87). This type of coding allows the researcher to change qualitative data into numbers and this research design seeks to represent the Directory information in an indicator, a collection of the 20 factors and subfactors describing law school programming. The indicator’s purpose offers viewers the ability to compare law schools across the factors using a summation of the information. The research project also makes use of structural coding; this
method relies on the assignment of a content-based or theoretical phrase to a section of data that connects with a specific research question. The coded sections provide the opportunity for collections suitable for additional coding or analysis (p. 98).

**CONSIDERATIONS FOR INDICATOR CONSTRUCTION**

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) is a forum that concentrates on issues of globalization (OECD, 2008, p. 2). The organization provides data on member countries including the United States and European, Asian and Oceania countries as well as the issues studied; OECD also curates news, economic forecasts, speeches, opinion pieces, working papers, books, and article information. One publication available on the website is a handbook for building composite indicators and contains technical guidelines to improve the results indicators produce (p. 2).

An indicator is a quantitative or qualitative measure derived from a series of observed facts that can reveal relative positions (p. 13). A regular, interval review can indicate the direction of change through time and across different entities (p.13). A composite indicator is formed when individual indicators are compiled into a single index based on an underlying model (p. 13).

**PROS AND CONS**

From the OECD’s handbook, indicators offer a few advantages such as the ability to summarize facts, which enables the assembly of any number of singular indicators into a more manageable and digestible indicator (pp 13-14). The efficiency of indicators reduces information overload without sacrificing the totality of the information presented, providing the summative ability to construct narratives and compare multiple features simultaneously (pp. 13-14). Indicators provide the means of identifying change over time as well (pp. 13-14).

Some of the drawbacks related to indicators include that the selection of factors to include may be controversial (pp. 13-14). Construction of an indicator, if done poorly, may support faulty conclusions and mislead policymakers to oversimplify policy solutions (pp. 13-14).

**STEPS IN CONSTRUCTING COMPOSITE INDICATORS**

The OECD handbook lists several steps involved in the construction of an indicator. One must have a theoretical framework that offers the reasoning for factor selection and why the combination of those factors of the selected elements construct a meaningful composite indicator (pp. 15-16). The basis for data selection emanates from analytical soundness, measurability, country coverage (typically a composite indicator’s use provides a comparison between countries), relevance to the phenomenon measured as well the relationship between factors (pp 15-16). Missing data requires specific approaches and extreme values necessitate review to avoid inappropriate use as benchmarks (pp. 15-16).
Further steps call for multivariate analysis to examine the construction of the indicators, substantiate methodological choices, as well as the appropriateness of the data set (pp. 15-16). Normalization must occur by addressing any extreme values or skewed data and accounting for those values when comparing indicators (pp. 15-16). OECD states that analysis needs to address robustness and sensitivity, i.e., the reasoning for excluding or including factors, the process for handling missing data and the selection of any weighted values must be included in the analysis (pp. 15-16).

Other guidelines call for transparency and the ability to decompose an indicator down to its subfactors (pp. 15-16). When using data visualizations, developers need to apply accepted design principles and employ data ethics as visualizations influence interpretation (pp. 15-16).

The following section reviews several articles concentrating on information, its value, use related to retrieval systems and potential for overwhelming a user.

**VALUE OF INFORMATION**

**INFORMATION OVERLOAD**

Bawden and Robinson discuss the “dark side of information” encompassing the “quantity and diversity of information available” such as information overload (Bawden & Robinson, 2009, p. 180). Citing information overload as one of the more familiar information pathologies, the authors attribute the condition to the many formats and avenues of communication (p. 182). The overload concept refers to the user’s inability to achieve their desired task when inhibited by the substantial amounts of useful information. The authors state that “the information must be of some potential value, or it could simply be ignored, and it must be accessible, or the overload will only be potential, not actual” (p. 182).

When determining the scope of content analysis, information overload considerations narrowed the amount of information coded. With twenty factors, the amount of information could create confusion rather than a precise portrait of a law school’s pro bono or public interest law programming. Rather than coding the entirety of the Directory report section, the decision to search for specific information aimed to limit information overload. Also, the indicator’s design intends to consider information overload. Users view an indicator and then can determine whether the information is potentially valuable rather than attempting to assess twenty or more spreadsheets of information.

**INFORMATION RETRIEVAL – FACTORS AFFECTING USER SATISFACTION**

Al-Maskari and Sanderson state in their introduction that the “main aim of an information retrieval (IR) system is to satisfy the need of its users” (2010, p. 859). While the ABA’s webpages dedicated to the Directory of Law School Public Interest and Pro Bono Programs
(Directory) may not appear to be an information retrieval system, web pages do return information to a user.

The article covers literature that concentrates on user satisfaction and then offers four factors that may influence user satisfaction: system effectiveness, user effectiveness, user effort and user characteristics (p. 860). System effectiveness looks at how successful an IR system is in achieving objectives, while user effectiveness relates to the “accuracy and completeness with which users achieve certain goals.” System effectiveness can be measured by “the number of successfully completed tasks, number of relevant resources obtained, and time used to complete tasks” (p. 860). User effort involves the number of steps or clicks, queries, and changes to queries; user characteristics cover user’s familiarity with the subject, search expertise and technology skills needed to utilize the IR system (p. 861).

The concepts utilized in the content analysis portion of the project include assessing how well the Directory’s contents expressed useful information. Therefore, the lack of information provision as well as the type of the information supplied have value. One of the codebook questions asks if the law school provided Factor information. If the content was missing, the codebooks provided reasons for the missing information. For example, the 996 code for “Information provided consisted of only a link to a webpage” addressed the fact that the user could not succeed in obtaining information on a law school by looking at the Directory. The user, when confronted by a link, needed to take additional action by clicking on the link. The possibility that the link led to errors or lost pages further exacerbates the user’s goal to obtain information.

Another consideration relating to the IR system experience offered that users may not be familiar with the law school environment. Therefore, some of the derived factors sought in the content were intended to appeal to someone seeking information for the first time. The T03 Program Description Factor offers an example of constructing subfactors that might be more useful than attempting to find commonalities between the 202 different descriptions. These subfactors are:

- Requirements of the program—what does a law student do to participate in the program,
- Opportunities—where can a student participate and for whom,
- Mission or philosophy of the program—why does the law school offer the program or what does the law school see as the primary objective of the program.

The next section offers a brief analysis of the fair use of the Directory contents.
COPYRIGHT CONCERNS

Two fair use assessments determined that the use of the website-based pages fell within the definition of fair use. These assessments utilized the Fair Use Evaluator, created by Michael Brewer and the American Library Association’s (ALA) Office for Information Technology Policy. One fair use assessment took place on April 7, 2017, and on April 26, 2018, after document review identified a typographical error. Both audits are available in Appendix C: Fair Use Evaluation Documentation.

There are four factors reviewed on a case by case basis regarding fair use of copyrighted works: “purpose and character of use, nature of the copyrighted work, amount and substantiality of the work and the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the work” (Copyright Act, n.d.).

The purpose and character of the intended use are transformative, socially beneficial, for non-profit purposes, defined and restricted in scope, and used one time (Brewer & Office for Information Technology Policy, American Library Association, 2008, p. Factor #1). By coding the content and then assigning a score based on the type of information as well, PILS transforms words into visualizations and data sets. The benefit of PILS lies in its ability to assist a potential law school student seeking pro bono or public interest law programming. PILS also identifies opportunities for programming support and the areas of strength or challenge for the curriculum. The scope is defined and restricted because the work involved a snapshot of the information and only served as a means of analysis and for completing an advanced degree in information science.

The nature of the work, the Directory, intended for use contains limited new knowledge, content or creative expression, work to be used is primarily of factual nature, original work was not created or marketed for the intended use, and previously published (2008, Factor #2). The content is factual; the law schools provide the information and the ABA posts that information for the public to view. The information is factual as in a law school states how many classes require service or how many fellowships support those interested in public interest law positions. The ABA provides the information to viewers; the organization does not assess the information or try to award a score or ranking of the programming. The Directory is a collected set of contributions from each law school regarding specific topics, and no one need pay to view the Directory, which has been a part of the ABA website on an ongoing basis.

The amount of the work, while comprised of the entire directory, is needed because no less than the whole work will achieve the stated purpose of building an indicator (2008, Factor #3). The content analysis documents, which contain the entire corpus used in evaluation, cannot be published as part of the project paper. At over 500 pages, the inclusion of these
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pages is prohibitive. However, UIUC’s IDEALs repository will host the content analysis documents to provide transparency and reproducibility regarding the research.

The use of the Directory for a purely academic purpose does not affect the marketability of the Directory. The Directory is not out of print or restrained by an embargo. More than sufficient notation in citations, text, and references provided attribution to the host of the Directory as well as the unnamed but assumed to be law school representatives (2008, Factor #4). As the use of the Directory is only for academic research, there is no commercial use associated with the research. The ABA does not charge or limit access to the Directory information; they post the Directory as a service to the public. The use now and in the future related only to degree requirements and continued related research.

The following section addresses the complicated process of building the indicator. The topics covered include the content analysis process, build of the data sets for the factors and the analysis factors, issues related to the factors, and the tools as well as the procedures utilized.
BUILDING THE INDICATOR

CONTENT ANALYSIS

APPROACH

Change in Content Analysis Tool

Initially, the content analysis process utilized Kami HQ to mark-up the content. The author had previous experience with the tool which functioned as a browser extension as well as a desktop tool. The browser extension allowed for noting PDFs found on the web or in the many research databases UIUC provides students. Kami HQ allowed for easier commenting via notepad pen as well as more colorful notations, given the large number of pages for review, these features should have provided the necessary means of color coding, notating, and commenting.

However, one month into coding, Kami HQ changed their access model and now forces users to deal with an access wall as well as cloud-based storage. Given that this project is research-oriented, the author did not want content sitting on some server in the ether. Limited by time and money, the author decided to rely on Adobe Reader DC. While far less flexible and non-responsive to pen input, this product did offer colors and highlighting functions as well as the ability to make comments on the digital document. The process of making comments proved cumbersome, and the highlighting function executed inconsistently as sometimes content would not highlight or would overextend.

Creating the Documents

The research for developing the indicator uses the ABA’s webpages dedicated to the Center for Pro Bono’s and Legal Education Directory. Report snapshots created a sustainable corpus for analysis. Creation of the snapshots utilized CutePDF, a proprietary PDF converter (portable document format) that installs on Windows OS as a printer subsystem. To create a document, one selects Ctrl + P, and a dialog box displays request a file name and file location. The PDF saves web pages and includes the date saved in the upper left corner, title from the webpage metadata in the center top and the URL of the page(s) saved. One note, the URL is often incomplete due to the long file paths of many web pages and the ABA’s site contains many levels in the website hierarchy. The PDFs preserve most of the active webpage links. Note that in early April 2018, the ABA reorganized the organization as well as the website; many webpage links tested as part of an editing review resolve into errors or stub pages as of April 30, 2018.

None of the pages viewed indicated specific date and time when a law school updated their information. The only time or date indicator displays at the end of a section of the report and this timestamp referred to when the ABA updated the pages based on a system date. After the last school’s information displays, Yeshiva or the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law,
there is a field “Updated on:” and then a date. The ABA last updated the documents on November 1, 2016, and all PDFs created of these sections occurred on November 16, 2016.

Multiple Rounds of Reviews
Inspired by content analysis and coding methods, several rounds of document reviews took place. The first round of review involved what Saldaña calls pre-coding, reading the documents and identifying keywords such as names of clinics and common concepts such as types of service recognitions (2015, p. 27).

The second round identified the ABA definitions expressed in the codebook questions and updated the codebooks to reflect any needed changes. An example of the changes to codebooks related to the order of the 99# code listing. On some codebooks, 998 displayed before 999; others 999 displayed before 998. The third round involved resolving any issues such as consistency in treating an issue. Issues included deciding what to include or exclude or how to address that so much of the information included non-PIL or non-pro bono related aspects. The fourth and final round involved the attempt to standardize notation and placement of information needed for developing the factor content. Archiving of the PDF sets took place for every round.

ABA Definitions
The ABA’s definitions posted in the Directory provided the concepts for developing what criteria to review in school-provided content. While not used as the definitive criteria for

Figure 9: Example of timestamp found in Awards & Recognition Directory section

Example of update information found at bottom of ABA’s report.
including or excluding content, the definitions assisted in understanding the school-provided information. The concepts of text-driven content analysis, magnitude coding, and structural coding motivated the use of the ABA definitions as well as the notations found in the content documents.

The following table summarizes the facets of the definition used to assess the content. There are eight Pro Bono Service Factors (PBF) and 12 Public Interest Law Factors (PIF). The table presents the information in the order of the ABA’s webpage.

**TABLE 2: ABA PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST DEFINITIONS—SUBFACTOR CREATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABA CATEGORY</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTOR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro Bono Definitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Subfactors derived from the content or inspired by the ABA definition are in italics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category or Type of Program</strong> – Involves a multiple-choice selection of options to describe a pro bono program</td>
<td>School choice indicated, not part of the content analysis</td>
<td>Part of the law school profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Description of Program** - Free form description of the program | T03_PB_Program_Description | Requirements of program
Opportunities for participation
Mission or Philosophy of Program |
| **Location of Program** – unit or department that runs the program | T06_PB_Location_Program | Combined with Another Unit
Dedicated
Faculty / Ad Hoc |
| **Staffing, Management, and Oversight of Program** – Identifies who runs the program(s) and roles associated with running the program | T07_PB_Staffing_Oversight | # of roles
# of total positions
Student / Staff or Faculty
Paid / volunteer
Full / Part-time
Dedicated / Shared role |
### ABA CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding – line item in the budget for the program, where does funding originate</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To5_PB_Funding</td>
<td>Type of Funding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Support Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated or Operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No separate funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Run Pro Bono Groups &amp; Specialized Law Education Projects – Many of the current pro bono programs began as student-run projects</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To8_PB_Student_Run_Specialized_Law_Ed</td>
<td>Used examples to determine inclusion or exclusion in group count.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty &amp; Administrative Pro Bono – examines policies regarding faculty service</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To4_PB_Faculty_Administrative</td>
<td>Policy requiring pro bono service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy encouraging pro bono service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pro bono service part of tenure or performance review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for participation indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awards &amp; Recognition – Included awards recognizing pro bono service provided to communities</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To1_Awards_Recognitions</td>
<td>Recognition provided, Recognition Event (Dedicated), Students Recognized, Forms of Student Recognition, Levels of Recognition (Levels 1 – 3), Faculty Recognition, Alumni Recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABA CATEGORY</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Service – Non-legal work supported by</td>
<td>T02_PB_CommmServ</td>
<td>Community service required for Students organization required to perform community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students and others from the law school</td>
<td>InstProj</td>
<td>1Ls required to perform community service as part of orientation or welcome week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is program discrete or continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PIL Definitions**

<p>| Certificate &amp; Curriculum Programs – Concentrated | T11_PI_Cert_Curr_Programs | # of certificates related to PIL courses |
| curricula dedicated to PIL scholar program participants or anyone completing specified requirements |
| Public Interest Centers – Formal centers dedicated to running PIL program or concentrating on PIL issue | T10_PI_Center | # of PI Centers |
| Note: Excluded projects &amp; programs, part of Factor 08. Excluded student or professional organizations, part of Factor 19 |
| Public Interest Clinics – Offer legal experience for credit, class, and practice components | T13_PI_Clinics | # of PI Clinics |
| Note: Included in count only something listed as a “clinic” |
| Externships &amp; Internships – non-compensated positions for credits outside of law school, for one semester or full-school year | T14_PI_Extern_Intern_Ships | # of externship programs |
| Note: Did not count each placement; grouped placements such as non-profit organizations or government agencies |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABA CATEGORY</th>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classes with a Public Service Component</strong> – classes that incorporate a service component in a doctrinal course</td>
<td>T12_PI_Classes_Public_Service</td>
<td># of classes requiring a public service component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: excluded courses that described a public interest component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Interest Journals</strong> – dedicated to PIL subjects</td>
<td>T16_PI_Journals_Websites</td>
<td># of PIL journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: Counted journals easily identified as PIL, if journal mentioned such as Intellectual Property or could include non-PIL perspectives, not counted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Interest Career Assistance</strong> – career services related to PIL opportunities</td>
<td>T09_PI_Career_Assistance</td>
<td>Dedicated career assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated in-house career fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated PIL job resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated PIL career-related programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated PIL mentorship or networking program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loan Repayment Assistance Programs (LRAP)</strong> – programs designed to assist law school graduates with repayment of the loans taken out to attend law school</td>
<td>T17_PI_LRAP</td>
<td>LRAP award amount indicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRAP award duration indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRAP award eligibility requirements indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included only law school programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABA CATEGORY

Post-Graduate Fellowships / Scholarships – financial assistance to law students taking public interest law positions

Term-Term Fellowships / Scholarships – fellowship programs and stipends awarded to students during school semesters

TABLE

| T18_PI_Post-Grad_Fellowships_Awards | T20_PI_Summer_Term_Time_Fellow |

FACETS USED (SUBFACTORS)

# of awards
Eligibility requirements
Support provided participants
Type of placement required
Compensation provided

Excluded national programs external to law school such as Soros, Skadden, etc.

Information repeated for the three distinct categories: law school funded, graduate student funded and other funding source

NOTE: Term-Time and Summer Fellowship Information combined into one factor
### ABA CATEGORY

**Summer Fellowships** - fellowship programs and stipends awarded to students during summer, out of session

**Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellowship Programs and Stipends Awarded to Students During Summer, Out of Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T20_PI_Summer_Term_Time_Fellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facets Used**

- # of awards
- Required participation requirements
- Support provided participants
- Post-graduate requirements
- Compensation

Information repeated for the three distinct categories: law school funded, graduate student funded and other funding source.

**Note:** Term-Time and Summer Fellowship Information combined into one factor.

### Extracurricular & Co-Curricular Programs

- activities, programming available to all students

**Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extracurricular &amp; Co-Curricular Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T15_PI_Extra_Co_Curricular_Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facets Used**

- # of programs listed

Excluded clinics, centers, community service and pro bono service projects.

### Student Public Interest Groups

- general or issue-dedicated

**Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Public Interest Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T19_PI_Student_Groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facets Used**

- # of PIL groups listed

PIL
- Dedicated Interest Groups (Ethnic, Culture, Religious)
- Government Functions (Agency, Constitutional)
- Subject Law (Labor, etc.)
- Multifunctional

Appendix D provides a PDF capture of the definitions. PDFill PDF Tools converted the PDF pages to PNG files suitable for presentation in this document.
COMMON FACTORS

Two questions appear on every codebook; one question addresses whether the school reported information for the factor and the second asks whether the information is old.

Information Provided for Factor

The first question took several rounds to identify all the reasons as to why a school did not report information. Four separate codes indicate why there is no information for the school for each report section. The most obvious reason for no information came from the blank space located under the law school’s section on the report. The school did not report any information.

![Figure 10: Examples of Two Law Schools Listed but No Information Indicated, a 999 code. Snapshot from the 07-PB_Staffing_Oversight_v_4_0.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/probono_public_service/resources/directory_of_law_school_public_interest_pro_bono_programs/defir)

Missing from the report sections: Other law schools appeared alphabetically on the ABA website dedicated to Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, but not listed in the report sections. Belmont, Concordia, Lincoln Memorial, Massachusetts-Andover, and Pennsylvania State are the five schools listed as ABA-approved law schools, but the names did not appear on any of the 20-factor reports.

A PDF file preserved the ABA-accredited school listing; PDFill Tools converted the PDF into images. Appendix E displays the images of the listing.

Reported information exclusions: Some schools reported information, but the content did not relate to the report section or incorporated information that was not the desired information or was unrelated to the report section. An example of the desired information exclusion relates to scope decisions to include only resources from the law school and exclude outside sources. The inclusion or exclusion of a fellowship illustrates the type of decisions made regarding content. Many schools indicated that their students received Skadden or Soros Foundation fellowships. However, law students are eligible independent
of their affiliation with a law school; the funding is external to the law school budgets or endowments. Every law student is eligible for this funding, and the award goes directly to the student rather than given to a law school to determine the honoree.

Regarding the provision of unrelated information, several schools included information on community service under pro bono projects. Other examples of information provision that did not qualify for analysis included only a webpage link or a contact listing.

All four codes receive a score of zero. The next table summarizes the reasons for missing information.

### Table 3: Type of Missing Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>996</td>
<td>Information provided consisted of only a link to a webpage OR Listed contact name, possible provision of address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997</td>
<td>Information was out of scope or irrelevant to the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>998</td>
<td>Law school omitted from report section, no name listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>Law school name displays on report section, but no information provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Type Content**

The ideal feature for the visualizations (viz) in Tableau would be to allow the viewer to determine their values for the magnitude of information, list, general or specific. However, this design feature is out of scope for the project. A single project could have consisted of creating visualizations of the data sets; however, the current project proposal called for building the foundations to design vizzes, and the resulting illustrations exceed that specification.

To facilitate the project, a simple progression in whole numbers of 1, 2, and 3 represents the list, general or specific type of information. The table below defines the information factors used and the kind of information they describe.

### Table 4: Information Type Factor Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE CODE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>CODE NOTED ON PDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>List Only – no description</td>
<td>L, List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Description provided in general terms, no proper names, numbers, dates, places</td>
<td>NS, genl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORE CODE</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>CODE NOTED ON PDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Description provides specific information, names of programs, dates, places</td>
<td>S, spec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicator**

The indicator consists of 20 distinct factors; each of which corresponds to a section of the ABA report. Eight sections address pro bono service; twelve sections cover public interest law. Pro bono service being service done in the public's interest as discussed in the literature review. The law refers to subject matter considered directly affecting the public interest; for example, poverty law or housing law.

Appendix F provides a listing of the report sections and their related files.

**Data Sets**

**Master**

The first file created included a master listing of found information on the alphabetical listing of the ABA-approved law schools. This file consists of the following information:

- Name of each ABA law school
- Each school's city and state
- Year the ABA approved the law school
- Private or public status

The information added to the master listing includes:

- Unique number identifier
- Short name code consisting of three capital letters
- Street address
- Longitude coordinate of the street address
- Latitude coordinate of the street address
- Program description multiple choice response

The multiple-choice response regarding program type is a value in the master data file. This information consists of selected responses. Given the nature of the content, a predetermined list, the data was not available for content analysis as were the other reports sections.
The need for longitude and latitude relates to the development of visualization in Tableau that utilizes a map and for any future development of those visualizations. A Google search for the law school address relied on the Knowledge Graphs and Doogal (a website); Doogal identified geocoordinates to provide the latitude and longitude information. See the Tools & Processes section for screenshots and steps involved in obtaining the longitude and latitude information.

**Quintile**

A score of zero occurs when a school provides information by stating they do not have services or resources for a factor. Any of the four 99# assignments also earn a zero score.

The issue of “multiple” zeros raised some concerns as to what a zero truly meant. There are the zeros created by the process of coding the information. Despite providing information, the content analysis and coding resulted in a zero.

The zero assigned as part of the indicator is a different zero. For comparison, the scale of zero to five represented a score determined by the quintile determination. A school could receive a zero because while it did provide information, the information did not respond to the codebook questions. A law school could also receive a zero due to a determination that included one of the 99#s.

After reviews for formula accuracy and random audits of a school’s information took place in February 2018, the quintile calculation occurred during March 2018.

**ANALYSIS FACTORS**

**DESCRIPTION OF ANALYSIS FACTORS**

Several spreadsheets facilitated understanding of the coded information and supported the development of visualizations in Tableau. Given the considerable number of spreadsheets that varied from 10 values per law school to over 50, there was a need to simplify the presentation of information to facilitate the visualizations. The following table details the analysis factors spreadsheets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5: ANALYSIS FACTOR SPREADSHEETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPREADSHEET NAME</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T21_99#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5: Analysis Factor Spreadsheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPREADSHEET NAME</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>998 - Law school omitted from report section, no name listed. 999 - Law school name displays on report section, but no information is provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T22_Old_Info</td>
<td>Tallies number of times a school reported old information per factor.</td>
<td>Includes percentage of data sets with old information. Based on dates or events known to have occurred before November 2015 as the snapshot of documents occurred in mid-November 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T23_Profile</td>
<td>Captures some of the subfactors used to create the PBFs (Pro Bono service Factors) and PIFs (Public Interest Law Factors)</td>
<td>Used to create mouse-over content (Tableau terminology for a pop-up is Tool Tip). Examples of information captured: # of student-run projects or certificates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T24_Indicator</td>
<td>Capture the PIFs and PBFs 0 – 5 scores for each law school.</td>
<td>A summary data set was created to avoid having to form a union of 24 spreadsheets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These analysis spreadsheets integrated with the profile spreadsheet of all 202 law schools to create the visualizations. Snapshots of the visualizations follow towards the end of the section.

### Factor Considerations

**Indicator**

The idea of building an indicator developed due to the types of information presented in the ABA’s report. While some of the factors presented information similarly, others offered information differently. For example, counts of programs or features coupled with a straightforward determination of the information required little effort to code. With some factors, each quantitative subfactor needed its information factor. An example of a complicated and straightforward factor follows in the next two paragraphs.

**Factor 10: Centers** demonstrates one of the factors with more straightforward content to code. The dataset captures seven fields of factor information and includes three fields of the school information from the profile dataset. The spreadsheet represents the simplest of the
determinations in two fields: # of centers multiplied by the information factor. The rest of
the five fields address the common questions of information provided and factor-specific
calculations to determine the score for each school.

Factor 20: Fellowships demonstrated how complicated some factors could be to code. The
data set combines two report sections to capture all the information related to fellowships
available to enrolled law students. The type of information presented appears twice; one set
represented information pertaining to summer fellowships and the other presented
information for fellowships available while school was in session. Each category contained
three subcategories: law school, graduate student and other. This dataset captures over 65
fields of information, plus the profile school information.

Another complication with Factor 20: Fellowships stems from making the information
factor assignment. The information type assignment for some factors required detailed
evaluation going beyond a holistic assignment found for the 10: Centers factor. In addition
to dividing the fellowships into two categories, summer and term time; there are three
sections for each school, law school, graduate student and other. For each type of fellowship,
schools could provide any number of fellowship programs. However, the information in one
section could be different from fellowship to fellowship. The spreadsheet needed to
accommodate an average per fellowship, per section and per category of summer or term-
time. The following screenshot shows the three subcategories for summertime fellowships

![Screenshot of Content Analysis for Baylor University Law School, Summer & Term-Time Fellowships](p. 3)

displays the stamp used to indicate old information alerts. (More information on old
information alerts to follow in a separate section of the paper).

The next section briefly addresses the concerns associated with each factor.
BY FACTOR

_Pro Bono Factors_

_Awards & Recognitions (T01)_ content analysis presented challenges in coding as what qualified as recognition and how to categorize those forms took two passes of the report. The subfactors searched for came from the ABA definitions; however, the variation in types of recognition and the lack of categorization of these recognitions required the additional initial pass. Some schools acknowledged pro bono service via levels of service as in the number of hours the student provided. Some schools notated service on transcripts or graduation programs; some provided graduation regalia to reflect achievement. Other forms of recognition included nominal cash awards, letters from the law school’s dean, certificates, or very nominal acknowledgments such as mentions in newsletters or news stories posted on the law school website. Two schools provided information but not for the specified subfactors and therefore received a zero: Denver and Michigan. Denver stated that they are “in the process of developing awards for students” that provided a variety of service; Michigan indicated they were “examining whether to institute a pro bono award” (Van Ploven, 2016a, pp. 23, 25).

_Community Service (T02)_ report provides information on the number of community service projects as well as whether graduation requirements included community service, if student organizations funding required community service, or if 1Ls performed community service as part of their orientation. The content analysis challenges for this factor relate to the need to identify subfactors (none identified in the ABA definitions) as well as the determination of a community service program. Some schools mixed in pro bono service or extracurriculars such as lecture series or forums. Nine schools provided information but not for the specific subfactors and therefore received a zero: Florida, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Southern Illinois, Tennessee, Utah, Wayne State, Cooley (Western Michigan), and Willamette. South Dakota supplied an example of the related but too general information. Their entry on the report states, “members of the USD School of Law administration, faculty, and staff are actively involved in a number of community organizations that provide pro bono services” (Van Ploven, 2016d, p. 29).

_Program Description (T03)_ is free-form information. The identified subfactors included looking for the program’s mission or philosophy, requirements of the program and the law school’s opportunities to participate in pro bono service, none of which the ABA listed in their definitions. The open-ended aspect of the description provided a chance to explore some possible subfactors but did not report every possibility. Six law schools did not indicate any of the three subfactors and therefore received a zero: Cornell, Creighton, Dayton, Fordham, Mississippi College and Samford. Dayton only provided that the “program started
in October 2000” (Van Poolen, 2016e, p. 37); whereas, Mississippi College indicated there is no formal pro bono program and volunteer opportunities post in various places (p. 21).

*Faculty Pro Bono (T04)* factor covers policy stating pro bono service for faculty as part of tenure or promotion processes as well as lists of faculty participation opportunities. Three of the four subfactors come from the ABA definitions; the one additional subfactor addresses whether pro bono service is part of the tenure requirements or performance review. Twenty-eight of the schools reported a policy of “encouraging” faculty to provide pro bono service. Fourteen schools reported relevant information but did not provide specific information for the subfactors, or they indicated no faculty pro bono requirement:

- Alabama
- Boston College
- California Western
- Drexel
- Georgetown
- John Marshall-Atlanta
- Nova Southeastern
- St. Thomas (Florida)
- Seton Hall,
- Vermont
- Washington University
- Widener-Delaware
- Widener-Commonwealth
- Yale

Boston College indicated that “some faculty and administrators independently perform pro bono work” (Van Poolen, 2016f, p. 3); Yale states “there is no formal faculty pro bono policy” (p. 24).

*Funding (T05)* factor mimics a multiple-choice selection in that many of the schools used the ABA’s definitions and descriptions in the responses. Therefore, the texts reviewed tended to be short and used common terminology. The only schools with a zero score were those coded as one of the 99#s.

*Location (T06)* factor’s content analysis parallels *Funding’s* analysis due to the similar terms used per the ABA definitions. Career services and clinics appeared throughout the report for this factor. Using Voyant Tools to obtain a word count revealed that “career” was in the text 66 times (including career used as terminology unrelated to location). “Clinic” and “clinical” displayed in the text a combined 37 times (including the words used as
terminology unrelated to location). The only schools with a zero score were those coded as one of the 99#s.

*Staffing (T07)* factor information proved to be one of the more complicated reports to code. One of the subfactors related to the number of roles associated with staffing the programming. Upon conducting the review, the author found that two related pieces of information comprised the content. One subfactor became two subfactors; the number of roles as well as the number of persons in each of those roles. The only schools with a zero score were those coded as one of the 99#s.

Staffing is one of two factors utilized to determine if the information factor moved a school from one quintile to another and therefore changed the score. A quintile distribution was determined for the sum of observed subfactors as well as for the sum of observed subfactors multiplied by the information factor. Below is a table demonstrating the change, if any, that occurred in the scores, without and with the information factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN QUINTILES</th>
<th># OF LAW SCHOOLS</th>
<th># OF POSITIVE (+) CHANGES</th>
<th># OF NEGATIVE (-) CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 37% (55 of 148) of the schools’ scores changed when applying the information factor.

*Studen-Run (T08)* factor report is dense with details and is one of the more lengthy sections at 60 pages. Student-run projects include programs such as Innocence Project, VITA (Volunteer Income Tax Assistance) and Street Law, all of which have national organizational structures. VITA, for example, offers free tax assistance to those making less than $54,000, those with disabilities and those limited English speaking filers; the volunteers are Internal Revenue Service certified preparers (“Free Tax Return Preparation for Qualifying Taxpayers,” 2017). Boston University is the only school to receive a zero score because the information provided, while relevant, did not discuss any of the subfactors. BU stated that “there are no formal student-run pro bono programs” and adds that student organizations provide projects (Van Poolen, 2016j, p. 5).
PILS—An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

To8 Factor: Student Run is the other factor utilized to show what differences if any, occur when applying the information factor. The methods delineated for the Staffing factor apply for this Student-run factor as well.

**Table 7: Student Run - Comparison of Quintiles Without and With Information Factor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFERENCE IN QUINTILES</th>
<th># OF LAW SCHOOLS</th>
<th># OF POSITIVE (+) CHANGES</th>
<th># OF NEGATIVE (-) CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over 33% (41 of 124) of the schools’ scores changed when applying the information factor.

Category (Master Data) factor is a multiple-choice question; the Master Data file contains the law school responses.

The following table indicates the total number of scores for each pro bono factor.

**Table 8: Distribution of Pro Bono Factor (PBF) Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 23</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 – 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Interest Factors**

Career Assistance (To9) presented minimal challenges as the subfactors were all listed in the ABA description of the factor. Excluded information includes regional or state career fairs as the content analysis focused on services and resources provided by the law school’s operations. Fourteen law schools received a score of zero not due to a 99#: Arkansas-Little Rock, Charleston, Cleveland State, Florida, Idaho, Kentucky, Pacific McGeorge, Regent, San
Francisco, Seattle, Washburn, Thomas Cooley (Western Michigan), Western State, and West Virginia. Two examples follow. Charleston stated that “the Department of Career Services assists students and alumni pursuing public interest careers” (Van Poolen, 2016g, p. 4). Thomas Cooley (Western Michigan) indicated that the Career and Professional Development Office provides “substantial public interest career support” (p. 25).

Centers (T10) presented challenges due to the addition of information for non-PIL Centers. Some schools included projects, programs, or student groups/societies. When the law school only provided line items, only items containing the word “Center” made the selection list. Projects and programs necessitated exclusion as they are part of the T08 Student Run Factor data set; student or professional organizations warranted exclusion as they are part of T19 Student Groups Factor. Fifteen schools received a zero score because they indicated no centers: Appalachian, Arkansas-Little Rock, Boston University, University of Chicago, Georgia, Illinois, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Regent, South Carolina, Tennessee, Touro, Tulsa, and Wake Forest. Boston University states that they have “none,” as in no Centers dedicated to public interest law (Van Poolen, 2016h, p. 2); Touro stated they were in the “process of creating a Public Interest Center” (p. 22).

Certificates (T11) coding challenge stemmed from the lack of information. Only a little over 1/4 of the schools scored higher than zero. Thirty-three of the zero score law schools received that score because they indicated no certificate programs. Harvard Law School offered that “while HLS does not have a public interest specialization, roughly 2/3 of the students take clinical courses with placements working on public interest cases” (Van Poolen, 2016b, p. 8). The remaining 112 law schools fell into the 99# category.

Classes (T12) presented a content analysis issue related to law schools including classes that had a public interest law component. However, a curriculum that contains elements or an entirety of a public interest law subject differs from a class that requires some service, either pro bono or community. A variable indicates whether the list or information states or appears to state a public interest component or course. Twelve schools indicated no classes require service: Alabama, Arkansas-Little Rock, Brooklyn, Liberty, Louisville, Pepperdine, St. Mary’s, Samford, South Carolina, Stetson, Touro, and Washburn. Encouragement of service did not equate with required service; for example, Washburn did provide that tax students are encouraged to volunteer for VITA (Van Poolen, 2016c, p. 31).

Clinics (T13), like Centers (T10), only included information with a keyword, “clinics” in lists. When details provided sufficient information to indicate clinic activity such as representing clients, taking depositions, writing briefs and motions, and interviewing potential clients, the information counted as a clinic. Appalachian indicated no clinics (Van Poolen, 2016i, p. 2). George Washington provided a list that did not name an item with the term “clinic(s)”; however, an accompanying URL (webpage) indicated “clinics+programs” (p. 13).
inability to determine what was a program and what was a clinic landed the school with a zero score.

_Externships (T14)_ presented a minimal challenge in coding. One smaller problem related to schools indicating the offices or organizations that placed students rather than programs; programs involve efforts to place students in the specific type of organizations. Worthy of note, some schools do not offer externship programs because the practical experience resides in clinical experiences. For example, New York University provides practical curricula via clinics and does not offer formal externship opportunities. Some schools provided only their programs, and the quantitative variables may be lower compared to schools that listed placements. The information factor for externships required a weighted average given that some schools provided mixed information using lists, specific, and general descriptions.

_Extracurriculars (T15)_ presented some issues as schools listed specific events rather than programs or series. Some schools offered clinical programs as extracurricular, clinical program information should be in T13 Clinics. Overall, the category presents as too open in execution; the ABA definition provided enough opportunity for interpretation that the Directory information proved challenging to assess.

_Journals (T16)_ content required separating the journals into two categories. One category remained exclusive to journals indicating public interest law in the title or a topic commonly associated with public interest law. The “other” category played a catch-all role as some schools listed all their journals. Some journals do present articles related to public interest law; however, the journal’s primary purpose is that of a law review or perhaps presented a special issue on public interest law. This category’s facets sought journals dedicated to the subject, not those that infrequently offer an article or two on the subject. Also, the ABA included websites with a public interest theme as appropriate for this section. Again, the factor for this project focused on journals. With more journals publishing exclusively online, the definition of publishing takes on some broader sense than referring to print only publication.

_LRAP (T17)_ or Loan Repayment Assistance Programs required the definition of some subfactors. The content varied widely in the type of information as well as the amount of detail. The information factor captured the latter and subfactors of the amount, time, and eligibility requirement addressed the former issue. As a result, many of the schools did not provide information on the subfactors, or they provide only a link, which warranted a zero score. Some schools included information on funding process for the program rather than information about the program for students.

_Post-Grad Fellowships (T18)_ presented challenges that are also present for T20 as they relate to information that appears in similar formats. Post-graduate fellowships contained the most zero scores because foundations tend to offer more of the post-graduate
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fellows. The analysis excluded fellowships from external organizations that provide funding directly to the students rather than establishing a pool of money for the school to distribute. One other issue focuses on the application of the information factor. Each fellowship varied with the degree of specificity and the three categories of funding, law school, student and other, also interject complications in determining the appropriate information factor.

Student Groups (T19) factor presents comparable questions as T16 Journals or T13 Clinics. Schools listed all their student groups rather than the ones solely dedicated to public interest law subjects. The coding required a breakdown of groups into subgroups, determinations of how a group’s focus related to public interest law proved difficult. Just because a group forms to represent a specific culture or acts as a student chapter of a larger organization does not imply that the group is a public interest law group. Therefore, the factor counts consist of a total count, public interest law, dedicated interest groups (such as Muslim Student Association), government or politics (such as the Federalist Society or affiliated party organizations), subject law, and related organizations—student chapters of professional organizations and honor societies.

Fellowships (T20) challenges are similar to T18; a substantive difference centers on the amount of information provided. This factor contains a higher volume of codable information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 23</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 – 35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 – 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section explores the findings of the data sets for all twenty factors plus the additional four data sets of the analysis factors.
TOOLS & PROCESSES USED
AUDITING THE DATA SPREADSHEETS

Checklist of Issues Identified During Coding
Throughout the coding process, a whiteboard tracked issues. A checklist grouped the issues and offered a means of tracking when a resolution took place. The issues related to omitted information, bad values, calculations, codebooks, formulas, document formatting, and factor-specific concerns. See Appendix G for the checklist.

Random Audits of School Information and Data Set Values
The Random Sequence Generator at Random.org created forty numbers, each associated with the Law School ID number. Each Factor’s audits involved checking the associated school’s information from the content analysis against the data set values. A partial spreadsheet that captured the random audit numbers is available in Appendix H.

Then a schedule spreadsheet documented audit completion as well as noted if data changed as a result of the audit. A simple highlight of the school denotes there was a change. Only typos or misaligned data changed, no re-interpretation of content analysis took place during these audits. The schedule of audits is available in Appendix I: Audit Tracking.

A total of 840 audits reviewed the twenty factors. One report represented the summer and term-time fellowships; therefore, the audit for the T20 Fellowships Factor involved reviewing both parts of the combined report. In effect, twenty-one documents comprised the content. Audits occurred between February 17, 2018, and March 1, 2018. Two passes of each report section took place. The first pass included noting any schools that did not provide information, the 99#s. The second pass covered the rest of the content. One factor was reviewed at the same time, regardless of time needed to complete the audit, to provide more consistency in the process. The review noted a total of 28 errors for an error rate of 3.33%, or 28 of 840 checks. Be aware that these errors often included a typo for one of at least ten fields per data set not that all ten or more fields required change.

In addition to the audits, another process augmented the quality of data for the project. The identification of the street addresses and the corresponding geocodes enabled visualizations utilizing maps in Tableau.

LOCATING LAW SCHOOLS ON THE MAP
In anticipation of creating data visualizations, the street address for each law school was identified and then utilized in obtaining latitude and longitude for the street address. Some trial and error with search criteria determined that searching on the state name and the
phrase “law schools” returned a styled page listing. When one of the search results items is selected, a Google Knowledge Graph displays including the address and unique information. All this information displays within one webpage which facilitated a quick identification of the needed information. The process to identify 202 addresses took approximately one hour. See figure below.

The website Doogal features Batch Geocoding; the time to process the address took less than a minute. See figure below. Doogal creates a map with all the geocodes as well as a text listing of the latitude and longitude. The text listing including the address as well as the geocodes is download ready. (See the figures below).

Doogal offers several options that may be more appropriate for use in other projects. One of the features includes KML notations, Keyhole Markup Language. The Library of Congress provides a listing of format description; “Keyhole, Inc. developed by KML and Google acquired the company and their products. KML is XML grammar that expresses geography data for display in 3D or 2D online maps” (Library of Congress, 2017). However, this project relied on the batch coding tool. An annotated screenshot illustrates the batch geocoding below.
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The next figure displays the geocoding results; note the one law school on Hawai‘i and two on Puerto Rico. The results download in several formats including comma-separated values (CSV). Another copy and paste of longitude and latitude rounded out law school information in the Master Data spreadsheet. See figure below.

Following the two screenshots of map information, the Results section presents the insights found by analyzing the Directory.
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Figure 15: Output of entered addresses on a world map. https://www.doogal.co.uk/BatchGeocoding.php

Figure 14: Geocoordinate information in text form. https://www.doogal.co.uk/BatchGeocoding.php
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RESULTS

PILS--THE INDICATOR

PRO BONO FACTORS

Description of Pro Bono Factors

The eight pro bono factors cover the following information: awards and recognitions, community service required, program description, faculty pro bono policy, program funding, program location, staffing and student-run projects.

Factors 01-08

The number of schools not reporting information was the lowest for the awards and the highest for faculty pro bono policy.

| TABLE 10: PRO BONO FACTORS |
| FACTOR                     | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Awards & Recognitions      | 45| 38| 28| 34| 31| 26|
| Community Service Required | 68| 28| 42| 12| 25| 27|
| Program Description        | 40| 45| 44| 33| 6 | 34|
| Faculty Pro Bono Policy    | 96| 30| 0 | 42| 17| 17|
| Program Funding            | 59| 54| 16| 23| 39| 11|
| Program Location           | 54| 1 | 66| 24| 51| 6 |
| Staffing                   | 54| 30| 29| 32| 27| 30|
| Student Projects           | 56| 42| 20| 35| 24| 25|

The pro bono factor scores range from 0 – 34; the highest score possible is 40. The mode is zero. The mean is 15.96; the median is 17. The removal of the modal scores of zero creates new values as follows: the new mode is 17.00; the mean, 18.52 and the median is 18.

Description of Public Interest Factors

The 12 public interest factors include career assistance, centers, certificates, classes with service components, clinics, externships and internships, extracurricular activities, journals, loan repayment assistance programs, post-graduate fellowships, student groups, and fellowships.
Factors 09-20

The number of schools not reporting information was the lowest for the externship and internships factor; the highest, post-graduate fellowships, followed closely by certificates and LRAP. The following table summarizes the results across all 12 public interest factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes w/ Service</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externships / Internships</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurriculars</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Repayment Assistance Program</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate Fellowships</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Groups</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Public Interest factor score range is from 0 – 50; the highest score possible is 60. The mode is zero. The mean is 15.96; the median is 17.51. The removal of the modal scores of zero creates new values as follows: the new mode is 19.00; the mean, 19.66 and the median is 18.

Indicator: Combined PB and PI Factors

Description of Combined Factors

The indicator includes all 20 factors by combining the pro bono and public interest factors. Each factor scores on a range from zero to five. If all 20 factors receive the maximum score of five, the Indicator highest score possible is 100.

Schools with Indicator Score of Zero

A school receives a score of zero when they fail to report information, the school is not listed, the school provides information not on point, or the school only provides a link or contact address.

Sixteen schools did not report any information in the Directory. Ten schools scored ten or fewer points. Two schools scored over 70 on the scale, and 46 schools scored 50 or higher.
The following table indicates the schools who have no reportable information for any of the 20 factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 12: SCHOOL WITH ZERO SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools in Alphabetical Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Summit (formerly University of Phoenix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A &amp; M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts (Andover)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontifical Catholic of Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern (Thurgood Marshall)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below, the table indicates the ten schools that scored between 1 – 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 13: SCHOOLS W/ SCORES BETWEEN 1-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools with Scores between 1 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(In ascending score order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The PILS Indicator scores range from 0 – 85; the highest score possible is 100. The mode is zero. The mean is 33.46; the median is 33. The removal of the modal scores of zero creates new values as follows: the new mode is 33; the mean, 33.32 and the median is 35.50.

### MISSING & OLD INFORMATION

*Missing Information*

Missing information relates to the missing law schools from the reports or the missing data.

Another category of missing information represents that the law school only provided a URL link or a contact name with address. The issue is that a viewer must review other sources and in many cases, the URLs tend to bring up errors. The last category addresses that the information provided is not relevant to the topic. For example, a law school may discuss pro bono service when community service is the topic. Each of these four categories is considered one of the 99#s:

- **996** Information provided consisted of only a link to a webpage
  OR
  Listed contact name or address

  **Figure 16: Example of 996 – Link only from T10_PI_Centers_v_4_0**

- **997** Information is out of scope for factor
Law schools may provide information in a report section. However, on occasion, the data may be irrelevant to the factor reviewed. Here, Stetson offers information on the Office of Student Life; however, the factor asks about Centers. Centers may run the public interest law or pro bono service programming; some Centers may focus on an area of the law. For Stetson, the Office of Student Life oversees the programming. However, the Office is not a Center, so the information received a 997 and therefore a zero score.

**Figure 17: Example of 997 – Information out of scope from T10_PI_Centers_v_4_0**

**998  Law school omitted from report section, no name listed**

Belmont University is listed on the ABA’s “Alphabetical School List,” see Appendix E for a full listing of schools. However, in the report sections, Belmont University does not provide any information. The report skips from Baylor University to Boston College.

**Figure 18: Example of 998 -- Law school omitted from report for T10 Centers Factor**

**999  Law school name displays on report section, but no information provided**
The ABA does not appear to require a response from the law schools, even if to indicate they do not have any relevant programming or services related to the factor. Throughout the reporting, the school name posts to the section without information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW SCHOOL</th>
<th>996</th>
<th>997</th>
<th>998</th>
<th>999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ave Maria</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Summit</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Mercy</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida A &amp; M</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Memorial</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts-Andover</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontifical Catholic (PR)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The dataset with the highest percentage of missing information is T18 Post-Graduate Fellowships Factor with 56.93% or 115 out of 202 schools. The dataset with the lowest percentage of missing information is the T03 Program Description Factor.


Twenty-nine schools failed to report information for two factors; twenty-five omitted information for three factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAW SCHOOL</th>
<th>996</th>
<th>997</th>
<th>998</th>
<th>999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern (Thurgood Marshall)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Missing Information Counts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Schools Reporting</th>
<th># of Factors Missing information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old Information

Old information alerts flag a school’s information, when a date or event stated indicates the content could be more than a year old. The alert consists of an icon; whenever old information presented, the stamp allowed for attaching a comment field. Information warrants a warning when the date or event indicates a context that exceeds November 16, 2016, the date of the content capture. The old information data resides on each set of content PDFs, the individual factor spreadsheets as well as in a summary spreadsheet, T22_Old_Info.

The original concept of old information alerts included applying a penalty to the overall PILS value as the information is outdated and not as valuable to users. The decision to do no more than place an alert on the specific factor relates to the absence of provenance. Other than contacting the schools, there was no way to verify whether the information provided functioned as a landmark, a note of contextual historical events or old information.

The Factor with the most alerts is T20_PI_Sum+ Term Fellowships; 21.56% or 25 of the 116 schools reporting provided old information. As this spreadsheet combines Summer and Term-Time fellowships, the combined information might have contributed to the increase in old information alerts. However, the summer fellowships information contains the super majority of information alerts.
Two factors, Funding and Certificates, had no schools reporting old information. Overall, of the 2,727 values tallied for old information fields, 4.11% of the values were tagged as old information. An example of old data based on date is below.

Figure 21: Example of Old Information based on date

An example follows of old information alert based on an event. Brooklyn Law offers that one of their groups supported Gulf Coast residents in 2005. Given that the snapshot occurred on November 16, 2016; thereby setting up the opportunity for an old information alert.
From this author’s data visualization report, data visualizations (vizzes) presented information since the 16th century when researchers illustrated concepts related to urban development and calculus. Recently, the ability to store data cheaply, tool development and the marked increase in the availability of data gave rise to the data visualization explosion. This influx of data can overwhelm one's ability to process the data. Vizzes convert the overload of data into a “manageable cognitive bite” without diminishing value of the underlying data (Van Poolen, 2017, p. 8).

Tableau Desktop illustrates the PILS dataset which contains over 92,000 values, over 500 variables, 25 spreadsheets, and 20 PDFs of over 500 analyzed pages of 202 law schools. The
following illustrations deliver snapshots of the interactive visualizations. All visualization snapshots and caption information are from Tableau as of April 30, 2018. Included for each visualization is a description, the caption from Tableau, color codes and color schemas if used. Tableau Public will host the visualizations. Search on the following terms to retrieve the set of vizzes, “UIUC,” “CAS,” “PILS,” “Indicator.”

One of the most apparent benefits of visualizing data is that of relating essential information to a viewer, often in an aesthetically pleasing illustration. Vizzes often become works of art and offer stunning portrayals of data. However, vizzes also serve an essential function in finding outliers in data and potential errors. The PI Factors (by Factor, Score Count), see Figure 31, provided an opportunity to view data visualizations as a way of identifying issues in the data. This dashboard places the charts for all twelve factors on the same page. This placement showed that two factors had the same counts for scores zero through five. By utilizing a data set that collected the scores for each factor separately, the data set unified all the scores rather than attempt to create unions with 20 data sets.

The danger lies in the transfer of values from the 20 data sets to create another, T24 Indicator. Upon review, the values for T17 LRAP Factor matched the values with T18 Post-Graduate Fellowships Factor. The probability of these factors having the same values is low. An examination of the original factor data sets indicated that the two factors’ data differed; the corresponding columns in the indicator data set, T24 Indicator needed updating. Why the data columns mixed is unknown, but most likely there was a copy and paste issue or an undo issue. The visualization identified the problem, and the data set was corrected.

Below, the visualization snapshots taken in April 2018, and subject to future editing, include Tableau-related notations.
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Map of U.S. Law Schools

Description: Map of all law schools in 49 states, Washington D.C., and Puerto Rico; Alaska does not have any law schools. Filters display all locations, several, or a single state.

Caption: Map based on average of Longitude and average of Latitude. The color dots represent law school locations identified geo-coordinates. The colors represent the value of the law school’s PILS (combined) indicator.

The values range from 0 to 85, on a scale of values 0 to 100.

Hover pop-ups, mouse over the circles, contains some of the factors identified in each of the twenty different areas. However, the pop-up or Tableau Tool Tip limits the number of characters. The profile data set includes some quantitative or subfactors. Due to the character limitation for Tool Tips, the pop-up contains a subset of the subfactors available. A complete listing of factors for each law school is available in the PBF and PIF illustrations.
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Color Codes:
Blue #2B6395, Purple #C46A99, Yellow #F1B969, Orange #E96148, Red #B6193A

Color Scheme: Tableau - Sunrise-Sunset Diverging
Stepped Color, 20 steps
Start: 0  End: 100

The following illustration shows how a viewer zooms into a location on the map. Here the example focuses on Berkeley for the University of California-Berkeley.

Figure 24: Tableau Map Visualization Snapshot, Zoom in on Berkeley, California
Figure 25: Tableau Map Visualization Snapshot, Pop-Up of School Specific Information

Inset of pop-up when viewer hovers over the Berkeley rectangle.
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_U.S. Law Schools, by State (alphabetically) and PILS (increasing)_

**Description:** Visualization of all law schools based on the hierarchy of state, city. Then the PILS indicators display in increasing order. The hierarchy can be the state or the state and city. When the hierarchy expands to include the city level, the information displays in order by city. Hover pop-ups, mouse over the bars, contains some of the factors identified in each of the twenty different areas. See the inset in the above illustration.

**Caption:** Sorted by state (alphabetically) and then by PIL Indicator (Increasing value). The scale is from zero to 100; however, no law school received more than 85.

**Color Codes:**
Blue #2B6395, Purple #C46A99, Yellow #F1B969, Orange #E96148, Red #B6193A

**Color Scheme:** Tableau - Sunrise-Sunset Diverging
Stepped Color, 5 steps, Use Full Range Start: 0  End: 100
Figure 26: Tableau Hierarchy Visualization Snapshot - U.S. Law Schools by Station, By PILS Indicator, Pop-up of School Specific Information

Name of School (Short Name): California-Berkeley (CBE)
City / State: Berkeley,
ALL Factors: 61
PB Factors: 19
PIL Factors: 42

Dedicated PIL Career Assistance: Yes
Description & Req’s for Program Provided: Yes
Faculty Pro Bono Service Encouraged: N/A
Funding Source for Pro Bono Program: Dedicated or Operating Budget
Location of Pro Bono Program: Dedicated, Independent

NUMBER of:
Certificates: 0
Extramural Progrmvr: 6
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*PILS (increasing)*

**Description:** Bubble graph visualization of PILS by increasing value, utilizes a category field to indicate the graduated color. As the PIL indicator scores rise, the color scale moves from gold to dark purple and the size of the bubbles increase. In this visualization, hovering over the circle pops-up the following information: name of the school, short name, PILS Indicator score, PB Factors score and PI Factors score.

*Figure 27: Tableau Bubble Visualization Snapshot of PILS Indicator, increasing*
Caption: Name of School and Short Name. Color changes represent an increase in scores from zero (gold) towards the highest value, 100—(dark purple). Bubble size also expresses the sum of ALL factors or the Indicator. The marks label, the three letter code is the Short Name.

Color Codes: Gold #E5B008, Lt Gold #DEBE59, Lt. Brown #DCCA99, Lt. Purple #9772B0, Purple #642680, Dk Purple #380053

PB Factors (PBF) (increasing scores, alphabetical order)

Description: Stacked bar graph visualization combining all eight pro bono factors to create the PB Factor total. Within each score, schools sort alphabetically. When viewers mouse over a color section for a school, a small pop-up appears with the short name, the name of the school, the name of the factor and the score for the factor only. Below is an illustration of the PB Factors at various points.

The next four figures capture sections of the PBF visualization and the legend.

Figure 28: Tableau Stacked Bar Visualization of PB Factors increasing
**Caption:** Awards & Recognition, Community Service, Program Description, Faculty Pro Bono, Funding, Location, Staffing, and Student Run for each Short Name. Color distinguishes the Factors.

**Color Codes:** Purple #8074A8, Lt. Purple #C6C1F0, Pink #FFBED1, Green #5AA355, Lt Red-Purple: #C799BC, Lt. Green #84B457, Yellow-Green #B2C25B, and Yellow #F4D166
PI Factors (PIF) (increasing)

**Description:** Stacked bar graph visualization combining all twelve pro bono factors to create the PI Factor total. Within each score, schools sort alphabetically. When viewers mouse over a color section for a school, a small pop-up appears with the short name, the name of the school, the name of the factor and the score for the factor only. Below is an illustration of the PI Factors at various points.

---

**Figure 32:** Tableau Stacked Bar Visualization of PI Factors, increasing

**Figure 33:** Tableau Stacked Bar Visualization of PI Factors, towards higher values, increasing
Caption: Career Assistance, Centers, Certificates, Classes, Clinics, Externships, Extracurriculars, Journals, LRAP, Post-Grad Fellowships, Student Groups, and Fellowships for each Short Name. Colors distinguish the Factors.

Color Codes: Dk Green #226C41, Green #61B344, Lt Green #8AD279, Mint #B6E5AA, Green-Yellow #A8BE58, Yellow-Green #D7CA62, Gold #D8C754, Dk Gold #AE9920, Purple #7F7549, Lilac #C7C1F0, Pink #DDB6D0, Dk Pink #AE729C

PB Factors, by Factor, Score counts

Description: Pie Charts of each of the eight PB Factors, counts by scores of zero to five. One pie chart per factor with a total of 202 scores. The dashboard visualization illustrates the variance in a score.

The color code information is part of the legend as presented in Figure 36. The next two figures illustrate the PBF score count.
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PI Factors, by Factor, Score count

Description: Pie Charts of each of the twelve PI Factors, counts by scores of zero to five. One pie chart per factor with a total of 202 scores. The dashboard visualization illustrates the variance in a score.

The color code information is part of the legend. The next two figures illustrate PIF by score count.

Figure 37: Pro Bono Factor (PBF) by score

Figure 38: Legend & Color Codes for Tableau Dashboard PI Factor Scores
Figure 39: Tableau Dashboard of PI Factor Scores
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*Old Info Bubble*

**Description:** Bubble graph illustrating the number of information alerts per law school. Four schools have three alerts: Mitchell Hamline, North Carolina Central, Pennsylvania State-Dickinson and Yeshiva (Cardozo). The pop-up information displays the short name, full name, and the number of old information alerts across all twenty factors.

![Old Info Bubble Graph](image)

**Caption:** Short Name. Color shows details about the sum of Old Information Alerts. Size of bubble also expresses the number of Old Information Alerts. The Short Name provides mark labels and filters the viz. The view contains all 202 schools.

**Color Codes:** Purple #8075C8, Yellow #F8B620, Red #F24D72, Green #3B7C4A
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99#s – Reasons for No Information

**Description:** Dual Y-Axis, Stacked Bar Graph for 99#s (Scale: 0 – 20) with PILS Line Graph (Scale: 0 – 100). Sorted by 99#s in increasing order and then by the school in alphabetical order. 99# Pop-up information displays short name, full name, and counts per type of 99#. PILS Indicator pop-up information displays short name, full name, and PILS Indicator score.

Dual Y-axis illustrations are problematic in that they can imply conditions that do not exist. One can easily manipulate the scaling of either axis to create an appearance of a relationship. This illustration is a combination chart, stacked-bar, and line graph, which eliminates some potential issues with making inferences where there are none. Here the idea is to allow a viewer to see two different sets of data for a school.

**Figure 41: Tableau Dual Y-Axis Stacked Bar Chart (99#s) & Line Graph (PILS Indicator)**
The following illustration takes a snapshot of towards the high-end of the 99#s scale, values of 14 – 17 total incidents of missing information.
Figure 43: Tableau Dual Y-Axis Towards Higher Values of Missing Information

Figure 44: Legend for Tableau Dual Y-Axis, 99#s
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**CHALLENGES**

**DATA-RELATED LIFE CYCLE OF DATA**

*Create Data*

*ABA list in alpha order*, which means all the schools starting with “University of” are not in order with schools such as University of Florida is not in order with Florida International or Florida A & M

* The issue is then that to follow the master list that was in alphabetical order, coding required two passes on the spreadsheet instead of one continuous pass. This multiple pass requirement could introduce errors in coding. To address potential issues, random audits and an issues checklist formed a review plan to revisit the content and the data sets.

Another issue related to the alphabetical order mentioned, some schools are out of alphabetical order towards the end of the list after the “U” s.

**Content Analysis:** The codebooks provided substantial guidance regarding inclusions and exclusions of content. The challenge remained throughout most of the Factor content as each school provided their information. The potential exists that multiple school representatives authored the information. Use of terminology varied and often the content did not comport with the definitions. The variation in content style throughout inspired the whiteboard and post-it combination to track any concerns.

Determination of whether to include some information required some additional thought beyond the facets identified in the ABA descriptions. For example, T02 Community Service Factor content included “encouragement” to provide community service. This information was excluded from the content analysis because the factors included looking for required service.

**Data Validation:** The creation of the data set spreadsheets in MS Excel took advantage of conditional formatting and data validation functions. Formatting any value of zero with a gray fill and red text created an easily identifiable number; all null fields remained gray-filled. Determinations regarding the validity of zero required only a quick review.
As many of the fields’ values were limited to small ranges of less than five values, data validation formulas were used throughout the spreadsheet construction to ensure data entry consistency and accuracy. The codebooks provided the acceptable range of values for each field.

Some data validation required whole numbers as the only values. Due to the issues with merged law schools and schools that presented information for two campuses instead of the one ABA recognized school, some values ended up in decimal form. The decimals also occurred when there was a need to assess information type for parts of the content; T18 Post-Grad Fellowships provides an example.

Another form of validation included a formula that checked to see if a school had provided information for a Factor. If the school did provide information, a formula executed to calculate a value. Schools receiving one of the 99#s should not have any values for the other fields, save the Indicator score. If a school had one of the 99#s, the formula provided an empty cell.

This approach also facilitated Tableau visualizations as Tableau can include null values or exclude them. The desire to retain as much flexibility in spreadsheet construction required that several means of validating data be employed.

**Information Type** was not a matter of quantity, some schools provided pages of information, but that information could have constituted lists or general statements regarding the Factor. Quantity did not presume specificity of content.

**Quintile** calculations took place on a separate tab within each spreadsheet. About 75% of the way through the creation of Factor data sets, the discovery was made that some quintile calculations were incomplete. A checklist item was added to include verifying all quintile tabs were complete and that no inadvertent copying and pasting created inaccuracies or other issues.

The quintile calculations occurred once the random audits were complete and relevant items on the Spreadsheet and Data Set Checklist were completed.
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**Population:** One of the reasons for selecting the ABA’s Directory for analysis relates to the known population, there are a discrete number of law schools. For years this number only grew. However, in the past five years, several law schools closed due to any number of issues including, low employment and bar passage rates as well as high debt incurred per student. From November 16, 2016, the date of the initial scan and the completion of analysis in March 2018, four law schools closed and two law schools merged. One other law school closed; Savannah Law School, a satellite of John Marshall-Atlanta, did not receive a separate law school entry in the ABA’s list of approved law schools. Nor did Savannah report pro bono service or public interest law programming. The other three law schools closed include Charlotte Law School (South Carolina), Indiana Tech and Whittier (California). The two Minneapolis schools that merged were William Mitchell and Hamline University to form Hamline Mitchell School of Law.

As of March 2018, three law schools obtained provisional approval: Concordia, Lincoln Memorial and UNT Dallas College of Law. Two law schools are on probation, Arizona Summit and Thomas Jefferson (Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar, 2018). The school omitted from the project is UNT Dallas.

The results exclude the closed schools’ content analysis. William Mitchell and Hamline University, as well as the two Rutgers campuses, necessitated a composite score. Rutgers maintains two campuses, Newark and Camden; however, the ABA recognizes one law school. The Directory provided information for both Rutgers’ campuses and therefore required the composite score.

**Provenance** of the information in the ABA report sections could not be determined. The ABA did not write the content as the information is law school specific and the ABA does not send out teams of legal education surveyors to make these assessments. The content is void of date and time stamps, all that is indicative of time is the ABA webpage that offers when the page was last updated. There is no information regarding a person, or persons, responsible for the content. Although some factor content contained a contact person’s name and address, this information did not necessarily provide the content’s author. The web pages associated with the Directory do not provide methods of data collection or requirements for posting content; nor does the Directory indicate who wrote, approved or entered the content.

**Research Content:** The ABA recently, April 2018, unveiled a redesigned website and the content captured initially for this research project may no longer exist. Most likely an update of the Directory content occurred as of April 3, 2018, a date located on the new content sections. The links on the Law School Resources webpage previously associated with the Directory malfunction as of April 25, 2018. A viewer can get to the content with some determination and more than several clicks.
Even with the updated design, there is no indication on how the ABA collects the information posted in the Directory, the reports by the school or the reports by section.

Assess
One of the tools utilized includes a checklist to ensure consistency in the data. The checklist covered formatting consistency checks as well as coding consistency checks. See Appendix G: Spreadsheet & Data Set Checklist.

99#s: This checklist included reviews of the 99#s to ensure that all data sets with any 99#s reflected the missing information reason from the coded content. Checks went in the reverse direction as well, reviewing content for missing information and ensuring the 99#s accuracy.

Codebooks field values were compared to spreadsheets to ensure accuracy. A codebook to spreadsheet and spreadsheet to codebook validation took place.

Old information alert review consisted of accuracy checks that verified all data sets that indicated old information truly reflected that state of the content. All content documents with old information alerts were verified to have the proper values in the data per the codebooks.

During the assessment phase, all values of old information and missing information were used to create two separate data sets to avoid clutter when creating visualizations.

Open Refine evaluated the spreadsheets for extraneous spaces in the open-ended or non-data validated fields. Open Refine did not identify any significant issues.

Analyze
All zero values for the quantitative factors and the information factors became part of an accuracy review. The issue of “multiple” zeros created some concerns as to what a zero truly meant. There are the zeros created by the process of coding the information. The respective factor sections note the zero values.

The zero assigned as part of the indicator is a different zero. For comparison, the scale of zero to five represented the score range. A school could receive a zero because while they did provide information, the information ended up scored as a zero. A law school could also receive a zero due to a determination that included one of the 99#s.

Any division by zero occurrence was also reviewed for errors. There was only one Factor spreadsheet with a division by zero identified, T19 Student Groups Factor. The division was legitimate considering the formulas and values, but a division by zero can be problematic. Arkansas-Little Rock’s value calculation yielding a division by zero error relates to the ratio of Public Interest Journals to Total Journals. The school indicated they had no Public Interest journals, setting up the condition of zero divided by zero, “0/0.” MS Excel returned
the division by zero alert. For purposes of this project’s limited results reporting, this issue is moot as Public Interest Journal to all Journals is not part of any visualizations or results section.

**Formula Checks** included the evaluation of the first row of data in each spreadsheet to verify the formulas if any. Subsequent rows of data were viewed to ensure the formulas copied appropriately. The formula audit mode of Excel accomplished formula checks.

**Mean, Median and Mode:** These summary statistics are captured only for future use; although the values all reported for each Factor. The “$” creates an absolute cell reference; when copying and pasting a formula, the range remains identical. Additionally, as the mode for all of the factors is zero, recalculations of median, mean and mode exclude the zero values.

![Figure 46: Sample Formulas](image)

**Quintile** calculations did not include the 99# law schools’ zeros. The ranges’ calculations consider values greater than zero. The formulas are as follows:

![Figure 47: Sample Formulas for Quintile](image)

Where the array $A2:A$164 represents the non-zero values for 162 law schools, T13 PI Clinics Factor. In this example, the non-zero values are for the number of public interest clinics indicated. Another quintile calculation was made using the number of public interest clinics indicated multiplied by the information type factor; this quintile is used to determine
the PILS indicator. All PILS Indicator scores consist of the quantitative values and the information type factor, not just the quantitative element.

From Microsoft support web pages for Excel, PERCENTILE.INC returns the k-th percentile of values in a range, where k is the range 0..1, inclusive. (See https://support.office.com/en-us/article/percentile-inc-function-680f9539-45eb-410b-9a5e-c1355e5fe2ed).

Preserve & Store
UIUC’s IDEALS (Illinois Digital Environment for Access to Learning & Scholarship) and the Illinois Data Bank will eventually host the final project documents and data sets; the timeframe to store all documents is June 2018.

All data sets will be converted to CSV formats removing data validation fields, custom formatting and any other proprietary features used in data set creation and analysis. The data sets will include formula audits.

Text documents will include analyzed content PDF format, the codebooks in TXT format and DOCX format, this document in MS Word and PDF to retain the outline hierarchy and illustrations.

The author’s computer and two external drives preserve the original documents. If future work positions offer the opportunity to continue the exploration of these data sets, the documents will be opened and updated with newer versions of MS Office annually.

Access Use & Reuse
UIUC’s IDEALS and the Illinois Data Bank will eventually host the final project documents and data sets making these data sets and documents available to the public for the duration of the agreement between the author and UIUC. Of note is that when looking for a data set with Geocode for the law codes, searches of the web and various for an appropriate data set turned up nothing. As documented earlier in this paper, the law schools’ street addresses, latitude, and longitude became part of the master list. Uploaded documents to the IDEALS repository will include a separate data set of the geocode information for the 202 law schools for others to use.

Factor Specific Issues
Factor 02: Community Service
The Community Service Factor acquired the most Factor reads of the original content with three. One check required review for general statements coded as List Only information. Another review involved checking for required community service, some inconsistent coding for the community services occurred regarding required or encouraged service. Also, some
schools required all student organizations to perform community service and, in some cases, required the services as a condition for receiving funding.

An issue also related to content lies in how some law schools intermingled programs of pro bono service with community service. This research project made the distinction that pro bono service involved an element of legal assistance and that community service included service projects such as food drives, sponsoring holiday events or providing labor for building homes.

Factor 04: Faculty Pro Bono
The concern with the evidence of policy regarding faculty pro bono policy related to the codebook question. Originally, the desired information related to whether a policy existed. As coding progressed, however, the observations required a change in the question. Some schools had a policy and that policy did not require pro bono service but did encourage service. An additional field was added to capture the encouragement but not required pro bono service; the spreadsheet and codebooks were updated and content reviewed to ensure consistency for this question.

Factor 07: Staffing
Some law schools listed outside attorneys that ran programs in which the law student participated. As this factor related to law school staffing of programs, analysis excluded outside participation.

Factor 11: Certificates
Many schools indicated they offered public interest courses or that some courses included public interest law. The question focuses on the concept of certificates meaning that a student completes a specified program of courses and in some cases, service, to receive a certificate. Some content coded as not having any certificates; however, later some content coded as a 997-- Information was out of scope or irrelevant to the analysis. Offering courses in public interest law differ from a bona fide certificate, one that becomes part of a transcript. The decision was made to code such content with a 997 to capture how the law schools used or did not use the ABA definitions when providing content. Of note is that the Certifications Factor had one of the three highest numbers of 997s with 18. The other two included Classes and Journals, with 22 and 25 respectively.

Factor 18: Post-Graduate Fellowships
Law schools tended to include fellowships that students received from outside organizations such as the Soros Foundation or Skadden Fellowship Foundation. These external fellowships that any student could apply for regardless of affiliation warranted an exclusion for not being a dedicated law school fellowship.

Law schools mixed the sub-categories or included content under two categories. The first instance was coded. If a fellowship’s funds came from a student-led effort but displayed
under “Other,” the school’s characterization was retained. The attempt to recategorize fellowships would assume the researcher’s knowledge supersedes the school’s determination and the time needed to verify category was prohibitive. The fellowship factors, T18 and T20, provided extensive content for analysis.

**Factor 20**

Law schools tended to include fellowships that students received from outside organizations such as the Soros Foundation or Skadden Fellowship Foundation. These outside fellowships that any student could apply for regardless of affiliation warranted exclusions for not being a dedicated law school fellowship.

Also excluded were law school indications of work study programs and LRAPs as fellowships. T17 LRAP provides a means of analyzing this type of content. Work study is a federal or state program, one not identifiable as exclusive to the law school. While some schools may offer a work study program entirely independent of state or federal financial aid processes, that determination could not be made based on the provided content. The decision to exclude any mentions of work study eliminated any issues as to exclusivity.
MANAGEMENT OF PROJECT & DATA

Project

Managing the project proved to be challenging given the project collection, which includes:

- Content analyzed - 500 plus pages
- Spreadsheets containing data sets - 25 separate files with over 80 tabs
- Variables – over 500
- Value fields – over 92,000
- Population – 202 law schools
- Data visualizations – 40
- Codebooks – 21, one for each Factor plus a template
- Graphics & Tables – over 100

To stay organized, various whiteboard decals, spreadsheets and use of color provided visual cues. A whiteboard decal provides the coating of a framed whiteboard that can be rolled up; with the backing removed the decal affixes to a wall or another solid surface. One whiteboard tracked dates: project timelines and audits. Another whiteboard collected the issues noted while coding and entering data.
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Another tool used is to track the audits, see Appendix I for the audit tracking information.

A spreadsheet tracked the basic phases and To Dos of the project. A screenshot of the tab for February & March is below.

![Figure 50: Screenshot of Phases, Dates for Project](image)

The PILS project progressed because the team was a team of one, any issues received immediate attention and the need for communication tools was minimal. The PILS project could take annual snapshots in summer with publication of analysis available in Fall. This timing scheme would allow prospective law students to use PILS in their application process. However, if a small research team would be available, the project requires some process and workflow development to accommodate multiple coders and analysts. Many of the tools used for the team of one could serve as templates for larger team efforts.

DATA

DMPs: Two Data Management Plans (DMP) focused on how to manage data best. Two data plans were used to gain experience with the different organizations; one, the National Science Foundation (NSF) awards funding and two, the DMP is part of the required process. The other plan, from the DCC (Digital Curation Centre), outlined far more detail and asked more questions than the NSF plan. Therefore the project relied on and implemented the DCC’s version of the plan.
The DMP Tool provided the templates. The DMP Tool is an open-source and free online tool that assists researchers to create data management plans. The DMP Tool offers a wizard that takes researchers through the plan, links to the funding agencies or agency of origin, assistance via text and additional resources related to data management.

Ensuring Data: A rigorous approach to saving data deployed as soon as the highlighting of the Directory contents began. Initially, UIUC’s version of Box stored the documents. However, after three incidents that created multiple copies of the same file occurred, a new plan was created and utilized. Two laptops were used, along with three external drives. The spare laptop stored mirror images of the primary laptop to provide backup of the operating system or recover from a catastrophic failure. That laptop mirroring occurred every two to three weeks due to the time needed to create images. Macrium Reflect provided the software needed to create the images.

UIUC’s Box was still used but not as the means of directly making changes to files and have the versioning preserved. Initially, Box provided version control and cloud storage. However, on two occasions, Box duplicated rather than synchronized the files causing issues with file management. An original file folder, on the desktop, stored all the research and that was copied daily over to the Box Sync Folder which then linked to Box. No more incidents of duplication occurred. Also, a file backup took place every night using Windows native file backup. Three external drives provided daily, weekly and month continuous backup using file merge.

The plan provided backup on three separate occasions, including two of the UIUC Box incidents that made finding the needed files confusing and frustrating. The other incident related to a user error where an original folder was mistaken for a copy, the original was deleted. With the daily backups, the original file restored without data loss.
The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) published a white paper titled, “Law Libraries and Access to Justice”; the fifty-two-page report published in July 2014. The extensive scope includes several types of law libraries, private firms, state, court, and county, as well as academic law libraries. For this project, the academic law library section is most appropriate.

What defines access to justice can vary widely, the report authors choose to cite Cappelletti and Garth’s description:

The words ‘access to justice’ are not easily defined but they focus on two basic purposes of the legal system – the system by which people may vindicate their rights and/or resolve their disputes under the general auspices of the state. First, the system must be equally accessible to all; second, it must lead to results that are individually and socially just. (American Association for Law Libraries, 2014, p. 5).

Furthermore, the report lists examples of what access to justice includes:

...affordable legal services; readily available legal information and forms; the ability to bring a case to trial without hiring an attorney; the unbundling of legal services; fair treatment and quality in the justice system regardless of social standing; and confidence that the outcome will be fair and just. It is all these things and more. (p. 5)

The AALL report makes a call to provide access to justice, “Not only are they [academic law librarians] experts at providing access to legal information, but they are also in constant contact with students preparing to become lawyers” (p. 34). The implication being that the very nature of law librarianship duties such as reference services, legal research, instruction as well as collection development, scholarly communications, and service present opportunities to involve access to justice. The challenge is that most academic law libraries tend to place public patrons towards the bottom of the priority list when faced with the service needs of faculty, students, local attorneys, and their university patrons.

The report’s comprehensive list of opportunities for academic law libraries to provide access to justice is the result of informal surveys conducted on law library and non-law library discussion lists (p. 36). The next few paragraphs summarize these opportunities.
Library Services relates to public access to library materials, a function that grows more difficult as the research services absorb many treatises, commentaries, and other resources of research. Also mentioned, the ability to access computers for word processing needed to complete legal forms or respond to motions. Document delivery services and borrowing privileges receive a mention as well (p. 36). The report suggests partnerships with prison librarians in service to a marginalized patron group; however, no specifics as to what this alliance may look like or function is offered (p. 36). Printing kiosks and computers increase the access to resources as well as the ability to create documents and explore what free or web-based resources exist. Either the university library system or the law school library hosts the research services geared towards the non-law school academic population; however, services such as LexisNexis Uni and WestlawNext Patron Access also require user support regardless of oversight. Law libraries have an opportunity to develop tutorials, offer workshops and provide access to those resources.

Collection Development activities include not only the obvious, curating a collection that supports self-representing clients (or pro se litigants), but also increasing awareness of these resources via outreach activities. Knowledge of resources can be achieved using tools such as LibGuides, promoting services targeting the public on websites, and highlighting digitized collections that focus on state and local legal resources. (See http://law-illinois.libguides.com/Self-Representation for an example of a Self-Representation LibGuide, last accessed April 26, 2018). The key is not only to curate those collections but conduct outreach to reach a broader selection of patron groups.

Workshops and Training for Librarians. Many county law libraries have closed or are minimally staffed especially in lower population counties. Some patrons drive hours to the nearest law library, which a law school typically hosts because law schools are not ubiquitous. Many schools educate in urban centers such as the Bay Area in California or Chicagoland. These areas tend to have a substantial number of pro bono organizations and services. The downstate law school, Southern Illinois in Carbondale or the lone state law school such as Wyoming may be the only professional law library in a vast region. Promoting access to justice to these patron groups may depend on training public librarians and other academic non-law librarians in the basics of legal research (p. 38).

Handbooks, training videos or screencasts, presentations, and LibGuides offer support and encouragement to those detached or too far removed from professional law librarians. Law librarians should consider assisting local libraries to develop a decent collection of legal resources, lists of state pro bono organizations, and explore forming a consortium that would offer access to valued but often restricted legal resources. While resources diminish in many higher educational institutions, sponsoring an annual workshop or dedicating graduate assistants to maintaining self-representing collections and materials at least keep the door open to justice.
**Access to Justice in the Law School Curriculum** concentrates on the opportunities available with the scope of academic law librarians instructing 1L and advanced legal research classes. The report mentions that Seattle University, known for a strong public interest curriculum, provides a collaborative writing experience embedded in the local legal services (p. 38). By instructing students in the free legal resources and how best to utilize them for clients, law librarians maintain access to justice (p. 38). Many pro bono projects, clinics, and journals would also benefit from the direct and active support of law librarians.

As law schools seek creative and active learning opportunities for students, law librarians should and need to be part of developing collections and support specifically for those opportunities. Some law schools offer advanced legal research, a class focusing on pro bono service organization and the self-representing patron information needs is just one more opportunity for the law librarians to be active and engaged in their communities. Often law schools celebrate Pro Bono Week in October and here is another opportunity to connect with the law school administration and offer sessions or presentations on the access to justice issues and how the law library supports access.

**Access to Justice Scholarship in Law Schools** includes developing support for faculty and student research via law librarians’ scholarly communication efforts (p. 41). Resources and guides focused on justice studies provide scholars with opportunities to explore these topics related to their specialty. Law librarians’ scholarly efforts can also address the need for access to justice, patron services for self-representing litigants, legal research tactics, development of resources to navigate legal systems as well as curriculum pedagogy for instruction on justice-related research curricula.

**Service and Advocacy.** The two remaining topics involve a more activist approach in seeking ways to promote justice. Whether service takes places in other libraries such as a prison library or a public library, law librarians’ service in providing instruction on legal resources would be valuable. Partnerships with non-profit organizations benefit all involved, such as offering legal research seminars at a community center or working with a public library to develop a forms library.

Advocacy takes place via professional organizations and state commissions that address access to justice issues (p. 43). Engaging in policy development, tracking legislation about justice and actively seeking positions on commissions or task forces addressing the legal issue of justice require the savvy and extensive bank of knowledge many law librarians possess.

**LEARNING FROM PUBLIC LIBRARIES THAT SERVE THE HOMELESS**

Nancy Bolt examines how public libraries work with community agencies serving the homeless. With the Great Recession of 2007 – 2009 homelessness rates increased,
according to a 2008 survey by the U.S. Conference of Mayors; 16 of the 22 cities providing information reported an increase in homelessness (Sard, 2009, p. 2). She begins the article with an examination of homelessness in America with some data from the 2013 National Student Campaign Against Hunger and Homelessness (Bolt, 2015, p. 2). The survey information Bolt cited creates a portrait of the homeless population.

- More than 3.5 million people experience homelessness.
- One-third of the homeless are in a family and women lead 88% of these families
- 23% are US Military veterans
- 8% are children alone
- 30% have experienced domestic violence
- 20-25% suffer from mental illness (p. 2).

While academic law libraries may not serve homeless patrons on a regular basis, there are some possibilities for service and outreach. In the Bolt article, she specifies the ALA resolution that established an objective to “promote networking and cooperation between libraries and other agencies, organizations, and advocacy groups to develop programs and services that effectively reach poor people” (p. 4). The Salt Lake City Public Library Director worked with staff to develop their homeless outreach program based on seven principles:

- Homelessness is a condition, not a characteristic
- People who are homeless are constituents of the library
- The library needs to be knowledgeable of all community services that can help people who are homeless
- Library staff need to be educated and trained about serving people who are homeless
- Embrace a leadership role in the community’s response to homelessness
- Bring service providers into the library
- Provide the same level of service to all who come to the library (p. 9).

Law libraries could develop workshops on the relevant law for local lawyers and organizations that serve the homeless, provide continuing legal education on issues and the relevant law related to those experiencing homelessness such as mental health law and law regarding veterans. The programs do not have to be all-encompassing or some grandiose continuous effort. However, ignoring this critical issue when some quite simple programming offerings could provide relief for those offering services to the homeless, only
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creates a greater divide between resource-rich universities and the communities where they reside.

Law library professionals must become more actively involved in pro bono service and support of that service as well as support the public interest law programming of a law school. In the book Law Librarianship in Academic Libraries: Best Practices the phrase "pro bono" is not mentioned once (Dina, 2015). The book’s clinical approach means that topics such as shelving and administrative models get attention. However, service mentions occur in the Appendices of various professional organizations codes. The critique here centers on the need for attention to issues of service in academic law libraries rather than to pan one author’s efforts.

In his article, Richard Leiter discusses collection development and the shift from considering collection size to curating and creating outreach regarding existing commercial databases such as the research services of Bloomberg, HeinOnline, WestLaw and LexisNexis (Leiter, 2015, pp. 324–325). Often these data providers are listed as a single entry in the catalog or the A-Z listing a library offers. Leiter emphasizes that creating helpful arrangements as well as collecting those resources curated by subject serve constituents better. He says “it is rare for patrons to come to a library wishing to access HeinOnline or BNA. They are more likely to come to the library’s webpage with a subject to research in mind” (p. 325).

LibGuides or a similar platform support the curation of many types of media, resources, and library collection items in one package based on topic, course or intended audience. A consideration for law libraries is whether they can provide content development that assists local lawyers, self-representing litigants, local pro bono organizations as well as those structures in the law school that are pro bono service and public interest law centric. Given budget and staff limitations, curating content challenges already stretched resources. At least content development can occur incrementally.

Public libraries live on the edge of many of their patrons’ lives, the hardships and challenges of the homeless, the mentally ill, and many other marginalized and in-need communities. As of 2013, 80 ABA-approved law schools are affiliated with public universities (Lenz, 2013, p. 31). As a public institution, the patron groups include the public, self-representing litigants, community organizations and local attorneys. In her article that also addresses the funding models of the public law school, Lenz also considers the mission of law school libraries which she says is to support the missions of their law schools (p. 44). Law libraries support their law schools by:

1. Educating students to serve the state and broader community
2. Using its expertise to provide service to the state and broader community, and
3. Researching to benefit the state and broader community (p. 44).
Lenz’s discussion speaks to the typical services of a law library, instruction, and research services. However, towards the end of the piece, she calls on public law libraries to reconsider their missions and distinguish those missions from those of private law libraries (p. 52). She offers an extensive list of questions, worthy of consideration:

- To what extent can the library continue to provide direct, one-on-one assistance to members of external constituencies?
- To what extent can the library continue to take the needs of external constituencies into account in selecting material and formats for its collection?
- Does the library’s public mission apply equally to supporting the legal information needs of the legal community and the needs of members of the public?
- Is providing a higher level of service to the law school’s alumni than to other members of the state bar consistent with the library’s public mission?
- Does the existence of a public law library within the same geographic area affect the public law school library’s public mission?
- Is active participation in resource-sharing activities part of the library’s public mission and should the library’s resource-sharing policies extend to external constituencies?
- How does the library define its stewardship role on behalf of external constituencies and for what specific areas will the library assume responsibility for stewardship? (pp. 52–53).

Service will not occur in a vacuum; leadership efforts to address even a few of Lenz’s questions would put service on the agenda. Public law libraries need to examine how a public library provides services, and best meets the needs of the community, what services deserve outreach efforts and what programming developments are needed to serve better. The role of law librarians and the academic law library in the age of unmet legal service needs is another area for potential study.

**CHANGE IN PRESENTING DIRECTORY INFORMATION**

**SHOULD LAW SCHOOLS BE REQUIRED TO REPORT PB PROGRAMMING**

While presenting a poster for this project at the AALL Conference in Austin (July 2017), one of the attendees asked whether the law schools should be required to report PB programming. Given that the ABA does not require the profession to report but “encourages” pro bono services, the consistent answer would say no requirement to report the programming. The ABA already established guidelines and states that law schools should provide pro bono opportunities. Reporting requirements require management of
storage, forms, and communication, which require dedicated resources and money to manage the reporting process.

One possibility is to continue with voluntary reporting, and the ABA posts those responses. Another opportunity is that some acknowledgment occurs during the approval and monitoring of legal education regarding programming. A simple yes or no question could provide some indication as to whether a law school formally provides pro bono service opportunities and related programming. Also needed, definitions of “opportunities” and “related programming.”

**PROVISION OF INFORMATION**

An honest assessment would be that the ABA could benefit from hiring a librarian. Besides being self-serving, the information that comprised the content for analysis contained issues that librarians often resolve. The problems included that the listing on the Directory did not match the ABA’s alphabetical listing of law schools and the Directory was not in alphabetical order. To provide transparency and ownership of the information, date, and timestamps of when individual sections update is needed as well as a valid contact responsible for the content. The Directory needs to contain a short description regarding how the ABA collects the information to provide provenance and transparency. These are not critiques so much as observations, issues that librarians notice.

Given that one of the impacted audiences included potential law students, the idea that information is outdated, missing or does not address the topic displayed seems problematic. Not every law student comes from a “law family” or is aware of the mysterious ways of law school. Amazon book lists and website alone do not prepare a student as a first-generation law student for law school. Some students seek a legal education inspired by politics or notable events such as Katrina, and they do so probably without an understanding of legal education or the institutions. Potential students come to law school to affect their communities and issues for the better. As Bill Quigley, Loyola-New Orleans College of Law, says:

> Many come to law school because they want in some way to help the elderly, children, people with disabilities, undernourished people around the world, victims of genocide, or victims of racism, economic injustice, religious persecution, or gender discrimination. Unfortunately, the experience of law school and the legal profession dilute the commitment to social justice lawyering (Quigley, 2007, p. 9).
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His impassioned letter to a law student seeking out social justice advocacy opportunities continues to address the battles to be faced by this fictitious student. Quigley fought many social justice wars before, during and after Katrina and he knows law schools. He points out that the traditional ideas of success, whether in law school or the profession, differ for social justice advocates (p. 11). Moreover, he says that “there is far too little about justice in law school curriculum or the legal profession. You have to learn most of it on your own” (p. 13).

Quigley offers hope and plenty of advice as well. Considering the realization that law schools may or may not wear their social justice badges in plain view, how does a potential law student become aware of the options? The ABA Directory would turn up on a general web search, but do potential law student, especially those unfamiliar with the legal education environment, know the terms “pro bono service” or “public interest law?” As more students come from marginalized communities into the law school environment, the role of the Directory could be critical in locating a law school that supports a social justice champion. By providing timeliness, accuracy, and transparency around the programming information, potential law students obtain valuable information.

Of significance is that as this final project underwent review, the ABA revamped their organizational structure to streamline some of the Centers and other organizational units in early April 2018. The website reorganization rendered most of the screenshots, PDFs captured, and additional information retained from the old website outdated. Future research should include another round of assessment given the new format and content.

Programming in Law Schools

While this project does not aim to rank programming or indicate the quality of programming in any way, PILS could assist administrators and support services in understanding how their pro bono and public interest law programs compare with other law schools. PILS illustrates how someone from outside of the law school views the information provided on programming and this view provides perspective. If a school does not provide information for the Directory or fails to update information, does a potential viewer than search and hunt out every law school website? Some sites follow website design trends, displaying oversized graphics and autoplay videos, but information regarding course offerings and student groups may be behind access walls. The Directory ignores that wall and offers schools an opportunity to demonstrate their contributions to the community, education, and the legal profession.

Another issue related to programming is that some schools focus on public interest law, government services and pro bono services. Their PILS scores are not indicative of their missions. For example, CUNY is known for their mission to bring “together the very best in clinical training with traditional doctrinal legal education to create lawyers prepared to serve the public interest” (City University of New York, 2018). However, CUNY’s PILS is 40 out of
100, the pro bono and public interest law factors each at 20. CUNY is not the only school that does not meet up with their reputations as pro bono or public interest programming strong. The questions remain: Is the current Directory structure providing the best portrait of the law school and do law schools even consider the Directory an essential part of their outreach?
IN CONCLUSION

REVISITING KATRINA WITH CHATMAN & DYSON

One of the challenges facing the New Orleans community in a post-Katrina world was the effect of the pre-Katrina world, information poverty. Living in a world where one’s city drowned exacerbated the condition to new heights. The inability of many communities to obtain information regarding safety, health, rebuilding, legal processes, programming, and other forms of critical information contributed to the tremendous need for assistance. Groups such as the Student Hurricane Network eased the gap in information provision by guiding residents through their legal issues and identifying partner agencies to resolve the problems regarding personal identification, bank records, missing relatives, food insecurity, FEMA assistance or other government programs and so many others. The residents of the Gulf Coast did not have the skills or the ability to access essential information to ensure their survival and recovery.

Information poverty does arise in specific circumstances as well as exist more persistently. After assessing many different definitions of information poverty included in the work of Elfreda Chatman and Manuel Castells, Britz and Blignaut offer their definition of information poverty. They say information poverty is “a condition of life where the majority of people in a specific context do not possess the skills and abilities to access, interpret and use information effectively for development” (2001, pp. 66–67). They utilized common features found in the many definitions of information poverty:

- Information poverty relates to the availability and accessibility of essential information that people need for development
- There is a link between economic poverty and information poverty
- Information poverty links to a person's ability/inability to understand and interpret information; and
- Although it is an international problem, information poverty manifests in specific situations and contexts (p. 66).

Chatman’s work emphasized information and those who fell into a world of poverty. She identified four concepts critical to understanding the information needs: risk-taking, secrecy, deception and situational relevance (Chatman, 1996, p. 193). The idea of situational relevance appears relevant to the needs of those living in a New Orleans post-Katrina and why student groups played such a vital role as information providers. As Chatman said, information poverty is a “complex social and cultural phenomenon” (p. 205). People in the
same physical space or environment might interpret the same information differently. One could be information rich in one situation such as in one’s neighborhood and be information poor in an unknown neighborhood, such as one’s neighborhood flooded to the rooftops.

The challenges of many of the neighborhoods damaged by the levee failures created a far more challenging environment for recovery. While some of the communities affected by the levee breaks or the storm surge were not ones of poverty, many neighborhoods experiencing poverty flooded in New Orleans. From the slave markets to the era of Jim Crow, from the New Deal era to contemporary times, New Orleans knows racism and poverty. New Orleans also experienced disaster and disaster does not strike everyone equally. In Orleans Parish, the flooded area population consisted of 80% people of color and the average income was 60% of those residing outside of the flooded neighborhoods. Thirty-eight of the 49 regions’ extreme poverty tracks flooded and all of the extreme poverty tracks in New Orleans flooded (Van Pooien, 2016k, p. 1).

In Come Hell or High Water by Michael Eric Dyson, the author defends the assertion that Katrina was really about race and class and just as important, how our society views poverty and race (2006). Katrina was and is about more than a hurricane, even society’s short-term charity not an appropriate surrogate for justice. For Dyson, charity is the result of injustice:

Charity is no substitute for justice. If we never challenge a social order that allows some to accumulate wealth—-even if they decide to help the less fortunate—while others are short-changed, then even acts of kindness end up supporting unjust arrangements. We must never ignore the injustices that makes charity necessary, or the inequalities that make it possible (p. 152).

Groups such as SHN viewed their work not as charity but as a cooperative effort with residents to address social justice for the Gulf Coast and others. While the group addressed an urgent and desperate situation, there is a need to continually address those issues that arise in our society, immigration, poverty, racism, classism, sexism and all those isms. Law schools and law libraries have the encouragement of the law communities to address those issues with pro bono service and public interest law programming; this world needs that programming to develop law students into active and resilient champions of social justice.

**THE PILS PROJECT & ITS IMPACT**

The PILS project centered on an online reference resource and applied the concepts of content analysis and coding to express how much programming a law school offers and the
type of information offered. While many law schools did not report any information at all, that phenomenon is significant. The Directory is one of a few consolidated sources that provide information from the law schools, not blogs or student pundit websites. The Directory adds more context to curricular and programming descriptions than ranking schemas or short publicity pieces. However, if the school does not provide information, students seeking pro bono and public interest law curricular programming may not pursue admission with that school, and the Directory may not serve its intended purpose. By offering a way to utilize the Directory to explore these specialized legal education opportunities, PILS offers a table of contents and the means of comparing schools’ programming.

The information available offers opportunities for legal educators to view their reports succinctly and address potential challenges or celebrate strengths in their curriculum. For the support units such as the library, the potential for identifying new services, reinforcing existing services and prioritizing collections offers direction for planning and leadership in establishing the library as an essential part of the legal education process. In addition, potential law students have another tool in helping them access information that often resides behind access walls.

By looking at how much information and the type of information a law school presented in the ABA’s Directory, this project attempted to shine a light on much needed legal services, the enormous amount of coordination and effort needed to continue meeting the challenges before the law profession and their communities. The challenges are always present, the trial never ends.

The PILS project utilizes spreadsheets, text highlighting and some creative illustrative software technology to tell stories. PILS offers a narrative regarding programming in a law school, programming that in turn champions the stories of the marginalized communities, persons who suffer but also endure. Such programming seeks to create justice via clinics that serve veterans, curricula—traditional and experiential—that prepare law students for courts and policy-making, journals that continue to shine lights on dark corners of policy and governmental systems, Centers that study, research and emphasize the need for justice. Such programming stresses that service connects the law school community to the larger social and continually evolving community in which that law school resides. As Quigley stated in the closing paragraphs of his article, “No one can build a house of justice on a foundation of injustice” (Quigley, 2007, p. 28). This project sought to provide a few bricks for building a better foundation for justice.
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APPENDIX A: STUDENT HURRICANE NETWORK LAW SCHOOLS (AS OF 2/2008)

Law students working for justice in the Gulf Coast

Partner Schools

The Student Hurricane Network has had the privilege of working with students from schools all across the nation. These schools are listed below. If you do not see your school listed and would like to be involved, please contact Diana at desank [at] gmail.com

To access contact information about our liaisons at the schools listed below, please join the site and visit our Library. Each liaison serves as a contact person for students at their university and works with the national network to coordinate on campus events, disseminate information, and arrange student trips. This list was updated 2/3/08.

In addition, there are a few law schools that have started regional coalitions including a coalition in Illinois. Please see the Illinois contingent website at www.studenthurricanenetwork.org/illinois.

- Akron - Lizzie Vollmer
- Alabama - Tari D. Williams
- Albany - Matrin Bonventure, Mae Nolan
- American - Adnan Sultan, Charlene Gomes
- Appalachian - Ron Diddle
- Arizona - Greg Stoltz
- Baltimore - Mahasin El Amín, Rebecca Coletto
- Barry University - Mark Hopson
- Boston College - Krishnan Devidoss
- Boston University - David Adams, Jonathan
- Connecticut - Erin Schmitt
- Georgia - Jessica Krause
- Howard University - Shana Parnell
- Indiana - Ann Johnson
- Iowa - Katrina Satterfield
- Kansas - Mewa Dhaliwal
- Kentucky - Jonathan Wills
- Louisiana - Elizave Memphis
- Michigan - Sarah Adkins, Ryan West
- Minnesota - Susan Reed
- Missouri - Tonya Dehnen
- New England - David Chao
- New York - Karen Knapp
- North Carolina - Ryan Kelly
- North Dakota - Kristi M. Arndt
- Ohio - Chris 

SHN Leadership 2008-2009

Partner Organizations
Partner Schools
SHN in the News

Login

Forgot Password?

Links

Trouble the Water

An award-winning film featuring a young couple living on the margins who survive the flooding of their city by any means necessary.

New Orleans 100

"The New Orleans 100" is a worldwide initiative that will highlight and encourage discussion among millions about 100 of the most innovative and world-changing ideas to take root in the city since Katrina.
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Anderman
- Brooklyn - Kesav Wable
- California - Davis-- Ji-Hyun Cho
- California - Hastings-- Todd Daloz
- California - Los Angeles-- Andy Boyle
- Capital - Karen Osmond
- Case Western Reserve - Susanne Townsend
- Catholic - Sean Mahoney
- Chapman - Patrick Hardy
- Chicago - Carl Gismervig
- Chicago-Kent - Alex Breland, Catie Heindel
- Cincinnati - Michael Becher, Courtney Lewicy
- City University of NY - Jonathan Stonebely
- Cleveland State - Lindsey Kasprzak
- Colorado - Maren Jaffe, Jessie Freer
- Columbia - Parker Hutchinsou
- Connecticut - Gavan Meehan
- Cornell - Jamie Rogers
- Dayton - Richard Huff
- Denver - Lisa Blattner
- DePaul - Kayleigh Van Poolen
- District of Columbia - Matthew Kozis
- Drexel - Karen Pearlman, Amy Montemarano
- Emory - Steve Weyer
- Fordham - Hilary Exter
- Franklin Pierce - Shay Zeller
- George Washington - Terry Schoone-Jongen
- Georgetown - Abby Fee, Yaamini Rao
- Georgia - Lori Daigle
- Harvard - Lee Branson, Mercedes Montagnes
- Hofstra - Danielle Notaro
- Howard - Jeremy Broussard
- Idaho - Amanda Ulrich
- Illinois - Jenny Carroll, Erica Siroti
- Indiana - Bloomington - Jen Nagourney
- John Marshall - Chicago - Ravi Sahota
- John Marshall - Atlanta - Amber C. Saunders
- Kansas - Brendan Fletcher
- Laverne - Kristin Eisler
- Lewis & Clark - Allison Reed
- Louisiana State - Leslie Ziober
- Louisville- Brandeis School of Law - Jen Schultz
- Loyola - Chicago - Melissa Beckman
- Loyola - Los Angeles - Marissa Kase
- Loyola - New Orleans - Erica Garnet, Lauren Boudre, Pam Occhipinti
- Marquette - Camille Monahan
- Maryland - Alicia Welch

SHN is one of them!

Gulf Coast Civic Works Project

The Gulf Coast Civic Works Project is the national effort to pass HR 4048: The Gulf Coast Civic Works Act, which would create 100,000 jobs for Gulf Coast residents and evacuees to rebuild their communities.

Social Entrepreneurs of New Orleans (SENO)

SENO is comprised of an amazing group of New Orleans residents working in creative ways to renew and revitalize the city. Check out the social entrepreneur profiles and initiatives on their website.

NOLA YURP (Young Urban Rebuilding Professionals)

The NOLA YURP Initiative is about connecting, retaining and attracting the city’s young workforce, but also an example of many different communities working together to solve a problem.

Pro Bono Legal Corps

The LA Bar Association and Equal Justice Works AmeriCorps legal fellows have volunteer opportunities available for law students.

probono.net

Website with resources for pro bono attorneys

LawHelp.org/la

Legal info for the public in Louisiana

http://www.studentjustice.org/about/item.Partner_Schools
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- Miami - Dean Marni Lennon, Public Interest and Pro Bono
- Michigan - Jake Weixler
- Minnesota - Arian Pirayesh
- Mississippi College -- Lorin Washington
- Mississippi - Lyle Gravatt
- Missouri - Columbia - Lauren Standlee
- Nebraska - Sean Zehtab
- Nevada - Las Vegas - Abigayle Farris-Dang
- New Mexico - Carrie Martell, Heba Atwa
- New York - Princetta Self
- Northern Illinois - Desiree Matel-Anderson
- Notre Dame - Kyle David Smith
- Nova Southeastern - Palmer Calabrese
- Oklahoma City - Kim Garelic
- Oregon - Erin Fair
- Pace - Malisa Chokshi
- Pennsylvania - Khalili, Michael Boyle
- Penn State - Dickinson - Lynn Long
- Pepperdine - Carly McKeeman
- Pittsburgh - Gina Mosely
- Pontifical Catholic of Puerto Rico - Rosario Flores
- Richmond - Ben Silbert
- Roger Williams - Dawn Euer
- Rutgers - Camden - Joseph John Console
- Rutgers - Newark - Jessica Kitson
- St. John's - Debra Smith
- Saint Louis - Laura Hawk
- St. Thomas (Minnesota) - Heidi Hovis
- San Diego - Kristin Santerre
- San Francisco - Liz Hallock
- Seattle - Matt and Allison Milner
- Southern University - Flora Powell, Ronnie Favors
- Southern California - Christine Guillory, Elizabeth Gonzalez
- South Texas - Karla Laffite
- Southwestern - Hildy Aguinaldo
- Stanford
- Stetson - Candice Bartholomew
- Temple - Maureen Olives
- Tennessee - Stevie Nicole Phillips
- Texas - Jordan Haedicke, Paul DiBlasi
- Texas Tech - Alex Eaker
- Thomas Jefferson - Andrea Monk
- Thomas M. Cooley - Tammy Allison
- Toledo - Michael Bryant
- Touro - Ray Malone
- Tulane - Jonathan Belaga, Brian McGarry

LawHelp.org/ms

Legal info for the public in Mississippi

katrinalegalrelief.org

University of Mississippi Law's website for Katrina Legal Issues

powered by probono.net

© 1999-2016 Pro Bono Net. All rights reserved. Photo Credits | Disclaimer

The Adobe Acrobat Reader is required to open some documents on this site. (If you have questions about screen reader ability to access PDFs, please visit the Adobe Accessibility Page for more information.)
• Tulsa - Kiki Beets
• Vanderbilt - Joy Royes
• Vermont - Sam Riley Medlock
• Villanova - Jen Herrmann
• Virginia - Julia Pizzi
• Washburn - Claire Terrebonne, Kelly Anders
• Washington - Ashley Walker
• Wayne State - Candace Kanka
• Western New England - Josh Papapietro
• Widener - Gabriela Arche de Smith
• William and Mary - Jennifer Bacon
• William Mitchell - Jay Stratton
• Wisconsin - Iliana Castillo, Sai Lui
• Yale - Ellie Sutton
• Yeshiva - Cardozo - Daniel Forman
APPENDIX B: CODEBOOKS FOR THE 20 FACTORS

The Codebooks for the 20 factors plus the template follow this text. Each table is distinguished from another by the variable names. They start with T##, so T01 is the codebook for Factor 1: Awards and Recognitions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q001. Is there information reported for this feature?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q1_Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“None” or “No” typed response = 0, Go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed = 998, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q002. Is there an old information alert place on school?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q2_Old_Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 1, go to Q003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = TBD, then go to Q003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q003. Question?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q3_Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q004. Question?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q4_Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q005. Question?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q5_Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q006. Question?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q6_Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q007. Question?</strong></td>
<td>ToN_Q7_Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>VAR_ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?</strong></td>
<td>T01_Q01_Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q 02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02 − Q##.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides link only information = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School information provided but not on point = 997, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 99 9, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed =99 8, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?</strong></td>
<td>T01_Q02_Old_Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1 go to Q 03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 2, then go to Q 03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q03. Is information provided on feature ?</strong></td>
<td>T01_Q03_Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List = 1, go to Q0 4_1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General = 2, go to Q04_1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific = 3 go to Q04_1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q04_1. Is there a recognition event for PIL or PBS?</strong></td>
<td>T01_Q04_Recog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 0, go to Q05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q04_2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q04_2. Is event dedicated to PIL / Pro Bono?  
No = 0, go to Q05  
Yes = 1, go to Q05

Q05. Is there student recognition?  
No = 0, go to Q07  
Yes = 1, go to Q04_2

Q06. What form does student recognition take?  
Cash = Q06_1, go to Q07_1  
Dean Letter = Q06_2, go to Q07_1  
Graduation Recognition = Q06_3, go to Q07_1  
Token = Q06_4, go to Q07_1  
Transcript Notation = q06_5, go to Q07_1  
If more than 1 of each type, increase the count to reflect the number of recognition forms.

Q07_1. Is recognition available for different amounts of donated hours?  
No = 0, Go to Q08  
Yes = 1, go to Q07_2  
Q07_2. Indicate level floors, typically 2 - 4  
T1_Q07_L1, L2, L3, L4
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______ ______ ______ ______, Go to Q08

Q08. Is recognition available for faculty?  

No = 0, go to Q09  
Yes = 1, go to Q09

Q09. Is recognition available for alumni?  

No = 0, go to next school  
Yes = 1, go to next school

C01_Sum  

Sum (Q04_Recog + Q06_Cash + Q06_Dean + Q06_Grad + Q06_Token + Q06_Transc + Q07_Levels + Q08_Fac + Q09_Alumni)

C02_Quint_Sum  

Ranking based on value of C02

C03_Multiple  

C01 * Q03_Type

C04_Quint_Multiple  

C03 * Q03_Type
Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?  
Yes = 1, go to Q02  
NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” “No,”, or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##.  
“None” or “No” typed response = 0, go to next school  
School provides link only information = 996, go to next school  
School information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school  
School listed but no response = 999, go to next school  
School not listed =998, go to next school

Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?  
Yes = 1, go to Q03  
No = 2, go to Q03

Q03. How are programs described?  
List = 1, go to Q04  
General = 2, go to Q04  
Specific = 3, go to Q04
If mention that programming is handled with a specific unit or partnering unit, set Q03 to 1 and Q06 to .5

**Q04. Is community service required for graduation?**

No = 0, go to Q05
Yes = 1, go to Q05

**Q05. Are student organizations required to perform community service?**

No = 0, go to Q06
Yes = 1, go to Q06

**Q06. Is there 1L programming as part of orientation or welcome week?**

No = 0
Yes = 1

**Q07. Count of discrete or continuous programs.**

Discrete = Count, go to Q08
Continuous = Count, go to Q08

**Q08. Count of Programs**

Count number of programs mentioned and record total

Co1.Quint_Q8 = \(Q8 \times Q3\)
## PILS—An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co3.Quintile_Multiply</th>
<th>Co2</th>
<th>T02_Co3_Quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **PILS**—An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL TABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?</td>
<td>T03_Q01_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides link only information = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School information provided but not on point = 997, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed = 998, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?</td>
<td>T03_Q02_Old_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 2, then go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUSTOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03. Are requirements or program described?</td>
<td>T03_Q03_ReqProg</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 0, go to Q03_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q03_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03_2. How is the pro bono program described overall?</td>
<td>T03_Q03_ReqProg_Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q04. Are pro bono opportunities discussed in description? T03_Q04_Opportunity

No = 0, go to Q04_2
Yes = 1, go to Q04_2

Q04_2. How is the pro bono program described overall? T03_Q04_Type

List = 1, go to Q05
General = 2, go to Q05
Specific = 3, go to Q05

Q05. Is mission or philosophy regarding pro bono discussed in description? T03_Q05_Mission

No = 0, go to Q05
Yes = 1, go to Q07

Q05_2. How is the pro bono program described overall? T03_Q05_Mission_Type

List = 1, go to Q06
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General = 2, go to Q06
Specific = 3, go to Q06

Q06. Is pro bono required for graduation?  
No = 0, go to next school  
Yes = 1, go to next school

C01.Sum  
Q3 + Q4 + Q5

C02.Multiply  
C01 * Q03_Type

C03.Quint_Multiply  
C03

T03.Q06_PB_Reqd
T03_C01_Sum
T03_C03_Multiply
T03_C04_Quint_Multiply
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codebook -04: Faculty Pro Bono Policy</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL TABLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?</strong></td>
<td>To4_Q01_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides link only information = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provided information but not on point = 997, go to next school (use for links only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed = 998, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed, but no response = 999, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?</strong></td>
<td>To4_Q02_Old_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 1, go to Q03_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = TBD, then go to Q03_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUSTOM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q03_1. Is there a policy requiring pro bono service for faculty?</strong></td>
<td>To4_Q03_Fac_PB</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 0, go to Q04_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q03_2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q03_2. Is information?</strong></td>
<td>To4_Q03_Fac_PB_Type</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List = 1, go to Q03_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General = 2, go to Q03_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific = 3, go to Q03_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q03.3. Is faculty pro bono service encouraged?**  
\[ \text{To4.Q03.Fac_PB_Enc} \]

No = 0, go to Q04_1  
Yes = 1, go to Q04_1

**Q04.1. Is pro bono service part of tenure or faculty performance review?**  
\[ \text{To4.Q04.Review} \]

No = 0, go to Q05  
Yes = 1, go to Q04_2

**Q04.2. Is information?**  
\[ \text{To4.Q04.Review_Info_Type} \]

List = 1, go to Q05_1  
General = 2, go to Q05_1  
Specific = 3, go to Q05_1

**Q05.1. Are examples of faculty participation indicated?**  
\[ \text{To4.Q05.Partic} \]

No = 0, go to next school  
Yes = 1, go to next school

**Q05.2. Is information?**  
\[ \text{To4.Q05.Partic_Info_Type} \]

List = 1, go to next school  
General = 2, go to next school  
Specific = 3, go to next school

When all schools entered, go to Table 5

**C01. Multiply**  
\[ (Q3.1 \times Q3.2) + Q3.3 + (Q4.1 \times Q4.2) + (Q5.1 \times Q5.2) \]

**C02. Quint**  
\[ Q01 \]
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### Codebook -05:--Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL TABLES</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T05.Q1_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?

- Yes = 1, go to Q002

**Note:** If a school indicates “None,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##.

- School provided link to some other content = 996, go to next school
- School provided info but not on point = 997, go to Next School
- School listed but no response = 999, go to Next School
- School not listed =998, go to Next School

#### Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?

- Yes = 1, go to Q03
- No = 2, go to Q03

---

#### CUSTOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T05.Q3_Info_Type</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q03. How are pro bono program funding described?

- List = 1, go to T06
- General = 2, go to T06
- Specified = 3, go to Q04

#### Q04. How is program funded?

- Ad hoc = 3, go to T06
- Admin Support Only = 4, go to T06
- Combination = 6, go to T06
- Dedicated or Op Budget = 7, go to T06
- External Only = 5, go to T06
- Minimal funding = 2, go to T06

- No budget = 1. Go to T06
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**Co1.Multiply**  Q3 * Q4  
**Co2.Quintile**  C01  

**To5_C01_Multiply**  
**To5_C02_Quint**
### Codebook -06--Location of Program

#### ALL TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID_________</th>
<th>VAR_Type__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q001. Is there information reported for this feature?</td>
<td>T06_Q01_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides link only information = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but information not on point, link only = 997, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed = 998, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?                  | T06_Q02_Old_Info | I          |
| Yes = 1, go to Q03                                                      |                  |            |
| No = 2, go to Q03                                                      |                  |            |

#### CUSTOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID_________</th>
<th>VAR_Type__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q03. Is information?</td>
<td>T06_Q03_Info_Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List = 1, go to Q04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General = 2, go to Q04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific = 3, go to Q04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q04. Where are the pro bono programs located?                            | T06_Q04_Location | I          |
| Combined with Another Unit = 2, go to Q04                               |                  |            |
| Dedicated = 3, go to Q04                                                |                  |            |
| Faculty, ad hoc = 1, go to Q04                                           |                  |            |

| C.01.Multiply Q03 * Q04                                                 |                  |            |
**Question** | **Codebook -07:--Staffing Oversight** | **VAR_Type**
---|---|---
**ALL TABLES**

**Q01.** Is there information reported for this feature? | T07_Q01_Info | I
Yes = 1, go to Q02
NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##.
School provides link only information = 996, go to next school
School provides information but not on point = 997, go to next school
School not listed =998, go to next school
School provides link only information = 996, go to next school

**Q02.** Is there an old information alert place on school? | T07_Q02_Old_Info | I
Yes = 1, then go to Q03
No = 2, go to Q03

**CUSTOM**

**Q03.** How is the pro bono program staffing described? | T07_Q03_Info_Type
List = 1, go to Q04
General = 2, go to Q04
Specific = 3, go to Q04

**Q04.** How are the Pro Bono programs staffed?
Indicate number of unique positions _____, go to Q04_1

Repeat for each positions, for each type of staffing code the following:

Q04_1  Total number of dedicated roles indicated:
Unspecified = 0, go to Q04_2
Specified = 1, go to Q04_2

Q04_2  Who participates?
Unspecified = 0, go to Q04_3
Faculty or Staff = 2, for Q04_3 enter “2” for Paid
Student = 1, go to Q04_3

Q04_3  Are the participants paid or volunteer?
Unspecified = 0, go to Q04_4
Paid = 2, go to Q04_4
Volunteer = 1, go to Q04_4

Q04_4  Are the participants full time, part time?
⇒ If student, = PT
⇒ If faculty, = FT, unless PT indicated
Unspecified = 0, go to Q04_5
PT = 1, go to Q04_5
FT = 2, go to Q04_5
Q04_5 Is participant a dedicated or shared resource? To7_Q04_DedShare

Unspecified = 0, go to To8
Shared = 1, go to To8
Dedicated = 2, go to To8

C01.Sum Q04_1 + Q04_2 + Q04_4 + Q04_4 + Q04_5 To7_C01_Sum
C02.Multiply C01 * Q03 To7_C02_Multiply
C03.Quintile C02 To7_C03_Quintile
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**Codebook -08:--Student Run Specialized Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALL TABLES</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?</td>
<td>T08_Q01_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: If a school indicates “none,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides link only = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School info listed, not on point = 997, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed =998, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school? | T08_Q02_Old_Info | I |
| Yes = 1, go to Q03 |
| No = 2, go to Q03 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUSTOM</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q03. How many programs are listed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03_1. List?______</td>
<td>T08_Q03_Program_List</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03_2. General?______</td>
<td>T08_Q03_Program_Genl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03_3. Specific?______</td>
<td>T08_Q03_Program_Spec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebook</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C01.Sum</td>
<td>Q03_1 + Q03_2 + Q03_3</td>
<td>T08_C01_Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C02.Quint_Sum</td>
<td>C01</td>
<td>T08_C02_Quint_Sum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03.Multiply</td>
<td>Q03_List * 1</td>
<td>T08_C03_MList</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Co4. Multiply</th>
<th>Q03_Genl * 2</th>
<th>To8_Co4_MGenl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co5. Multiply</td>
<td>Q03_Spec * 3</td>
<td>To8_Co5_MSpec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co6. Sum</td>
<td>Sum of C02 + C03 + C04</td>
<td>To8_Co6_Sum_Multiply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co7. Quintile</td>
<td>C05</td>
<td>To8_Co7_Quint_MultiSum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question**

**Codebook -09:--Career Assistance**

**ALL TABLES**

**Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?**

T09_Q01_Info

Yes = 1, go to Q02

NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” or “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##, go to Q02.

School provided link only or just contact info = 996, go to next school

School provided information but not on point = 997, go to next school

School not listed = 998, go to Next School

School listed but no response = 999, go to next school

**Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?**

T09_Q02_Old_Info

Yes = 1, go to Q03

No = 2, go to Q03

---

**CUSTOM**

**Q03. Is there dedicated PIL Career Assistance?**

T09_Q03_Asst

No = 0, go to Q04

Yes = 1, go to Q04

**Q04. Does Career Services hold dedicated in-house PIL career fair or on campus interviews?**

T09_Q04_Career

No = 0, go to Q05

Yes = 1, go to Q05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q05.</th>
<th>Does Career Services provide dedicated PIL job resources?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>T09_Q05_Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 0, go to Q06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q06.</th>
<th>Does Career Services provide dedicated PIL programming?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>T09_Q06_Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 0, go to Q07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q07.</th>
<th>Does Career Services provide a PIL mentor/network program?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>T09_Q07_Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 0, go to Q08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q08.</th>
<th>Overall, is information provided:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>T09_Q08_Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List = 1, go to T10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General = 2, go to T10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific = 3, go to T10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C01.Sum</th>
<th>Summation of Q03-Q07</th>
<th>T09_C01_Sum</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C02.Quint_Sum</td>
<td>C01</td>
<td>T09_C02_Quint_Sum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03.Multiply</td>
<td>C02 * C08</td>
<td>T09_C03_Multiply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04.Quint_Multiply</td>
<td>C03</td>
<td>T09_C03_Quint_Multiply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

#### ALL TABLES

**Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?**

- Yes = 1, go to Q02

**NOTE:** If a school indicates “None,” “No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02-Q##, go to next school
- School provides link only = 996, go to next school
- School provides information but not on point = 997, go to next school
- School not listed = 998, go to next school

**Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?**

- Yes = 1, go to Q03
- No = 2, go to Q03

**CUSTOM**

**Q03. How many Centers are indicated?**

- ________, go to Q04

**Q04. Is information general or specific?**

- General = 1, go to T11
- List Only = 1, go to T11
- Specific = 3, go to T11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebook -10:--Centers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q01</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_Q01_Info</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q02</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_Q02_Old_Info</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q03</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_Q03_Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q04</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_Q04_Info_Type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C01_Quint_Q03</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_C01_Quint_Q03</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C02_Multiply</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_C02_Multiply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C03_Quint_Multiply</strong></td>
<td><strong>T10_C03_Quint_Multiply</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

#### Codebook -11:--Certificates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL TABLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?</strong></td>
<td>T11_Q1_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides a link only = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides information but not on point = 997, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed =998, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: If a school indicates “None,” No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q03 – Q##.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?</strong></td>
<td>T11_Q2_Old_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 2, go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUSTOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>VAR_ID</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q03. How many certificate and curriculum programs?</strong></td>
<td>T11_Q3_Cert</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>______, go to Q04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co1.Quint</strong> Q03</td>
<td>T11_C01_Co1_Quintile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q04. Is information provided general or specific?</strong></td>
<td>T11_Q4_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List = 1, go to T12
General = 2, go to T12
Specific = 3, go to T12

\textbf{Co2.Multiply} \quad Q03 \times Q04 \quad T11\_Co2\_Multiply

\textbf{Co3.Quint.Multiply} \quad C02 \quad T11\_Co3\_Quintile\_C02
Question | Codebook -12:--Classes with Public Service
---|---
ALL TABLES

**Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?**

T12_Q01_Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR_ID _______</th>
<th>VAR_Type__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL TABLES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q02</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides a link only = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides information but not on point = 997, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed = 998, go to Next School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** If a school indicates “None,” No,” or some similar text, then score accordingly in Q02 – Q##.

**Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?**

T12_Q02_Old_Info

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR_ID _______</th>
<th>VAR_Type__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL TABLES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q03</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 2, go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUSTOM

**Q03. How many classes have a public service or service component?**

T12_Q03_Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR_ID _______</th>
<th>VAR_Type__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____, go to Q04</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C01_Quint_Sum** Q03

T12_C01_Quint_Q03

**Q04. Is information general or specific?**

T12_Q04_Info_Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR_ID _______</th>
<th>VAR_Type__</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List Only = 1, go to Q04_01</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General = 2, go to T13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 3, go to T13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Q04_1. If list, does course listing possibly cover PIL courses?**

Yes = 1, go to T13

No = 2, go to T13

---

**Co2_Multiply**  
Q03 * Q04  
T12_Co2_Multiply

**Co3_Quint_Multiply**  
Quintile C02  
T12_Co3_Quint_Multiply
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Codebook -13:--Clinics</th>
<th>VAR_Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL TABLES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?</td>
<td>T13_Q01_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides a link only = 996, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School provides information but not on point = 997, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School not listed = 998, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School listed but no response = 999, go to next school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE: If a school indicates “none,” or “no” or some similar text, then score accordingly Q02 – Q##.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?</td>
<td>T13_Q02_Old_Info</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes = 1, go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = 2, go to Q03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03. How many clinics are listed?</td>
<td>T13_Q03_Clinic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ , go to Q04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co1_Quint_Sum Q03</td>
<td>T13_C01_Quint_Sum</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q04. Is the information general or specific?</td>
<td>T13_Q04_Info_Type</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List only = 1, go to T14
General = 2, go to T14
Specific = 3, go to T14

\[ C02\text{ Multiply} \quad Q03 \times Q04 \quad T13\_C02\text{ Multiply} \quad C \]
\[ C03\text{ Quint\_Multiply} \quad Q02 \quad T13\_C03\text{ Quintile} \quad C \]
### Codebook -14:--Extern & Internships

**Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question</strong></th>
<th><strong>Codebook</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL TABLES</td>
<td>Codebook -14:--Extern &amp; Internships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?

- Yes = 1, go to Q02
- School provides a link only = 996, go to next school
- School provides information, but not on point = 997, go to next school
- School not listed on report = 998 go to next school
- School listed but no response = 999, go to next school
- School not listed =998, go to Next School

#### Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?

- Yes = 1, go to Q03
- No = 2, go to Q03

#### CUSTOM

- **Q03. How many extern or internship program are listed?**
  - _____, go to Q04

  - **Co1_Quint_Q03** | Q03 | T14_C01_Quint_Q03 |

- **Q04. Is the information general or specific?**
  - List only = 1, go to T14
  - General = 2, go to T14
  - Specific = 3, go to T14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO &amp; PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C02_Multiply</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C03_Quint_Multiply</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALL TABLES

Q01. Is there information reported for this feature? T15_Q01_Info I
    Yes = 1, go to Q02
    Link only = 996, go to next school
    Information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school
    Not listed on report section = 998, go to next school
    Listed but no response = 999, go to next school
    If “none” or “no” programs indicated, score Q03-Q## accordingly to get score of 0

Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school? T15_Q02_Old_Info I
    Yes = 1, go to Q03
    No = 2, go to Q03

CUSTOM

Q03. How many extra or co-curricular programs are listed? T15_Q03_ExtraCo I
    ______, go to Q04

Q04. Is the information general or specific? T15_Q04_Info_Type I
    List only = 1, go to T16
    General = 2, go to T16
    Specific = 3, go to T16

C01_Q quint_Q03   Q03   T15_C01_Multiply  C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C02_Multiply</th>
<th>Q03 * Q04</th>
<th>T15_C02_Quintile</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C03_Quint_Multiply</td>
<td>C02</td>
<td>T15_C03_Quintile</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question | Codebook -16:--Journals
---|---
**ALL TABLES**

**Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?**

Yes = 1, go to Q02

Link only = 996, go to next school

Information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school

Not listed on report section = 998, go to next school

Listed but no response = 999, go to next school

If “None” or “No” programs indicated, score Q02-Q## accordingly to get score of 0

**Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?**

Yes = 1, go to Q03

No = 2, go to Q03

**CUSTOM**

**Q03. How many extra or co-curricular programs are listed?**

PIL / Govt _____, go to Q04

Other _____, go to Q04

Summation of JournalPIL + JournalOther

**Q04. Is the information general or specific?**

List only = 1, go to T17

General = 2, go to T17

Specific = 3, go to T17
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO &amp; PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co2. Multiply. Both</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co3. Quint. Co2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co4. Multiply. PIL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co5. Quint. Co4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question | Codebook -17:--LRAP
---|---
ALL TABLES

**Q01.** Is there information reported for this feature? | T17_Q01_Info
---|---
Yes = 1, go to Q02
Link only = 996, go to next school
Information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school
Not listed on report section = 998, go to next school
Listed but no response = 999, go to next school
If “none” or “no” indicated, score Q02-Q## accordingly to get score of 0

**Q02.** Is there an old information alert place on school? | T17_Q02_Old_Info
---|---
Yes = 1, go to Q03
No = 2, go to Q03

CUSTOM

**Q03.** Does the information describe the LRAP’s award amount? | T17_Q03_LRAPAmt
---|---
No = 0, go to Q04
Yes = 1, go to Q04

**Q04.** Does the information describe the LRAP’s length of availability? | T17_Q04_LRAPTime
---|---
No = 0, go to Q05
Yes = 1, go to Q05

**Q05.** Does the information describe the LRAP’s eligibility requirements? | T17_Q0_LRAPElig
---|---
No = 0, go to Q06
Yes = 1, go to Q06
Q06. Is the information provided?  
   List only = 1, go to T18  
   General = 2, go to T18  
   Specific = 3, go to T18

C01.Sum  Q03 + Q04 + Q05  
C02.Multiply  C01 * Q06  
C03.Quint  C02
Question    VAR_ID_________   VAR_Type__
ALL TABLES
Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?    T18_Q01_Info    I
      Yes = 1, go to Q02
      Link only = 996, go to next school
      Information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school
      Not listed on report section = 998, go to next school
      Listed but no response = 999, go to next school
      If “None” or “No” typed response, score Q02 – Q## accordingly to get score of 0
Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?    T18_Q02_Old_Info    I
      Yes = 1, go to Q03
      No = 2, go to Q03

CUSTOM
Q03_1. Does the information describe the Law School funded Awards?    T18_Q03_LawSchool
      No = 0, go to Q09 (Q04-Q08 → 0)
      Yes = 1, go to Q03_2
Q03_2. How many awards? ____________    T18_Q03_Count
      → go to Q04
Q04. Describe the information indicating the number of awards available  \text{\textit{T18\_Q04\_LSNumber}}

- None = 0, go to Q05
- List = 1, go to Q05
- General = 2, go to Q05
- Specific = 3, go to Q05

Q05. Describe the information indicating the eligibility requirements.  \text{\textit{T18\_Q05\_LSElig}}

- None = 0, go to Q06
- List = 1, go to Q06
- General = 2, go to Q06
- Specific = 3, go to Q06

Q06. Describe the information indicating any support provided.  \text{\textit{T18\_Q06\_LSSupport}}

- None = 0, go to Q07
- List = 1, go to Q07
- General = 2, go to Q07
- Specific = 3, go to Q07

Q07. Describe the information indicating any requirement.  \text{\textit{T18\_Q07\_LSReqs}}

- None = 0, go to Q08
- List = 1, go to Q08
- General = 2, go to Q08
- Specific = 3, go to Q08
Q08. Describe the information indicating any compensation.  

None = 0, go to Q09  
List = 1, go to Q09  
General = 2, go to Q09  
Specific = 3, go to Q09

\[ \text{C01.Sum.Q04-08} = \sum_{0}^{Q08} Q \quad \text{(Sum of Info scores for Q04-Q08)} \]

Q09_1. Does the information describe the Graduate Student funded Awards?  

No = 0, go to Q15 (Q10-Q14 \(\rightarrow\) 0)  
Yes = 1, go to Q09_2

Q09_2. How many awards? ________________

\(\rightarrow\) go to Q10

Q10. Describe the information indicating the number of awards available.  

None = 0, go to Q11  
List = 1, go to Q11  
General = 2, go to Q11  
Specific = 3, go to Q11

Q11. Describe the information indicating the eligibility requirements.  

None = 0, go to Q12  
List = 1, go to Q12  
General = 2, go to Q12  
Specific = 3, go to Q12
Q12. Describe the information indicating any support provided.  
None = 0, go to Q13  
List = 1, go to Q13  
General = 2, go to Q13  
Specific = 3, go to Q13

Q13. Describe the information indicating any requirement.  
None = 0, go to Q14  
List = 1, go to Q14  
General = 2, go to Q14  
Specific = 3, go to Q14

Q14. Describe the information indicating any compensation.  
None = 0, go to Q15  
List = 1, go to Q15  
General = 2 go to Q15  
Specific = 3, go to Q15

\[ \text{Co2.Sum.Q10-14} = \sum_{0}^{10} \sum_{14}^{Q} \]  \text{(Sum of Info scores for Q10-Q14)}  
T18_Co2_Sum_Q10-14

Q15_1. Does the information describe the Other funded Awards?  
No = 0, go to T19 (Q16-Q20 \(\rightarrow 0\))  
Yes = 1, go to Q15_2

Q15_2. How many awards? ____________  
T18_Q15_Count  
go to Q16
Q16. Describe the information indicating the number of awards available

None = 0, go to Q17
List = 1, go to Q17
General = 2 go to Q17
Specific = 3, go to Q17

Q17. Describe the information indicating the eligibility requirements.

None = 0, go to Q18
List = 1, go to Q18
General = 2, go to Q18
Specific = 3, go to Q18

Q18. Describe the information indicating any support provided.

None = 0, go to Q19
List = 1, go to Q19
General = 2 go to Q19
Specific = 3, go to Q19

Q19. Describe the information indicating any requirement.

None = 0, go to Q20
List = 1, go to Q20
General = 2 go to Q20
Specific = 3, go to Q20
Q20. Describe the information indicating any compensation. T18_Q20_OComp

None = 0, go to T19
List = 1, go to T19
General = 2, go to T19
Specific = 3, go to T19

\[ \sum_{0}^{16} Q \]
(Sum of Info scores for Q16-Q20)

\[ \sum_{0}^{03} C \]
(Sum of C01 + C02 + C03)

\[ \sum_{0}^{03} \text{Q03}_1 \]
(Sum of Q03_1 + Q09 + Q15)

(How many reported types of fellowships)

(C06.Quint.Info.All C05)

T18_C06_Quint_Info_All

T18_C03_Sum_Q16-20

T18_C04_Sum_All

T18_C05_Info_All

T18_C05_Quint_Info_All
ALL TABLES

**Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?**

- Yes = 1, go to Q02
- Link only = 996, go to next school
- Information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school
- Not listed on report section = 998, go to next school
- Listed but no response = 999, go to next school
- If “none” or “no”, score Q02-Q## accordingly to get score of 0

**Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?**

- Yes = 1, go to Q03
- No = 2, go to Q03

CUSTOM

**Q03. How many student groups are listed?**

- PIL _____
- **Q03.SGPI** Q03_SPIL
  - Dedicated Interest Groups _____
  - Govt Functions _____
  - Subject Law _____
  - Multi _____, go to Q04
### PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING

**Q04. Is the information specific?**

- List only = 1, go to T20
- General = 2, go to T20
- Specific = 3, go to T20

**Codebook -20:--Summer & Term Fellowships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Formula/Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C02. Sum. All</td>
<td>Summation of SGPIL + SDIG + SGOV + Subject + SMulti</td>
<td>T19_C02_Sum_All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03. PIL Ratio</td>
<td>Ratio of PIL to All Groups</td>
<td>T19_C03_PILRatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C04. Multiply. All</td>
<td>C02 * Q4</td>
<td>T19_C04_Multiply_All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C05. Quint. All</td>
<td>C04</td>
<td>T19_C05_Quint_All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06. Multiply. PIL</td>
<td>Q03_SGPIL * Info_Type</td>
<td>T19_C06_Multiply_PIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07. Quint _Q03*Info</td>
<td>C06</td>
<td>T19_C07_Quint_Q03*Info</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question | VAR_ID | VAR_Type
--- | --- | ---
ALL TABLES

**Q01. Is there information reported for this feature?**

- Yes = 1, go to Q02
- Link only = 996, go to next school
- Information provided, but not on point = 997, go to next school
- Not listed on report section = 998, go to next school
- Listed but not no response = 999, go to next school
- If “none” or none indicated, score Q03-Q## accordingly to get score of 0

**Q02. Is there an old information alert place on school?**

- Yes = 1, go to Q03
- No = 2, go to Q03

CUSTOM

SUMMER

**Q03_1. Does the information describe the summer fellowships available?**

- No = 0, go to Q09 (Q04-Q08 → 0)
- Yes = 1, go to Q03_2

**Q03_2. Does the Law School guarantee summer PIL position funding?**

- No = 0
- Yes = 1

**Q03_3. Provide the count of programs indicated.**

- Number of programs _______, go to Q04
PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

Law School Funded

Q04. Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available

   None = 0, go to Q05
   List = 1, go to Q05
   General = 2, go to Q05
   Specific = 3, go to Q05

Q05. Describe the information indicating required participation.

   None = 0, go to Q06
   List = 1, go to Q06
   General = 2 go to Q06
   Specific = 3, go to Q06

Q06. Describe the information indicating any support provided.

   None = 0, go to Q07
   List = 1, go to Q07
   General = 2 go to Q07
   Specific = 3, go to Q07

Q07. Describe the information indicating any post-graduate requirement.

   None = 0, go to Q08
   List = 1, go to Q08
Q08. **Describe the information indicating any compensation.**

None = 0, go to Q09

List = 1, go to Q09

General = 2, go to Q09

Specific = 3, go to Q09

---

**Graduate Student Funded**

Q09. **Does the information describe the Graduate Student funded Awards?**

No = 0, go to Q15 (Q10-Q14  → 0)

Yes = 1, go to Q09_2

Q09_2. **Provide the count of programs indicated.**

Number of programs ________, go to Q10

Q10. **Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available**

None = 0, go to Q11

List = 1, go to Q11

General = 2, go to Q11

Specific = 3, go to Q11

---

Q11. **Describe the information indicating required participation.**
PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

General = 2, go to Q08
Specific = 3, go to Q08

**Q08. Describe the information indicating any compensation.**  T20_Q8_LSComp

None = 0, go to Q09
List = 1, go to Q09
General = 2, go to Q09
Specific = 3, go to Q09

**C01.Sum.Q04-08**

Summation = \( \sum_{Q04}^{Q08} \)

T20_C01_SumQ04-08

Graduate Student Funded

**Q09_1. Does the information describe the Graduate Student funded Awards?**  T20_Q9_GradStudent

No = 0, go to Q15 (Q10-Q14 \( \rightarrow 0 \))
Yes = 1, go to Q09_2

**Q09_2. Provide the count of programs indicated.**  T20_Q09_Count

Number of programs _______, go to Q10

**Q10. Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available**  T20_Q10_GSNumber

None = 0, go to Q11
List = 1, go to Q11
General = 2, go to Q11
Specific = 3, go to Q11

**Q11. Describe the information indicating required participation.**  T20_Q11_GSElig
None = 0, go to Q12
List = 1, go to Q12
General = 2, go to Q12
Specific = 3, go to Q12

Q12. Describe the information indicating any support provided.  T20_Q12_GSSupport
None = 0, go to Q13
List = 1, go to Q13
General = 2, go to Q13
Specific = 3, go to Q13

Q13. Describe the information indicating any post-graduate requirement  T20_Q13_GSReqs
None = 0, go to Q14
List = 1, go to Q14
General = 2, go to Q14
Specific = 3, go to Q14

Q14. Describe the information indicating any compensation.  T20_Q14_GSComp
None = 0, go to Q15
List = 1, go to Q15
General = 2, go to Q15
Specific = 3, go to Q15

\[ C_{20}.Sum.Q10-14 = \sum_{14}^{14} Q \]  T20_C02_Sum_Q10-14
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Other Funded

Q15_1. Does the information describe the Other funded Awards? T20_Q15_Other

No = 0, go to T19 (Q16-Q20 → 0)
Yes = 1, go to Q10

Q15_2. Provide the count of programs indicated. T20_Q15_Count

Number of programs __________, go to Q16

Q16. Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available T20_Q16_ONumber

None = 0, go to Q17
List = 1, go to Q
General = 2, go to Q17
Specific = 3, go to Q17

Q17. Describe the information indicating required participation. T20_Q17_OElig

None = 0, go to Q18
List = 1, go to Q1
General = 2, go to Q18
Specific = 3, go to Q18

Q18. Describe the information indicating any support provided. T20_Q18_OSupport
Q19. Describe the information indicating any post-graduate requirement.  
None = 0, go to Q19
List = 1, go to Q1
General = 2, go to Q19
Specific = 3, go to Q19

Q20. Describe the information indicating any compensation. 
None = 0, end
List = 1, end
General = 2, end
Specific = 3, end

\[
\text{C03.Sum} = \sum_{Q16}^{Q20} Q \\
\text{C04.Sum.Info.Count} = Q03 + Q09 + Q15 \text{ Y/N Count} \\
\text{C05.Sum} = \sum_{03}^{01} C \\
\text{C06.Quint_C05} = \text{Quintile Rank of C05}
\]
PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING

C07.Ave  C05 / 3, info across three types of fellowships  T20_C07_Ave_C01-03
C08.Ave  C05 / 5, info across five elements  T20_C08_Ave_C01-03_El
C09.Sum  Sum of Q3+Q9+Q15  T20_C09_Sum_Q3915

TERM_TIME

Q21_1. Does the information describe the summer fellowships available?  T20_Q21_LawSchool
                No = 0, go to Q27 (Q21-Q26 \rightarrow 0)
                Yes = 1, go to Q21_2

Q21_2. Provide the count of programs indicated.  T20_Q21_Count
            Number of programs ______, go to Q22

Law School Funded

Q22. Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available  T20_Q22_LSNNumber
            None = 0, go to Q23
            General = 2.5, go to Q23
            Specific = 5.0, go to Q23

Q23. Describe the information indicating required participation.  T20_Q23_LSElig
            None = 0, go to Q24
            General = 2.5, go to Q24
            Specific = 5.0, go to Q24
Q24. Describe the information indicating any support provided. T20_Q24_LSSupport

None = 0, go to Q25
General = 2.5, go to Q25
Specific = 5.0, go to Q25

Q25. Describe the information indicating any post-graduate requirement. T20_Q25_LSReqs

None = 0, go to Q26
General = 2.5, go to Q26
Specific = 5.0, go to Q26

Q26. Describe the information indicating any compensation. T20_Q26_LSComp

None = 0, go to Q27
General = 2.5, go to Q27
Specific = 5.0, go to Q27

C10.Sum Summation = $\sum_{i=22}^{26} Q$ T20_C10_SumQ22-26

Graduate Student Funded

Q27_1. Does the information describe the Graduate Student funded Awards? T20_Q27_GradStudent

No = 0, go to Q33 (Q28-Q32 $\rightarrow$ 0)
Yes = 1, go to Q27_2

Q27_2. Provide the count of programs indicated. T20_Q27_Count

Number of programs ________, go to Q28
Q28. Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available
T20_Q28_GSNumber

General = 2.5, go to Q29
Specific = 5.0, go to Q29

Q29. Describe the information indicating required participation.
T20_Q29_GSElig

None = 0, go to Q30
General = 2.5, go to Q30
Specific = 5.0, go to Q30

Q30. Describe the information indicating any support provided.
T20_Q30_GSSupport

None = 0, go to Q31
General = 2.5, go to Q31
Specific = 5.0, go to Q31

Q31. Describe the information indicating any post-graduate requirement
T20_Q31_GSReqs

None = 0, go to Q32
General = 2.5, go to Q32
Specific = 5.0, go to Q32

Q32. Describe the information indicating any compensation.
T20_Q32_GSComp

None = 0, go to Q33
C117  Summation = \[ \sum_{28}^{32} Q \]  T20_C07_Sum_Q28-32

Other Funded

Q33_1. Does the information describe the Other funded Awards?  T20_Q33_Other

No = 0, STOP (Q34-38 \(\rightarrow\) 0)
Yes = 1, go to Q34

Q33_2. Provide the count of programs indicated.  T20_Q33_Count

Number of programs ________, go to Q34

Q34. Describe the information indicating the number of fellowships available  T20_Q34_ONumber

None = 0, go to Q35
General = 2.5, go to Q35
Specific = 5.0, go to Q35

Q35. Describe the information indicating required participation.  T20_Q35_OElig

None = 0, go to Q36
General = 2.5, go to Q36
Specific = 5.0, go to Q36
PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING

**Q36. Describe the information indicating any support provided.**

None = 0, go to Q37

General = 2.5, go to Q37

Specific = 5.0, go to Q37

**Q37 Describe the information indicating any post-graduate requirement.**

None = 0, go to Q38

General = 2.5, go to Q38

Specific = 5.0, go to Q38

**Q38. Describe the information indicating any compensation.**

None = 0, STOP

General = 2.5, STOP

Specific = 5.0, STOP

---

**C12.Sum** \[\text{Summation} = \sum_{34}^{38} Q\] \(T20\text{.C12.Q34-38}\)

**C13.Sum** \[\text{Sum } Q21 + Q27 + Q33\] \(T20\text{.C13.Q212733}\)

**C14.Sum** \[\text{Sum } C10-12\] \(T20\text{.C14.C10-12}\)

**C15.Quint** \[\text{Quint of } C14\] \(T20\text{.C15.Quint.C14}\)

**C16.Ave** \[\text{Ave of } C10-C12 / 3, across fellowship types\] \(T20\text{.C16.Ave.C10-12}\)

**C17.Ave** \[\text{Ave of } C10-12 / 5, across elements\] \(T20\text{.C17.TT_Info_Ave}\)

**C18.Sum** \[\text{Sum of } Q21 + Q27 + Q33\] \(T20\text{.C18.TT_Fellow_Count}\)

**C19.Sum** \[\text{Sum } C05 + C14, Summer + Term Time}\) \(T20\text{.C19.Add.Combine}\)

**C20.Quint** \[\text{Quintile for}\] \(T20\text{.20_Quint.Combine}\)
Appendix C: Fair Use Evaluation Documentation

April 26, 2018 – Final Version

Fair Use Evaluation Documentation

Compiled using the Fair Use Evaluator [cc] 2008 Michael Brewer & the Office for Information Technology Policy, http://librarycopyright.net/fairuse/

Name: S. K. (Kayleigh) Van Poolen
Job Title: Graduate Student, Graduate & Teaching Assistant
Institution: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Title of Work Used: ABA's Directory of Law School Public Interest and Pro Bono Programs (as of November 1, 2016)
Copyright Holder: American Bar Association
Publication Status: Published
Publisher: ABA
Publication Year: Ongoing
Description of Work: Listing of all ABA-accredited, provisionally accredited and on probation law schools and their public interest law and pro bono service programming. The ABA presented this data filters by Law School Name in a portrait report as well as by feature then law school. The information is self-reported, the law schools can update the site by contacting the ABA; however, there is no requirement the law school provide the information or update that information on a scheduled basis.
Date of Evaluation: April 26, 2018
Date of Intended Use: November 20, 2016

Describe the Purpose and Character of Your Intended Use:

I am viewing the reported data, creating PDFs by feature, conducting content analysis, coding the information and then creating an indicator that expresses how much public interest law and pro bono service programming a law school offers compared to other law schools. This is a graduate requirement project to complete the Certificate of Advanced Studies (40-credit hour) for the School of Information Sciences at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. [*] Use is for "criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching. (including multiple print copies for classroom use), scholarship or research"

[*] Use is transformative, i.e. it uses the existing work in a new way (creates an index to the work) or for a new purpose (parody, pastiche, instructional materials, etc.) Transformative works are favored because the purpose of U.S. Copyright Law is to encourage the development and dissemination of new knowledge to benefit the public and thereby advance learning.

[*] Use is socially beneficial (promotes the creation of new knowledge, learning, etc.) by identifying public interest law and pro bono programs that benefit community and underserved or marginalized communities

[*] Use is not-for-profit
PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING

[+] Use is clearly defined and is restricted in scope (limited duration, not iterative, restricted access, etc.)
[+] Use is one-time, or is only occasional or spontaneous

Describe the **Nature** of Your Intended Use of the Copyrighted Work:

The nature of the work is a website containing information that law schools report to the ABA. There is no required paywall access nor is a viewer required to be a member of the ABA or of a contributing law school.

[+] Work to be used contains limited new knowledge, content, or creative expression (in relation to previously copyrighted works)
[+] Work to be used is primarily of a factual nature (non-fiction, collection of facts, etc.)
[+] Original work was not created and/or has not been marketed for the stated purpose of the proposed use
[+] Work to be used has been previously PUBLISHED

Describe the **Amount** of Your Intended Use in Relation to the Copyrighted Work as a Whole:

I here will no direct copying of the information, although the entirety of the content will be analyzed. In an effort to provide transparency, the resulting content analysis documents are provided for the repository but not published as part of the project report. Only the transformed content is expressed in the project report.

[+] If the entire work is to be used (which would NOT favor the use being fair), it is clear that no less than the entire work will achieve the stated purpose of the use (e.g. use of a photograph, a short poem, an article, etc.)
Describe the **Effect** of Your Intended Use on the Potential Market or Value of the Copyrighted Work:

As this use is related to purely academic pursuit, there is no hindrance regarding market value. Also, the ABA does not charge or limit access to paid members, they post the information for the benefit of the public. The use now and in the future is not-for-profit and is related only to the fulfillment of academic degree requirements.

[*] The work is NOT currently under commercial exploitation (out of print, no licensing available, etc.)

[+] Proper attribution will be given with the intended use

[+] The copy of the work to be used is a legal copy

[+] A market for the work as it will be used is absent or is negligible & use of the work will have little or no negative impact on its value or potential value

---

The Average "**Fairness Level,**" Based on Your Rating of Each of the 4 Factors, is:

[see tool disclaimer for important clarifying information]:

---

Based on the information and justification I have provided above, I, S. K. (Kayleigh) Van Poolen, am asserting this use is **FAIR** under Section 107 of the U.S. Copyright Code.

Signature: ________________________________

Date of Signature: ________________________________

**Disclaimer:** This document is intended to help you collect, organize & archive the information you might need to support your fair use evaluation. It is not a source of legal advice or assistance. The results are only as good as the input you have provided by are intended to suggest next steps, and not to provide a final judgment. It is recommended that you share this evaluation with a copyright specialist before proceeding with your intended use.
Fair Use Evaluation Documentation

Compiled using the Fair Use Evaluator [cc] 2008 Michael Brewer & the Office for Information Technology Policy, http://librarycopyright.net/fairuse/

Name: S.K. (Ksyleigh) Van Pooen
Job Title: Graduate Student, Graduate Assistant
Institution: University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana
Title of Work Used: ARA's Website - Directory of Law School Public Interest and Pro Bono Programs
Copyright Holder: American Bar Association
Publication Status: Published
Publisher: ABA
Place of Publication: Chicago, IL: https://www.americanbar.org
Publication Year: ongoing
Description of Work: Listing of all ABA accredited, provisionally accredited and on probation law schools and their public interest law and pro bono service programming. The ARA presents this data filters based on Law School Name in a portrait report as well as by feature then law school. The information is self-reported, the law schools can update the site by contacting the ABA; however, there is no requirement they provide the information or update that information on a regular basis.

Date of Evaluation: April 9, 2017
Date of Intended Use: November 20, 2016

Describe the Purpose and Character of Your Intended Use:

I am viewing the reported data, creating PDFs by feature and then law school, conducting content analysis, coding the information and then conducting multifactor analysis to create an indicator of how much PIL and pro bono service programming a law school has compared to other law schools. This is a graduate requirement project to complete the Certificate of Advanced Research for the iSchool, School of Information Sciences at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. [+] Use is for “criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, (including multiple print copies for classroom use), scholarship or research”
[+] Use is socially beneficial (promotes the creation of new knowledge, learning, etc.) [define how]
[+] Use is not-for-profit
[+] Use is clearly defined and is restricted in scope (limited duration, not iterative, restricted access, etc.)
[+] Use is one-time, or is only occasional or spontaneous

Fair  Unfair
Describe the **Nature** of Your Intended Use of the Copyrighted Work:

The nature of the work is a website containing information that law schools report to the ABA. There is no required paywall access nor is a viewer required to be a member of the ABA or of a contributing law school. [+ ] Work to be used has been previously PUBLISHED

[+ ] Work to be used contains limited new knowledge, content, or creative expression (in relation to previously copyrighted works)

[+ ] Work to be used is primarily of a factual nature (non-fiction, collection of facts, etc.)

[+ ] Original work was not created and/or has not been marketed for the stated purpose of the proposed use

Fair  |  Unfair

Describe the **Amount** of Your Intended Use in Relation to the Copyrighted Work as a Whole:

There will no direct copying of the information, although the entire directory of information is part of the content analysis. All the content analysis will do is translate the specific information into general descriptions. Any need to see specific information will include a link back to the website itself rather than include the information in the research project documents. For example, the law school may indicate that recognition for the most service hours is granted via "The John Doe Recognition Award". And the research project will indicate that the code "recognition" = dedicated award. Where is there no different means of expression, those expressions will be used. For example, the law school provides oversight via faculty committee. The research project may indicate the code "oversight" = faculty committee.

Fair  |  Unfair
Describe the **Effect** of Your Intended Use on the Potential Market or Value of the Copyrighted Work:

As this use is related to purely academic pursuit, there is no hindrance regarding market value. Also the ABA does not charge or limit access to paid members, they post the information for the benefit of the public. The use now and in future is not-for-profit and related only to academic pursuits.

[+] The work is NOT currently under commercial exploitation (out of print, no licensing available, etc.)
[+] Proper attribution will be given with the intended use
[+] The copy of the work to be used is a legal copy
[+] Use of the work has the potential to create or improve the market for the work
[+] A market for the work as it will be used is absent or is negligible & use of the work will have little or no negative impact on its value or potential value

---

The Average **"Fairness Level,"** Based on Your Rating of Each of the 4 Factors, Is:

[see tool disclaimer for important clarifying information]

---

Based on the information and justification I have provided above, I, S.K. (Kaseleigh) Van Pooen, am asserting this use is FAIR under Section 107 of the U.S. Copyright Code.

Signature: ____________________________

Date of Signature: ____________________________

---

*Disclaimer: This document is intended to help you collect, organize & archive the information you might need to support your fair use evaluation. It is not a source of legal advice or assistance. The results are only as good as the input you have provided by are intended to suggest next steps, and not to provide a final judgment. It is recommended that you share this evaluation with a copyright specialist before proceeding with your intended use.*
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Definitions of Terms Used

Updated: 9/25/2007

Law Schools Pro Bono Categories
Category or Type of Program
Description of Program
Location of Program
Funding
Student Run Pro Bono Groups and Specialized Law Education Projects
Faculty and Administrative Pro Bono
Awards and Recognition
Community Service

Law Schools Public Interest Categories
Certificate and Curriculum Programs
Public Interest Centers
Public Interest Clinics
Externship and Internships
Classes with a Public Service Component
Public Interest Journals
Public Interest Current Awareness
Loan Repayment Assistance Programs (LRAP)
Post-Graduate Fellowships
Term Time Fellowships/Scholarships
Summer Fellowships
Extracurricular and Co-Curricular Programs
Student Public Interest Groups

Pro Bono Definitions
Go to Public Interest Definition Section

There are three models for structuring a law school pro bono program, with two models having sub-terms. The models are:
Graduation Requirement Programs: The Graduation Requirement Program model requires students to engage in public service as a condition of graduation. There are three types of these mandatory programs.

https://apps.americanbar.org/legalservices/probono/lawschools/definitions.html
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Pro Bono Graduation Requirement Program: These programs require students to perform a set number of hours of law-related public service. The number of hours required by these programs ranges from 20 to 70. The students' service is pro bono as they receive neither academic credit nor pay for their service. A few of these programs allow non-legal service to count toward part of the requirement.

Public Service Graduation Requirement Program: The way in which this type of graduation requirement can be met varies from school to school. Most programs require students to perform law-related public service but are flexible in the form of the service, allowing service in pro bono placements, externships, clinics, and/or internships to count towards the requirement. Some of these programs allow the requirement to be met only through participation in a pro-bono clinic. A few of the programs do not require actual service but allow the requirement to be met by exposure to poverty law through a class or independent study.

Community Service Graduation Requirement Program: This type of program is identical to the Pro Bono Graduation Requirement Program except that it allows both law and non-law related service to satisfy completely the graduation requirement. The student receives neither pay nor academic credit for their service.

Formal Volunteer Pro Bono Program: There are two types of these programs.

Formal Volunteer Pro Bono Program Characterized by a Referral System with a Coordinator: The referral system is designed to match students with law-related pro bono opportunities in the community. These programs have a designee pro bono coordinator/Advisor, or group of coordinators/advisors, who has the responsibility for developing, promoting and/or coordinating pro bono placements. In some schools, these coordinators/advisors also provide administrative support to student group projects. Students participate voluntarily.

Formal Volunteer Pro Bono Program Characterized by Administrative Support for Student Group Projects: These schools have pro bono service primarily through the provision of administrative support for student groups engaged in law-related pro bono work. The student groups often work in partnership with outside organizations. The type of support provided by the school ranges from full-time staffing of a center where the pro bono projects may locate to administrative assistance in tracking hours volunteered. Students participate voluntarily.

Independent Student Pro Bono Groups Projects with no school-wide pro bono program: The third model for structuring a pro bono program is to rely on students to form and run group projects. There is no formal program for school-wide pro bono coordination and support, but individual pro bono projects—usually student organized and run—do exist. The student groups target a particular legal need or a particular segment of the population. Many groups work with a faculty supervisor and/or in collaboration with an outside organization. Some of the groups are long-standing and raise their own funding.

Description of Program

View this data for all responding schools

Pro bono programs in the law school setting are designed to inspire and enable students to engage in pro bono service, uncompensated by credit or pay, while in law school. The primary purpose of these programs is to teach all students why pro bono service is an important professional value and to introduce them to the ways in which they can contribute in their practice as attorneys.

The ABA signaled the importance of institutionalizing pro bono within the law school setting by amending its law school accreditation standards to require all ABA-approved law schools to offer “substantial opportunities for student participation in pro bono activities”. In August 2007, the ABA provided further clarification of this Standard when it adopted Interpretation 302-10 which provides the following:

Each law school is encouraged to be creative in developing substantial opportunities for student participation in pro bono activities. Pro bono opportunities should at a minimum involve the rendering of meaningful law-related service to persons of limited means or to organizations that serve such persons; however, volunteer programs that involve meaningful services to those who are not necessarily poor should be recognized and may be included within the law school's overall program. Law-related pro bono opportunities need not be structured to accomplish any of the professional ethics training required by Standards 302(b) and 302(c). Where most existing law school pro bono programs include only activities for which students do not receive academic credit, Standard 302(b)(2) does not preclude the inclusion of credit-granting activities within a law school's overall program of pro bono opportunities so long as law-related non-credit bearing initiatives are also part of that program.

Location of Program

View this data for all responding schools

For schools with formal pro bono programs, the location of the program may be one of the most defining characteristics of the program. The location may be determined by the vision for the pro bono program, by the location of the pro bono coordinator, or by other practicalities such as space and resources.

There are six locations within a law school where one might “find” a pro bono program. Four of these locations are outside the administrative offices of the law school and, collectively, represent the majority of pro bono programs. These may exist:

As a “Stand-Alone” Program (not in any office/center). These programs are not part of any other office and maintain a separate identity. Some are mandatory programs; some are not. Some have full-time staffing; others have minimal staffing.

Within a Public Interest Office/Center. The director of the center may or may not also serve as the pro bono coordinator.

With the Clinical or Externship Program. This arrangement most often exists because of the unique interest of the faculty in these programs. This arrangement is less popular, in part, because of the already high time demands on clinical faculty.

With Faculty. Faculty members play a significant role in the operation of these programs. Each program is very different.

Law school pro bono programs located outside of the school's administrative offices often have a curricular feel about them. Sometimes this is true because a faculty person is in charge of the program; other times this is true because the program is part of a larger effort to provide an array of public interest programming or to incorporate public service pervasively throughout the curriculum. Often these pro bono programs have an identity separate from any other program in the school, even if within a larger public interest or service center.

The administrative offices where one might find a pro bono program are the Office of Career Services (“OCS”) and the Office of Students Affairs/Services. OCS is the single most popular location for a pro bono program.

Within the Office of Career Services. Some schools have chosen this location in order to emphasize the importance of pro bono work as a professional value to be carried into one's career. For others, it is a matter of practicality. Some of these schools have separate pro bono/public interest counselor in the Office of Career Services. In a few cases, this function is delegated to students, who may or may not be paid.

Within the Office of Student Affairs/Services. Regardless of the location of a law school pro bono program, the structure, staffing and operation of these programs differ greatly. No location by itself defines how a program looks or operates. Many vary programs, for example, exist in each of the six identified locations. No location guarantees success; successful pro bono projects exist in each of the locations.

Staffing, Management and Oversight of Program

View this data for all responding schools

There are, at least, five distinctive aspects of the staffing of law school pro bono projects:

the number of persons running the program, whether the coordinator(s) is paid or volunteers his or her time,

https://apps.americanbar.org/legalservices/probonolawschools/definitions.html
whether that person is a student or a non-student, if paid, how much of that person's time is designated for running the program, and if the person is a paid non-student, what status that person has within the law school structure.

Most pro bono programs are run by administrators, many of whom wear other hats. A few of the pro bono coordinators' directors have the status of faculty, mostly non-tenure track.

Some schools involve students in the running of the pro bono program. These students may be paid to work as a pro bono coordinator, under the supervision of an administrator or faculty member, or to assist the pro bono coordinator. Some programs involve students as members of a board or committee that coordinates and develops pro bono placements or as members of an advisory board or committee.

**Funding**

View this data for all responding schools

Almost all pro bono programs are funded through the law school's operating budget. In these cases, some programs have their own budgets; others have budgets as part of the office in which they are located; and others have no specific budget. A few pro bono programs rely on outside funding for some or all of their operating expenses.

Most schools provide funding to faculty members, usually through faculty accounts and administrative assistance, to support pro bono service.

**Student Run Pro Bono Groups and Specialized Law Education Projects**

View this data for all responding schools

Student pro bono group projects pre-date the formal, administratively supported, pro bono programs now existing in many law schools. Most schools still have these group projects, whether or not a formal school-wide program exists. These group projects range in formality, in subject matter and in scope. Some are student initiated and operated. Others have emerged out of collaboration with faculty and the community organizations. The most common subject areas for student group projects are:

- Bankruptcy
- Children's Rights
- Civil Rights/Human Rights
- Community Economic Development
- Criminal Law/Death Penalty/Innocence Projects
- Domestic Violence
- Elder Law
- Environmental Law
- Homelessness/Housing
- Immigration/Asylum
- Income Tax Assistance
- Labor Law
- Law Reform/Public Policy
- Law Related Education/Street Law
- Mediation
- Prisoner's Issues

As described in the section above on program structures, some schools have built their pro bono programs around student group projects. Many of the other formal programs also work closely with student groups. Some simply consult with and involve the student groups in the formal program; others help create new projects.

A few of the student group projects are part of a national network. These are the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) program, sponsored by the IRS (1-800-829-1040); "Street Law," a law-related education project that grew into an international non-profit known as Street Law, Inc (www.streetlaw.org); and Innocence Projects, with their national support center at The Innocence Project at the Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University (http://www.innocenceproject.org/; 212-790-0375).

**Faculty and Administrative Pro Bono**

View this data for all responding schools

Believing that "active faculty participation in pro bono work is highly important for the sake of their students," the AALS Commission recommended that "all law schools adopt a formal policy to encourage and support faculty members to perform pro bono work." Specifically, the Commission recommended that law schools adopt a policy with six components: an annual expectation, universality, beyond teaching and institutional service, institutional support similar to research support, autonomy, and annual reporting. Only a few schools have adopted such policies.

While the Commission's recommendation focuses on faculty, this category also includes policies that address both faculty and administrative staff.

Also captured in this category are the ways in which faculty are involved with pro bono student group projects and/or in stimulating new opportunities by involving students in faculty-related pro bono projects such as research assistance, independent study, and course offerings supporting pro bono work.

**Awards and Recognition**

View this data for all responding schools

Institutions award and recognize that which they consider important -- in order to give due praise but also to show others what can be accomplished and, in some cases, what is expected. Accordingly, recognition of pro bono service performed by students and faculty makes a public statement about a law school's commitment to teaching the value of public service.

Many law schools give one or more awards -- sometimes a financial reward -- for student pro bono service. These awards may be given at the time of graduation or annually at an awards ceremony or dinner. Some schools have special awards for outstanding faculty pro bono service.

At schools with voluntary pro bono programs, the coordinators may obtain student commitment through pro bono challenges, pledges, and honor programs. At a minimum, these methods help set expectations for the students, expectations that are often exceeded. In some cases, the recognition programs themselves help to define the pro bono program.

**Community Service**

View this data for all responding schools

At every law school there are students and faculty engaged in non-legal volunteer work in the community. Many law schools have found ways to institutionalize this work, such that the students find it easy to volunteer and the community needs are addressed in a systematic manner. Students have created and maintained some of these programs, law school administrators and/or faculty members have implemented others.

**Public Interest Definitions**

Return to top and pro bono definitions

https://apps.americanbar.org/legalservices/probonolawschools/definitions.html
Definitions of Terms Used

View this data for all responding schools

Public Interest Centers are formal centers that either oversee a law school's public interest programs or focus on a particular public interest issue, such as poverty law or environmental law. These centers vary greatly in staffing and stature. They may be funded fully by the school or dependent upon outside funding.

Public Interest Clinics

View this data for all responding schools

Clinical programs enable students to gain practical experience with clients and cases under the supervision of law school professors. Most clinical programs consist of both practice and classroom components. Some clinics offer community legal services for the poor, while others may be structured around a specific substantive area, such as health law or non-profit law. For their participation, students receive academic credit and are not compensated for their work.

Extermships and Internships

View this data for all responding schools

Extermships are non-compensated positions in settings outside a law school, for which students receive academic credit. Linking theory and practice, externships provide experience in and direct exposure to a legal work setting. Generally students enrolled in an externship program work for a semester or full school year in a non-profit organization, government agency or judicial office under the supervision of a licensed attorney. Many programs supplement a student's field placement with a required classroom component.

Classes with a Public Service Component

View this data for all responding schools

Some faculty incorporate a service component into their doctrinal courses. The service component may be voluntary or mandatory, credit-bearing or pro bono. For example, an estates and trust professor may offer a service component in which enrolled students draft wills for low income seniors.

Public Interest Journals

View this data for all responding schools

Law school publications covering substantive issues relating to public interest or public policy matters enable participating law students to gain experience in legal research and scholarship while exploring ideas and issues from a public interest law perspective. Typical topics include civil rights, environmental law, family law and poverty law.

Public Interest Career Assistance

View this data for all responding schools

Career Services (or Professional Development) Offices collect and disseminate information regarding employment opportunities and assist with the development of strategies to secure employment. A student's and/or graduate's career needs and goals. All law schools offer some level of career services or development to students and graduates, which typically include resource materials, general placement counseling and on-campus interviewing opportunities. Others offer more, including participation or sponsorship of specialized job fairs, mentor programs, individualized public interest career counseling and public interest panels or networking events.

Some career services offices have a specialized public interest counselor or a public interest program. At other schools, general career services staff assist public interest-minded students.

Among the many helpful outside resources for students searching for public interest employment are: Public Interest Job Search Guide, published and updated annually by the Harvard Law School Office of Public Interest Advising and the Public Service Law Network Worldwide ("PSLawNet"). The Public Interest Job Search Guide discusses myths about public interest careers, types of public interest work, sample resumes and cover letters, and other resources. Many law school career services offices have a copy of this publication for students' use. For more information, visit http://www.law.harvard.edu/students/opia/

The Public Service Law Network Worldwide (www.pslawnet.org), or PSLawNet, is a global network of more than 120 law schools and over 11,000 public service organizations working to foster a community service ethic for law students and lawyers and to encourage all lawyers to incorporate public service into their careers. PSLawNet offers comprehensive current information on a broad range of pro bono and public service opportunities for law students, as well as public interest job openings for lawyers. The PS LawNet database, available through

Loan Repayment Assistance Programs (LRAP)

View this data for all responding schools

Loan repayment assistance programs ("LRAP") provide financial aid to law school graduates working in the public interest sector, government, or other lower-paying legal fields. In most cases, this aid is given to graduates in the form of a forgivable loan to help them repay their annual educational debt. Upon completion of the required service obligation, the LRAP administrator will forgive or cancel these loans to program participants. Most LRAPs contain limits on the amount of income a recipient can earn while participating in such a program. There are various types of LRAPs, administered by law schools, state bar foundations and federal and state government organizations.

For more information about LRAPs, visit www.ableagalsservices.org/lrap or www.equaljusticework.org.

Post-Graduate Fellowships and Awards

View this data for all responding schools

Post-graduate fellowships provide financial assistance to law students who accept a public interest position upon graduation. Post-graduate fellowships generally pay a salary or stipend to a graduate in a lower-paying public interest job. Some law schools offer public interest fellowships to their graduates. For information about outside fellowships, such as those sponsored by Equal Justice Works (www.equaljusticework.org) and the law firm of Skadden Arps (www.skaddenarps.com), please visit http://www.pslawnet.org/fellowship/index.php.

Term Time Fellowships/Scholarships

View this data for all responding schools

Term-time fellowships and stipends are awarded during the school year and are designed to encourage pursuit of public interest law by students who have demonstrated a commitment to public interest. Students may receive a full or partial tuition scholarship and enjoy special programming and counseling as well as academic opportunities not available to the student body. While academic grade point average, LSAT scores and financial need may be considered for eligibility, schools also place a heavy emphasis on a demonstrated commitment to and experience in public service. Stipends and fellowships range from nominal sums to full tuition waivers.

Summer Fellowships

View this data for all responding schools

One of the more common financial resources available to law students, summer fellowships and stipends provide financial assistance to students who would otherwise not be able to accept low paying or non-paying public interest summer employment. At many law schools, law students spearhead efforts to raise funds, with law schools matching or contributing to the amount raised. Other summer fellowship funding is provided by grants from foundations and gifts from alumni.

Extracurricular and Co-Curricular Programs

View this data for all responding schools

Most schools, either through a school's Public Interest Center, Career Services Office or Student Services Office offer school-sponsored extracurricular public interest programs. These activities, which are generally open to all students, may include lecture series, brown-bag lunches and book clubs focused on a public interest topic, such as domestic violence or human rights.

Student Public Interest Groups

View this data for all responding schools

https://apps.americanbar.org/legalservices/probono/lawschools/definitions.html
Definitions of Terms Used

Student organizations relating to public interest enhance the academic experience by allowing law students to contribute directly to the public interest in a wide-range of areas, receive the benefit of extra-curricular exchange and gain leadership experience. Many student organizations are involved in service projects, such as raising funds for summer public interest fellowships or sponsoring a food drive for the poor.

Most law schools belong to Equal Justice Works (www.equaljusticeworks.org) and have an Equal Justice Works chapter, which may be a school’s most prominent public interest organization. Equal Justice Works (formerly the National Association for Public Interest Law) was founded in 1986 by law students dedicated to surmounting barriers to equal justice that affect millions of low-income people. Today, Equal Justice Works organizes, trains and supports public service-minded law students in creating summer and postgraduate public interest jobs. Through annual donations from law firms, corporations and foundations, Equal Justice Works funds a post-graduate fellowship program. Equal Justice Works chapters typically raise funds for summer public interest fellowships, organizes law-related or community service projects and sponsor public interest career panels or brown-bag lunches.

Other public interest student organizations may be organized according to subjects relating to public interest concerns, such as the death penalty, human rights, environmental law and immigration law. Some student groups are dedicated to the needs and interests of traditionally under-represented populations, such as the Black Law Students Association and Hispanic Law Student Association.
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APPENDIX E: ABA ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF LAW SCHOOLS (AS OF NOVEMBER 1, 2016)

In Alphabetical Order

Alphabetical School List
+ Provisionally approved
**Probation

A
AKRON (1961)
ALABAMA (1926)
ALBANY (1930)
AMERICAN (1940)
APPALACHIAN (2001)
ARIZONA (1930)
ARIZONA STATE (1969)
ARIZONA SUMMIT (formerly Phoenix - 2007)
ARKANSAS - Fayetteville (1926)
ARKANSAS - Little Rock (1969)
ATLANTA'S JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL (2005)
AVE MARIA SCHOOL OF LAW (2002)

B
BALTimore (1972)
BARRY UNIVERSITY (2002)
BAYLOR (1951)
BELMONT UNIVERSITY (2013)
BOSTON COLLEGE (1932)
BOSTON UNIVERSITY (1925)
BRIGHAM YOUNG (1974)
BROOKLYN (1937)

C

N
NEBRASKA (1923)
NEVADA (2000)
NEW ENGLAND LAW | BOSTON (1969)
NEW MEXICO (1948)
NEW HAMPSHIRE (1974) (formerly Franklin Pierce)
NEW YORK LAW SCHOOL (1954)
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY (1930)
NORTH CAROLINA (1923)
NORTH CAROLINA CENTRAL (1950)
NORTH DAKOTA (1923)
NORTHEASTERN (1969)
NORTHERN ILLINOIS (1978)
NORTHERN KENTUCKY (1954)
NORTHWESTERN (1923)
NOTRE DAME (1925)
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN (1975)

The online Official Guide to ABA-Approved Law Schools allows you to download Standard 509 Information and Employment Summary data charts for each ABA-approved law school. The Guide also contains links to other legal education statistics and resources.

ABA-Approved Law Schools
Accreditation
Bar Admissions
Distance Education
Foreign Study
Post J.D. / Non J.D.
Pre Law
Pro Bono
Questionnaire
Standards
Statistics
Legal Education Links
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CALIFORNIA - Berkeley (1923)
CALIFORNIA - Davis (1968)
CALIFORNIA - Hastings (1939)
CALIFORNIA - Irvine (2011)
CALIFORNIA - Los Angeles (1950)
CALIFORNIA WESTERN (1962)
CAMPBELL (1979)
CAPITAL (1950)
CASE WESTERN RESERVE (1923)
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA (1925)
CHAPMAN (1998)
CHARLESTON (2006)
CHARLOTTE (2008)**
CHICAGO (1923)
CHICAGO-KENT (1936)
CINCINNATI (1923)
CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK (1985)
CLEVELAND STATE (1957)
COLORADO (1923)
COLUMBIA (1923)
CONCORDIA (2015)+
CONNECTICUT (1933)
CORNELL (1923)
CREIGHTON (1924)
DAYTON (1975)
DENVER (1923)
DePAUL (1925)
DETROIT MERCY (1933)
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (1991)

OHIO NORTHERN (1948)
OHIO STATE (1923)
OKLAHOMA (1923)
OKLAHOMA CITY (1960)
OREGON (1923)

PACE (1978)
PENNSYLVANIA (1923)
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-Dickinson Law (1931)
PENNSYLVANIA STATE-Penn State Law (1931)
PEPPERDINE (1972)
PITTSBURGH (1923)
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC OF PUERTOrico (1967)
PUERTO RICO (1945)

QUINNIPIAQ (1992)

REGENT (1989)
RICHMOND (1928)
ROGER WILLIAMS (1995)
RUTGERS (1941)

ST. JOHN'S (1937)
SAINT LOUIS (1924)
ST. MARY'S (1948)
PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

DRAKE (1923)
DREXEL (2008)
DUKE (1931)
DUQUESNE (1960)

E
ELON (2008)
EMORY (1923)

F
FAULKNER (2006)
FLORIDA (1925)
FLORIDA COASTAL (1999)
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL (2004)
FLORIDA STATE (1968)
FORDHAM (1936)

G
GEORGE MASON (1980)
GEORGETOWN (1924)
GEORGE WASHINGTON (1923)
GEORGIA (1930)
GEORGIA STATE (1984)
GOLDEN GATE (1956)
GONZAGA (1951)

H
HARVARD (1923)
HAWAII (1974)
HOFSTRA (1971)
HOUSTON (1950)
HOUSTON COLLEGE OF LAW 1959
(formerly South Texas College of Law)
HOWARD (1931)

I
ST. THOMAS (Florida) (1988)
SAMFORD (1949)
SAN DIEGO (1961)
SAN FRANCISCO (1935)
SANTA CLARA (1937)
SEATTLE (1994)
SETON HALL (1951)
SOUTH CAROLINA (1925)
SOUTH DAKOTA (1923)
SOUTH TEXAS
HOUSTON (1959)
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY (1953)
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (1924)
SOUTHERN ILLINOIS (1974)
SOUTHERN METHODIST (1927)
SOUTHWESTERN (1970)
STANFORD (1923)
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK-Buffalo (1936)
STETSON (1930)
SUFFOLK (1953)
SYRACUSE (1923)

T
TEMPLE (1933)
TENNESSEE (1925)
TEXAS (1923)
TEXAS A&M
IDAHO (1925)
ILLINOIS (1923)
INDIANA TECH (2016)+
INDIANA UNIVERSITY - Bloomington (1937)
INDIANA UNIVERSITY - Indianapolis (1944)
INTER-AMERICAN (1969)
IOWA (1923)
J
THE JOHN MARSHALL LAW SCHOOL (1951)
JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S SCHOOL (1958)
K
KANSAS (1923)
KENTUCKY (1925)
L
LA VERNE (2006-2011; 2012)
LIBERTY (2006)
LINCOLN MEMORIAL (2014)+
LEWIS AND CLARK (1970)
LOUISIANA STATE (1926)
LOUISVILLE (1931)
LOYOLA - Chicago (1925)
LOYOLA - Los Angeles (1935)
LOYOLA - New Orleans (1931)
M
MAINE (1962)
MARQUETTE (1925)
MARYLAND (1930)
MASSACHUSETTS (2012)
(1994)
formerly texas Wesleyan)
TEXAS SOUTHERN (1949)
TEXAS TECH (1969)
THOMAS JEFFERSON (1996)
TOLEDO (1939)
TOURO (1983)
TULANE (1925)
TULSA (1950)
U
UTAH (1927)
V
VALPARAISO (1929)
VANDERBILT (1925)
VERMONT (1975)
VILLANOVA (1954)
VIRGINIA (1923)
W
WAKE FOREST (1936)
WASHBURN (1923)
WASHINGTON AND LEE (1923)
WASHINGTON (1924)
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (1923)
WAYNE STATE (1937)
WMU THOMAS M. COOLEY (1975)
WESTERN NEW ENGLAND (1974)
WEST VIRGINIA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO &amp; PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCGEORGE (1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMPHIS (1965)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERCER (1925)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI (1941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN STATE (1941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI (1930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI - Kansas City (1936)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITCHELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly William Mitchell-1938; Hamline-1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITTIER (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDENER- Delaware (1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIDENFNR- Commonwealth (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLAMETTE (1938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM AND MARY (1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YALE (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YESHIVA (1978)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F: PBF & PIF WITH CORRESPONDING FILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro Bono Factors (ABA Titles)</th>
<th>ABA Document Content Analysis File Name &amp; <strong>### pages (pdf)</strong></th>
<th>Codebook (pdf)</th>
<th>Factor Spreadsheets (csv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awards &amp; Recognitions (Awards &amp; Recognitions)</td>
<td>01_PB_Category_Type_Program_v_4_0 **34 pages</td>
<td>T01_PB_Awards_ Recognition_v_4_0</td>
<td>T01_PB_Awards_ Recognition_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service (Community Service &amp; Institutionalized Projects)</td>
<td>02_PB_Comm_Service_ Inst_Projects_v_4_0 **34 pages</td>
<td>T02_PB_CommServ_ InstProj_v_4_0</td>
<td>T02_PB_CommServ_ InstProj_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Description (Program Description)</td>
<td>03_PB_Description_Program_v_4_0 **55 pages</td>
<td>T03_PB_Description_Program_v_4_0</td>
<td>T03_PB_Description_Program_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Pro Bono (Faculty &amp; Administrative)</td>
<td>04_PB_Faculty &amp; Administrative_v_4_0 **24 pages</td>
<td>T04_PB_Faculty_ Administrative_v_4_0</td>
<td>T04_PB_Faculty_ Administrative_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding (Funding)</td>
<td>05_PB_Funding_v_4_0 **21 pages</td>
<td>T05_PB_Funding_v_4_0</td>
<td>T05_PB_Funding_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location (Location of Program)</td>
<td>06_PB_Location_Program_v_4_0 **20 pages</td>
<td>T06_PB_Location_Program_v_4_0</td>
<td>T06_PB_Location_Program_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing (Staffing Oversight)</td>
<td>07_PB_Staffing_ Oversight_v_4_0</td>
<td>T07_PB_Staffing_ Oversight_v_4_0</td>
<td>T07_PB_Staffing_ Oversight_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pro Bono Factors (ABA Titles)</th>
<th>ABA Document Content Analysis File Name</th>
<th>Codebook (pdf)</th>
<th>Factor Spreadsheets (csv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pro Bono Factors (ABA Titles)</strong></td>
<td><strong>ABA Document Content Analysis File Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Codebook (pdf)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Factor Spreadsheets (csv)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25 pages</strong></td>
<td><strong>ABA Document Content Analysis File Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Codebook (pdf)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Factor Spreadsheets (csv)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Run (Student &amp; Specialized Projects)</td>
<td>08_PB_Student_Run_Specialized_Law_Ed_v_4_0</td>
<td>T08_PB_Student_Run_Specialized_Law_Ed_v_4_0</td>
<td>T08_PB_Student_Run_Specialized_Law_Ed_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category (Category or Type of Program)</td>
<td>00_PB_Category_Type_Program</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC INTEREST FACTORS (ABA TITLES)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career (Public Interest Career Assistance)</td>
<td>09_PI_Career_Assistance_v_4_0</td>
<td>T09_PI_Career_Assistance_v_4_0</td>
<td>T09_PI_Career_Assistance_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers (Public Interest Centers)</td>
<td>10_PI_Centers_v_4_0</td>
<td>T10_PI_Center_v_4_0</td>
<td>T10_PI_Center_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates (Certificate &amp; Curriculum Programs)</td>
<td>11_PI_Cert_Curr_Programs_v_4_0</td>
<td>T11_PI_Cert_Curr_Programs_v_4_0</td>
<td>T11_PI_Cert_Curr_Programs_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes (Classes with a Public Service Component)</td>
<td>12_PI_Classes_Public_Service_v_4_0</td>
<td>T12_PI_Classes_Public_Service_v_4_0</td>
<td>T12_PI_Classes_Public_Service_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinics (Public Interest Clinics)</td>
<td>13_PI_Clinics_v_4_0</td>
<td>T13_PI_Clinics_v_4_0</td>
<td>T13_PI_Clinics_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Bono Factors (ABA Titles)</td>
<td>ABA Document Content Analysis File Name</td>
<td>Codebook (pdf)</td>
<td>Factor Spreadsheets (csv)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Externships (Public Interest Externships &amp; Internships)</td>
<td>14_PI_Extern_Intern_Ships_v_4_0</td>
<td>T14_PI_Extern_Intern_Ships_v_4_0</td>
<td>T14_PI_Extern_Intern_Ships_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**51 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurriculars (Extracurricular &amp; Co-curricular Programs)</td>
<td>15_PI_Extra_Co_Curricular_Programs_v_4_0</td>
<td>T15_PI_Extra_Co_Curricular_Programs_v_4_0</td>
<td>T15_PI_Extra_Co_Curricular_Programs_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**39 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals (Public Interest Journal &amp; Websites)</td>
<td>16_PI_Journals_Websites_v_4_0</td>
<td>T16_PI_Journals_Websites_v_4_0</td>
<td>T16_PI_Journals_Websites_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**28 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRAP (Loan Repayments Assistance Programs (LRAP))</td>
<td>17_PI_LRAP_v_4_0</td>
<td>T17_PI_LRAP_v_4_0</td>
<td>T17_PI_LRAP_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**27 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate Fellowships (Post-Graduate Fellowships &amp; Awards)</td>
<td>18_PI_Post-Grad_Fellowships_Awards_v_4_0</td>
<td>T18_PI_Post-Grad_Fellowships_Awards_v_4_0</td>
<td>T18_PI_Post-Grad_Fellowship_Award_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**42 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Groups (Student Public Interest Groups)</td>
<td>19_PI_Student_Groups_v_4_0</td>
<td>T19_PI_Student_Groups_v_4_0</td>
<td>T19_PI_Student_Groups_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**53 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships (Summer Fellowships / Termtime Fellowships &amp; Awards)</td>
<td>20_PI_Sum+Term_Fellowship_v_4_0</td>
<td>T20_PI_Sum+Term_Fellowship_v_4_0</td>
<td>T20_PI_Summer_Term_Time_Fellow_v_4_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**102 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX G: SPREADSHEET & DATA SET CHECKLIST

### 99# Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>99# Issues</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>996 = links or contact info only</td>
<td>2018-03-02</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
<td>2018-03-04</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
<td>2018-03-06</td>
<td>2018-03-07</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997 = not on point, make notes that not on point, this 99# only</td>
<td>2018-03-02</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
<td>2018-03-04</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
<td>2018-03-06</td>
<td>2018-03-07</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 99# Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>99# Issues</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>996 = links or contact info only</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-11</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>997 = not on point, make notes that not on point, this 99# only</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-11</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bad Information Verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>99# Issues</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All “1” values are old info</td>
<td>2018-03-02</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
<td>2018-03-04</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
<td>2018-03-06</td>
<td>2018-03-07</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Bad Information Verification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>99# Issues</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All “1” values are old info</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-11</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All zero values are matter of having no programming to report</td>
<td>2018-03-02</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
<td>2018-03-04</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
<td>2018-03-06</td>
<td>2018-03-07</td>
<td>2018-03-08</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All zero values are matter of having no programming to report</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-11</td>
<td>2018-03-12</td>
<td>2018-03-13</td>
<td>2018-03-14</td>
<td>2018-03-09</td>
<td>2018-03-10</td>
<td>2018-03-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Codebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebooks</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Codebooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codebooks</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Factor Specific Check

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To2 – Check for General Statements, one liners that states with another entity vs general within a department</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To2 – Check for required community service</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To2 – Review for issues of unspecific programs from other departments</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To2 – Text indicates “encouragement” but ~ indication of program → code = 0</td>
<td>2018-03-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To4 – No policy indicated. Need consistency in coding (1,3) vs. (1,0) or (0,0).</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11 – Consistency Check, offer courses but not certificates s/b 997 not zero</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T14 – Externship vs placement, is this an issue?</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T18 – Skadden / Soros / Outside Fellowships: EXCLUDED because open to any school → code a 0 ~997</td>
<td>2018-03-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUSTIFICATION: design choice to exclude, ~ school misinformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Factor Specific Challenges & Issues: Notes for Final Paper**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge/Issue</th>
<th>Master / T01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABA in alpha order, which means all the schools starting with “University of” are not in order with schools such as University of Florida is not in order with Florida International or Florida A &amp; M</td>
<td>Master / T01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also, schools still out of order Valparaiso for example</td>
<td>Master / T01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclude public participation</td>
<td>T07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded work study, not fellowship.</td>
<td>T20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information consistency, issue in difference between pro bono service and community service</td>
<td>T20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No date indicated for when data added or edited</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No info due to 996-999 → Table of Counts</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No provenance</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an issue of quantity of information; there can be paragraphs of information but not on point</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old info → Table of Old Info Counts</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick two tables: show varying scores based on information weights</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement of fellowship: Information placed in multiple categories or incorrect categories. Let the school’s characterization stand even if clearly in wrong category.</td>
<td>T20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible contact for information not as apparent</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools: Did not include Charlotte, Whittier, and Indiana Tech due to closures in 2016-17 academic year</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools: Mitchell Hamline merged; however, listed separately in master and reports. Unable to determine which programming was altered or eliminated.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools: Rutgers listed as one school on master, but in reports listed as two different law schools. Had to adjust to every table.</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should schools be required to report PB programming and community service</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro bono vs. community services. Assumed fundraisers = discrete events; drives of any sort (food, books, supplies) = discrete; programs = continuous if held semester after semester / year after year</td>
<td>T02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming**

| VITA, for example, listed in multiple places, inconsistent within school and across schools: pro bono service, community service, required for class, student group | All |
| Who entered data, how was data entered | All |
## APPENDIX H: AUDIT TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit</th>
<th>01-</th>
<th>02-</th>
<th>03-</th>
<th>04-</th>
<th>05-</th>
<th>06-</th>
<th>07-</th>
<th>08-</th>
<th>09-</th>
<th>10-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audit 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 11</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 12</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 14</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 15</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 16</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 17</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 18</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 19</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 20</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>11-</td>
<td>12-</td>
<td>13-</td>
<td>14-</td>
<td>15-</td>
<td>16-</td>
<td>17-</td>
<td>18-</td>
<td>19-</td>
<td>20-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 14</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 15</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 16</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 17</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 18</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 19</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>01-</td>
<td>02-</td>
<td>03-</td>
<td>04-</td>
<td>05-</td>
<td>06-</td>
<td>07-</td>
<td>08-</td>
<td>09-</td>
<td>10-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit</td>
<td>11-</td>
<td>12-</td>
<td>13-</td>
<td>14-</td>
<td>15-</td>
<td>16-</td>
<td>17-</td>
<td>18-</td>
<td>19-</td>
<td>20-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 21</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 22</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 23</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 24</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 25</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 26</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 27</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 28</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 29</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 30</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 31</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 32</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 33</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 34</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 35</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 36</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 37</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 38</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 39</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit 40</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Generated by Random Sequence Generator at Random.Org
## APPENDIX I: AUDIT TRACKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 01</th>
<th>Audit 02</th>
<th>Audit 03</th>
<th>Audit 04</th>
<th>Audit 05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 00 Description</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 02 Community Service</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2018-02-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2018-02-25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 05 Funding</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 06 Organizational Location</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2018-02-28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2018-02-28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI 10 PI Centers</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2018-02-28</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI 18 Post-Grad Fellowships</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI 19 Student PI Groups</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PI 20 Term-Time Fellow/Scholarships</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PILS—An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 06</th>
<th>Audit 07</th>
<th>Audit 08</th>
<th>Audit 09</th>
<th>Audit 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 02 Community Service</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 03 Program Characteristics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 09 PI Career Assistance</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 10 PI Centers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 11 Certificate and Curriculum Prgms</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 12 Classes w/ Service Component</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 13 PI Clinics</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 14 Extern / Intern Ships</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 15 Extra &amp; Co-Curricular</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 16 PI Journals</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 17 LRAP</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 18 Post-Grad Fellowships</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 19 Student PI Groups</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 20 Term-Time Fellow/Scholarships</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 11</th>
<th>Audit 12</th>
<th>Audit 13</th>
<th>Audit 14</th>
<th>Audit 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 02 Community Service</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 03 Program Characteristics</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2018-02-25</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2018-02-25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 19 Student PI Groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 20 Term-Time Fellow/Scholarships</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS -- An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 16</th>
<th>Audit 17</th>
<th>Audit 18</th>
<th>Audit 19</th>
<th>Audit 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td>98 2018-02-23</td>
<td>104 2018-02-17</td>
<td>105 2018-02-17</td>
<td>106 2018-02-17</td>
<td>113 2018-02-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>80 2018-02-23</td>
<td>90 2018-02-23</td>
<td>91 2018-02-23</td>
<td>92 2018-02-23</td>
<td>97 2018-02-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 02 Community Service</td>
<td>67 2018-02-25</td>
<td>73 2018-02-25</td>
<td>76 2018-02-25</td>
<td>80 2018-02-17</td>
<td>90 2018-02-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 03 Program Characteristics</td>
<td>65 2018-02-17</td>
<td>75 2018-02-25</td>
<td>76 2018-02-17</td>
<td>79 2018-02-25</td>
<td>91 2018-02-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>92 2018-02-17</td>
<td>97 2018-02-17</td>
<td>100 2018-02-26</td>
<td>105 2018-02-17</td>
<td>107 2018-02-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>67 2018-02-26</td>
<td>68 2018-02-26</td>
<td>74 2018-02-26</td>
<td>75 2018-02-17</td>
<td>85 2018-02-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>74 2018-02-28</td>
<td>77 2018-02-17</td>
<td>81 2018-02-26</td>
<td>85 2018-02-26</td>
<td>87 2018-02-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</td>
<td>87 2018-02-28</td>
<td>90 2018-02-28</td>
<td>92 2018-02-17</td>
<td>94 2018-02-28</td>
<td>101 2018-02-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</td>
<td>86 2018-02-28</td>
<td>92 2018-02-28</td>
<td>98 2018-02-28</td>
<td>103 2018-02-28</td>
<td>110 2018-02-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 15 Extra &amp; Co-Curricular</td>
<td>64 2018-02-18</td>
<td>65 2018-03-01</td>
<td>76 2018-03-01</td>
<td>77 2018-02-18</td>
<td>78 2018-02-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 16 PI Journals</td>
<td>66 2018-03-01</td>
<td>71 2018-02-18</td>
<td>72 2018-03-01</td>
<td>76 2018-02-18</td>
<td>79 2018-02-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 17 LRAP</td>
<td>66 2018-03-01</td>
<td>68 2018-03-01</td>
<td>69 2018-02-18</td>
<td>72 2018-02-18</td>
<td>75 2018-02-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 18 Post-Grad Fellowships</td>
<td>91 2018-03-01</td>
<td>92 2018-03-01</td>
<td>98 2018-03-01</td>
<td>110 2018-03-01</td>
<td>114 2018-03-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PILS—An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 21</th>
<th>Audit 22</th>
<th>Audit 23</th>
<th>Audit 24</th>
<th>Audit 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 02 Community Service</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>102 2018-02-23</td>
<td>91 2018-02-25</td>
<td>92 2018-02-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 03 Program Characteristics</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>134 2018-02-19</td>
<td>110 2018-02-19</td>
<td>139 2018-02-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>96 2018-02-26</td>
<td>103 2018-02-26</td>
<td>108 2018-02-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 09 PI Career Assistance</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 10 PI Centers</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 11 Certificate and Curriculum Programs</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 12 Classes w/ Service Component</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 13 PI Clinics</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 14 Internships</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 15 Extra &amp; Co-Curricular</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 16 PI Journals</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 17 LRAP</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 18 Post-Grad Fellowships</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 19 Student PI Groups</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 20 Term-Time Fellow/Scholarships</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 26</th>
<th>Audit 27</th>
<th>Audit 28</th>
<th>Audit 29</th>
<th>Audit 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2017-02-17</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 02 Community Service</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2017-02-17</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2018-02-25</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>2018-02-25</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2017-02-17</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2018-02-28</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2017-02-17</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 16 PI Journals</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 17 LRAP</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 19 Student PI Groups</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PILS--An Indicator of Pro Bono & Public Interest Law Programming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 31</th>
<th>Audit 32</th>
<th>Audit 33</th>
<th>Audit 34</th>
<th>Audit 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>151 2018-02-23</td>
<td>156 2017-02-17</td>
<td>165 2018-02-23</td>
<td>172 2017-02-17</td>
<td>179 2018-02-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>160 2017-02-17</td>
<td>161 2018-02-25</td>
<td>163 2018-02-25</td>
<td>167 2018-02-25</td>
<td>171 2018-02-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>163 2018-02-26</td>
<td>170 2018-02-26</td>
<td>171 2018-02-26</td>
<td>172 2017-02-17</td>
<td>183 2018-02-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>170 2018-02-26</td>
<td>172 2017-02-17</td>
<td>176 2018-02-26</td>
<td>175 2018-02-26</td>
<td>179 2018-02-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</td>
<td>141 2018-02-26</td>
<td>145 2017-02-17</td>
<td>148 2018-02-26</td>
<td>151 2018-02-26</td>
<td>164 2018-02-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 08 Student-Run PB Groups / Projects</td>
<td>148 2017-02-17</td>
<td>150 2018-02-28</td>
<td>158 2018-02-28</td>
<td>168 2018-02-28</td>
<td>170 2018-02-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 17 LRAP</td>
<td>143 2018-03-01</td>
<td>144 2018-02-18</td>
<td>145 2018-03-01</td>
<td>151 2018-03-01</td>
<td>170 2018-03-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 18 Post-Grad Fellowships</td>
<td>159 2018-03-01</td>
<td>164 2018-02-18</td>
<td>166 2018-03-01</td>
<td>172 2018-02-18</td>
<td>183 2018-03-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 19 Student PI Groups</td>
<td>169 2018-03-01</td>
<td>176 2018-03-01</td>
<td>179 2018-03-01</td>
<td>180 2018-03-01</td>
<td>188 2018-03-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 20 Term-Time Fellow/Scholarships</td>
<td>154 2018-03-01</td>
<td>156 2018-02-18</td>
<td>162 2018-03-01</td>
<td>164 2018-03-01</td>
<td>168 2018-03-01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PILS--AN INDICATOR OF PRO BONO & PUBLIC INTEREST LAW PROGRAMMING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info Category</th>
<th>Audit 36</th>
<th>Audit 37</th>
<th>Audit 38</th>
<th>Audit 39</th>
<th>Audit 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PB 00 Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 01 Awards &amp; Recognition</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 02 Community Service</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2018-02-23</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 04 Faculty / Admin PB</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 05 Funding</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 06 Organizational Location</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2018-02-17</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PB 07 Staffing / Mgmt / Oversight</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2018-02-26</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 18 Post-Grad Fellowships</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2018-02-18</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 19 Student PI Groups</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI 20 Term-Time Fellow/Scholarships</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>2018-03-01</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>