

AGENDA ITEM

133 MARCH

DATE: March 2, 2012

TO: Members, Member Oversight Committee
Members, Board of Trustees

FROM: Robert A. Hawley, Deputy Executive Director
William Chiang, Senior Director Communications

SUBJECT: State Bar Membership Survey

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the Board's September, 2011 meeting, it authorized the State Bar's Office of Communications and Information Services to initiate and conduct a survey of the State Bar's membership on subjects consistent with membership surveys that have been previously conducted by the State Bar. A survey was commissioned, the results of which have now been received. Hertz Research conducted the survey. Mr. Hertz will be present at the Board's March meeting to present and interpret the survey results. The survey itself will also be presented at the meeting.

BACKGROUND

At the Board's September, 2011 meeting, it authorized the State Bar's Office of Communications and Information Services to initiate and conduct a survey of the State Bar's membership on subjects consistent with membership surveys that have been previously conducted by the State Bar. A survey was commissioned, the results of which have now been received. Hertz Research conducted the survey. Mr. Hertz will be present at the Board's March meeting to present and interpret the survey results. The survey itself will also be presented at the meeting.

ISSUE

This is an information report item. No action is required.

CONCLUSION

This is an information report item. No action is required.

DISCUSSION

Surveys of the State Bar's membership have periodically been conducted since 1990 for the purpose of informing the State Bar of the demographic makeup of the membership and also on the membership's perspectives on issues of significance to the State Bar. Stanford Research International (SRI) and Rand Corporation conducted surveys in 1990 and 2001. In 2007, Richard Hertz Consulting conducted a survey. These surveys sought information updating demographic data on the State Bar's membership and how members practice law. This data is relevant to assist with projecting trends in the legal profession and tracking other issues of relevance to the profession, the State Bar and the Administration of Justice.

These surveys have traditionally been administered as in this instance, by the State Bar's Office of Media and Information Services and its successor the Office of Communications and Information Services.

The survey recently commissioned is now complete. The survey report is attached as Attachment 1. The survey will be presented to the Member Oversight Committee and to the Board at their March meetings. Richard Hertz, the principal of Hertz Research, who conducted the survey, will be present to interpret and report on the survey.

FISCAL / PERSONNEL IMPACT:

There is no personnel impact, the fiscal impact is within existing budget and policy standards. The survey was conducted and completed for a cost well below the authorized \$75,000 contract limit.

RULE AMENDMENTS:

None

BOARD BOOK IMPACT:

None.

RECOMMENDATION

No action is required on this item. The survey is being reported to the Board of Trustees by Hertz Research.

Report of Survey Results
Survey of Members of The State Bar of California
January 5, 2011

Conducted by
Hertz Research
Bodega Bay, California

Table of Contents
Survey of Members of The State Bar of California
December 2011

Survey Background Facts	Page 3
Major Conclusions, Areas of Potential Follow-up Research and Action ...	Page 4
Summary of Key Findings	Page 6
Summary Results	Page 12
Verbatim Responses and Comments	Page 21

Background Facts

Survey of Members of The State Bar of California

December 2011

Our firm was retained by The State Bar of California in November 2011 to conduct a survey of its membership. The primary goal of the research was to determine the current demographic makeup of the State Bar and to assess any significant changes that may have occurred since past surveys were conducted.

The survey also measured member sentiment about a number of other topics including MCLE, State Bar benefit programs, the State Bar website and the California Bar Journal.

The survey was conducted by Hertz Research of Bodega Bay, which also conducted similar demographic surveys of the State Bar membership in 2001 and 2006. Hertz Research designed the survey questionnaire in consultation with State Bar staff.

A random sampling of 10,000 active and inactive members was selected to participate in the survey. On November 30, 2011, selected members were sent an email invitation from the President of the State Bar asking them to participate in the survey, which was conducted entirely online. A reminder email invitation was also sent several days later.

As of the December 9, 2011 deadline, 1,820 surveys were completed and were tabulated for this report. In addition, a link to the survey was posted on the State Bar website. The results of the survey in this report reflect only the random sample.

Regardless of methodology, all polls are potentially affected by a number of factors that may influence their accuracy. A common source for survey inaccuracy is sampling error. The number of respondents largely determines sampling error. Statistical theory indicates that in the case of a survey with this sample size (1,820 total interviews), the margin of sampling error would be approximately plus or minus three percent, with a confidence level of 95 percent.

The margin of sampling error for subgroups of respondents is higher than it is for the overall results. While the survey results should be generally reflective of the demographic makeup of the State Bar membership, analysis of small subgroups should be viewed with that in mind.

Other sources of error can also impact the accuracy of poll results. These include but are not limited to, the percentage of the sampling universe who choose to take part in the survey, the likelihood that respondents are available or connected to the Internet, the wording and ordering of questions, and the techniques used to determine possible survey participants. The cumulative impact of these potential sources of error is impossible to assess precisely.

Major Conclusions, Areas of Potential Follow-up Research and Action Survey of Members of The State Bar of California December 2011

At first examination, the results look similar in many ways to past surveys of State Bar members conducted over the past 15 years.

However, upon closer inspection of both the tabulated results as well as the more than 100 pages of verbatim comments, there are indicators of a membership very much in transition.

A good case could also be made that the results warrant reexamining the benefits the State Bar currently offers to its members and examining other ways to make itself more relevant to the challenges facing California attorneys today.

The major conclusions of the results of this survey can be broken down into three categories:

1. The membership of the State Bar is continuing to age significantly. Almost half of its members are now 55 years of age or older.
2. Apart from predictable differences attributable to age and length of practice, there are substantial disparities in income and upward mobility to partnership, related to gender and ethnicity.
3. Although overall average income levels derived from their legal practice have remained relatively stable since our last major demographic survey in 2006, it is clear, particularly from the verbatim comments, that many members are under the same financial pressures from the economic downturn that impact other people.

The challenge is how to translate the perception many members have of the State Bar as an organization that is indifferent to their needs and merely takes their money, into something more positive.

The list below articulates specific actions as well as potential lines of additional research that could help address these problems and challenges. Some may be difficult or even impossible to accomplish because of economic or other factors. However, they are offered with the intent of trying to identify actionable steps the State Bar can take that would truly meet the needs of its members, especially in these difficult economic times.

- Identifying potential steps that could assist new and other State Bar members who are having a difficult time finding work as an attorney. Among those who are actively seeking work as an attorney, 60% have been doing so for one year or longer.
- Identifying potential services or assistance the State Bar could provide to newer practicing attorneys and solo practitioners. In past surveys, many members expressed interest in obtaining assistance with back office, Internet and marketing services for

attorneys opening their own law practice.

- Determining why only about one in four members use the discount and insurance programs available to members. This might include reexamining some of the existing benefits the State Bar currently offers to make them more attractive to members. For example, it may be possible get a credit card with a better interest rate, as well as other financial benefits from a credit union rather than through a major bank.
- Both in this survey and others conducted for the State Bar, members most often mention they would like the bar to offer access to group health care coverage. In California, the rise in health care costs for individuals has far exceeded that for group coverage. This greatly impacts the many members who practice as solo practitioners. If a way could be found to offer group coverage through the State Bar, this could be a very valuable and popular benefit.
- Conducting further analysis and research of the income disparities and partnership opportunities available to female and ethnic minority attorneys.
- Conducting a more detailed usage study of the State Bar website in order to determine how to increase its usefulness to members.
- Determining why about one-quarter of State Bar members say they either do not receive or are not sure they receive an email of the online California Bar Journal.
- Conducting a more detailed readership study of the Bar Journal, particularly as it relates to its conversion from print to online publication.

Summary of Key Findings
Survey of Members of the State Bar of California
December 2011

Demographic Characteristics and Changes

- The demographic makeup of The State Bar of California continues to diversify but somewhat slowly and unevenly (See Table A for details).
- Females now comprise nearly 40% (39.4%) of the State Bar's membership, up from 34% in 2006, 32% in 2001 and 26% in 1991.
- Female attorneys (56%) are less likely than males (79%) to work in private practice, less likely to be partners (16%) than males (36%), and less likely (7%) than males (23%) to make more than \$200,000 per year in their legal practice.
- In the 2011 survey, the number of male attorneys dropped to 79.3%, from 84.4% in 2006 and 91% in 1991. Female attorneys (26%) are more likely than males (17%) to be non-white.
- The largest rate of growth among non-white attorneys has been among those of Asian and Pacific Islander descent. In the 2011 survey, lawyers in these groups comprised 7.7% of State Bar members compared with 5.3% in 2006, 6% in 2001 and 3% in 1991.
- The percentage of State Bar members of African-American and Latino or Hispanic descent has remained virtually flat since 1991. African-Americans comprised 2.7% of the State Bar membership in the current survey compared with 1.7% in 2006, 2.4% in 2001 and 2% in 1991.
- In the 2011 survey, attorneys of Latino or Hispanic descent comprised 4.2% of the State Bar's membership compared with 3.8% in 2006, 3.7% in 2001 and 3% in 1991.
- Non-white attorneys (15%) are much less likely than whites (33%) to be partners, work in private practice (non-whites 57%, whites 70%), or make more than \$200,000 per year (non-whites 9%, whites 19%).
- The membership of the State Bar continues to age significantly. In the current survey, nearly half (48%) of California attorneys were 55 years of age or older compared with 35% in 2006, 24% in 2001 and 14% in 1991.
- 56% of male attorneys are 55 and above compared with 37% of female lawyers. White attorneys (54%) are more likely than non-whites (28%) to be 55 or older.
- The percentage of LGBT attorneys was 4.6% in the 2011 survey compared with 5.2% in 2006, 2.4% in 2001 and 3% in 1991.

Table A
Demographic Makeup of The State Bar of California 1991 - 2011

	<u>1991</u>	<u>2001</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Age Group				
Under 35 Years	24%	24%	15%	15%
35 - 39 Years	20%	12%	10%	7%
40 - 44 Years	21%	13%	11%	10%
45 - 54 Years	21%	28%	29%	20%
55 + Years	14%	24%	35%	48%
Gender				
Male	74%	68%	66%	60.6%
Female	26%	32%	34%	39.4%
Ethnic/Racial Background				
White	91%	83%	84.4%	79.3%
African-American	2%	2.4%	1.7%	2.7%
Latino/Hispanic	3%	3.7%	3.8%	4.2%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	6%	5.3%	7.7%
Other/Mixed	1%	4.9%	4.8%	6.1%
Sexual Orientation/Gender Identity¹				
Heterosexual	97%	97.6%	94.8%	95.4%
LGBT	3%	2.4%	5.2%	4.6%

¹ Gender Identity was not asked in 2011 Survey

Legal Practice

- In the current survey, 67% of members said they were in private practice, compared with 65% in 2006.
- The percentage of attorneys working as solo practitioners dropped from 40% in 2006 to 33% in 2011.
- During the same period, there has been an increase in those working at firms or organizations with more than 75 attorneys going from 13% in 2006, to 22% in 2011.

Table B
Number of Attorneys Practicing in Firm/Organization 2001 – 2011

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Solo	35%	40%	33%
2 - 5	18%	22%	20%
6 - 20	18%	16%	15%
21 - 75	11%	9%	11%
Over 75	17%	13%	22%

- Between 2006 (27%) and 2011 (31%), there was a slight increase in those working 50 or more hours per week in their legal practice. This number remains significantly below that reported in 2001 (58%). Solo practitioners are much more likely than other attorneys to work fewer hours in their legal practice.

Table C
Average Weekly Number of Hours Worked in Law Practice 2001 – 2011

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Less than 35 hours	12%	26%	21%
35 - 40 hours	18%	16%	19%
41 - 49 hours	12%	31%	29%
50 - 59 hours	36%	20%	22%
60 or more hours	22%	7%	9%

- Average annual income levels from legal practices were relatively flat in the current survey compared with 2006. The largest shift was a slight increase in those making between \$150,000 and \$200,000.

Table D
Average Annual Income From Legal Practice 2001 – 2011

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Under \$50,000	16%	25%	26%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	34%	24%	22%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	27%	25%	20%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	11%	11%	15%
\$200,000 - \$300,000	8%	8%	9%
Over \$300,000	4%	7%	8%

- 58% of attorneys said they performed some pro bono work for people of limited means. This was a slight drop from a 2007 State Bar survey on pro bono work where 60% said they performed these services. Those in private practice and public defenders are the attorneys most likely to perform some pro bono work.

State Bar Website

- Usage of the State Bar website has dropped slightly since the 2006 survey.

Table E
How Often Do You Use The State Bar Website?

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Every day/Almost every day	2%	2%
Once or Twice a Week	15%	11%
Once or Twice a Month	33%	32%
Rarely	47%	52%
Never Visited	3%	3%

- Ratings of the usefulness of the State Bar website dropped somewhat since 2006.

Table F
How Would You Rate the Usefulness of The State Bar Website?

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Very Useful	14%	10%
Useful	63%	55%
Not Very Useful	8%	11%
Not at All Useful	1%	2%
Not Certain	14%	22%

- Attorney search (76%), MCLE information (40%) and paying dues online (36%) were the three features rated most useful on the State Bar website.

MCLE, Substance Abuse Requirements, Ethics Hotline and Other Member Benefits

- 68% said they felt that MCLE courses were useful or informative, 17% said they were not and 16% were not certain.
- 60% also said they had taken an MCLE course for credit on the Internet.
- 48% said they paid for their MCLE courses, 39% said their firm or organization paid and 13% said these costs were divided. Those in private practice are much more likely to pay these costs themselves.
- 21% said they found the State Bar's requirement that every attorney take one hour of substance abuse training helpful or informative, 52% said it is not and 27% were not certain.
- 52% said they were not certain whether substance abuse is a significant problem in the legal profession, 21% felt it is and 27% said it is not.
- 35% said they had used the State Bar's Ethics Hotline. Among this group, 72% felt the hotline was useful in resolving their question.
- Only about one in four (24%) said they had used State Bar member discount or insurance programs. Health insurance was mentioned most often as the additional benefit or program members would like the State Bar to offer.

The California Bar Journal

- 74% said they receive a monthly email of the online edition of the California Bar Journal, 14% said they did not and 12% were not certain. Solo practitioners were the most likely group to say they received it.
- Among those who received or were not certain they received this email, 70% said they read some part of the Bar Journal.

Table G
Which Parts or Features of the California Bar Journal Are Read Most Often?

47%	Legal profession news
34%	Disciplinary summaries
29%	State Bar news
25%	Ethics news
21%	Commentary
15%	MCLE tests for credit
8%	Job announcements

Other Findings

- 60% said that their firm or organization carried malpractice insurance. Those in private practice were more likely to be certain they had such coverage. Solo proprietors are less likely to have malpractice insurance.
- Membership in specialty bar associations was higher in 2011 compared with 2006. Local bar association membership declined during the same period.

Table H
Do You Belong to a Local or Another Type of Bar Association?

	<u>2006</u>	<u>2011</u>
Local Bar Association	49%	43%
Minority Bar Association	2%	6%
Specialty Bar Association	6%	14%
Women's Bar Association	2%	4%
Other Bar Association	10%	17%
Don't Belong to Any Other	32%	41%

Summary Results
Survey of Members of The State Bar of California
December 2011

1. Since you were admitted to the State Bar of California, how many years have you been practicing law?

1. Less than 1 year	6%
2. 1 – 5 years	14%
3. 6 – 9 years	9%
4. 10 – 19 years	21%
5. 20 or more years	50%

2. Do you currently work as an attorney?

1. Yes [<i>Skip to Q. 6</i>]	77%
2. No	23%

3. Which of the following best describes your current employment situation?

1. You have a law-related job	22%
2. You have a job in which you use your legal education	28%
3. You are employed in a job in which you do not use your legal education	13%
4. You are currently unemployed	26%
5. Other	11%

4. Are you actively seeking work as an attorney?

1. Yes	11%
2. No [<i>After this, skip to Q. 16</i>]	89%

5. How long have you been seeking work as an attorney?
[*After this, skip to Q. 16*]

1. Under 3 months	10%
2. Between 3 and 6 months	15%
3. Between 6 months and one year	15%
4. Between 1 and 2 years	31%
5. More than 2 years	29%

6. What kind of legal practice do you have?

1. Private practice	67%
2. In-house counsel	10%
3. Public Defender	2%
4. District Attorney	2%
5. Government Agency/Judiciary	11%
6. Other	7%
7. Retired	1%

7. Are you an associate, partner or solo practitioner? *[Ask only of those in private practice]*

1. Associate	23%
2. Partner	30%
3. Solo proprietor	47%

8. What is your primary area or field of legal practice?

1. Business/Contracts	13%
2. Insurance	2%
3. Domestic/Family	6%
4. Civil rights/Discrimination	1%
5. Real Estate	5%
6. Criminal Defense	6%
7. Labor and Employment	7%
8. Intellectual Property/Copyright/Patent	4%
9. Civil Litigation	19%
10. Estate/Trust Planning	6%
11. Personal Injury	4%
12. Other	27%

9. Roughly how many attorneys practice in your firm or organization?

1. Solo	33%
2. 2 - 5	20%
3. 6 - 20	15%
4. 21 - 75	11%
5. More than 75	22%

10. Do you ever work as a mediator or arbitrator?

1. Yes	20%
2. No	80%

11. Do you do any pro bono work for people of limited means?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 58% |
| 2. No <i>[Skip to Q. 13]</i> | 42% |

12. Including all types of volunteer legal services you provide, approximately how many hours of pro bono work do you usually perform annually?

- | | |
|----------------------|-----|
| 1. 1 - 25 hours | 39% |
| 2. 26 - 50 hours | 24% |
| 3. 51 - 99 hours | 11% |
| 4. 100 - 149 hours | 8% |
| 5. 150 - 199 hours | 3% |
| 6. 200 - 249 hours | 2% |
| 7. 250 hours or more | 6% |
| 8. Not sure | 7% |

13. On average, how many hours per week do you work in your law practice?

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| 1. Less than 25 hours | 14% |
| 2. 25 - 34 hours | 7% |
| 3. 35 - 40 hours | 19% |
| 4. 41 - 49 hours | 29% |
| 5. 50 - 59 hours | 22% |
| 6. 60 or more hours | 9% |

14. Do you use social media such as Facebook or Twitter in your legal practice?

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 14% |
| 2. No <i>[Skip to Q.16]</i> | 86% |

15. Which social media do you use in your legal practice? *[Check all that you use]*

- | | |
|-------------|-----|
| 1. Facebook | 9% |
| 2. Twitter | 4% |
| 3. LinkedIn | 8% |
| 4. Google+ | 3% |
| 5. MySpace | <1% |
| 6. Digg | <1% |

16. How often do you visit the State Bar website?

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Every day/Almost every day | 2% |
| 2. Once or twice a week | 11% |
| 3. Once or twice a month | 32% |
| 4. Rarely | 52% |
| 5. Never visited <i>[Skip to Q. 21]</i> | 3% |

17. Overall, how would you rate the usefulness of the State Bar website?

- | | |
|----------------------|-----|
| 1. Very useful | 10% |
| 2. Useful | 55% |
| 3. Not very useful | 11% |
| 4. Not at all useful | 2% |
| 5. Not certain | 22% |

18. What features of the State Bar website do you find most useful? *[Check all that you use]*

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Attorney search | 76% |
| 2. MCLE information | 40% |
| 3. Paying dues online | 36% |
| 4. Ethics/Rules of Conduct | 23% |
| 5. Legal news | 19% |
| 6. Attorney disciplinary summaries | 16% |
| 7. Online CLE | 15% |
| 8. Articles | 13% |
| 9. Member Benefits/Products/Services | 11% |
| 10. Bar exam results | 10% |
| 11. Sections | 9% |
| 12. Announcements/Events | 9% |
| 13. Other | 4% |

19. Are there any features of the State Bar website you feel could be improved or you would like to see added in the future?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 16% |
| 2. No <i>[Skip to Q. 21]</i> | 84% |

20. What features of the State Bar website do you feel could be improved or added in the future?

See Verbatim Responses

21. Have you ever taken a course for MCLE credit on the Internet?

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes <i>[Skip to Q. 23]</i> | 60% |
| 2. No | 40% |

22. Do you think you will take a course for MCLE credit on the Internet in the next two years?

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 32% |
| 2. No | 31% |
| 3. Not certain | 37% |

23. Do you personally pay the costs of your MCLE courses, or does the firm or organization where you work pay these costs?

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. You pay | 48% |
| 2. Your firm or organization pays | 39% |
| 3. Some you pay/Sometimes your firm pays | 13% |

24. Do you feel MCLE courses are helpful or informative?

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 68% |
| 2. No | 17% |
| 3. Not certain | 16% |

25. Would you please tell us why you feel that way?

See Verbatim Responses

26. Do you feel substance abuse is a significant problem in the legal profession?

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Yes – It is a significant problem | 21% |
| 2. No – It is not a significant problem | 27% |
| 3. Not certain | 52% |

27. Has the State Bar's requirement that every attorney take one hour of substance abuse training been helpful or informative?

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 21% |
| 2. No | 52% |
| 3. Not certain | 27% |

28. Have you ever called the State Bar's Ethics Hotline?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 35% |
| 2. No [<i>Skip to Q. 30</i>] | 65% |

29. Was the State Bar's Ethics Hotline helpful in resolving your question?

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 72% |
| 2. No | 22% |
| 3. Not certain | 6% |

30. Have you ever used any State Bar member discount or insurance programs?

- | | |
|--------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 24% |
| 2. No | 76% |

31. Are there any other member benefit programs you would like the State Bar to offer?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 20% |
| 2. No <i>[Skip to Q. 33]</i> | 80% |

32. What other member programs or services would you like the State Bar to offer?

See Verbatim Responses

33. Do you feel the annual \$410 California attorney licensing fee is too low, too high or about right?

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| 1. Too low | 2% |
| 2. Too high | 60% |
| 3. About right | 38% |

34. Do you receive a monthly email of the online California Bar Journal?

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 74% |
| 2. No <i>[Skip to Q. 38]</i> | 14% |
| 3. Not Certain | 12% |

35. Do you read any part of the Bar Journal?

[Among those who answered Yes or Not Certain to previous question]

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 70% |
| 2. No <i>[Skip to Q. 38]</i> | 30% |

36. Which parts or features of the California Bar Journal do you usually use?

[Check all that you read or use]

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Legal profession news | 47% |
| Discipline summaries | 34% |
| State Bar news | 29% |
| Ethics news | 25% |
| Commentary | 21% |
| MCLE tests for credit | 15% |
| Job announcements | 8% |
| Other | 5% |

37. If there are any additional features you would like to see in the California Bar Journal, please list them below.

See Verbatim Responses

38. Are you currently an active or inactive member of the bar?

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Active | 84% |
| 2. Inactive <i>[Skip to Q. 40]</i> | 16% |

39. Do you, your firm or organization carry malpractice insurance?

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| 1. Yes | 60% |
| 2. No | 30% |
| 3. Not certain | 10% |

40. Do you belong to a local or another type of Bar Association?
[Check all that you belong to]

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----|
| 1. Local Bar Association | 43% |
| 2. Minority Bar Association | 6% |
| 3. Specialty Bar Association | 14% |
| 4. Women's Bar Association | 4% |
| 5. Other Bar Association | 17% |
| 6. Don't belong to other Bar Assoc. | 41% |

41. Where is your office located?

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Los Angeles area | 22% |
| 2. Orange/San Diego | 16% |
| 3. Riverside/San Bernardino | 2% |
| 4. Ventura/Santa Barbara | 2% |
| 5. Central Coast | 2% |
| 6. San Francisco Bay Area | 23% |
| 7. Other Northern California | 4% |
| 8. North Central Valley (Sac. Area North) | 5% |
| 9. South Central Valley | 3% |
| 10. Other California | 1% |
| 11. Out of State | 12% |
| 12. Don't have office | 8% |

42. What is your age group?

1. 35 years or less	15%
2. 36 - 39 years	7%
3. 40 - 44 years	10%
4. 45 - 54 years	20%
5. 55 years or more	48%

43. What is your gender?

1. Male	60.6%
2. Female	39.4%

44. What is your ethnic or racial background?

1. White	79.3%
2. African-American	2.7%
3. Latino/Hispanic	4.2%
4. Asian/Pacific Islander	7.7%
5. Native American	.6%
6. Other	2.6%
7. Mixed Race/Ethnicity	2.9%

45. What is your domestic status?

1. Single	16.5%
2. Separated/Divorced	9%
3. Married	69.2%
4. Living with Someone/Domestic partners	5.3%

46. What is your sexual orientation?

1. Heterosexual	95.4%
2. Gay	2.4%
3. Lesbian	1.2%
4. Bisexual	1.0%

47. What is the approximate annual income you receive from your legal practice?

1. Under \$50,000	26%
2. \$50,000 - \$99,999	22%
3. \$100,000 - \$149,999	20%
4. \$150,000 - \$199,999	15%
5. \$200,000 - \$300,000	9%
6. More than \$300,000	8%

48. How were you contacted about this survey?

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Received an email from the State Bar | 99.5% |
| 2. Saw the survey on the State Bar website/Other | .5% |

49. Are there any comments you would like to add about any of the topics we discussed in this survey?

See Verbatim Responses

50. To stay in touch with the needs of our members, the State Bar plans on conducting more surveys like this in the future. Would you be interested in participating in future research studies?

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Yes — Would like to participate | 52% |
| 2. No — Would not like to participate <i>[Skip to end of survey]</i> | 48% |

Verbatim Responses and Comments
The State Bar of California Demographic Survey December, 2011
(Responses were edited for spelling and readability but not content)

20. What features of the State Bar website do you feel could be improved or added in the future?

1. Forms 2. Ethics issues

1. Online submission of discipline complaints about lawyers 2. Online ordering and delivery of certificates of standing 3. Online triggering of callbacks from Ethics Hotline 4. Online, searchable opinions of State Bar Court Review Department. 5. Easier-to-understand discipline and active/inactive histories in member profiles

1. More free online CLE; 2. free legal research tools online, such as CEB action guides, California Codes, California Rules of Court, reported decisions, etc.; and 3. networking opportunities and/or forums for members only to build referral bases and exchange information.

A facility whereby members living overseas could use their overseas credit card to pay dues. Paying dues from overseas where I reside without this facility is a major pain! Have you ever considered PayPal?

A page or site dedicated to each state bar committee

A reorganized website which was more interactive would be appreciated.

A solid jobs board would be great. Also, I'd like to see the areas listing volunteer opportunities easier to navigate. I've looked for pro bono project listings and committee positions, and I could not find what I was looking for.

Ability to research specific CEB books by the hour using credit card

Access to MCLE courses that are not listed on the MCLE approved list and easier ability to transfer information on classes for approval by California Bar.

Accessibility and/or visibility of the section regarding practical training of law students

Add brief banks to sections

Add more options to the attorney search tool advanced search, like law school fields, company, and other aspects of the profile.

Additional MCLE classes and esp. for ethics.

Advisory opinions issued, particularly as to ethics. For example, San Francisco City Attorney Dennis Herrera's election conduct should be investigated and clarified in his failed mayoral bid

in 2011. How can his conduct be reconciled with State Bar rules and the duty of loyalty to a client when his personal interests conflict with same and he publicly denounces his clients – members of the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor of San Francisco? How is his use of "inside information," which he "spins" and distorts for personal advantage in a political campaign against his clients, reconciled with his legal duty as an attorney to them?

All the other sections I did not check in the prior question regarding what I used the website for.

Allow blogs

Allow users to find Certified Specialists

Almost all of it. It is hardly worth reading

An explanation of how the discipline process works and how to work with discipline counsel or the State Bar to exonerate yourself when you are wrongfully accused. Illustrative charts and statistics could be used, along with explanatory articles by counsel who handle defense of State Bar claims.

Articles that discuss important legal issues that may not be "politically correct" or fit into a general P.C. agenda but are nevertheless very relevant to the legal community.

Attorney and Attorney Specialist search by ZIP CODE

Attorney and section news

Attorney Search by law school, admission date, business address and other identifiers when the attorney's name is unknown/not recalled.

Attorney search could get even smarter and become a password-protected networking tool to help us find colleagues and alumni at other organizations.

Attorney search is unfriendly. If misspell at all, get nothing. Programming change needed to at least give you the alphabetical field for the last name.

Better general organization. Recent Example – could not find definition of participatory MCLE – out of state providers tout their online courses are "participatory" but what is criteria? Compared to other websites – difficult to find things. Needs better web design for ease of use.

Better job postings

Better layout of links – information regarding sections is hard to find on page and section portions are difficult to navigate.

Better navigation

Better referral service of experts

Better/easier access to legal specialization sites and articles from section periodicals. Central calendar of events, CLEs, networking, bar results, exams, linking to Google or personal calendar updates with email reminders. Blogs on legal updates at central place to access. Email can get clogged and mixed with client emails and it gets overwhelming. Access through RSS feed instead of email to look at all of it at once instead of individual emails. Central place of information to access information for if someone wants to change their practice focus – where are the basics? Central place to access information by attorneys looking for help but can't afford to hire someone and to cross reference it for those that may want to volunteer to get the experience. Statistics on the median fees charged for different types of work.

CLE products that are searchable by the number of hours offered, such as being able to look for a program that fulfills 2.5 hours of ethics, for example.

Clearer, more concise language about CLE requirements.

Compensation surveys

Complete revamp of your site

Create retrievable archived past articles section

Critics against the courts or judges, and the State Bar. The courts or judges are really bad and the State Bar takes order from the court or the judges without looking to the merits of the judges' complaints against individual attorneys. Especially, I strongly feel there are judges who thrive on biases. The State Bar does not protect the attorneys but takes unjust orders from the judges that hurts the individual attorneys. The State Bar must investigate and keep evidences against the judges that do not worth to be on the bench, not only the attorneys. The judicial council is really going to the wrong the direction, it has completely failed the justice system of California when it being controlled by the law enforcement influence. It is very hard to really rely on the court system in California for the protection of civil rights. The State Bar should step up for the protection of just judicial system. So far the State Bar failed miserably and it has become the arms of the unjust judicial system. Thank you.

CURRENT PHOTOS OF ATTORNEYS

Delete CBJ summaries of why an attorney was disciplined. These can be inaccurate. If someone wants to know why, they can obtain the actual pleadings from the bar. Also, I believe after 7 or 10 years of no discipline, an attorney should be able to have his/her prior record expunged – especially in minor matters. It is an incredible hardship and embarrassment to have this information on the internet for the rest of one's life. There should be a mechanism to expunge or at least make private (remove from the website) this information after a lengthy time of problem-free practice.

Detailed info on how to stop independent paralegals and others from practicing law.

Detailed information about any attorney complaints, whether closed or not

Digital access to the California code, federal code, etc. For free.

Discipline summaries

Do not like having Bar Journal only on line. Prefer hard copy.

Ease of finding things. Rules of professional conduct are important but often a few clicks to get to.

Ease of understanding administrative requirements and MCLE requirements.

Ease of use

Easier access to legislative changes.

Easier reading layout of the monthly news.

Easier searching of bar rules.

Easier way to find non-profit organizations that provide technical support to other attorneys.

Email ethics questions to email hotline

Employment – job openings

Employment ads

Employment opportunities

Ethics and office practice could be a lot easier to use. When I need to know how to address an issue in a retention or non-retention letter, it would be great to see an index and review samples. If I have an ethical question, why can't I input the topical issue and get a screen of results, rules, opinions, etc?

Ethics and rules of professional conduct sections

Ethics Hotline questions and answers. More information about members of the bar, such as year graduated from law school and college, past employment, etc.

Ethics information

Ethics information can be easier to access, especially bar decisions or determinations.

Expanded search parameters for attorneys

FAQs and quick response on ethics questions. Prevention is so much cheaper than enforcement!

FIND A WAY TO MAKE IT SO IT KEEPS ME FROM HAVING TO ANSWER EVERY STUPID QUESTION IN THIS STUPID SURVEY! IF I DON'T ANSWER A QUESTION, WHY DO I HAVE TO GO BACK? ARE YOU PAYING FOR MY TIME???!!!

Free access to legal research.

FREE MCLE

FREE MCLE, since my "practice" is as a contract attorney doing electronic document review I resent paying \$30+ / hour for MCLE.

Free online CLE

Free online MCLE's in the CBJ

Free research services

Geared more for the solo practitioner or small firm instead of THE CURRENT DOMINATION BY LARGE FIRMS

Go back to printing and mailing it in hard copy.

Greater access to legal forms, research

Help senior lawyers maintain their practices

Home page is better than it used to be, but could still be improved re: ease of navigability.

I do not know the site; nothing has compelled me to visit it

I do not know, but I could not leave the question unanswered and move on. So, I don't doubt that there is some room for improvement among all the site's content.

I find the MCLE reporting section to be a little unclear.

I find very little need for the State Bar overall so there is not much that could be done to improve the website.

I really don't want to have to log on with a username & password. It's just a big hassle to keep track of all these details. Better just never to touch the website. Paying dues online is a big pain – usually requires that I take time away from my practice instead of giving it to my assistant to do.

I want the monthly Bar Journal in hard copy. I don't like getting it online.

I wasn't aware of the features available through the website. I think an online presentation introducing the website would change that. Perhaps use the format used for MCLE (assuming there is one.) I want to acknowledge that I'm inactive in CA but active in AL, nevertheless I regularly use the site for attorney searches and would likely use it for more (e.g. MCLE) if I knew what was available. G.O. 120939

I would like to have a feature or cross-reference ability in the attorney search portion that would permit searching for an attorney even if one doesn't know the attorney's current last name. For example, there have been times I have searched for a woman attorney, only to learn she had married, changed her last name, and there was no way to find her by her middle (maiden) name or by her prior last name. If, when an attorney changes the attorney's last name, there were two entries, one under the prior last name with a cross-reference of "See x"" giving the current last name, that would be very helpful.

I would like to see a section that links attorneys based on interest. Almost a LinkedIn for attorneys that are interested in specific areas of law, or attorneys that are doing development work for their non-profit law firm or a charity.

I would like to see links to service providers that can help small firms; particularly with health insurance.

I would like to see more practice materials and practice guides made available to members online. And in electronic, searchable format.

I would like to see statutes and changes in the law.

I would like to see the website address issues faced by active members practicing in other states (e.g., general counsel of a business out-of-state). We pay full dues but receive very little back.

I would love to see the addition of CA statutes, cases, etc. for members

I'd like to see salient news that impacts California attorneys.

I'm not sure, but since I don't find it to be that useful, I'm sure it could be improved. If there is MCLE on the website, I wasn't aware of it. Low cost MCLE would be very useful, especially in areas of ethics & other required subspecialties. I get plenty of business & tax MCLE, but interesting ethics classes are virtually nonexistent.

If you are inactive and have to use home address, make it private

Immediately reporting attorney misconduct.

Improve navigation and links. The website can be confusing. MCLE explanations and requirements are not very clear.

Improve search functions.

Improved search functionality. It's decent, but sometimes it will not return a different spelling than what you plug in, even if they do (or could) sound similar.

Inclusion of articles written by members who aren't graduates of A.B.A.-accredited law schools.

Index and references to MCLE courses.

Inexpensive online research services similar to the one available to members of the Idaho State Bar.

Info on independent paralegals who are practicing law and how to stop them.

Information about upcoming Board of Governors' meetings.

Information for alternatives for less expensive malpractice insurance.

Information that is a benefit to lawyers such as free legal research.

Interactive ethics searches

It could be simplified and streamlined. It's too complex now.

It would be useful if I could change my status from active to inactive online as well as back to active.

It's a difficult website to navigate.

Job announcements

Job listings

Job listings for newly admitted attorneys; functions and networking.

Job Openings MCLE Calendars

Job postings/info

Job search

Job Search Database Career information

Jobs, Job training, Student loan default help, Warnings not to go to law school

Latest highlights/developments in areas of law regularly announced

Law and Regulation is business. This site neither informs nor assists that principle. It is organized for you (the brainchildren behind this survey). New ideas, that are internet, will be ignored and you will praise yourselves for the effort despite the lack of true results. Point worth noting: In two question forward, the answer is "you pay". It should be "I pay" but as an average licensee, this site and survey is not about me. You see us (average lesser attorneys and other lesser legal professionals) as intruders into "your" profession. I'm just an engineer with a bar card.

Lawyer referral, MCLE, fewer clicks to get to actual information, etc.

Layout could be improved and ease of use.

Legal Research for Attorneys of limited means.

Less "news" and more training/reference material.

Less clutter, more readily available useful information, better UX

Letters to the Editor, CBJ; they don't seem to want to put them out where we can find them.

Links to other useful legal websites, such as <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov>

Links to relevant social media; the Cal Bar circles attempt at social media, how should I put this? Sucks.

Local information by county; senior practitioners; volunteer opportunities by county and practice area.

Lower cost MCLE

Make it easier to find a specialist

Make it easier to navigate.

Make it more accessible to attorneys

Make the MCLE requirements more prominent and easier to find (fewer clicks needed to find the information).

Make the site easier to navigate

Making it easier to find how

MCLE

MCLE calculator

Member benefits and discounts; MCLE hour tracker for providers and members to enter data.

Member directory could include more information to provide a more detailed profile on each member.

Member discounts CLE compliance and directed specialized programs member search more/easier to locate standardized interactions with State Bar forms

Mentorship

More articles about legal trends, topics.

More available online MCLE credits, primarily in the ethics, substance abuse and elimination of bias credits. These can be tougher to get in our regular training.

More bio and practice info

More career development tips. Tips on careers outside the law. More job postings for attorneys.

More CLE

More CLE information, more detailed attorney profiles

More detail on attorneys

More detail regarding discipline (and which is already publicly available).

More direct access by local bar association staff

More educational, and more legal news would be helpful.

More ethics and CLE in an easy to use online form

More events and news re the sections. I pay so much money to join sections, and I really don't know why. I get a magazine from the Solo section every now and then, and it's really not useful at all. That's it. But if information and events were posted on the State Bar website and announcements went out by email, whether for section-specific events or not, I might check the website and see what's coming up.

More free online MCLE

More free resources online for solo/small offices who can't afford Westlaw/Lexis subscriptions

More help for solos

More info on CLE options

More info on deceased attys. Date admitted, date died, place of death, age at death, cause of death. More info on attys not eligible to practice law. Date of suspension or disbarment; reason for same.

More information about the attorneys

More information about the worker's compensation and landlord-tenant sections; and the forms to be used

More information about upcoming Board of Governors meetings.

More information concerning deceased attys and attys ineligible to practice.

More information for beginning attorneys – resources about areas of law or opportunities for pro bono work

More information on attorney practices (those who specialize without being certified specialists) or areas of interest/expertise

More information on criminal law, info on opportunities and happenings with government attorneys in all areas – prosecution and defense, regulatory agencies, etc.

More informative or more publicity about the information available. It's pretty much just static right now.

More learning resources

More legal news from around the country and academic articles.

More legal research materials for attorneys would be very useful

More letters to the editors from private practice attorneys.

More links to California law and treatises

More MCLE, more articles about law office management, more discussion forums (for help from other members re legal questions)

More member content available to me when I log in to my State Bar profile, like members-only sections or legal specialization information. Also, community building and/or job search that are easy to access

More member info

More new attorney resources

More news about legal economy

More on line MCLE

More section information online (i.e., new case law, and statute & rule changes affecting particular sections)

Much more info on ethic and ethical situations. That could be in an encyclopedic format or situational references, case look up by facts, FAQ's. But it takes too long to call in and get called back. We are trained to read situations and apply them. We NEED to be able to get references and consider them.

My State Bar Profile

Networking

Networking & interest groups; forums and live seminars on varying topics...

Not sure, but there's always room for improvement. =)

Often difficult to find needed info.

On line, very low cost, CLE.

Online ethics FAQ, or online submission of ethics questions.

Online MCLEs

Opportunity purchase of services and or goods based on group purchasing power associated with the organization.

Perhaps a forum for each of the sections & an ability of attorneys to have an ability to online chat with fellow attorneys from the website

Personalized information – when MY CLE is due, my fees are due, etc

Practice workshops, articles on how to improve practices.

Provide more direction regarding ethical issues (e.g., examples of what is improper solicitation).

Reference material and sources for assorted areas of practice.

Reminders of MCLE requirements and hours necessary for that reporting year, including ethics and bias requirements.

Remove attorney discipline

Require attorneys provide an email address. Provide ethics hotline FAQs. Allow attorney complaints to be filed online (and by telephone.)

Research such as Transaction Guide, Pleading and Practice Guide, employment, consulting, volunteer counsel for non-profits, and other opportunities. Ethics guidelines for situations such as the last San Francisco mayoral race where the City Attorney was running against the incumbent mayor and selectively targeted the mayor for feeding spun sound bites to the media for personal advantage and publicly chastised the mayor – HIS CLIENT – as well as sitting members of the Board of Supervisors who were also running for mayor.

Research tips, free research resources like Google Scholar, networking opportunities by section
Article of more help

Resource pages with links to governmental and other third party resources related to identified topics

Rules and Guidelines for Accredited Law Schools should be easy to find and up-to-date. Schedules and membership lists of the Committee of Bar Examiners should be easy to find, up-to-date and include identifying info. Addresses and phone numbers for State Bar and CBE staff should be easy to find. Other than Attorney Search, almost nothing works well.

Search for members by law school

Searches are not very useful when you are trying to find something.

Section committee pages

Section membership used to be accompanied by opportunities for free CLE. Now it seems there is a charge for ALL section-sponsored CLE, presumably to amortize the cost of the new online CLE system. Which is great and all, but it makes me completely unwilling to renew my section membership – no bang for the buck anymore.

Service to send relevant information to members by email.

Should provide forum for complaints about the State Bar.

Simplify it

Someone is using my name and member number fraudulently; I would like the website to alert people about this, including a warning on my profile page to report such persons.

Sooner or later, the State Bar should be much more involved in MCLE.

Special Master information

State Bar Court and its rules

Stop harping in favor of permissive, left-wing causes all the time. I've got a mind of my own, TYVM, and resent being preached to by people whom I find very hard to respect with ideas I don't respect at all. Your push for so-called "civil Gideon" is only the latest example of an ill-considered cause that should not be advocated in a publication financed by mandatory dues. Focus on discipline and leave it – and us – at that.

Stop spending money on the website and lower attorney dues.

Stress reduction tips, organization tips, job listings

The "search" results.

The addition of a standard form bank

The attorney locator

The attorney search is often awkward in the results it pulls up. Not sure how to fix it as I don't know computers at all.

The Business Law Section does a great job of providing useful content to its members. There is little value in knowing who is being disbarred or subject to disciplinary action, although I suspect that a few bar members may have an interest. A master calendar of events with links to programs, annual meetings and the like would be helpful.

The CLE part is very confusing. Information on requirements takes too much searching. The CLE store doesn't seem well-integrated.

The dashboard of "My State Bar Profile" is too cluttered and would be easier to use if it contained links without all of the explanations right there. Terminology could be refined too.

The editorial content apart from case discussions wanders all over with puff pieces about lawyers and law firms that seem mostly designed to promote social or political views favored by editors. No objection to the views but does anybody really read these pieces?

The ethics portion could be improved especially with the recent areas of law arising. Make CLE requirements and how to meet requirements more prevalent.

The feature that I find most useful is also the one I would most like to see improved, and that is the area providing information about bar exam eligibility, applying for the bar exam and becoming an attorney in California, specifically regarding foreign-trained attorneys. I am the

Director of an LLM program for foreign attorneys, and I access these pages often. I can usually find the information I need, but I still struggle to navigate through the pages.

The legal news and committee sections could be more integrated into the overall site.

The member search program could/should be improved. For example, I would like to be able to search by location and/or practice area.

The navigation is difficult and should be improved.

The organization

The overall look could be updated.

The State Bar Court portion of the website is woefully inadequate....all documents filed in cases should be able to be accessed on-line at no cost to the public. All decisions should be published....often the disciplinary action posted is old and not the most recent one.

The Utah State Bar allows people to search for attorneys based on the area of practice and location, I would like to see this feature added to California's website.

Under Attorney Discipline, state from which law school they graduated.

Useful content would be helpful.

When looking up rules of conduct, it is not easy to determine which are current rules, which are former rules and which are future rules.

Would like to be able to access more details of members' discipline history.

Years in practice as an attorney in addition to date of admission

You need a makeover by a professional

25. Would you please tell us why you feel that way about MCLE?

I learn

If chosen well, they cover areas of law relevant to practice or practicing ethically.

The law is always changing and we should keep up in order to help our clients.

"M"CLE is pointless; I take CLE for topics of interest/need. The "ethics" topics especially tend to be intellectually offensive

(1) Attorneys stay updated on the things that they need to stay updated on by simply practicing law. (2) By the time an attorney might be able to use anything that he learns in an MCLE course, he's already forgotten it. (3) The courses are invariably boring.

1 – I keep abreast of the law in the fields in which I practice; 2 – MCLE credit should be given for jury duty, I learned more about trial practice when I served for 10 days than in any 10 years of MCLE classes; 3 – Enact the rules to allow extra hours in one period to carry over to the next period.

A few of the courses I have taken had useful information, but most are just a means to charge fees for the illusion of education – no useful content is provided.

A good MCLE class makes you think and review principles.

A good variety and I can take them online

a) Most courses have 5% useful information and the rest is repetitive drivel; and b) most of the hours are crammed in at the end and people aren't listening anyway

Able to learn basics of other areas of law not typically practice

Actually MCLE courses can be helpful, but there was only a yes/no option. When helpful they provide heads up into new developments in law, or trends or insight in areas of new concern to me.

Add current knowledge; expand understanding; help with existing projects; refresh knowledge... etc

After being a public defender for years, went into private practice. Had to come up to date quickly.

After I get through the mandatory stuff, I pick courses in areas in which I have an interest and enjoy the learning.

Aids in keeping current

All education is good.

All MCLE courses are politically inspired and used to make the public and politicians think something is being done to correct the malfeasance of a few lawyers that get prominent attention. For example, does anyone really think that an ethics course will really make an unethical person ethical? Then you have the politically correct courses such as gender bias. This course assumes lawyers live with their heads in the sand and have to take a course to teach them how to treat women. The courses are a waste of time.

All mine are tailored to my work except for the ridiculous annual requirement ones on anything but ethics.

Allows me to stay current in various fields. Problem is that you also have to take courses that have no value and simply waste time and provide no upside to my desired knowledge.

Allows you to obtain a wide spectrum of information at your own pace, and without having to schedule conference attendance.

Already know much of the information.

Although an inactive member, I speak regularly on CLE topics.

Although as a SCIF employee I do not take MCLE courses, I did before this employment. I always found them interesting and informative.

Although I am inactive and do not take MCLE courses now, when I was taking them, I found they were helpful in keeping me apprised of current practices.

Although I have not worked as an attorney for several years, I still enjoy learning

Although MCLE courses are not always helpful, they can be useful in making you aware of issues to be concerned about and sometimes give guidance on current job needs (such as a recent MCLE I took on appeals in CA when I expect to be filing an appeal soon).

Always good to learn more about things that can help me be a better lawyer.

Always helpful to get educated and/or re-educated

Always learn something

Always learn something

Always learn something new

Always learn something new.

Always learn something new.

Always learn something.

Always learning...

Always look at take new subjects

Always need to keep updated on changes in litigation field

Always something new to discuss

Always something to learn

Any course keeping me current or apprised of areas of the law that I practice is helpful to me. It also depends on how the course is put together or who the teacher is. Usually they are pretty good.

Anyone who wants to practice law, keeps up with the law in the fields in which they practice. The MCLE is a boondoggle for MCLE providers. Other aspects such as elimination of bias are simply sops thrown to minorities to show that lawyers care about this. It's obvious nonsense in that lawyers are committed to much pro bono work helping prisoners, poor people, handicapped people and minorities without the necessity of this. The only things that arguably many lawyers would not be exposed to except for the MCLE requirements are ethics, but I doubt that taking an ethics course prevents an unethical lawyer from acting unethically.

Applicable to my work

As a former attorney for the U.S. Treasury Dept., I rarely found that classes were informative for my field of practice.

As a gov't attorney I do not take MCLE. I would be interested in taking some courses for informational reasons, but they are out of my price range as a civil servant and our agency cannot fund any.

As a government attorney, I'm exempt from MCLE requirements, and haven't taken an MCLE course since I left private practice 15 years ago. Back then, many of the courses were not terribly useful, though some were at least interesting.

As a governmental attorney, I am exempt from MCLE reporting requirements. I generally do not take courses for MCLE credit, so I'm not sure whether MCLE courses are useful.

As a new practitioner, I learn what the current, relevant issues are in the fields in which I'm trying to earn a living. I try to pick my MCLE courses carefully to get the most relevant info for the money.

As a professor with inactive status, my interests are highly focused and entirely scholarly.

As a retired lawyer (inactive), I don't feel they serve a very useful purpose.

As a solo practitioner, one has limited resources with which one can communicate, learn from, and discuss concepts, strategies, and theories...

As a young attorney, I find it beneficial to hear from experienced attorneys who practice in my field

As a young attorney, there are a lot of practical aspects of being a lawyer to learn. MCLEs help with that. Also, with the changing legal climate it is useful to stay current.

As an independent contractor on the fringes of practicing law not specializing in any areas of law, the areas of law in MCLE lectures generally have nothing to do with what I have been doing for the last 20 years.

Assembles useful info in one article

Assists in keeping up to date with law and legal techniques – also nice forum for meeting other attorneys

At a minimum, I like to hear another person's perspective on matters that I am otherwise familiar with. If the MCLE covers an area of the law that I am otherwise not familiar or comfortable with, then it is likely I will learn something from my participation therewith.

At a minimum, they are great refreshers on areas of law that we may not have been practicing in for a while. I always try to take MCLE courses in areas that I do NOT practice in, so that I can maintain a more general understanding of many areas of law, in order to better serve my clients.

At my level of experience and because of my specialization, I find the MCLE is a rehash of what I already know. It should not be mandatory – but, of course, this all a political area that is unlikely to change.

At times I learn something new and otherwise the courses act as a refresher.

Attorneys have spent twenty plus years educating themselves and will continue to do so (without the State requiring it) if they desire to be effective.

Because most of the CLEs are not interesting

Because any competent lawyer keeps up with the law without being forced to do so.

Because I always learn something.

Because I am a Board Certified bankruptcy attorney (ABC, not the State Bar bankruptcy certification) and I am required to stay on top of recent developments and to have expertise in my areas of bk law.

Because I am in a narrow specialty (federal communications regulatory law) I need to keep current in other areas through MCLE courses. Some of the courses are very useful, some are totally useless.

Because I am on Inactive Status and do not use that option.

Because I learn about new cases and methods which keep me at the forefront.

Because I take classes that are directly relevant to municipal law, my area of practice. I take the vast majority of classes from the League of CA Cities.

Because I usually learn something at them

Because I was able to learn about specific areas of the law that I did not take courses for in law school.

Because it is closest to the right answer. For the most part, they are not of much value. Sometimes you hit something interesting or important.

Because it requires an attorney to keep current

Because most of the MCLE courses have no applicability to my life as an atty.

Because of the distribution requirements, courses were either in areas I didn't practice or else they were in a relevant area but I already knew the material so that it wasn't edifying.

Because of the number of required hours, I often take courses only for credits.

Because often learn new things by taking classes outside my specialty

Because the correct response is not offered (a flaw in the survey) – sometimes MCLE courses are informative and sometimes they are not.

Because there is an opportunity to obtain updated information in an MCLE course, to get a sense of changes in the law.

Because they are

Because they are often the most current information on new developments in my field of practice

Because they cover pertinent subject matter that we need to excel.

Because they either educate me about an area of law that I am not familiar with or they update and refresh areas that I am familiar with.

Because they help attorneys to stay current with developments in their field(s).

Because they provide additional information

Because you didn't give an option of responding that some are VERY useful, and some just a way of obtaining hours. It varies by provider and topic, but again, your response choices were not useful.

Because you learn or refresh information

Because: (1) lawyers regularly educate themselves in their areas of practice as a necessity of staying in business; (2) many MCLE offerings are a joke with only a fraction of the educational benefit of reading, say, a single case; and (3) for lawyers who don't want to expend the effort to maintain their knowledge of the law, there are countless ways to satisfy the requirements without actually learning anything meaningful. The MCLE program merely gives legislators, the State Bar, and consumers (to the extent they even know about it) the ILLUSION that lawyers are keeping up to date in their fields thanks to some mandatory education program.

Been to live courses

Benefits outweighed by costs

Boring/irrelevant

Brings you current on the law

Can't really learn something just by reading about it for an hour

Can't recall using much of the information I learn at MCLE. The MCLE courses are disproportionately expensive compared to their usefulness.

Certain course are required but of limited applicability to me.

Certain MCLE courses are informative, while others are not.

CLE courses help to keep my current on recent developments in the law.

CLE courses offer an opportunity to learn at least "a little something" about other areas of law besides what I usually practice. CLE requirements also help weed out the less competent and the lazy.

CLE is a bit of a ruse. I've worked in firms where our state's leading lawyers satisfy their CLE by running a video very quietly in the corner of their office while they work, & they mute when a

call comes in. I don't blame them – much CLE is of such poor quality, I'd learn more on a typical day on the job. I get my CLE through a non-profit foundation that is active in my field of practice – it's very good. But this is the exception, and I couldn't do it if I were paying for it myself.

CLE is pretty good, but I already know most of the points covered by the courses.

CLE provides information on latest legal developments as well as general (if basic) information on a range of areas outside my main areas of focus.

CLEs if chosen wisely, keeps one current in the law.

Combination of alerts to immense number of laws and practical tips for use in client matters.

Confident in good reputable content that meets my needs.

Content is dull.

Content is useful to me

Continuing education extremely important to both attorneys and judges. I am a retired judge sitting by assignment.

Continuing education is a good way to stay abreast of the law.

Continuing education is an important requirement that assures attorneys' understanding of the law remains vibrant and growing.

Continuing education is good. The law keeps moving and developing and we should, too.

Continuing legal education is always important.

Continuing updates are always helpful.

Convenience regarding scheduling on your own; relatively low costs.

Convenience.

Convenient and easy to take on line. Easy attendance forms and proof. Can view the courses at my convenience.

Convenient to meet requirement for substance abuse, etc. type courses which have nothing to do with area of practice I need and aren't usually part of programs that I attend to keep up with substantive issues in my area of the law.

Convenient way to get current practice info for my area of practice, as well as satisfying the State Bar MCLE requirements.

Cost

Courses are informative and invite discussion among peers regarding applications of the law in specific situations.

Courses I take for my practice area are often helpful and informative. Courses I take just for MCLE credit (e.g., to meet substance abuse requirement) are rarely of any other value to me.

Courses in my area of practice (juvenile dependency appeals) have traditionally been extremely helpful in giving updates on the law

Courses in my specialty are helpful to keep me informed of the rapidly changing state of the law. The courses I am forced to take either as a bar requirement or to fill in my required credits are a waste of time and money.

Courses offered by my E&O carrier, Lawyer's Mutual, have been helpful as I downsize my practice after 40+ years of practice. Other courses to help me keep current on developments in the law.

Courses often stimulate thought and keep one up to date.

Courses relevant to issues I may face in my business are helpful. Unrelated courses take time away from other matters I need to be addressing.

Courses tend to be comprehensive and provide a big picture and tone that can be missed while researching individual issues.

Courses which relate to my field of practice help update new cases and or statutes and different and new approaches to complex areas

Current case law and trends

Current case law updates and specialized training

Current events

Current issues/easy

Current topics

Depending on the course, they are usually informative and allow me to update my knowledge. It also provides a convenient way to attend the courses.

Depends entirely on the quality of the presenter.

Depends on presentation

Depends on the course and the subject matter. Classes on substance abuse for example are a waste of time and money. Too often MCLE classes are too basic for someone with almost 30 years of experience. The classes on ethics are also of questionable value as there is no way a class for a few hours will improve the ethics of someone who is unethical nor will it change the ethics of an ethical person. The rules do not mandate that the education be directed toward new laws, etc. that might have some significance.

Depends on the course, but generally, I learn new information about my field of expertise.

Depends on the course.

Depends on the course. The mandatory substance abuse and bias courses are a waste of time. If there is a particular area of law that I need to learn or refreshed, then the course is useful.

Depends on the presentation. Some are very informative and helpful, others not so much.

Depends on the presenter.

Depends on the provider

Depends on the topic. In general MCLEs are a waste of time (and MONEY). They are way overpriced for what you get. They are simply a way for the bar to believe it is keeping members "educated."

Depends on the topic. I have no need for drug and alcohol abuse issues every 3 years

Discussion of current cases and trends in the areas selected for study.

Diversity, substance abuse etc mandatory?!!

Do not find the substance abuse and bias cles informative

Do not recall much of the information learned

Do not use the product to form an opinion

Don't feel that it really helps because if I am practicing, I am up to date in my field of practice. The only classes I would be interested in are those that relate to my practice.

Don't like to stay dumb

Don't use

Ease of access

Ease of searching for classes

Easiest way to keep up. Though I fail to see the benefit of repeated substance abuse training. I have never seen a lawyer admit they had a problem from a class.

Easy access. Concise information.

Easy accessibility of content

Easy convenient

Education is always a good thing. I do not like having to take the ethics, substance abuse or bias classes every three years. I'm ethical, have no abuse or bias issues...why do I need to keep taking them every three years? If you are unethical, hate a particular race or are a drunk, is taking a course really going to change that? Probably not. So why am I forced to take these classes because other people have these issues. I really don't get it. It's like punishing all of the good students because of one bad student. There's a disconnect in the logic somewhere.

Education is rarely boring.

EDUCATION ON NEW LAW AND TRIAL STRATEGIES

Educational

Either the course has areas I am not interested in, or the course contains little that I don't know or could quickly look up. Waste of time. A boondoggle for the providers.

Either too basic if you know that area of law or too complex if you don't. Some MCLE requirements, substance abuse, are a waste of time.

Either you practice in that particular area, and you already know the information (or should), or you do not practice in that area and you are only in attendance to comply with the required MCLE. If it was a seminar in your practice area that you felt would assist you in your practice, you would attend even absent the MCLE requirement. Without insult intended, MCLE really is simply a business generated requirement.

Enables me to stay up to date.

Encourages taking classes, sometimes in fields other than specialty, leads to new areas of expertise

Enjoy the education process from the lectures.

Especially in new areas of the law or where the law has changed.

Even though I try to find courses that relate to my practice, I typically get very little truly useful information from them. And the courses I have to take for the specialty credits are even less beneficial.

Every so often I learn something useful.

Expand legal knowledge into new areas of practice which provide you with valuable perspective you might not otherwise have solely based upon your principal area of practice.

Experts in my field and other fields share up-to-date information on the state of the law in California and nationally.

Exposed to new issues and greater depth of knowledge.

Exposes me to useful concepts and practice areas beyond what I usually experience in practice.

Family law is constantly developing

Few in my field and I rarely learn much that is new.

Field is evolving and updating is necessary

Firm believer in professional development.

First let me say I am not an active member so my participation here is of no moment. However, the content is generally nil, the courses have nothing to do with one's own practice or interest. It appears to be mainly a way for certain providers to make a lot of money. Fortunately the local law library here provides courses to satisfy the requirements.

For a first-year attorney, MCLE courses are very helpful in teaching points of law and tips which are useful in actually practicing law, which is not emphasized in law school. Law school prepares you for the Bar. MCLEs help prepare you for practice.

For experienced attorneys, the courses are boring and repetitive.

For solos, there is no partner to bounce questions off of. This is the replacement for it and to get the legal updates explained other than through browsing the zillions of cases and statutes that may come down without any practical application for it to apply it to, in order to understand it.

For the most part, right now, the MCLE courses I take are offered by an organization for the type of law I practice so they are topical and informative. But there are plenty of MCLE courses I have taken over the years that have not been very informative.

For the most part, they are inapplicable to my practice, and I take them only because they are required.

Forces everyone to keep up with changes in their specialties.

Forces practitioner to remain conscious of changing societal norms and demographics. Public reputation of bar as legitimate measure of attorney qualifications.

Forces you to sharpen your knowledge, keep up on changes in the law

Found them interesting and helpful for reminding me about things I wasn't practicing in at the time I took them (this was the last time I fulfilled my MCLE credits; I'm currently inactive).

From my experience, they generally provide helpful information on the current state or practice of areas of the law that can often be obtuse or confusing.

Fulfilling my CLE requirements was important to keeping my legal mind working. In my current position I am the only attorney, rarely perform legal work, and am one of the only workers on premises.

Generally interesting, helpful

Generally provides useful and applicable information.

Generally they are specific to the areas of law I practice in and provide updates and new trends. BTW this survey is so firm focused you did not include a legal services category?!

Generally try to achieve too much in too little time – content forgotten in a month

Generally, my experience has been that the persons presenting the information are knowledgeable and they communicate the information well.

Generally, not a lot of learning

Get current data on law.

Get updates and recent news

Gives high level overview to different areas of law or special subject matters that are applicable to my practice

Going to courses takes too much time from the office. I always verify legal conclusions or opinions with updated research which is more cost and time effective than CLE. To sit at a CLE and watch everyone typing on their Smartphone seems unproductive.

Good attorneys are going to keep up with the law in which they practice anyway. For too many of the MCLE courses, bad or any attorney can simply sit through the course without listening or learning anything. Too much of the MCLE requirements are not applicable to most attorneys' practice, work or even their ethics, and are simply a waste of time and money. Also, there are not enough courses listed or available for other practice areas, such as Social Security, disability law, non-profits, charities, etc.

Good information on timely topics

Good interesting MCLE subjects outside your practice area can be very interesting and informative.

Good lawyers keep up in their field of practice; bad lawyers are not improved by sitting through a mandatory course

Good pointers and updates on various subjects, offset by useless mandatory courses.

Good practice pointers by attorneys in the field

Good resource for attorneys who need to complete required training.

Good substantive law courses relevant to practice have been extremely useful.

Good survey courses; helpful for the general practitioner.

Good to get others perspective particularly on new areas of the law

Good to have up to date information

Good to keep up with changes in the law and to keep abreast of legal landscape

Good way to obtain practical insight on issues in my practice; good way to keep current on the law

Great for receiving updates on recent changes in law

Hard to make a global assessment – some are very relevant and useful; others are not at all.

Harder to keep up with changes in a small town practice.

Have not taken any – inactive

Have not taken one since I became inactive

Haven't taken one yet

Haven't taken any yet

Having a time set aside to learn of new legal developments is useful, as compared to reading email blurbs while multitasking. Learning by sound bite doesn't sink in as well as learning by immersion.

Help attorneys stay up to date on changes in the areas of law they practice in

Help in updating skills

Help keep you current

Help me keep current on my area of practice. Disagree with being mandatory.

Help me keep up with current developments in law and current approaches to resolving legal issues.

Help me to stay current on changes in the law

Help my practice

Help to keep me up on recent developments in areas of interest and refresh my recollection on issues that only come occasionally for me.

Helpful

Helpful for current issues.

Helpful for getting information on subjects that I'm not familiar with, areas of law that are new to me.

Helpful for staying up to date on current case developments and hearing the interpretations of those developments by others.

Helpful in areas of law that I practice.

Helpful to get different perspectives on familiar issues and to keep up with issues in my field.

Helpful to get MCLE credits

Helpful to get updates and current info

Helpful to review ethics rules and sometimes able to attend classes applicable to field of practice.

Helpful with the exception of the required specialty classes – i.e. elimination of bias, substance abuse. They tend to be repetitive.

Helps answer questions for current issues.

Helps brush up on the area of law that I am practicing in

Helps keep current on the law and practice techniques.

Helps keep current, especially in family law.

Helps keep me current on recent developments and issues.

Helps keep me up to date on changes in the law in fields other than the one in which my day-to-day practice is concentrated.

Helps keep me up to date on current law/developments

Helps keep me updated and refreshed on the law, and learn new areas.

Helps keep on top of subjects and meet attorneys with similar practices.

Helps learn new areas of law as well as keeping current on areas of practice.

Helps me keep up. Also needed for staying in practice and retention on assigned counsel program.

Helps me stay abreast of changes in the specific areas of law with which I regularly deal.

Helps me to keep up with new laws, ideas, etc. in my field.

Helps one keep current

Helps the attorney to stay current and apprised of best practices.

Helps to keep current with diverse portions of the law

Helps to keep me informed and up to date.

Helps you keep current in your area of practice.

Helps you keep current on the changes in the law.

Highlights new and important issues that may be missed w/o having MCLE

Highlights the state of the law

How useful/informative an MCLE

I agree with MCLE from the perspective of ensuring attorneys stay current with the law but I feel requiring specific subjects is not helpful. Set a number of hours and let us spend those hours in the areas in which we serve our clients.

I almost always learn something from an MCLE course, infrequently not.

I already know most information relevant to my practice, and I am not very interested in information that is not relevant to my practice.

I always choose MCLE courses that are directly related to my practice field.

I always get some extra practice or law information at every program. I also regularly present at MCLE programs. Preparation hones my skills, too

I always learn something

I always learn something from the courses I elect to take.

I always learn something I'm able to use in practice. MCLEs both teach and refresh. They're a great way to stay up to date and gauge where other attorneys in the area are in terms of expertise/experience.

I always learn something new and valuable.

I always learn something new from the courses

I always learn something new that I would not have otherwise known if I had not taken the course.

I always learn something new.

I always learn SOMETHING, even from a poor course. Unfortunately poor courses are cost-disproportionate to the useful info learned, so care in selection is important.

I always learn something.

I always learned something new or gained a new perspective.

I always pick up a nugget or two of useful information.

I am 83 years old. I am an active volunteer in a bar association but I am a retired inactive attorney. Thus, questions relating to MCLE are not applicable to me.

I am a new attorney and have only taken one MCLE "course" because it was in an area I was interested in and free. I found that one course helpful and informative, but I am not sure in general if they are helpful and informative.

I am a newer member of the bar and some of the MCLE courses I have taken have were geared toward fundamentals.

I am a professor so not a requirement.

I am a US Bankruptcy Judge and I do not have to take CLE so I have no exposure to the programs

I am able to educate myself in areas of the law in which I do not ordinarily practice, which helps me issue spot, and keep current on the areas of law in which I practice.

I am an out-of-state attorney and will rely primarily upon MCLE programs to teach me California practice.

I am current on law and case law

I am exempt. Also, most of the MCLE courses are a bunch of litigators telling war stories.

I am familiar with the law I need to use on a daily basis. I don't need to attend classes to know this law, and I have little interest in unrelated law.

I am inactive and don't have to take MCLE courses but that's not an option on your survey

I am inactive and don't take MCLE courses.

I am inactive but cannot check your really meaningless last option which gives me a choice of "inactive/Never taken an MCLE course". This choice is so really poor that it discredits your whole survey, I am afraid. Of course I have taken MCLE courses before I was inactive so I cannot click the last box. The wording on your very first question is also so poor as to discredit your survey. I am inactive but working in a law-related job. When you ask "how long have you been a practicing attorney"? what does that mean???? I "worked in a law firm as an active attorney for 6 years, since then, for well over 20 years I have used law in law related jobs – such as being a professor. Do professors "practice" law?

I am interested in continually learning about the law, and they provide helpful information.

I am not always able to attend the classes in person and taking the courses this way enables me to select courses that I am interested in and those that I think are most applicable to my position.

I am not good with using computers.

I AM NOT INVOLVED WITH MCLE

I am not practicing law at all and I live in Virginia.

I am not required to take MCLE.

I am not subject to the CLE requirement b/c I work for the federal gov't.

I am not sure if you are referring to courses that are sponsored by the Bar Association or ones I have taken that are sponsored by other agencies.

I am not sure that the structure of MCLE courses really help to make me a better lawyer.

I am on inactive status and do not need to take MCLE, so I don't.

I am retired and I enjoy keeping up with the changes in the law.

I am usually able to learn new information or I am reminded of important information

I am usually able to take courses that interest me, though the substance abuse and ethics classes tend to be a bit dull.

I answered this a few questions ago.

I attend courses that are specific to worker's comp, which are helpful in obtaining updated case law and trends in the area of law. I do not find the required units in ethics useful.

I attend only MCLE's in my specialty – immigration law – and the courses help me keep up-to-date and think of potential litigation strategies.

I believe there is a definite need for ongoing training. That said, a lot of the MCLE classes I've attended have been of little practical value. Most of the attendees seem bored and merely there because they have to be.

I can keep up my professional knowledge in my own and related fields.

I can never find the type of program I want – viz. a summary of the year's developments in civil practice.

I catch up on developments outside my main area of practice

I choose MCLE courses carefully and the content is usually directly applicable to my practice.

I choose my MCLE courses carefully to reflect areas I actually can use.

I choose several MCLE courses in which I was interested and I thought they were worth the cost to my solo practice/me.

I chose courses where I know I will learn something new. I check out the provider and context before I take the course.

I could read an article much more quickly and learn the same things with less of a drain on my time. All I really care about is my practice area, and I stay on top of that on my own. MCLE classes tend to be very basic. I don't learn anything new, or anything especially useful to me. The only useful courses really are ones on ethics, which is important to keep in mind and stay on top of the rules.

I deem it essential to keep up with new trends in the law especially in the field in which I practice.

I do learn about legal topics that I don't encounter in my daily legal practice.

I do like MCLE as it requires time to be invested in learning. Learning daily is necessary in order to be keep abreast of changes and to do a better job.

I do my own studying in areas I feel will help my practice not in areas where we are forced to take courses that has no importance or help to my area of specialty

I do not have enough familiarity with it to respond meaningfully.

I do not have time to keep up with changes in the law and procedure. MCLE courses are excellent at keeping me posted on changes and in reminding me of law in areas I rarely practice.

I do not learn much from them at this point in my career.

I do not take MCLE courses very often. I am a state employee and therefore, exempt from MCLE requirements. I occasionally take MCLE courses from law firms (typically, MoFo) because of an interest in the subject matter and find that the courses are very well done.

I do not understand requirements for ethics, bias in workplace and substance abuse. These are often hard to find. Attorneys should be required to take courses in their field only.

I do the courses I want to keep up with criminal law

I don't like that there are politically correct mandatory CLE programs.

I don't practice in the areas that most CLE classes are offered. It's like going to Law School again and doing the required courses, except now I have a career and it's a complete waste of time and costs me money

I don't practice law, so continuing ed keeps me in touch with the field.

I don't think I learn anything from them. My chosen response would have been "Rarely."

I don't understand the question. The CLE courses are mandatory; the very fact that I can fulfill at least some of them online is "helpful."

I enjoy learning, and in my experience speakers prepare carefully and try very hard and well to do a good job.

I feel like MCLE courses are the abbreviated version of law school courses, except that you get the interesting info with much less of a hassle, I also like interacting with other members of the bar, and talking about what they do, etc. Face to face time is important.

I feel that courses on bias and diversity are a waste of my time.

I feel that it is important to keep up to date on certain legal issues and taking MCLE courses are one of the best ways to do so.

I feel that most of the courses do not substantially increase my knowledge.

I feel the topics cover current issues I face at work.

I find it useful to keep on top of the latest developments in law in the particular area.

I find that MCLE courses duplicate information I already have through my practice.

I find updates on the law in my practice area to be esp. useful.

I found the MCLE courses to be very informative and easy to use.

I frequently take MCLE courses offered by organizations serving public agencies, primarily the League of California Cities. These courses are an important part of my efforts to keep up-to-date on my areas of practice.

I generally attend courses relating to my sphere of practice, and always learn something useful from them

I generally choose topics that apply to my substantive area of practice, and there is usually at least one tidbit in any program that is useful. Sometimes more, sometimes less.

I generally find MCLE courses provide relevant information about areas of law that are new/changing/unfamiliar to me, but it really varies from course to course, provider to provider.

I generally find the content useful, particularly in areas I don't know much about.

I generally learn something new at most MCLE programs.

I generally take courses in areas of practice that I am unfamiliar with or have had recent changes. This allows me to become familiar with new areas and maintain my proficiency levels.

I get more information on topics that interest me.

I get more legal education – the more the better. This is a pretty dumb question, by the way.

I get more out of going to seminars that have information I desire to learn about. There are not too many of those that are affordable.

I get updates on the law

I have a specialized practice and I keep up with the law. I don't need the information. It is also quite expensive to complete the full requirements.

I have gotten some good information from various MCLE courses, although I do not think they are worth the cost (compared to, say, a hornbook).

I have learned a great deal and picked up valuable practice pointers during MCLE trainings. I like taking courses at my leisure and own pace when possible.

I have learned a lot from MCLE courses over the years.

I have learned beneficial information from my MCLE courses.

I have learned new things about my area of practice when taking MCLE courses.

I have learned valuable information over the years through MCLE.

I have not taken an MCLE course in 10 years, so I am not certain how useful they currently are.

I have not taken MCLE course yet.

I have picked up little tips along the way. Like all seminars, there is a lot covered that is irrelevant or too basic, but even if I pick up 1 or 2 things, that's great.

I have received information in MCLE courses (particularly the LA County Bar Associations CD courses) that has proven both timely and useful in my practice. I have referred to the CDs long after completing my MCLE studies.

I have to stay up with the changes in case law for my practice as they happen. The MCLE classes are taken only because they are mandatory.

I have yet to learn anything practical in the classes I have been forced to take and pay for.

I haven't taken any MCLE courses yet.

I haven't taken MCLE courses yet.

I haven't taken one that was pertinent to the field of law that I practice in.

I keep abreast with the new developments in my field

I keep up already.

I keep up on areas of the law and learn things I need to know.

I keep up to date with the law, at least on an annual basis.

I keep up with current issues in my practice – the bias and substance abuse are simply fillers after taking so many of the years. They are a waste of time and I resent the requirement

I keep up with developments in my field of practice on my own.

I keep up with my practice area independently and the classes seldom have anything to add.

I know what I need to know, and if I don't, I get it in voluntary conferences, not to meet mandatory CLE requirements, although sometimes the conferences give me CLE credit

I learn

I learn a little something or more each time

I learn a lot and get some really good ideas for my cases

I learn about areas outside of my field of specialization.

I learn about new areas, or new details in familiar areas of the law

I learn from MCLEs, I get to network as well

I learn more about the areas of law I practice.

I learn new information and it reinforces old

I learn something I didn't know, and maybe didn't know I didn't know.

I learn something that I didn't know before. Not sure how much relevance it has to what I do, (research and writing) but it is always informative.

I learn things that I use in my practice. I feel it is important to keep up with the law in my field.

I learned helpful information that without MCLE I would not have pursued.

I like keeping up with new matters.

I like the general courses, but dislike the thought control associated with substance abuse and bias classes that are not germane to my practice and are nothing more than pandering to the left winger who run the bar. I would like to see the bar disbanded and replaced with some governmental regulatory agency, who would actually focus on practice capabilities, instead of social engineering, and would be much cheaper than the State Bar.

I like the opportunity to learn about different areas of law through MCLE. However, I feel that both MCLE and bar dues are expensive, particularly for lawyers like me who have to pay the entire cost of both.

I like to learn more about the topics of CLE that are useful in my practice.

I like to learn. I like to keep up. I prefer a course to self-research.

I like updates in law

I listen to MCLE in a Box and find the CD's informative. The courses provided by West help us to use West.

I love learning new things about the area of law in which I practice or sometimes I like to wander into seminars about topics I know little about to expand my knowledge base.

I need to stay current on many aspects of civil law. I am a retired Judge doing mediations, arbitrations and trials by reference.

I needed a course in a certain area quickly to complete the requirements and your site provided that.

I negotiate / litigate issues daily. If I don't research/learn the law, the other side/court will teach me (not good). Those needing CLE most are in-house gov't attys who are exempt & don't interact with outside counsel. MCLE was established to provide customers for providers. Issue of note: we have lots of bias in the world – the only elimination of bias that qualifies for the bar is bias in law firm hiring. I'm a solo – I don't deal with hiring, but I deal with bias every day.

I normally am careful in selecting CLE courses and strive to pick ones that are useful to my practice.

I often choose courses to educate myself in other areas of law from the areas in which I work.

I only handle criminal cases so some of the courses I have taken have limited applicability.

I particularly like the MCLE courses that update current law in areas of my practice.

I particularly like the MCLE exams that provide credits for legal ethics and I generally find the topics and/or issues covered to be very on point to the daily practice of law.

I pick topics of interest or help.

I pick topics that are relevant to my practice and interest me, therefore I typically find they are relevant and useful when I attend them. I don't choose topics and seminar just to get credit or go on vacation

I practice every day and being a good lawyer mandates that I keep abreast of new laws, procedures, etc. Being told I have to take MCLE AND pay for it is demeaning. It is a racket....

I practice in WA state and take CLE courses relevant to my practice.

I prefer having the freedom to take courses of my choosing with constraint and on my own schedule. Whenever I become interested or involved in any substantial project, the first thing I do is look for a CEB publication and MCLE course as well as identify colleagues knowledgeable in that field.

I rarely learn anything new

I receive current information that helps in my practice

I receive most of my information from what I research myself or through others in my former office. I am currently retired.

I remain at the cutting edge of my field of practice. I have yet to attend a CLE class where I learned something new. Often, I end up being the one answering the presenter's questions.

I seem to always get some valuable information keeping me up to date on aspects that are important in my daily work

I select areas that are useful to my practice. Good for updating on recent case law etc.

I study what I need to in the course of my work. MCLE is generally irrelevant.

I take 40 hours of CLE each year, and feel that I benefit with the knowledge learned, but also from attending CLEs and talking to other attorneys

I take care to select courses that won't waste my time or money.

I take classes in my practice area, and it is helpful so that I stay current.

I take courses tailored to the work I'm doing.

I take MCLE courses in areas that I know I need to learn more about, or in areas that interest me, and they are always very informative.

I take MCLE courses that are directly relevant to my work, attend conferences and professional meetings. I learn a lot and have 118 hours accumulated in less than 2 years.

I take most MCLE classes through CPDA (Calif Public Defender Assoc). Since I am a public defender, they tend to be completely relevant to my work and interesting to me.

I take online courses from my carrier

I take the courses that apply to my work. I would like to see more in areas related to fraud prosecution.

I tend to pick those courses that directly advance my practice needs and keep me up to date. They are often not at the depth I need to be useful, but serve a notice function for me to search for other practice guidance that provides the detail that I need. In other cases I take courses in areas where I should be familiar with the material so I can spot issues. Many of these courses have just the right amount of detail to be useful.

I tend to select courses that interest me or have well regarded speakers.

I tend to take courses that have information about a subject area that is involved in one of my cases. The substantive information is helpful.

I tend to take MCLE for areas that I don't have a strong knowledge base

I think it has turned into a profit center – if not an outright scam supported by local bar associations and the people who speak are often not particularly prepared or qualified.

I think it is important to learn new developments as they occur and periodically take a refresher course.

I think it is impossible to keep up to speed on all aspects of immigration law as it is constantly changing and developing. CLEs are a great way to learn about new developments and/or emerging issues in the law.

I think lawyers would become stale.

I think that in most cases MCLE is little more than a profitable scam. In my case, it is a useless obligation that I fulfill grudgingly. I spent an enormous amount of time maintaining my knowledge about my practice area and MCLE is irrelevant.

I think that MCLE courses for ethics, bias, substance abuse are useless. If someone is unethical, no amount of MCLE courses will make that person ethical. The same thing applies to bias and substance abuse.

I took online course that taught how to use various internet sources for free legal research. I found this very useful for someone working independently.

I took only two courses, but both were informative.

I try to attend courses or read articles when they pertain substantively to my practice.

I try to focus on courses that have practical application to my practice. In every session, I learn something that is useful to my practice.

I try to pick classes that interest me or are things I need to understand better in my practice.

I try to select courses that are helpful to my practice.

I try to select those that pertain to things that relate to my practice.

I try to take classes pertinent to my practice and, if so, usually feel that I learn something. (I do not find the substance abuse courses helpful. The elimination of bias courses can be interesting, but not particularly helpful)

I try to take classes that are applicable to my practice. Certain required courses (i.e.: substance abuse) are worthless.

I try to take MCLE courses that allow me to learn about both the areas in which I practice and areas outside my regular practice. They refresh my knowledge and give new insights into the law.

I typically choose CLE courses in my field.

I typically learn something

I typically learn something from courses.

I use MCLEs to improve my practice, and to learn new things about areas that I don't practice in that often.

I used to learn at least one thing from each MCLE course I took. Obviously, some programs were more informative than others.

I usually come away with something that is immediately helpful and feel invigorated and refreshed. Takes me beyond my normal routine. This varies, of course, with the class.

I usually concentrate on courses in my field of practice, with a few courses in general topics such as law firm administration. I cannot comment about the utility of courses in other legal fields to attorneys in those fields.

I usually do MCLEs that focus on updates in the law or are specifically focused on my practice area.

I usually learn something.

I usually learn something.

I viewed several relating to starting a practice when I went solo from a big firm. Keeps me updated on my area of practice, and I have attended others based on general interest.

I was not practicing for a while and MCLE helps to keep me current with my area of practice.

I work as a court staff attorney, so my daily job is reviewing the current state of the law.

I work at the DOJ. We do not have to take MCLEs. I do take DOJ in-house courses and try to read the new published cases.

I work in a very limited area for which courses offered are extremely limited

I would prefer to take course that are applicable to my practice. However, I often take courses for which I have little interest simply to meet my MCLE requirements.

I'd really answer "Sometimes". Often I am just taking the course to satisfy the requirement. Occasionally, perhaps 30% of the time, the content of the course is useful and relevant.

I'm constantly educating myself to stay current, and MCLE is a check-the-box requirement that requires me to pay money to 3rd party people to check a box to certify something. I find whatever is cheapest and quickest, regardless of relevance to comply with State Bar requirements.

I'm constantly learning in my practice. CLE is superfluous.

I'm currently inactive and don't need to meet MCLE requirements.

I'm inactive in California. I'm admitted and active in Delaware.

I'm inactive.

I'm retired

I've found learning is mostly done by actually practicing law instead of taking a course. The most important lessons come from trial/error and on a case by case basis. Some of these courses are sometimes too general or too broad in scope. On the other hand, they are too specific to a particular practice area that I do not practice.

I've gotten useful information from some MCLEs.

I've learned some important concepts in these classes in the past. Especially helpful have been more practical classes.

I've never failed to learn something.

I've only relied on Business Law Section programs/courses and evaluate their courses by the quality of the speakers/presenters and organization of the material. Current topics are the most useful.

I've rarely felt an MCLE course was a waste of time. Particularly helpful for "latest developments"-type courses and courses relating to specialized topics relevant to my practice.

I've worked as an attorney for 37 years. I learn about my specific areas of practice with every engagement that I undertake. Spending time taking classes in what I already know well is a waste of time.

If certain government attorneys are exempt from MCLE requirements, then everyone should be exempt

If courses are selected carefully, I always learn something from them.

If I read a law review article, I get no credit. But if someone reads it to me at a seminar, I get credit.

If I take a course just because I need credits, it may not have to do with a subject matter area that I am generally involved in. It may be interesting at the time I take the course, but I may forget much of the information because I never use it.

If it is a subject matter you are unfamiliar with, the MCLE course is a good way to get acquainted.

If it is in my field, they are rarely informative. Likewise, they are usually hugely expensive for little real content.

If it pertains to the area that I practice, I find it helpful to hear seminars on those matters

If subject matter is very specific to my practice

If the topics are in the area which I practice, they are helpful. Unfortunately, I am a criminal prosecutor, and there are limited MCLE courses related to criminal law in general

If they are concerning subject matter I work on they are helpful. Ethics is helpful when aimed at in-house rather than firm practice.

If they are run by true experts, the materials they provide are usually helpful.

If they pertain to an area in which I'm interested, I find them informative. If, however, I'm only taking the courses to satisfy a specific MCLE requirement, I often do not find them helpful or informative.

If this question is referring to the previous question, I will say that MCLE classes are form of ways to catch-up on the current laws and to learn of the cases that form the current laws.

If well written, the information is useful.

If you pick CLE courses that are relevant to your practice area, you almost always learn something you didn't know before. I mean, 90% of the program isn't new, but the other 10% almost makes it worth it.

Important source of updates on legal developments

Important to keep current on new developments. In particular, advances in technology research require that a person is aware of the available resources.

Important to keep up on changes in areas of law which you practice.

Important to keep up with changing developments in legal practice

Improves legal skills and stay current with developments in the law.

In many instances, the actual content of the course does not comport with what was promised

In my job I do research at least once a week, sometimes every day. In my area of practice, I know what I am doing because I research all the time. I find those classes a waste of time. If I need bringing up to date in a particular area or on a particular topic, I will sign up for a class or research it myself. I think it is just a way for the State Bar to make money and most attorneys do not benefit from it.

In order to stay abreast of my area of practice, I read and attend seminars associated with my field of practice. I don't need other areas to study and I don't believe that there needs to be a minimum. If you are not informed, you are not going to survive and therefore it is incumbent upon the member to know the law and it should not be mandated

In some areas, it keeps me informed. In other areas, it does not.

In the main, the subject matter is of interest to me, the presenters and materials adequate to very good. There is, of course, a wide spread, ranging from excellent to mediocre, in both program materials and presenters.

In the past I have attended conferences related to my work and they have been very helpful but now that I am not working, the MCLE that I take are based on the cost and convenience rather than providing a substantive benefit.

Inactive

Inapplicability to real life practice

Information is much too general

Information is presented in simple terms.

Information provided is often information of which I was already aware or would find on my own.

Informative

Informative, with good information

Informs of recent court cases and issues not normally observable from practice guides

Insight into unfamiliar areas or changes

Insures attorney makes an effort to stay abreast of changes in the law whether substantive or in areas of practice or procedure

Interesting topics and convenient

It depends completely on the particular course involved. There are a limited number of courses available in my field (criminal defense), so sometimes I have to take courses outside my field in order to fulfill my requirements. These are not particularly helpful. The best courses for my field are those offered by the various Appellate Projects for court-appointed counsel.

It depends on the class.

It depends on the course and the presenter. Some MCLE's can be very informative, others may not be as relevant to my practice area.

It depends on the course content. Generally, I feel that courses about sex discrimination do not reflect current reality & I do not find them useful.

It depends on the course of course. I use CEB

It depends on the course, but usually the panels I attend are valuable both as networking events and to get the perspective of an expert in a field that interests me.

It depends on the course.

It depends on the course.

It depends on the course. Some are more informative than others, but overall I feel they are helpful for keeping me informed about the law.

It depends on the courses selected, but MCLE can be helpful in keeping up with current developments.

It depends on the instructor and subject.

It depends on the presenter and written materials. It is helpful to receive updates all at one time.

It depends on the provider, and the content.

It depends upon the person giving the seminar, but if they are good teachers you generally learn something useful

It depends widely on the usefulness, but I tend to do MCLE that are in related areas to complement my present skill set. Therefore, I'm expanding my knowledge of my field.

It expands my knowledge in certain areas.

It exposes me to areas of practice that I do not come across, giving me a wider breadth of knowledge, which I always think is a good thing.

It forces very busy practitioner's to stay au courant in their areas of expertise, and other areas that complement their practice areas

It gives me an opportunity to either review an old subject that I do not use very often, or brush up on current case law in my field.

It gives you direct access in summary form to different focuses of the law.

It has useful information

It helps keep me abreast of changes in law.

It helps me be updated in my field of law

It helps to expand my knowledge and keeps me current on new law.

It helps with unfamiliar topics

It informs me of changes in the law and gives me insight into how other attorneys handle situations.

It is a fast and convenient way to keep current in areas that only tangentially affect my practice.

It is a lawyer's job to know the law; hence, the need for legal education.

It is a way to keep current on the law.

It is always a good idea to stay current on developments in your area of practice.

It is always good to read current, accurate information, particularly in a relatively concise form.

It is always useful to learn more about the law and to stay up to date.

It is an opportunity to become “current” on an area or facet. I almost always conclude that I learned something that I did not previously know.

It is difficult to keep abreast of every development relevant to your practice or work, even if you are immersed in it every day. CLE is a good way to stay engaged and keep up with developments in law.

It is good to get up to date on new law and practice techniques.

It is helpful to be able to take the courses at my convenience as my schedule does not allow me much time to travel to CLEs.

It is helpful to be challenged with new information.

It is important to be current on our new and old issues. This is one of the ways to encourage lawyers to do so.

It is important to keep abreast of changes in one's area of practice and in areas of general importance to the profession.

It is indeed a good way for attorneys to refresh and be engaged in current developments of the law.

It is more convenient to take the courses on line, particularly when they are web or pod casts

It is one way to keep up to date on the subjects that interest you. However, I don't think CE should be mandatory. Too many lawyers go and read a book in the back row because they need a certain number of units. I would go regardless of being required to do so. Additionally, I am always reading cases on line or looking at various legal magazines.

It is overly bureaucratic and overly burdensome to small firm environment. It reduces down to cursory obligation which does not contribute to improvement of practice.

It is rare for me to be able to find courses that are specifically applicable to my field of practice (biotech business development/clinical/FDA regulatory) that I can afford, so I have to take whatever I can find and afford to fulfill the MCLE requirements

It is required but not particularly helpful to my practice. Most programs are boring and after 25 years of practice I find most teach me little.

It is the best way to stay current.

It is useful but I would like more courses dealing with contracts and transactional law

It is useful to get updates or refresh understanding on many areas of law, particularly professional responsibility/ethics matters.

It is useful to keep abreast of changes in relevant law and practice methodology, as well as to explore emerging areas of the law.

It is very difficult to get classes that exactly match practice needs, so I end up taking courses that are more of general knowledge value than specific to improving things I actually do.

It is very important for me to take MCLE courses to stay refreshed on the law and legal practice.

It is virtually impossible for a small law firm or solo practitioner to stay current on changes and advances in the law. More and more I find it necessary to limit my practice to areas I deal with on a day to day basis, for fear of missing a new development or committing malpractice in an unfamiliar area. MCLE allows me to stay more current in the areas in which I practice.

It keeps an attorney abreast of new law and methods and procedures for improving your practice.

It keeps me abreast of developments in my area of practice.

It keeps me current in the law.

It keeps me current on the law.

It keeps me up to date on any changes

It keeps me updated with the law and with areas of practice I'm not readily familiar with.

It offers an outlet for legal professionals to continue to keep abreast of current developments in specific areas of the law in furtherance of providing more competent representation to the public.

It provides up to date information on topics of interest to me, including relevant case law that has come down or regulations being drafted.

It serves as one source of updates on recent changes on the law

It varies by the course but most that I have attended/viewed do provide relevant, current and topical information.

It varies widely with the preparation, motivation and organization of the presenter.

If the materials are well organized, it can't fail; even if the presenter is a flop, you can fall back on the materials. On the other hand, if the presenter is energized, it can be contagious. "Recent developments in ____" seminars can easily be a drag, as can "Views from the Bench." I remember a highly interactive seminar on Evidence (a sitting superior court judge from Alameda Co presented it) that was excellent! Participants were given black profiles of a "thumbs up" (or down) on 2 sides of a paper that they'd hold up (positioned accordingly) to vote on objections as sustained or overruled.

It very much depends upon the provider.

It was difficult to find courses that were relevant to my work and that were affordable.

It was hard to find things applicable to me that didn't cost too much. Now, I am inactive and it doesn't matter.

It's always beneficial to keep abreast of developments in the law.

It's always good to refresh your memory or learn something new.

It's always helpful to learn developments or changes in the areas of the law you practice.

It's appropriate for lawyers to stay abreast of current laws and trends.

It's been a long time since I've taken a CLE course.

It's crucial in order to be a competent attorney to stay updated with latest developments and MCLE help achieve that.

It's important to keep abreast of developing case law and statutes.

It's important to keep up with developments in the trust and estate field.

It's like everything – some courses are good and I learn things, some are a waste of time. Honestly, most of the "required" areas of MCLE I find less helpful; substantive legal areas more helpful.

It's on a topic that I need information about.

IT'S THE SHARED INFORMATION LIKE W/DCSS OR ORGANIZATION OF CASE MATERIAL; SOMETIMES INFORMATION PERTAINING TO OTHER FIELDS

It's useful to get an overview of topics indirectly related to my work.

It's useful to set time aside to receive case/statutory law updates and other innovative problem solving strategies. Otherwise, I get so busy it's easy to lose track of these things. Networking with colleagues is also very valuable.

It's been a while but often they were simply war stories and not terribly helpful

It's just a fraud racket to shake down attorneys for the course fees.

Judges write opinions and the legislature passes statutes every day

Just are

Keep abreast of changes in the law and hear others' opinions about issues.

Keep abreast of new developments/decisions

Keep current on the law

Keep current with latest legal news.

Keep me certified

Keep me current on legal developments.

Keep me current on new developments and/or introduce me to new area of law.

Keep me up to date

Keep me up to date on any changes in the law.

Keep me updated on recent developments.

Keep up on latest laws and trends

Keep up on new developments

Keep up to date

Keep up to date

Keep up to date with changes in the law that affect practice and ethics.

Keep up with new issues

Keep up...new stuff

Keeping current on recent developments is important

Keeping current on substantive or procedural changes.

Keeping up on changes and developing unique strategies to assist clients in a rapidly changing legal and social landscape is essential to modern practice.

Keeping up with current issues in my field of practice.

Keeping up with new developments and learning new things.

Keeping updated

Keeps attorneys current on practice areas

Keeps legal professionals on their toes. Even though classes are offered each year on ethics. I believe everyone needs to continue their education in order to prevent sexual harassment and ethic violations.

Keeps me abreast of new developments in the law.

Keeps me abreast of the law

Keeps me abreast of the updates in the law.

Keeps me current and up to date on the changes in the law

Keeps me current in new developments of cases and the law in my practice area.

Keeps me relatively up to date

Keeps me up to date on current cases and changes in the law

Keeps me up to date on issues relevant to my practice.

Keeps me up to date on legal developments, esp. case law.

Keeps me up to date with the law, and gives me different perspectives on handling various legal and practical issues I encounter in my practice

Keeps me up to date.

Keeps me up to date.

Keeps me up to date and current

Keeps us sharp and in the game.

Keeps us up to date on the topics in which we're interested.

Keeps you current on changes in the law

Keeps you informed and gives you a chance to meet others in your practice area outside of the court room.

Keeps you up to date

Keeps you up to date

Keeps you up to date on areas of the law that you might not otherwise pay attention to in your every day practice.

Keeps you up to date on the law

Keeps you up to date.

Kept me up to date and assisted in my practice prior to my recent retirement.

Lacking substantive information

Largely a waste of time when practicing as a litigator, as continuing education is part of everyday practice.

Last MCLE course I took was two years ago and probably had nothing to do with the area of practice I am involved with now. Once I take a course that involves my areas of practice, my views may change.

Law changes. You have to keep up.

Law is always changing and CLE can be informative on those changes.

Law is always changing, good to be up to date. Learn new areas of law

Law is always changing. MCLE requires me to learn some of it from time to time. If left on my own, I would probably only focus on areas that result in revenue production. The educational requirements make me a more well-rounded attorney.

Law is constantly changing; also getting other attorneys' views are critical for a solo practice person

Laws change; rules change; interpretations of laws and rules change.

Lawyers cannot function at a professional level without refreshing themselves about, and acquiring, information relevant to the practice of law.

Lawyers need to be current on law and need to be competent overall.

Learn a lot and stay up to date in my field, before I retired.

Learn about cutting edge issues in the law

Learn about fields in which I do not practice

Learn and get updated on substantive law

Learn better ways to handle various cases, learn new procedures, laws, etc

Learn more about legal methods and procedure

Learn new information and/or refresh memory, meet and interact with colleagues

Learn new subjects or get a refresher on subjects you normally work around.

Learn new things

Learn new things

Learn new things all the time.

Learn new things. But actually, the answer should have been, some are, some aren't.

Learned new things and reminded of the need to stay up to date.

Learning about practice area and other areas of law

Learning is an attorney's vocation

Learning is fun

Learning is good (this is really a dumb question)

Learning is good.

Legislated waist of my time and money

Like most continuing education requirements for other professions they falsely signal to the public that the members of the profession are informed about ethics etc. To the people who have to take them they cost money and most are a waste of time.

Like the content. Helpful.

Limited subject offerings result in taking some courses of little or no use so far as content is concerned (i.e. related to my practice) in order to fulfill MCLE requirement rather than content directly related to my field.

Litigation necessarily requires up to date research. There is no need to compound a practicing litigator's workload by requiring unnecessary additional research.

Maintaining currency on emerging issues is important. Training is not difficult and the MCLE requirement is positive encouragement to keep up to date. I personally prefer seminars/in person training options.

Many don't relate to what I do, but are required. After 30+ years in practice I don't really need more alcohol/drug/discrimination courses.

Many MCLE courses are barely tartered up infomercials, or "look what I've learned."

Of the few MCLE courses I've taken that I have found interesting, none have any real practical application to my legal practice.

Many of the instructors are excellent and you gain a lot of knowledge.

Many times the "mandatory" programs are not worth the time. The content is so obvious.

Many topics are unrelated to my practice and, hence, not useful and a waste of time.

Many of the required elements of MCLE are repetitive and elementary. After many years of practice, they become a chore instead of a useful tool.

MCLE classes help to re-energize my analysis and practice methods. It educates me on aspects of the law about which I seek to be informed. I enjoy learning.

MCLE courses are generally tailored to be informative. I take courses for the content, to apply in my practice.

MCLE Courses are helpful in keeping me abreast of the many changes in the law and give me an opportunity to learn about areas that I would not ordinarily research on my own.

MCLE courses are helpful ways to stay current in your areas of specialty practice and with the decisional law relating to ethics and professional responsibility. It is difficult to stay current reading advance sheets or summaries of cases and the MCLE environment allows for a better discussion of the effect of new legal developments with your fellow attorneys.

MCLE courses are most helpful when they provide updates on changes to the law. Courses help to keep abreast of changes.

MCLE courses are often just a matter of putting in your time. Once in a while an MCLE course will give a good update where the law has changed greatly.

MCLE courses are useful in providing current information on legal topics to which I might not otherwise be exposed.

MCLE courses are useful when they update or clarify matters of law and procedure, ethics and other issues.

MCLE courses can be informative and interesting, particularly when they relate to subject matters outside my regular practice area.

MCLE courses can give insight into legal issues.

MCLE courses have exposed me to new areas of law, ethical issues, e-discovery issues and solutions, and have helped to keep me updated on trends and specific legal issues unique to my field of practice.

MCLE courses have just been a way for the people giving the courses to make more money.

MCLE courses in my field, employment law, are a good way for me to stay on top of developments. It is, however, difficult to find enough relevant courses to satisfy the 25-hour minimum.

MCLE courses keep me apprised of new developments in the law

MCLE courses keep me current on the law.

MCLE courses on updates in the law, or areas of the law I have not explored are helpful. The avoidance of substance abuse course are of little value to me (each one seems a rehash of statistics on substance abuse in profession without any productive information).

MCLE courses provide new information or perspectives on practice that is valuable for improvement of skills or essential for keeping current in the law.

MCLE courses reinforce ethics or knowledge

MCLE courses related to my practice area are informative. Others (ethics, substance abuse, bias, etc.) are repetitive, and I don't feel that I learn any "new" information from them.

MCLE courses seem to vary greatly in quality.

MCLE courses sometimes provide new law or reminders of forgotten law.

MCLE courses that are relevant to my practice area provide valuable training and information that I use regularly. MCLE courses in other areas of the law give me a better understanding of areas of the law that I do not practice.

MCLE courses usually help me learn something new or something more.

MCLE courses vary in usefulness, but the good ones are helpful in staying current and thinking through issues that I otherwise might not have time to investigate, but which inform my practice.

MCLE generally is a good way to stay up-to-date on the law and hear about other attorneys view particular practice areas as well.

MCLE helps us stay updated in the law and also exposes us to issues we may not be aware of in our practice.

MCLE in workers' comp is very useful because of all the changes in the law

MCLE is a complete waste of time. It just generates money for the Bar and it makes the Bar look good. I have yet to find one class that was useful. I take them just to check the time off a list.

MCLE is a money making scam and /or a networking tool. They are hardly ever truly substantive.

MCLE is helpful and informative.

MCLE is not useful nor should it be mandatory. It does not add to the member's competency.

MCLE is very rarely cutting edge, useful presentations that would be useful in my practice or my career. Rather, they are almost always of the "we need X hours of MCLE to keep my license" variety.

MCLE keeps me current on immigration law developments.

MCLE presents an opportunity to learn about different areas of the law and to receive updates on my area as well as in legal ethics

MCLE providers design programs to appeal to a broad spectrum – from new admittees to attorneys expanding into a new field – with the result that the programs are simplistic, boring, and repetitive. A total waste of time for established attorneys who are aware of developments in their field.

MCLE provides essential information regarding current trends and recent developments.

MCLE requirements are poorly designed to ensure continuing legal competence.

MCLE should be free

MCLE that sharpen my skills or give me a new perspective on issues I handle on a day to day basis are helpful and interesting. You have to keep learning or you get bored and your skills stagnate.

MCLE's keep me up to date on dynamic changes in the law and practice.

MCLEs are good ways to keep up to date with changes in the law or to learn new parts of the law.

MCLEs in my area of practice are useful to my practice and cases.

MCLEs keep me up-to-date on recent changes of law.

Meeting MCLE requirements isn't the same as taking courses that keep an attorney up to date.

Minimal reward for large time commitment especially because I perform research on a current basis

More practice pointer oriented

Most are for subjects that are not helpful to my practice – I try to pick ones that are, but rarely are they useful. I try to keep current on case law relevant to my practice anyway. And how many times do I need to take a class on substance abuse? Really, each time I am told the same thing. I also feel like the providers charge outrageous fees and we are forced to take them

Most are just drudgery where no one pays attention because it is irrelevant... we do it because we have to and grab whatever is cheapest at the time whether we do that kind of law or not...usually it is not in our practice area

Most attorneys I know take coursed to complete legal requirements or as a perk; are they inexpensive, are they convenient, can I write of a vacation or good time. Pre mandatory requirements, attorneys took course from CLE and others because they were helpful to their practice.

Most courses are bundled to be affordable and not geared to my practice. Most courses are in areas of highly technical as opposed to useful nuts and bolts law or updating of civil law in general as opposed to anti-trust, etc. which average practitioner doesn't do. ETHICS & DIVERSITY ARE WASTE OF TIME, WITHOUT ANY BENEFIT. I HAVE PRACTICED ALMOST 30 YEARS AND NEVER BEEN CITED BY THE BAR FOR UNETHICAL BEHAVIOR. I AM SOLO PRACTITIONER AND DON'T NEED TO ASSOCIATE WITH OTHER GENDERS OR RACES, AND I AM A RAGING LIBERAL WHO COMPLETELY SUPPORTS DIVERSITY REGARDLESS OF RACE, GENDER OR SEXUAL PREFERENCE SO I DON'T NEED TO TAKE COURSES ON THESE ISSUES. Anyone who has problems is not going to change due to a stupid course some idiot at the Bar decided lawyers had to take! I DON'T HAVE A SUBSTANCE ABUSE PROBLEM AND SO DON'T NEED COURSES ON IT. EVEN IF I (OR ANYONE ELSE) HAD A PROBLEM A STUPID COURSE SOME IDIOT THOUGHT OF ISN'T GOING TO CHANGE MY BEHAVIOR OR ANYONE'S. I THINK HAVING TO TAKE THESE LAST 3 TYPES OF COURSES AS REQUIRED ARE BS!

Most courses are not relevant to my law practice or even my life.

Most courses are not relevant to my practice or I have recently taken.

Most courses are rudimentary, and many do not pertain to my focus of practice.

Most courses have nothing to do with my practice.

Most courses I have taken are too basic

Most MCLE are not related to my field of practice.

Most MCLE classes are taken to complete the requirements and often do not relate specifically to the field of practice (b/c of limited selections or time constraints)

Most MCLE courses are treated as a means of "going through the motions" to insure that the required number of credits are obtained. A thorough review of the topic at hand is rarely, if ever, provided.

Most MCLE is basic and does little or nothing to tell you anything you don't already know. This is especially true for the mandatory subjects. Taking an ethics course does not make you an ethical person. Taking a one hour substance abuse will not keep you from drinking, doing drugs, or stealing from clients. Taking a bias course will not cure you of bigotry. In short, MCLE is a waste of time and money, and simply gives the appearance of doing something to make do-gooders feel better.

Most not applicable to realities of practice

Most of boring and not very informative. Occasionally one may be interesting and have useful information, but that is the exception.

Most of my MCLE credit is earned doing things I need to do anyway, directly related to staying current with the law in areas I practice. The others are random fillers to complete requirements – even trying to select the ones most likely to be interesting and at least vaguely relevant to my professional life, I've found them to be a waste of time and money.

Most of the time it's information I already know. Most of the canned stuff is old. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health requirements are stupid. Ethics topics generally need a MAJOR update, especially in this era of social media, mobile phones, and digital distribution, and most of them are geared toward litigators and generally irrelevant to those of us who practice transactional law, particularly in entertainment.

Most of the time the information is presented in a dreadfully boring way, which doesn't lend one to be interested or engaged.

Most of the time they do not provide actual useful information and are just a way for people to get necessary credits. They are generally pretty expensive and I would actually like to get useful information out of it rather than just killing time.

Most often MCLE courses I take help me to stay current in my practice.

Most provide practical advice that improves skills.

Most providers have courses of little interest and in the areas which are of interest they are very shallow.

Most seem outdated. They seem instead of trying to teach and provide updated information they are only to take care of the MCLE requirements.

Most that I attend provide recent updates on areas of practice. I do not believe the substance abuse or elimination of bias are helpful at all, however, as it is usually just war stories and of no application at all.

Most useful MCLE is via live presentations through local bar organizations.

Most, not all, give updated information on law or courtroom issues and usually give helpful hints on the practice of laws. Some are a total waste of time.

Mostly repetitive information to meet particular hours in categories required. Would prefer updated courses on matters in my field.

Mostly the people there are just putting in their time

My first time reporting MCLEs included only standard sources, State Bar, local bar organization or MCLE companies. The topics did not provide pertinent information. It was as functional as most law review topics including Supreme Court debate. I do engineering and related regulations. However, I found an organization that presents mixers and MCLE on areas of the

law that touches my area. These classes, not associated with any bar organization, help. More important is the information helps me to direct people who need help. I do not profit from the information but I know when others need to seek help which allows me to help people. Every other MCLE class that I have sat thru is an exercise in theory or a rehash of law school.

My license is on inactive status, so I do not take MCLE.

My office (city attorney's office) offers in house MCLE programs. I find it interesting to learn about other aspects of municipal law then the areas in which I practice.

My office organized the MCLE training which covered topics relevant to our practice of law.

My organization puts the MCLE courses on and they are very relevant to our work.

My particular practice area trusts estates and taxes are generally met by Bar Section CLE

My practice area is specialized, there are no courses where I can learn more about that area. The result is that I do the CLE classes solely to satisfy the requirements and do not actually improve my applicable legal knowledge.

My practice field, government contracts, is changing on a daily basis. CLE keeps me current.

My practice inherently involves substantial legal research and requiring me to take courses as to subjects I neither need nor rarely encounter does not benefit me or my clients.

My response was perhaps an overstatement, because occasionally I learn something useful. Usually, however, I feel that the MCLE covers things I either know or are not helpful to my practice. But I have been practicing for over 30 years.

My specialty is immigration, and the MCLE offered in that specialty is from the American Immigration Lawyers Assoc. (AILA). The only other MCLE I would do are the required subjects, which are generally fairly contrived, so I have little experience with it.

My useful knowledge comes from specific research on pending and real issues. The continuing education is too broad and too detailed and mostly irrelevant.

Need to keep current with changes in the law

Need to keep up to date with the law changes

Need to maintain current my knowledge of changing laws

Needs to be some requirement to keep the membership alert. The ethics classes are usually useful: the bias & substance are not.

Networking

New cases update

New criminal law updates

New information

New information and ideas.

New information on relevant topics.

New topics, areas I would not otherwise explore.

No matter how many years I've practiced, or how many courses I've taken, I always learn something new.

No new information

No one knows everything. Despite having been in practice for over 35 years I learn something every time I attend an MCLE event and they help me stay current with the law

No reason.

No time

None of the ones I've taken have been tailored to my practice. Generalized MCLE courses are helpful for about the first year of practice, if that – beyond that, useless.

Normally, I learn something new at every program that I do. Also, I am better able to issue spot when I learn about issues that have not come up in my practice.

Norton Tooby's crimes/immigration cross-over courses are very practical & regular students are encouraged to, and do, network to share experiences with actual cases. Education is a good thing, in and of itself.

Not all of the courses are useful or applicable to me (I don't have a substance abuse problem or any diversity issues, for example). The courses that are useful usually have information that I can use immediately in my practice.

Not applicable to my practice as an attorney for the federal gov't

Not certain

Not enough experience to judge.

Not enough experience with them yet.

Not information in my areas of interest

Not necessary. Daily practice is sufficient education in my field.

Not practicing

Not relevant to my specific areas of practice.

Not specific enough to my practice area and too expensive

Not specific enough, not practical enough. MCLE seems like it is mostly a time for lawyers to meet other lawyers in the community and then whoever is giving the MCLE presentation gets a chance to brag about themselves for an hour or so.

Not worth the time and effort.

Obviously none of the courses are so bad that they convey no information; some convey quite a bit of information. For the avoidance of doubt, I basically feel many of the courses are of low quality and this applies particularly to courses on ethics and substance abuse.

Occasionally they are helpful but many times the information is just not useful for day to day, or even month to month, practice.

Often attend because required – usually little useful in those types of CLEs. Substantive areas that I am interested in I attend for reasons other than CLE.

Often too general to really cover a topic or if the firm pays they only will send you to things related to your practice area and generally have that knowledge already.

Often too general

Often, it provides knowledge on areas of the law that I might not otherwise have known about

On rare occasion, there's something I do not know, but, as a litigator who routinely does cutting edge litigation, I often find that I know more about new developments than the presenters.

One can always learn something from a well-presented course

One can find good MCLE in the areas in which I practice – M&A, business, tax – although you have to put in the time to find advanced classes. The main criticism of MCLE is that it is often way too basic for someone who has been practicing for a while. Most often, I take classes in areas in which I don't practice, because some basics there are appreciated. The subgroups we are required to take are ridiculous. The classes are boring and it is the same stupid conflicts stuff cycle after cycle. If you can't figure out the conflicts rules, you shouldn't be a lawyer. 3 hours of this stuff should be required every 10 years, at most.

One gets the latest changes in the law or cases.

One of the only way I can learn substantive law in a structured way.

One of the ways to keep current.

Ongoing training is important

Online courses seem most convenient

Online MCLE are helpful. Even though I did not take MCLE online, I can look online where to find the MCLE I want to take. I can also choose among online registered courses and take them at other places where I feel appropriate for time, payment and my practice.

Online MCLE courses allow me to learn more about other areas of practice that interest me & that my firm won't pay for.

Online saves time and time is our product

Only helpful if it involves an area of the law that I am not familiar with.

Only in the mandatory areas is it important. On the other part, I can sleep through the program and get the credit. The participants are either going to learn from the program or not. To make it a requirement is a waste of time and probably only an economic benefit to the program providers.

Opportunity to improve your basic and general knowledge.

Opportunity to learn about developing issues and trends.

Opportunity to obtain knowledge in areas outside specialty.

Opportunity to take a step back from daily practice and look at overarching legal issues that are relevant to practice but would otherwise not spend time really indulging because so busy with details of daily work. Definitely good to get ethics updates and discuss these scenarios out with other attorneys.

Our office provides courses directly related to my job duties. I'm able to stay current on the law.

People who want to learn will attend the classes regardless of any requirement. Those who attend only to satisfy a requirement are not likely to learn anything.

Perhaps I enjoyed it because I'm straight out of law school...

Practice specific education courses have help me gain competence and confidence.

Practice updates

Primary source of current information

Professional Development

Provide me with updates in the law and inspire me to continue being a public servant.

Provide new information and confirm existing knowledge.

Provide opportunities of update knowledge in areas that I do not necessarily have allocated time for following during my normal work day (e.g. development in laws related to law practice, ethics, bias, etc.)

Provide up-to-date information.

Provide updates and information to be able to stay current on legal issues for practice

Provides access to developments and research sites.

Provides additional insight as to current developments in the law and practice areas
Provides an insight into fields of law not currently practicing.

Provides information relevant to my practice.

Provides information that I would otherwise not be exposed to

Provides me info that I did not know or that is updated

Provides updated material

Put simply, I've learned a lot from MCLE courses. They are invaluable for the sole practitioner.

Quality and relevance are variable. Much of what I need I can find online.

Question is too generic – some are helpful, some are not

Question too open. Of course they are not devoid of all information so a yes is compelled. Also not clear which courses you are talking about.

Rarely applicable to my areas of practice.

Rarely are any courses that would truly help me ever offered

Rarely impart enough useful information or insight relative to the time required to attend

Rarely used.

Reading/listening about a topic for an hour at a time is not something I will remember in the long run

Really depends on the course but feel I glean at least a few morsels from each class.

Really I only get something from the ones at the State Bar conferences. The written ones and taped ones tend to be too superficial and "phoned in." Presentation is so important, and it seems like many are just really bland.

Receipt of up to date information.

Recitative format

Reflects insights which may go unnoticed

Refresher for matters I know and also provides updated information in my practice areas

Refreshing my knowledge

Relevant to my practice and to meeting requirements

Relevant topics are made available and the instructors are generally good.

Remaining current on the law is important, so is exploring new areas of the law and related topics.

Required education

Review is always helpful to improve perspective and competency.

Same material year after year, not relevant to my interests, survey courses not useful

Seems like a lot of them are articles with little useful information

Seems more like busy work.

Seldom learn much through CLE, more frequently through practice

Since the law changes constantly, it is important to stay informed of these developments for an effective practice of law.

Solo practice can get lonely, leaving me unsure of how to handle certain issues, etc. CLE reinforces what I already know, giving me back a modicum of confidence...and occasionally, I learn something new!

Some are a waste of time, e.g. elimination of bias and substance abuse...

Some are and some are not; as you become an experienced practitioner in a particular field, the usefulness declines; many courses are below the level of highly advanced practitioner

Some are better than others

Some are better than others but usually I get something out of it

Some are better than others; some are too old (recorded) to be of current value. Recorded MCLEs do not repeat audience questions or provide handouts to listeners

Some are better than others.

Some are but some I take just for the credits.

Some are good and some are not. I find that they are only as good as the instructors and their preparation to present the materials.

Some are good, some are terrible.

Some are good, some are worthless.

Some are good; some are boring; some are in the middle.

Some are helpful and informative; some are not. I take some because I want the information and updates; I take some to fill the requirements.

Some are helpful and others aren't

Some are helpful if they are in a relevant area of practice. Others that are simply "required" but do not apply to me or my practice are not necessarily very helpful.

Some are helpful, but most are not. They are too shallow for real learning.

Some are helpful, Others are just there as a requirement that have no bearing on my work.

Some are helpful, some are not. It depends on who is teaching.

Some are helpful, some are taken just to accumulate the required number of hours.

Some are informative, some are not.

Some are informative, while others feel like busywork.

Some are interesting, like Chemerinsky's Supreme Court updates. Others are not very interesting. I'm probably not in the mainstream here. I'm keeping my license active, but I'm not practicing law. It's hard to find a CLE that is relevant to what I do with international legal education. Something like tips for ESL legal writers or writing workshops in general are good.

Some are interesting, others are boring. Most are not really teaching anything, just answering the required questions to get credit.

Some are more useful than others. Most I have attended are useful. I prefer recorded MCLE, so I can listen to them more than once.

Some are not substantive and attempt to fill time

Some are obvious. They aren't always challenging.

Some are some are not. They are either too general or too specialized to be of any real utility.

Some are, some aren't. The ones in my field are generally useful and relevant to my practice. Some of the other general credit MCLE courses are not. Sadly, while ethics are very important, most of the MCLE courses on it are useless and deadly boring.

Some are up to date and useful, others are just ego trips.

Some are useful for new developments

Some are useful than others. The good ones are very expensive.

Some are useful, many are not. There are not many that help me in my day-to-day job. They are mostly geared to attorneys in private practice.

Some are useful, most are not.

Some are useful, some are not.

Some are useful; many are not.

Some are very good, but I have to be selective.

Some are very helpful, but because I try to take free ones as much as possible often times the free MCLE classes are not relevant to my practice areas.

Some are very helpful. Others repetitive.

Some are very informative; others, not as much. I find the ones which discuss very recent changes in the law (especially if they give you a little chart to take home summarizing the old law and the new law, so you can see the changes side by side) the most helpful. Now that I'm not in school anymore, these MCLEs are one of my predominant resources for changes in what I've otherwise known as the law. They are very helpful in that regard.

Some are worth the time and money based on the content. Others are a waste of time and money.

Some are, many not

Some are, some aren't

Some are, some aren't

SOME ARE, SOME AREN'T – EG, THE NECESSITY OF TAKING COURSES ON DISCRIMINATION IN THE FIRM WHICH REMAINS THE SAME PEOPLE FOR YEARS AND HAS NO DISCRIMINATION

Some are, some aren't. I've been doing substance abuse awareness training for the past ten years. I'm over it. On the other hand, MCLEs related to changes in law are very useful.

Some are; some are not.

Some are; some are not.

Some are; some aren't.

Some are. Some aren't. But all new info is potentially helpful.

Some are/ some are not. Recent local courses in short sale/foreclosures etc in RE very informative, local info as well as tax etc general info – example. Some are just rehash of old stuff – provider making a buck.

Some classes are excellent, some are not. General credit courses are usually better, as more relevant and substantive, than the required special credits (ethics, substance abuse, etc.)

Some classes are helpful, some not. Many of the required classes are not helpful

Some classes are more informative than others.

Some CLE courses are better than others. I've found some helpful but mostly, they have not been very good.

Some courses are and others are not.

Some courses are helpful, others are not.

Some courses are helpful. Most courses just fill time so that you can receive credit.

Some courses are informative, others not so. It is very hit or miss. Sometimes the mandatory courses are not particularly relevant to my practice.

Some courses are informative.....others have no application to my type of practice

Some courses are relevant or timely to my field: tax law

Some courses are useful and informative while others are not.

Some courses are useful for my practice.

Some courses are very helpful to keep up on changes in the law. However, the courses dealing with ethics, bias, and substance abuse are generally a WASTE OF TIME.

Some courses have new information which allows me to give broader advice to a broader clientele.

Some courses help but some are not helpful at all.

Some courses provide useful information on new areas or trends – i.e. issues arising with Medicare Liens. Some courses are simply filler to get the required units.

Some courses seem like older courses that don't really provide many updates on current changes in the law.

Some I find interesting

Some material is useful and some not

Some MCLE courses are useful and you learn things, e.g. ethics courses. Most other subjects are of questionable value. Also, the cost is pretty bad for a lot of young attorneys who don't have jobs and money, it's very difficult.

Some MCLE programs are better than others.

Some MCLE programs feel more like compliance for its own sake rather than actually educational or useful.

Some MCLE programs have been very informative, and some have not – it just varies.

Some of the information is useful.

Some of the MCLE courses I've taken have been very informative and I learned a lot. Others have been less so. I find that the instructor matters a great deal. The better courses are those taught by an instructor who is knowledgeable enough about the topic that he/she can move away from the printed materials or power point presentation and go deeper into the topic.

Some of the programs are helpful. I work in a very narrow area of residential real estate transaction work. There are very few courses that pertain to my area.

Some of them are just money spinners.

Some of them are not, but ones that are specific to my industry help me volumes to learn what other attorneys who do the same type of work that I do have used, and it gets more that much further ahead.

Some of them cover useful areas which are not in my field

Some seem to be attempts to hire speakers on grounds that you need expert help

Some seminars are useful, but many other courses seem to be just busywork designed to fulfill the obligation without really teaching relevant information.

Some topics are useful, some not

Some topics are very relevant to actual practice within my specialty. So training programs that provide MCLE credit are very useful.

Some useful ideas from courses; would be attending seminars in the field I work in regardless of MCLE requirements

Some useful information

Some, not most, courses are good. A lot of the courses simply suck. Between 25% and 50% of the courses add value to my business (edify me). Usually the instructors are dull and off point. The Cal Bar mag MCLE articles are generally confusing. I am unsure whether the author and editor (I assume there's an editor) are trying to be 'clever' & tricky, or cannot ask a straight forward question (e.g. – double negatives, and absolute questions).

Some, such as ethics, are worthwhile, but I find many to be a waste of time. As a practicing attorney, I feel that I am capable of doing the research necessary to my areas of practice and, where I need help, have members of the firm I can draw upon.

Sometime they are helpful and sometimes they are interesting but not really relevant to what I need.

Sometimes CLE provide a refresher in areas practiced or provide updates on new areas of law

Sometimes contain current information, but silly to require continuing education simply to require it

Sometimes I learn something new. Sometimes I find I am already up to date.

Sometimes it may not apply to any area of law I am currently practicing.

Sometimes learn new information, or new tactics that can be implemented into my practice.

Sometimes the courses are helpful, sometimes a waste of time because the instructors are not the best.

Sometimes the focus more on the presenter's practice and less on what is useful to the audience.

Sometimes the information I learn is informative.

Sometimes the MCLE courses are introductory, and repetitive. I would love to see the MCLE's given more interactively with access to the speakers by e-mail at the time of the course. And, getting the best speakers, even if they aren't from California is critical.

Sometimes the talk is so terribly vague and cliché that it has no practical value.

Sometimes the talk is so detailed that if you didn't already know the material, you would be nothing but confused.

Sometimes the topics are relevant, but most times, they are not

Sometimes they are & sometimes they're not.

Sometimes they are sometimes they aren't. If I select subject matter, chances are it's better.

Sometimes they have relevance to what I'm doing, but most of the time, I'm just taking them to meet requirements.

Sometimes they meet the needs of my practice or general federal litigation work which is useful. Other times the MCLEs are only to fulfill a specific CLE bar requirement and are not useful.

Sometimes they provide novel information, but not usually

Sometimes yes; sometimes no; but that wasn't one of the options

Sometimes, depending on the subject and the way it is handled

Sometimes, not often, new case or statutory reference is made that I was not aware of.

Sometimes, the information is neither new nor relevant.

Specialized interests. Too many courses not applicable to situation. However, ethics, drink and drug and other required helpful info/reminders.

Specific to my area of the law, and usually new law or updates in the employment arena.

Stay current of current areas of practice and explore new topics.

Stay up to date on the law, especially in areas in which I do not practice.

Staying current with change and trends is very valuable.

Staying informed in my practice area is a practical requirement for my success.

Taking the prescribed classes seems arbitrary.

Subject area MCLE keeps me current on changes in the law. Avoidance of discrimination/substance abuse, etc. are a waste of time, but I understand the political environment in which we practice law, and don't blame the State Bar for those requirements.

Subject matter CLE is helpful because keeps up to date. Substance abuse and ethics tend to be recitative and of little use.

Take enough to meet the requirements. Further, the cost is so high.

Teaches useful information

Tedious, and rarely provided information that I used in my practice.

The classes I require are filled satisfactorily at the tax bar level

The content for harassment and ethics courses has been overly simplistic. I deal with an entirely different type of case every week, so it's hard to say that a course focusing on a particular subject will cover something that I need to know. The Judicial Appellate Attorneys Institute provides some useful information, but due to budget concerns, the last institute was cancelled. I learn more every day from my own research.

The continuing education I personally need is too complex for CLE type courses. One tends to outgrow the CLE concept after about 8 to 10 years of practice. For example, my last research was on International Law and China's power projection into the South China Sea. CLE courses are not intended to cover this area. Yes CLE has its place so I would never recommend its discontinuance. However, more flexibility may be required in allowing non-traditional methods of continuing one's education. If a member reads a book on California legal history as related to Chinese immigration in the 1880's, there should be some CLE credit for the effort.

Thanks for asking.

The courses are informative if you can find one that is relevant to your area of practice and is affordable. Most attorneys I know just take courses based on the cheapest price because the credits are mandatory and the attorneys are not gainfully employed; or the attorneys only want to pay the minimum to satisfy the requirement.

The courses are not applicable to my practice. They cost way too much and never provide useful information.

The courses are not practice specific for my needs

The courses are often so short that presenters can never get into enough detail to make the presentation worth more than a few key nuggets of knowledge, if that.

The courses are uneven, so the question asked for an overall assessment, which is why I answered in the affirmative. I look for specialized areas to help in learning for potential new practice areas.

The courses either refresh my knowledge of the subjects or inform me as to developments about which I was unaware.

The courses focus information in one place and that saves time.

The courses help me keep up-to-date on the most current law.

The courses help me learn new things.

The courses help to avoid pitfalls

The courses help with updates in the subject practice area as well as providing information on areas of the law in which I do not concentrate my practice.

The courses I took were in areas I had little prior knowledge of so they increased my legal knowledge.

The courses I took were useful primers.

The courses keep you abreast of the changes that are occurring in the particular course that you are taking.

The courses present information that I can use in my practice.

The courses that are useful offer a way to keep current without having to research /read on my own

The courses that I took were very informative, on the subject they were supposed to be on. I enjoyed them.

The difficulty is the mandatory courses. They are a waste of time. I like the courses in my specialization.

The ease of being able to take the courses from your desk is great.

The elimination of bias and substance abuse requirements are just silly, as are the MCLE courses. They're meaningless, serve no purpose, and only seem to be there so that the Bar can say it has them. The substantive MCLE presentations generally don't provide enough detail to be very useful.

The ethics, alcohol and narcotics, and diversity courses are a joke, not for adults. I know how not to mistreat gay people; my son is gay. I pay for and list through my compliance and learn nothing that I couldn't have learned when I needed to know it. Minimum Requirements have not helped me to be an ethical or better attorney. You know this. The public knows this.

The form of the question didn't allow my true answer which is the courses are sometimes informative, etc. Others are taken by most lawyers because they are convenient, cheap or available in order to fulfill MCLE requirements.

The give me information about a field of law I may not have much experience in.

The information can be gathered from other places and the cost of the classes far outweigh their worth.

The information conveyed substance abuse and elimination of bias requirements "preach to the choir". Also mcle courses in these subjects seem repetitive year after year.

The information is generally not detailed or related to my practice.

The information is old and not always up to date. The speakers are usually too full of themselves to provide any useful information.

The information is repetitive, outdated, not useful, mostly common sense or generally obvious.

The information rarely applies to my law practice.

The information usually seem too general.

The internet courses are mostly bad. The ones I attended in person were usually redundant, in that I knew the information because I worked in the field, or unnecessary because I didn't.

The law changes daily – CLE is a good way to keep current

The law changes yearly, if not daily, and the only way to keep up and utilize, as opposed to running afoul of new law is to learn it. And, it's cool to know more than opposing counsel, and know it first.

The law in my practice – dependency is always changing so updates are helpful.

The law is always changing, and MCLE courses help us keep up with the changes.

The law is always changing. There are new potential issues to learn how to deal with presenting themselves all the time.

The law is constantly changing and it forces lawyers to keep up.

The law is ever changing and I appreciate the opportunity to stay current in areas of my practice and concern.

The law is evolving and you need to keep up. Can learn from others on tricks of the trade or nuances in case law and statutory authority

The longer you practice law, the more you need to be reminded of new developments in the law.

The material covered is timely and relevant to my practice area.

The material is not thoughtfully organized/presented, and accordingly the pedagogic impact is often minimal.

The material presented is normal not novel and the presentations are normally dull.

The MCLE courses are simply a moneymaker for the entities that provide the courses. As an attorney I take it upon myself to keep abreast of changes in the law particularly in those areas of the law that I specialize in.

The MCLE courses often contain current information on topics that are relevant to my area of practice.

The MCLE courses provided a quick snapshot of whatever legal issue is being discussed in the article.

The MCLE program is a complete joke, a criminal waste of time / money, and an obvious racket. If I want to learn something related to my practice, I can do that in many ways, most obviously in my on the job practice and research. Forcing attorneys to sit in (95% of the time) useless seminars for the purpose of satisfying some arbitrary hourly requirement is complete nonsense. I would suggest as an alternative, if the State Bar has something that it thinks will make attorneys better or less prone to discipline, put out mandatory bulletins on occasion to those attorneys. You never see those, do you? I wonder why that is given the regulatory mandate of the State Bar? Maybe sitting through a three hour seminar for on employment law (that costs \$350 or whatever)

is a better approach? I doubt that, having read some discipline reports. There is no way in my opinion that the MCLE, in its current form, justifies the costs in money and time of that program. I am 100% in favor of ending it now.

The MCLE that has been valuable has been the skills-based trainings – trial skills, etc.

The substantive law trainings, on the other hand, have proven to have limited value to me. They do give me a sense of what the issues are, but I tend to learn new law best in practice – when I'm digging into actual cases.

The MCLEs usually give me some information that I didn't know before.

The more current MCLE courses can be helpful. Sometimes they can be outdated and not as helpful where the panel doesn't really go in depth.

The more doing the more helpful the course. MCLE should be more "hands-on".

The most helpful courses are those reviewing recent changes in the law. The least helpful are those unrelated to substantive legal issues.

The non-practice related requirements (e.g., gender bias, substance abuse) are a waste of time.

The online courses tend to be on topics that are not useful to my practice but those in the magazine have been more helpful and practical.

The online courses make it possible to take MCLEs without leaving the office.

The practice of law is becoming extremely specialized. Our clients expect us to be the highest of experts in our area of emphasis; but also to know 99% of all other areas. I try to spend at least 102 hours a day increasing my legal skills. I need high level MCLE, but at an affordable level

The quality is uneven depending on the provider and speaker.

The quality of continuing education courses was much higher before they became mandated. Now that they are mandated, they are geared to the lowest common denominator and, except when I or one of my friends are giving the course, they are of limited depth and hence value.

The quality of the presentations is weak.

The quality of the web based classes has been poor. Need better instructors and speakers.

The quality varies drastically

The required courses are generally irrelevant. Some specialized courses have value.

The requirements generally do not pertain to my job. As an attorney for a court, I am constantly updating my legal knowledge and do not feel I should be required to pay for MCLE.

The statewide organizations of attorneys within my specialty provides monthly MCLE courses designed for my specialty

The subject matter is often out of my area of interest.

The substance abuse courses are NEVER worthwhile. Elimination of bias is SELDOM worthwhile. We could do away with both. Otherwise, courses are hit or miss as to quality of information and value.

The substantive courses are very helpful in my practice. The ethics courses are repetitive and boring. The courses on substance abuse and elimination of bias are useless.

There are always cases and or statutes that might otherwise not be called to my attention. I primarily rely on the San Bernardino Bar association for MCLE credits.

There are issues that come up in practice such as conflicts of interest that are explained through MCLE classes.

There are lawyer jobs open that de facto never consider graduates of night law schools, especially those night law schools unaccredited by the A.B.A. This is unreasonable and perpetuates "The Paper Chase" mythos. Being a white male doesn't help either, and I don't care whether you dismiss these comments as mere "sour grapes."

There are many topics to choose from and requiring attorneys to keep current is essential to insuring quality of representation.

There are too many hours required, which has resulted in a watering down of content that qualifies for credit. I never have a problem meeting my requirement but am aghast at what qualifies. I find the specialized requirements to be a waste of time. I sign up for programs that directed benefit my practice regardless of whether credit is given. In the end it is simply a mandated subsidy to the CLE industry and does not benefit the profession, and since we are "professionals," we should be continuing our legal education regardless.

There is always more to be learned.

There is always something new or interesting to learn.

There is always something new. At least one is reminded of what one knows already

There is no requirement the attorney take a course relevant to their area of practice

There is wealth of information created on a daily basis by lawyers in California. MCLE classes are a good way to access that information and experience.

There seems to be a redundancy on ethics, gender, substance abuse issues. There are a lot of courses but it basically boils down to a single theme. Cut the number of hours from 25 to a lower number.

There should really have been a choice for "sometimes." I have generally found that the courses do not live up to their descriptions – and they are made to sound as though they will be helpful to a very broad range of practitioners, but are actually targeted at a very specific and narrow audience. Often we are treated to the idiosyncratic stories of the panel members or lecturers without real how-to type of directions or advice. There have certainly been some seminars that have been worthwhile, but often I just feel like I am sitting through them to get the MCLE credits – particularly bad have been some of the presentations at the annual State Bar meetings. Maybe the descriptions offered should be more accurate – or the lecturers/panels should be made to READ the descriptions and try to conform to them.

There usually aren't enough relevant courses to fill the required hours. So it's necessary to pay for enough irrelevant courses to fill the quota. The benefit to MCLE providers is clear. The benefit to anyone else is not.

There's always more to learn.

There's always room to learn something new or to enhance my knowledge of something I feel I already know. MCLE is worthwhile.

There's always something new to learn

There's always something new to learn

These courses are a convenient and effective means of delivery of important information on current issues and changes in the law

They act as a refresher and supplement my knowledge of existing and recently enacted statutes.

They address my area of practice and highlight new and creative approaches to problems that I may encounter.

They aid me in my practice by increasing my knowledge base on the specific topic or area of law

They allow me to move out of my regular area of practice and learn new information.

They allow me to remain current with the state of the law

They are a money making racket that have little to nothing to do with enhancing an attorney's practice.

They are a refresher on areas of the law that do not come up in my every day activity and spur thought about how I do things.

They are a waste of time as I am constantly educating myself with respect to the current state of the law and its practice.

They are all too basic.

They are educational tools that I am using to transition into my private practice in the area of trusts/wills, after a 20+ year career as a prosecutor.

They are generally boring and not on point.

They are generally educational and I usually learn something new.

They are good refresher courses

They are good reminders of the ethics rules. Some courses provide excellent summaries of recent changes in the law. Other courses provide practice tips.

They are helpful if I find courses actively relevant to my field of practice

They are helpful in getting MCLE credit easily

They are helpful, however, CLE has become a business and then a price-gouging cost of doing business for small firms and solo practitioners.

They are in areas I do not practice in and thus most of what I learn is forgotten within a short time.

They are informative because they inform of topics and issues one may not have ready access to. They are not necessarily helpful because they may not fully address issues of immediate importance to the attorney.

They are informative.

They are informative.

They are never narrow enough in focus for the informed audience member nor broad enough in scope for the casual member. They are also quite boring.

They are not often related to the field. It seems MCLE is an industry in itself.

They are not pertinent to what I do.

They are not typically in my area of practice and unlikely to ever be needed. I only take the courses to be in compliance with the requirements.

They are politics not education

They are quick, generally well structured and provide the materials online.

They are required

They are somewhat useful in the sense that they provide basic information download, but they generally lack substantive learning that would make me and others better attorneys. Part of the problem is the medium (i.e. the internet), but the larger problem is outdated thinking regarding what and how attorneys should learn to be better practitioners. We are still as a profession, sadly, constrained by rigid and uncreative thinking that puts a premium on logic and argument used for any purpose so long as "rules" are literally complied with. In other words, we have dehumanized how and why the law is taught and practiced. Current MCLE courses are simply a reflection of this broader state of affairs.

They are survey lectures that do not teach and cost too much time and money. Also, courses on substance abuse, etc., are useless. I don't abuse substances and if I did, an MCLE course would not help me.

They are usually in 1 hr segments, which is oftentimes not enough time to really get into the details of the subject. I feel this is particularly true with respect to the "required" courses, i.e. substance abuse, bias and even to an extent, ethics. I especially feel that the substance abuse requirement is a waste of time and money. If someone has an abuse problem, it is not going to be solved in one hour. For everyone else, it's not relevant.

They are well constructed and provide useful information.

They can be a bit too obvious.

They can bring me up to date on areas of the law I do not have constant contact with

They can provide relevant information that is helpful to my practice.

They contain the information I seek.

They do not deal with issues of my interest.

They do not need to relate to your area of practice

They don't deal with my area of practice (investment management) and therefore aren't very relevant.

They don't usually touch on what I want to learn. Not enough basic courses for people who want to learn about some new field of law. The law profession ties you down to what you decided to do the month after you graduate from law school. Such a shame.

They expose us to different areas of law from that in which we practice. However, they sometimes end up being relevant to some of the cases we encounter. It is also valuable to understand the needs of clients who may need a referral to another lawyer who deals with a different area of law such as trusts and estates, etc. Most importantly, it brings home ethical issues that we deal with, yet may not understand, daily in our practice. Ethics, I believe, is probably the thing required of us the most, and we need to be reminded of the issues that we must address.

They generally involve someone reading information that I can read on my own in much less time. Also, I keep up to date on all areas within my work and stay abreast of all rules, etc., changes.

They generally provide a good overview of the subject matter and a few practice tips.

They give a practical perspective. Also lets you see what other attorneys are doing, issues in that area, understanding that you encounter the same things and are on the right track with respect to issues and how to resolve them

They give me updates on the law that I might have missed otherwise

They have no relevance

They have useful and interesting information and fulfill the need for cle's

They help hone and update my legal skills, and encourage new thinking.

They help keep current with the changing trends in the law, as well as serving as a refresher on general principles

They help me keep abreast in my field, and serve as a primer in those fields that I'm not a specialist in.

They help me keep current in areas of the law that affect my practice.

They help me keep up to date with my practice and learn about other current legal issues that otherwise I might not know about.

They help me stay up to speed in my area of the law.

They help us keep up with current developments and encourage socialization amongst lawyers (when we attend in person).

They just aren't particularly informative

They keep me current on new developments. I get information about some topics not directly involved in my work. It provides a lot of topics for use in my work as a mediator. Many courses give me an opportunity to socialize with people I wouldn't meet otherwise. If it wasn't required, I don't know that I would do it as often.

They keep me posted of new developments in the field/s

They keep me up to date of relevant issues happening in the law

They keep me up to date on changes in the law. They expose me to areas I don't practice in, so I have enough knowledge to identify issues, and refer to someone who can advise me on the issue.

They keep me up to date.

They keep me updated on areas important to the practice of law generally and to my specific area of practice.

They keep me updated on law and practice.

They keep me updated on the law since the law is constantly changing.

They keep my skills sharp, remind me of things that I knew but don't always think about, allow me to network with peers, etc.

They keep us updated

They keep you informed of changes in the law.

They keep you up on the latest developments in the law.

They make sure we are current with our information.

The material presented is basic and redundant. The entire MCLE requirement is nothing but a revenue generating scheme.

They may help illuminate issues on matters I am working on.

They may not always be pertinent to my practice, but I certainly feel I learn a lot. It is nice to be back in a "classroom"

They never pertained to anything I was actually working on. I continued my legal education every time I wrote a brief. The CLE requirement was and is superfluous and merely a PR gimmick to make the public happy.

They normally are timely with updated information

They offer information about areas outside my specific practice area.

They often involve matters that are totally unrelated to the fields or areas of practice I am involved in, yet taking these courses are made mandatory.

They often provide new information

They often times provide updates in areas of the law that I would not otherwise be aware of.

They present straightforward information.

They provide a full range of educational courses, from a broad introduction to very specific facets of almost every area of law. It's a great place to get an overview of an area of law you want to get into and to fine tune your current skills and be updated on the newest case law and procedures.

They provide access to experiences of other practitioners.

They provide an update of current laws and legal trends

They provide information

THEY PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT NEW LAW AND USEFUL PRACTICE POINTERS

They provide quick or basic education in new areas, so that we at least have a starting point for developing proficiency, and they remind us of our ethical responsibilities and spread a culture among attorneys of ethical conduct and collegiality.

They provide reminders about practice standards and updated information about my area of practice.

They provide up to date information that is helpful to my practice

They provide updated laws and information about my practice.

They provide updates to the law.

They provide useful information and provide education on a lot of different topics

They provide useful information in a convenient and time-economical manner.

They provide you with updated information regarding changing laws. They also provide you with practical points for practicing law.

They rarely align with issues that arise in my practice. Rather, I take the courses because earning credits is required.

They rarely relate to my practice (or former practice) and now that I do not practice they are irrelevant. They are just something I do because they are required.

They refresh laws, give seasoned attorneys'/speakers' opinions, and give guidance to young attorneys like myself.

They reveal the current trends in the legal arena

They sometime help me understand new areas of law.

They sometimes provide information useful to the practice. Other times they do not.

They teach.

They typically confirm what I already think I know plus sometimes add little increments of practical wisdom

They typically provide useful summaries of areas of law of interest to me.

They usually don't provide a lot of interesting information, either rehashing obvious legal rules, especially in areas outside of my practice, or are discussions with individuals that end up being more of a discussion about the industry that doesn't help my practice in anyway, but rather hurts it because I am not working on billable matter.

Things in the law change all the time; MCLE inspires educating in new areas and reviewing old areas. Also a safe way to become involved with unfamiliar areas of law.

This is a stupid question. Because they are.

This is an almost impossibly vague question! Basically, I do most of my CLE through the American Immigration Lawyers Association and the Immigration section of the SF Bar Association. Both organizations regularly offer excellent programs; I learn a lot.

Those I took because I wanted to be kept me current in the areas I practiced in and allowed me to meet other attorneys. Usually only two or three in an MCLE cycle. Otherwise, most classes were either required or taken to fill out the MCLE dance card and were of little value.

Those that help you use the internet for legal research and legal topics are helpful.
The others are not.

Time and cost efficient.

To be abreast of current developments in fields of interest

To elementary

To ensure familiarity with trends and changes in the law.

To keep abreast of changes in the law; keep current.

To keep ahead of changes in the law.

To keep current on substantive areas of law. But I think the requirement is too high, and has me taking (and paying for) courses that are unnecessary.

To keep track of the current status of the law; to enlarge sources of information which may be useful in a current of subsequent case

To keep up with changes/legal developments in my area of practice

To keep up with new developments

To keep up with required hours of CLE

To learn developments in the law, as well as to learn more in depth about an area/practice that I may not know as much about.

To learn from others and to stay up on changes in the law and cases.

To learn new things

To stay informed as to changes in the law.

Too basic

Too basic

Too basic.

Too basic. Irrelevant info.

Too basic. I could teach the courses myself.

Too broad and often times irrelevant to my practice area

Too esoteric – not practical.

Too few free MCLE courses on my practice area.

Too generalized

Too many hours spent on irrelevant and wandering discussions

Topically important in areas of law I might not practice regularly or need to refresh my knowledge on.

Topics and course are too general. There are so many superior research tools available.

Topics related to my particular area of criminal practice, including trial, have been informative.

Trends in technology and law and economics are updated regularly

Typically, the courses provide an overview of information that I already know or am familiar with.

Um, because they help me by informing me about the subject?

Unless there's a change in the law it's less useful.

Unless very specific to areas of practice, information is too general/cursory

Update knowledge

Update knowledge base

Update my knowledge and skills

Update on new law

Update your knowledge on applicable topics

Updated information

Updated information and/or refresher course.

Updated information in many areas of the law is always helpful

Updated information is provided; nuts and bolts of practice areas are discussed; practice area information is refreshed

Updated information presented.

Updates are important

Updates in the law; recent case decisions; pointers on how to do certain activities such as examining an expert witness; there are many reasons I think MCLE is useful/informative.

Updates information you may already know.

Updates on changes in the law.

Updates on information are important

Updates on law and ethics and practice techniques

Updates on law in specialty areas. Advice of experienced practitioners. Refresher on areas you're expected to know.

Updates on the latest changes.

Updates on the law and practice are useful

Updates on the law are helpful.

Updating knowledge and awareness of legal developments and issues affecting the business of law

Updating legal information and focusing on ethical issues as technology and ethical requirements evolve is highly valuable.

Updating on current case law, statutes and trends

Updating on current developments.

Used to teach CLE classes when they weren't mandatory, attended by lawyers interested in the subject matter, and reasonably priced. When they became mandatory, I stopped teaching them because they were attended by individuals who had to take something and read newspapers in the course of the classes that had become outlandishly expensive.

Useful for learning about new areas of law, as well as latest developments.

Useful for staying abreast of recent developments in the law.

Useful info, efficiency of learning curve depends greatly on presenter.

Useful information

Useful re changes in technology, e-discovery, changes in the law.

Useful relevant and topical information

Useful topics. Short and to the point

Usually boring, mandatory

Usually I learn something about the subject I didn't know or learn some tactics I haven't employed

Usually provide updates on developing areas of the law

Usually they are basic stuff that I already know due to my experience.

Usually they are in my area of practice.

Usually they discuss the latest cases and court procedures

Usually, an MCLE seminar has at least one practical tip, either case authority or procedural approach

Valuable updates on current legal developments.

Very expensive so to save money the last time I bought a package which includes many courses which were interesting but not relevant to my practice areas.

Very specific information

Waste of money as there isn't anything presented that is not already known

Waste of time. Material is not specific enough

Waste of time. Boring speakers. Boring topics. Waste of money.

We all get stale – and it is a good way to force us to stay current.

We all need updating and refreshing

We get an opportunity to stay abreast of changes in the law.

Well, I choose ones that relate to my field of work, which I would do even if they were not "mandatory."

What courses are you talking about. Some are great. Others are a waste of time.

When active I did not need or want extraneous courses. I took those that enhanced my area of practice. Many required courses were unnecessary

When attending a course applicable to my field, they are often helpful and provide a new perspective on issues.

When I am able to take courses that relate to my practice, I find the information I learn updates and clarifies my understanding of the law.

When I practiced law I regularly stayed up to date on relevant matters.

When I practiced the majority of areas were not in my area of interest

When I was actively practicing, I found internet CLE was a very good way of learning about particular subjects without having to spend time traveling to and from the course location. I also found that it was possible to find courses on relatively narrow subjects of interest, while many live presentations tended to be survey courses of little interest to practitioners.

When I was an active member of the bar it was one of the means of keeping up with the changes in the law.

When you purchase a "bundle", there is little choice in subject matter. Not all subject matter is interesting or relevant.

Whether a given MCLE course offers any benefit depends on the subject, the speaker and the practice area of the lawyer taking the course. I choose my MCLE courses by the lecturer, then the subject matter.

Whether the course is helpful entirely depends on the content of the course.

While it is some time since I took an MCLE course I believe it was helpful in describing recent changes in the law. For the most part, all continuing education helps keep people current and raises issues that otherwise might have been forgotten or not known.

While some have been of poor quality, most have been quite educational. It's important to keep expanding my skills.

While some update programs are useful, the periodic mandatory MCLE topics (ethics and discrimination issues) are repetitive and basically insulting to members of the profession.

WHY DO YOU THINK? MAYBE I'M NOT CERTAIN BECAUSE I'M NOT CERTAIN?

Wide variety available

Without CLE programs, attorneys must learn by trial and error. Sharing information is invaluable.

Yes, where MCLE credit is directly related to the work I do

You always learn something new.

You can always learn something from everything you participate in

You can always learn something new from any learning experience – however, a J.D. is a doctorate. We are able to research and learn on our own. We should have the flexibility to obtain the type and topics for training that we need.

You can always learn something new that is of value to your practice.

You may pick up a little bit during the process, but mostly it is just process.
you receive info

You're always learning new things if you continue your education.

Your question is very broad, and I'm afraid I won't be able to provide much by way of specifics. I've been a member of the bar for over 20 years, and have taken many courses. Certainly, some MCLE courses are informative; some offered through Cal Bar are informative. Many, however, are not on topics specifically applicable to my practice. But, at the end of the day, they serve a purpose.

Your questions don't make sense, because I am not practicing and am inactive and, therefore, have to MCLE requirement and don't take courses.

32. What other member programs or services would you like the State Bar to offer?

More discounts

1. A better or more consistent system to access court file information state wide. 2. Group discounts for small firms with library providers such as West and Lexis.

A decent health insurance program

A good health insurance policy would be wonderful. My husband is a solo, so we have to buy individual insurance, which is quite expensive in California. The bar is such a big group it could probably get wonderful rates for its members.

A referral service would be a nice addition.

Access to a practical library would be helpful. This would especially help those in solo practice who need quick references during trials. I feel I am at a disadvantage when going against a large firm which has instant access to LEXIS or another research program. This could be an offshoot to the CEB program, just smaller, more condensed and induced in the bar fee or very discounted.

Access to electronic legal research.

Access to group health insurance at a discount would be great.

Access to health insurance at group rates for those of us who are either unemployed, underemployed or who otherwise are responsible for 100% of our health care costs.

Actual useful discounts. Get us all 15% off at Joseph A Banks or Men's Warehouse

Advice and counsel about purchase of technology. Any group purchasing (life insurance?) similar to the clout that AARP offers to retirees.

Affordable health insurance

Affordable health insurance

Airfare discounts

Airline discount program

Airline travel discounts and discounts with major legal publications publishers.

All forms of group insurance, e.g., life, health, property, malpractice.

Allow payment of dues using credit cards issued by well-known, reliable overseas banks.

Any additional discounts are appreciated.

Any further affiliations or discounts would be great!

Anything

Anything more than what you have now would be good.

Anything that gives me a discount without raising dues.

Anything useful.

Anything, as long as it is presented clearly and is clearly distinguishable from ads and solicitations.

Anything.

As attorneys we use the Unilateral Control Model of Conversation. We should be taught the Mutual Learning Model by Schwartz. We need to scaffold our epistemic complexity to be able to grapple with systemic problems. Many have not reached this cognitive level.

As many as possible

Assistance or mentorship to new attorneys. like a hotline for help with legal questions as we are forced to venture out on our own due to the poor economy, lack of jobs, and huge loans at ridiculous interest rates

Assistance with shutting down the unauthorized practice of law.

AT&T; Costco membership free or discounted; inexpensive health and dental insurance; better deals on other insurance; B of A discounts (not just glorified chosen provider status which anyone can get); LA Daily Journal discount subscription; Lexis and West discounts

Attorney trying to collect money from another attorney.

Auto buying discounts, office rental discounts

Better access to health insurance plans

Better and more varied travel discounts, Westlaw/Lexis, office supplies.

Better car rental organizations – Hertz is neither competitive nor competent for efficient service or clean cars.

Better car rental, dental

Better discounts. What is there now is pretty useless.

Better travel discounts

Business loans; partnerships with mortgage brokers/lenders that offer favorable interest rates to bar members; business equipment/electronic supplier partnerships

Car insurance

Car rental discounts, hotel discounts

Car rental, hotel accommodations, MCLE price breaks

Career development/headhunter services

Cell phone, car rental, & other useful negotiated discounts

Cell phones banking home mortgages auto dealerships

Cell phone plans.

Cheap term life insurance

Cheaper health insurance, retirement, disability

CLE discounts

Collections on non-paying clients.

Confidential peer evaluations

Consumer discounts – the credit card, car rental and insurance items currently done are good examples

Costco membership

Credit Union

Credit union

Credit union (and benefits of same)

Credit Union, E&O insurance, Medical insurance, Hertz car rental

Credit Union; bundle of products for solos getting started; health insurance; housecleaning services; work/life balance related discussion group, community, or products

Daily report on published appellate decisions. Access to case law and legal research for free. Access to concise summaries of other state's laws such as used to be in the back of the last volume of Martindale Hubbel for quick reference when out of state discovery or other process required.

Decent cell phone plans

Deep discounts for legal books.

Dental

Disability insurance that is competitive with the ABA sponsored programs. Group discounts. Comparative cost/benefit marketwide surveys for any program offered by the State Bar so it can be readily determined if it is in fact a competitive deal and not just more commercial mail to spend precious time sifting through or discard.

Disability insurance that kicks in 30 days or less

Disability insurance, pension plan

Discount airfare, hotels and car rental. Discount health club memberships (the bar should be encouraging members to get healthy)

Discount airfares and hotels

Discount gym membership, if possible. Credit union membership, if not already offered

Discounted banking, credit cards, office supplies, etc.

Discounted dues for members over 62

Discounted dues for senior members...

Discounted gym memberships

Discounted health insurance

Discounted law practice management and legal research services. It seems that with our collective buying power, we should be able to significantly reduce the individual costs of these essential practice tools. Why let Lexis and Westlaw continue to make all the profit?

Discounted parking and/or bridge tolls

Discounted rates for non profits for computerized legal research

Discounted travel

Discounts for court reporters and office supply stores

Discounts for office supplies.

Discounts in gym memberships and therapy.

Discounts of any kind would be wonderful – hotels, airfare, health insurance, auto insurance, mortgage loans, for example.

Discounts on Apple computers, or computer other than just Lenovo.

Discounts on computers and other work-related products.

Discounts on goods needed for private practice such as office supplies, etc.

Discounts on guns and ammunition.

Discounts on insurance and supplies that REALLY are discounts

Discounts on other services or goods.

Discounts on travel

Discounts on travel and everything

Discounts possibly on legal research services or time/billing programs

Discounts to museums, events, etc.

Disney discounts

Disneyland discounts

Do we have health or credit union memberships available?

Don't know – but discounts are good

Education discounts, tuition assistance for family members, increased # of scholarships for dependents, discount dining coupons, theater coupons, sports and entertainment coupons

Employment help

Employment outreach/services/assistance.

Entry to amusement parks, more types of insurance, referrals to psychologists, etc.

Equipment discounts

Everything they can provide a discount on, such as hotels/travel/etc.

Expand the discount programs and thereby indirectly help us cope with the very high annual dues. Increase the number of required hours of MCLE and make some of it "live only."

Flight and hotel discounts

Flights, health insurance, auto insurance, banking, social networking

Free legal research. Free briefs. Why do we have to pay for Lexis-Westlaw? The State Bar should be able to provide this service to its membership

Free MCLE

Free MCLE DVDs and webinars; even if they are only 10-15 minutes. Plus something akin to the Los Angeles Daily Journal case or topic of the day article.

Free seminars on ethics and other legal requirements

Go back to doing the bar info in paper form and mailing it out.

Good individual health insurance plans for solo attorneys

Group Health & Dental insurance should be offered to State Bar members when they are out of work.

Group health and dental insurance

Group health and other personal insurance, banking, etc. services...

Group health care for solo practitioners who have to go into individual market. Good to offer both HMO (Kaiser) and other plans. Would really help to be able to have

Group healthcare – personally now paying almost \$1,000 per month for individual Kaiser. Could start with Kaiser – other groups/ associations listed by them have such group plans but not State Bar.

Group health insurance

Group health insurance

Group health insurance

Group health insurance

Group health Insurance

Group health insurance

Group health insurance – the opportunity to be part of a pool for those who purchase individual policies

Group health insurance (this may be offered; I haven't needed to check, but sure would want it if I did need it)

Group health insurance for small business

Group health insurance for solo practitioners.

Group health insurance for solo practitioners. I now pay \$745 per month to Regence Blue Shield as a business owner and that cost is ridiculous. That cost does not include the \$47 I pay for dental. Moreover, coverage on both is limited.

Group health insurance for solo Ps

Group health insurance for solos and small firms!!!!!!!!!!

Group health insurance for solos and their staffs.

GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE GROUP DRUG INSURANCE GET IT LOWER THAN AARP

Group Health Insurance Group Medical Malpractice Coverage

Group health insurance plans for small firms.

Group Health insurance so that solo attorneys can combine to obtain health insurance at group rates.

Group health insurance that is available to members outside the state of California.

Group health insurance was most beneficial

GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE!!!!!!!!!!

Group health insurance.

Group health plan

Group medical

Group medical

Group medical – these costs are as horrific for solo practitioners as for anyone else...

GROUP MEDICAL INSURANCE

Group medical insurance

Group Medical Insurance – (D'oh!)

Group medical insurance or at least access to the provider network so we can pay the same rate the insurance company pays.

Gym

Hard to answer but the more programs that are offered, the greater the chance that I would use one of them.

Hard to say; not a "Y" or N" matter.

Health, dental, vision insurance: retirement planning: technology (hardware) discounts: technology services discounts:

Health club

Health coverage similar to that of the Congress of the United States

Health coverage; auto insurance; E&O coverage

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

HEALTH INSURANCE

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

HEALTH INSURANCE

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance

Health insurance access.

Health insurance as a group; more discounts on various products and services

Health insurance for solo-practitioners; highly discounted MCLE courses for attorneys practicing less than ten years.

Health insurance like the NY Bar offers

Health insurance options

Health insurance would be nice. Malpractice insurance. Online MCLE.

Health insurance, auto insurance

Health insurance, auto insurance, etc

Health insurance, auto insurance, homeowners insurance, movie discounts, restaurant discounts, etc.

HEALTH INSURANCE, CREDIT CARDS

Health Insurance for attorneys below 65 and over 65.

Health insurance!

HEALTH INSURANCE! PLEASE! – A LARGE GROUP PLAN. I use the professional liability (Seabury and Smith) firm and have the disability policy. What sole practitioners desperately need is large firm ability to obtain group health insurance.

Health insurance.

Health insurance.

Help for nonprofits that are not LSC law corporations.

Help in obtaining employment placement

Highly discounted malpractice insurance

Home health insurance

Home, auto, health

Hotels

Hotels and air fare.

I do use the Hertz rental car "Gold" card.

I was glad to see the State Bar start the eco-pledge, which our firm has taken. More leadership on environmental issues would be great. The bar could offer discounts or rebates on solar, transit, or other green products/measures to help firms meet the sustainability goals.

I would have answered "not certain" to the previous question but that wasn't an option. I'm sure there are other member programs or services that I would like the State Bar to offer; I just don't know what my options are.

I would like as many insurance options or member discounts as possible. As a state employee, I am seriously underpaid.

I would like to member programs that are significantly cheaper than what I can find on my own. Presently, the member programs appear more expensive than those available to the general public. I guess the service providers believe that we are too busy making lots of money to notice that their prices are high.

I would like to see the State Bar get the largest possible member discounts on as many different services and items as possible.

I'd like to see the fee scaling come back for those of us who do not practice law or make much money each year from any source.

If not already offered, low cost health insurance, especially for retirees.

Incentive to do pro bono work, or volunteer.

Inexpensive on-line legal research similar to what is available to members of the Idaho State Bar.

Inexpensive programs for research similar to Westlaw

Instead of offering medical insurance as an individual program which costs a fortune, the bar should form an actual group and negotiate for group rates.

Insurance

Insurance (not malpractice), travel, more vendors

Insurance for retired attorneys over 65

It is demeaning for lawyers in civil lawsuits to go through security screening. I would love for the bar to provide a pre-screening for security risks and if a lawyer qualifies to bypass security at the courthouses.

Items with real discounts. I can go to other sources to find lower prices.

Job search

Kaiser coverage.

Lakers ticket discount

Legal research – Westlaw, etc. Publications – West, Lexis, etc. Quill, Office depot, etc.

Less expensive MCLE

Life insurance

Life insurance for older attorneys.

List attorneys by practice and geographic areas as well as alpha by name

List of services / companies that provide discounts to attorneys. For example, State Farm gives me 10% off just because I am an attorney. I'd like to know who else does that.

Long term care insurance

Long term care insurance

Long term disability

Long-term care insurance

Low cost health insurance

Lower cost MCLE courses, free or low cost legal research tools

LOWER DUES!

Make the Court Priority Access Pilot Program permanent for members who are part of it.

Malpractice

Malpractice INS

Malpractice insurance

Malpractice insurance that is actually cost-competitive. Long-term disability insurance that is actually competitive. Court-reporter rates that are actually competitive.

Mediator and arbitrator assistance thru hotline or ethics assistance.

Medical and dental insurance

Medical insurance

Medical Insurance (Group plan)

Medical insurance if there can be substantial group discounts.

Medical insurance, life insurance, group buying services.

Medical insurance.

Medical, dental and vision

Medical/Dental/Vision programs or discounts on same via partnership with third party providers.

More comprehensive health plan

More discount CLE.

More discounts at different locations.

More discounts for more businesses

More discounts of every sort

More discounts to various merchants

More discounts.

More free MCLEs for new attorneys, discounts and other benefits

More health insurance options for over 65.

More interesting places for the convention

More member discounts. Along the lines of what unions get for their members. Should be easily doable since we have over 200,000 members and lots of purchasing power (relatively).

More possibilities of receiving discounts as a member of the bar for services or products we use.

More programs for solos

More substantial travel-related benefits

More travel discounts

More travel discounts in addition to Hertz car rentals.

More/variety of insurance, hotel & car discounts. To make it more prestigious for our membership fees & status of being an attorney.

Mortgages; activities

Networking events by practice area in both large cities and smaller cities

No question group health care insurance whether you practice full time or not.

Not certain if you offer access to malpractice insurance, but if you don't it would be helpful.

Not certain yet – perhaps downloadable apps or information useful in legal practice.

Not so much additional services but do some actual negotiation of serious and useful benefits. For example, there are enough sole practitioners in CA that you should be able to offer much more competitive health insurance coverage options than is currently the case. Do more homework and really negotiate these things, or hire an expert. Otherwise, I would bet that the number of attorneys actually taking advantage of that benefit may be so low as to make it a waste of our time and money.

Not sure

Not sure

Offers for office space/rental

Ones I'd actually use. Gas?

Other discount programs

Other discount programs, e.g. movie tickets etc.

Other states have programs geared towards out of state active members.

Parking at courts; public facilities/offices; court security passes.

Percentage discounts off air travel

Perhaps internet/facebook groups?

Pooled malpractice insurance

Professional insurance at a discount

Programs that help new attorneys find employment and training

Real car rental discounts

Real health insurance

Reasonable car insurance

Reasonable options for group plan health insurance. I looked into health insurance options through the bar at one point, but got the run-around, and the preliminary answers were not competitive. I eventually got health insurance through the Auto Club, who offered a much better deal than the bar provider. That should be give pause for thought.

Reasonably priced healthcare

Reasonably priced medical insurance coverage.

Reciprocity with other states

Reciprocity with other states/jurisdictions.

Reduce the cost of dues.

Reduced bar dues for non practicing attorneys

Reduced fees for inactive members for CLE courses

Reduced price MCLE for solo practitioners, especially part-timers like me for whom paying for MCLE is a big burden

Regular health insurance for active and inactive. Job assistance. Student loan default assistance.

Research discounts or freebies. Business freebies for my solo practice

Restaurant and hotel discounts would be nice

Rewards cards, fee reduction

Rosetta Stone – discounted language learning.

See AARP.

Services catered to attorneys. And not so much commercial matters.

Shooting classes utilizing State Bar board members as targets.

Significant coping programs with alcohol and drug abuse.

Similar to corporate discounts like: entertainment, travel, restaurants, amusement parks. You have a huge membership and places would probably love to give you discounts to drive business there.

Sole practitioners need a realistic option for professional liability insurance. Purchasing it on your own in the open market, even with the State Bar "discounts," is outrageously expensive. If CA solos could form a CA Bar-sponsored "group" they could purchase it much more cost-effectively.

Solo practitioner benefits such as office equipment/computer/copier purchase/leasing discounts, online services discounts, etc.

Something I could use

Something with student loans.

Staffing resources (paralegals, secretaries, etc)

Supplemental health insurance , dependent care insurance, more alternative career counseling, contact info for attorneys willing to talk with others on informal basis about practice in their field

of specialty, how to services for those of us who care for aging parents – i.e. legal tools to get in place etc., free internet MCLE on areas of pro bono interest to people

The current programs seem like they would be helpful if they actually offered a discount. The discounts I've seen advertised are generally still more expensive than the competitors offering the same services, i.e., rental cars. It doesn't appear the best deal is being gotten for members. I don't care about life or AD/D insurance. I DO care about health insurance as a solo and paying out of pocket. It would be nice to have a group to pay into for health insurance.

The more member-benefit and discount programs, the better!

Theme park discounts

There are a number of research services, FastCase comes to mind, which bar associations across the country have provided to their members for free or at a reduced price. As a solo, I cannot justify a subscription to either Westlaw or Lexis. A subscription to FastCase would be very helpful on those occasions when I need to do research.

There are many unemployed or part-time attorneys so any reduction in costs of membership or classes would be helpful.

There should be an inactive. Volunteer status like physicians have. State Bar should provide insurance in those instances. There should be more comprehensive substance abuse services perhaps in cooperation with a particular HMO or hospital.

The State Bar should provide secondary coverage for such services. There should be intervention services where a member's family can seek help for the member from the State Bar without fear of opening an investigation for disciplinary purposes.

Training courses.

Travel

Travel and hotels

Travel discounts

Travel discounts

Travel discounts

Travel discounts

Travel discounts (air/hotel/car)

Travel discounts and auto purchase discounts

Travel discounts and upgrades, hotel discounts. Discounts for legal supplies and electronics.

Travel discounts would be helpful

Travel discounts; CLE discounts

Travel discounts; legal research discounts; access to statutes, regs, etc.

Travel discounts? CEB discounts?

Travel discounts.

Travel plans

Travel related discounts

Travel seminars

Travel, clothing, dining, lodging, health insurance, office supplies

Unemployment insurance; group health insurance (I think you just offer individual)

Vacation discounts.

Verizon wireless discounts

Voluntary health insurance at group rates

Whatever it offers should really be some significant discount or benefit. I feel as though what is offered is no better than what I could find on my own. Hertz is good, though.

Why isn't there a "volunteer" attorney classification that the State Bar insures for those who are semi-retired or providing essentially pro bono services?

Would love to see more general discounts for things and places to go, i.e. discounts to large amusement parks, retailers, etc.

You should investigate a State Bar sponsored malpractice insurance policy.

Zipcar fee waivers; gym discounts; more retail store discounts

37. If there are any additional features you would like to see in the California Bar Journal, please list them below.

Articles about office equipment/software, and practice guides and suggestions

Being a Solo P; fact patterns where other attorneys made honest mistakes that were very costly and easily avoided.

Brief summaries of recent Appellate and Supreme Court decisions

Can't think of any at the moment, though I suspect I will shortly after completing this survey.

Can't think of any right now.

Can't think of anything in particular.

Civil case summaries comparable to Siegel for New York attorneys

Compliance

Electronic forms relating to CLE areas discussed.

Expand job and career opportunity announcements – sell ads for same.

Expanded job, consulting, volunteer opportunities.

Features that will alert new lawyers to client scams against lawyers

Free on-line MCLEs; as a computer can indicate incorrect answers, why do we need to pay for someone to correct it?!

Given that the legal market has shrunk, a feature assisting solo practitioners to know all the market opportunities would be helpful.

Go back to printing it and mailing it out.

How about a humor section?

How to shut down the unauthorized practice of law by independent paralegals and others and updates on specific instances of actions taken.

I can't think of any.

I think they should follow the format of the ABA Journal sent out weekly, which is more user friendly.

I would like information for the average attorney, not the arrogant DA's and Big Firms who dominate the Bar. Big Peeve: Having done (and still do) some criminal work WHY DOESN'T BAR DISCIPLINE AND DISBAR THOSE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS WHO ROUTINELY FAIL TO PROVIDE EVIDENCE AND COMMIT UNETHICAL ACTS ON A CONSTANT BASIS? I know, THE BAR IS BOUGHT OFF BY THEM!

I would like to see more articles from a politically conservative point of view, or at least a more balanced content. It seems there is a very liberal bent in most of the articles.

I would like to see more information about improving the reputation of lawyers.

I would like to see more of specialty witnesses lists in all fields of profession such as accountant, economist, engineers, of course medical professionals, attorneys, etc.,

I would prefer that the Journal was a hard copy in the mail like it used to be.

I'm not sure, have not had much experience yet.

If I have time, I just scan the titles to see whether there is anything of interest. I don't think I've ever even followed-up on a link.

In the discipline section, list what law school the disciplined individual attended.

Issues of interest to out-of-state practitioners

It is sort of ho hum. You need a makeover.

Key California case summaries.

Less about big firms and poverty law and more about the real world outside of SF and LA.

Less information on bar discipline and more information on the state of the legal community in the state and the country.

Make the Journal subscription based so that high State Bar fees can be reduced for people who really care about the content. Somebody has to be paid to put together the information.

More about legal practice (business aspects of the legal profession).

More academic commentary on current subjects.

More analysis of recent court decision

More articles on elder abuse

More assistance in finding new jobs; commentaries on all of the judges and all of their qualifications

More attention to coping with substance abuse problems.

More business related

More educational matters, and various legal sections

More for public attorneys

More info on Indian law

More job announcements

More job postings and networking

More legal news

More letters to the editor

More objective judicial profiles

More openness of the Letters to the Editor

More practice substantive articles

More technology features.

Non State Bar MCLE courses

Not that I can think of. I am inactive in CA as I practice in TX so I get updated on CA by reading the Bar Journal.

Once in a while, a funny joke about an actual legal scene or quotation from court proceedings would be nice

Ongoing trial court funding problems and resultant impacts on law practice.

Online link to national, 9th Cir, and state cases of major impact or significance impacting on California

Practitioner tips and best practices. Humor. War stories about the art and activities of the practice.

Pro bono opportunities with firms or organizations.

Ranking of judges.

Ratings of judges

Salary and bonus information

Salary ranges for attorneys for example: 1st yr attorney: % that earn \$25,000-50,000 % that earn \$50,000-\$75,000 etc 2nd yr attorney: etc. 3rd -5th yr attorney: etc 6-10 Yr attorney etc 11-15 Yr attorney, etc

Short bullets about new changes to laws in my area

Short two or three line obits. Announcements of CLEs in adjoining states for the interest of those traveling.

Substantial legal decisions

Summaries of significant California case law developments and US Supreme Court activity.

Technology in law practice; work/life balance; maybe some national legal news; practical ethics tips for solo practice; articles on law as a profession – something to raise the image and help people think about the future of the profession

The bar should provide a list of all lawyers who have practiced for more than 60 years

The current features are alright.

The one I use is the CAL BAR NEWSSTAND.

The State Bar should do 2 things – control admission and discipline. Everything besides that is unnecessary and beyond what the bar should do. So, the CBJ should focus on those 2 things.

There is a significant entertainment law practice in the state and some focus on a regular basis might be of value.

Training corner articles, similar to those provided by CDAA in its publications. Or at least did.

Uncertain

Updates on funds to court system and who is working on lobbying to keep it funded.

Updates on upcoming CLEs

When I read the discipline reports, I would like to see the law school and year of graduation.

Why not feature an attorney from the State Bar once a month so that we can get to know who is the agency?

Would like to see something helpful to the nitty gritty of practice, like law practice management, marketing, law office technology, etc.

You could have summary reports from each of the sections...

49. Are there any comments you would like to add about any of the topics we discussed in this survey?

a. Would go to bar website if there was a specific section there, or heading, or sub-organization, for lawyers who don't practice law. Real medical and dental insurance would be hugely helpful

Although an inactive CA bar member, I am an active IL bar member and work as an attorney editor for a nonprofit organization outside of CA.

As a military attorney, my responses may not reflect the structure of my practice accurately

As a new attorney, I feel in despair about my profession. Even reaching \$60k or \$65k a year right now feels like an uphill climb. Please keep in mind that many new attorneys, due to the present job market, are probably feeling this way and wondering why we went through law school in the first place.

As an inactive attorney I do not take MCLE courses, the survey did not have an option for not paying for MCLE courses so my answer as to who pays for the course is inaccurate. Also my response regarding my income is for my non-legal practice position

As an inactive member who receives no benefits from the State Bar, I believe my dues are too high. I am paying for administration from which I derive no benefit.

As general counsel for a firm working out-of-state and paying full active status dues, I would like the State Bar to offer people such as myself the opportunity to participate on boards, etc. With technology (e.g. video conferencing, etc.) geography should not prevent us from being able to take an active role in the State Bar.

As more and more lawyers take up work overseas please consider adding an overseas credit card facility for payment of dues – even PayPal would help! At the moment it is a royal pain as I have to get a relative to pay the fees for me and then I have to PayPal her back!!

As with taxes, focusing on one Bar Association does not give an accurate picture of practice obligations or costs. I am a member of the BASF, and the ABA, sections in both, and NCPGC. I take between 45 and 60 hours a year in MCLE. It all adds up!

Ask question: What could be done about high membership fees? Answer: Reduce high salaries of unqualified State Bar employees.

Asking for sexual orientation without giving a "decline to state" is more intrusive than racial profiling.

California should have reciprocity with other jurisdictions!

Charge less dues for those not practicing or earning under \$100,000

CLE is a pure racket. Attorneys should rise up and oppose the extent of CLE required.

Corporate office is in San Francisco. I telecommute from my home in Oregon. It may be worthwhile to add a question about telecommuting.

Dealing with the bar is not the focus of my career. I wish the bar would condense its message – quick bullet points. The bar throws too much clutter at us. Also, I really wish that CLE could be rationalized. In its current form, for many lawyers, it's just meaningless liturgy, or an opportunity for firm-paid days away from the office.

Demographic questions were inappropriate as usual.

Do away with mandatory membership

Does the CA bar ever offer online MCLE credits that have to do with juvenile dependency or delinquency law?

Don't see relevance in asking about sexual orientation

Drop the questions about gender, race and other divisive classifications.

Ethics and civility toward other members of the bar.

Email reminder got me to do this survey.

Employment issues and the difficulty with which new attorneys have finding employment in a legal profession due to inexperience. Most if not all job postings require 3-5 years of experience and new attorneys have no way of obtaining such experience.

FEES are way too high for many attorneys, especially if you are a new grad and working as an independent contractor. Fees are still too high for inactive attorneys, especially when inactive for medical reasons.

Focus of bar newsletters and topics seems incredibly narrow and out of date. A legal education is valuable for so many professions. However, the thrust of everything from the bar seems based on the assumption that lawyers are working for firms. Also, the bar seems too driven by politically correct issues. It seems that the bar and its members are 10 - 15 years behind the curve on globalization, CSR, and other issues.

For the avoidance of doubt I oppose the existence of a mandatory bar association and have done for many years. I participate almost not at all and believe that the State Bar should be liquidated.

Former Governor & Mayor of San Diego had it right. The State Bar is a bloated bureaucracy that does nothing but put its resources into attacking solo practitioners on frivolous complaints from morons. DISBAND THE BAR!! Make it voluntary.

Get rid of MCLE requirements for elimination of bias and substance abuse. Most of my colleagues groan about them. Although I enjoy the substance abuse programs, that's one of my practice areas. But the programs overall are a waste of time. Given the economy and the fact I know many attorneys who are struggling to make ends meet, I think the yearly fee is too high. There needs to be more information that is spread about changing areas of laws to help keep all attorneys informed regularly.

Good survey

Guys, I am new to this thing, next year my answers will be more valuable, thanks!

Happy holidays!

Happy to participate.

How can we make our profession more of a learning community?

How does sexual orientation inform the State Bar of anything relevant to being licensed by the State Bar to practice law?

I access membership records almost daily. Would be great if State Bar revised membership records format so we can download a member's contact info as VCard into our Contacts. Just an idea!

I am 78 years old and on inactive status. I would like to see some issues/activities/service associations offered in which older inactive attorneys could participate.

I am 82 years old, in practice for 45 years, keep my dues up to service a few old time clients and think the dues structure should have a "semi-retired" group.

I am a federal administrative law judge. I do not take or need to take CA MCLE. I do not live in or practice law in CA. I really do not understand why the State Bar thinks it is necessary that I pay bar dues, other than it needs the income.

I am a retired Deputy District Attorney, not currently practicing law

I am a widow.

I am an attorney for the State of California; therefore I am exempt from MCLE and malpractice insurance.

I am inactive, out-of-state attorney. Some of the questions were hard for me to answer. I do not practice law in my home state, but I am very active in volunteer activities for my state bar, particularly on the issues of impaired lawyers. I am working on have my state association adopt mandatory education on the issue of attorney impairment similar to that required by CALBAR.

I am just beginning my own practice and times are tough. Reduced fees would be helpful...

I am not white, I am European American

I am surprised that your survey does not include any thing about the court or judges. This shows that the judges are feared like God and the State Bar does not even raise any thing as to what is going on the court. The State Bar must take opinion about as what is going on in the court. The State Bar must not only look into the attorneys' activities but look into whether there is really justice in the court. I am sorry to say but I do not feel there is justice in the California court system, especially for the minorities.

I answered that the substance abuse MCLE requirement was not useful; that may have been an overstatement, in that general awareness of the issue is significant. Other than that, no. So far, I've been able to avoid the problem.

I became a lawyer only because I was victimized by a shyster who later became a judge. While in night law school, I represented myself in court and had the misdemeanor conviction declared "void ab initio" (writ of error coram nobis). I then sued the bastard but lost only because the statute of limitations has passed.

I believe there is a need for low bar dues for part time lawyers

I can do without State Bar emag; I prefer old way; but I can't "unsubscribe." State Bar should not expand its activities.

I did read the State Bar Journal when it was in printed form. The online version is hard for me to read. Age is a factor in whether one wants to sit in front of a computer screen straining one's neck and eyes or to relax in a comfortable chair with a bright light to enjoy reading. I would like it if the State Bar made the hard copy Journal available again to those of us who do not use a computer screen to read for pleasure.

I do not accept the explanation you offered for compiling racial information, marital status, age, sex, sexual information, and other personal information on those of us participating in this survey. The results ought to be considered independently of such factors.

I do not appreciate the numerous emails/spam that I receive because the bar sold my information. I get the spam at both my personal, which I understood to be private, & business/public email. The bar should not under any circumstances sell our personal information.

I do not like the question regarding whether I am hetero or bisexual or any related questions to ethnic. How can you preach bias when your questions segregate people?

I do not mind taking this survey, but the personal questions at the end (especially the one on sexual orientation) are ridiculous!!! I answered them, but honestly these types of questions should be removed from the survey.

I do not think the sexuality question is necessary or appropriate.

I don't believe the race, gender or sexual orientation of State Bar members is relevant to anything the state bar does, should do, nor to the practice of law. Justice must be blind.

I don't entirely understand the purpose of the State Bar. Almost nothing the State Bar does is relevant to me or my practice. That said, I do feel the State Bar does a good job prosecuting attorneys who break the rules.

I don't have a law practice. I teach Hebrew school.

I don't like surveys because they are too cut and dried. For example, I am a retired judge working part time as a mediator/arbitrator. The bar has required me to "reactivate" my bar membership. My answers are accurate, but technically, I am not really "practicing law." The survey did not give me an opportunity to give the analyst this clarifying information. I am also skeptical that this survey will somehow be used for political/public relation purposes. That didn't affect my answers this time, but, if this survey is "misused" that might influence me about taking a survey in the future.

I don't think much focus is given to sole practitioners and that they are often tripped up on issues that large firms get away with all the time.

I feel strongly about race, gender and sexual orientation questions. Coming from the State Bar and published by the State Bar, they encourage the notion that those issues can be measures of the quality and suitability of the lawyers and that people should choose a lawyer based on common racial etc. characteristics. In my 42 years of experience this is rubbish and dangerous to consumers.

I feel that the Bar has lost its way. Its primary purpose should be to represent and help the attorney, not promote programs that ruin the attorneys income stream and help non-lawyers to do it themselves or allow non-attorneys to work in areas that attorney's used to be able to find employment. Examples are real estate, title searches, facilitators in family law and the proliferation of "document prepares". I feel that the bar's actions are one of the prime reasons new attorneys cannot find work or get started in a practice.

I feel the bar exists primarily for the benefit of consumers and not so much for the benefit of attorneys. Should be better for us.

I find classification by gender, race and orientation – and questions about these areas – highly offensive and an utter abuse by the bar of my dues money (which is also unreasonably high).

I find it offensive for you to ask for my sexual orientation, I answered it since I agreed to complete the survey when I clicked on the link but in future I think our state BAR should concentrate on viewing our membership as a group of professional persons who are held to a professional and ethical standard regardless of their personal lifestyle choices. The conflicting views in our society on the rights of a small segment of people who aggressively push their

sexual orientation agenda are having a polarizing effect on a great many people. I would hope that the BAR will be professional enough to avoid promoting a certain agenda and stay away from taking "sides".

I got this email twice so I suggest you sort your responses better. In my first response I told you in this block that I disapprove of the State Bar and think it should be liquidated. I have thought so for years and still think so.

I have never believed in the bar taking responsibility for my continuing education. When dictated by the bar, the needs of individuals will never be met. Each member of the bar must be responsible for his/her own continuing education; by so doing, the marketplace will weed out the ones that do not keep up with their clients' needs. A competent attorney will always keep abreast of his/her interests. I add that it is hubris for the bar to believe that it can control the quality of legal services by mandating CLE. This especially applies in trying to control substance abuse or ethics by mandating CLE. Any human development experts will tell the bar that a person's value system is in place by the time they reach puberty – changing that value system it is extremely difficult. Mandating CLE is like teaching a pig how to sing; it only makes the pig unhappy and never accomplishes its goal.

I have no information on which to base my answer regarding cost of bar dues, so I wish I could have responded in that way. Also, the sexual orientation question is offensive – there can be no legitimate reason for the bar to ask it.

I hope my responses are anonymous and, if not, confidential.

I just retired, and none of the questions elicited any information about that status.

I know I am supposed to do MCLE but I am not sure how to complete them and when they need to be completed by. A reminder e-mail would be nice.

I live in Texas and am tragically underemployed Boalt Hall graduate. Sad, huh? It is a drag that I have to pay California bar rates on top of Texas bar rates. How about a discount for people who practice law (and are therefore technically "active"), but who do not practice law in California? There needs to be a better sliding scale for poor lawyers. We exist.

I object to classification based on race, gender, etc. I do not believe those types of classifications should be considered when making policy decisions.

I practice in Washington state but I keep my connections to California. My brother is also a member of the Cal Bar. I keep up with bar news and issues.

I read the monthly California Bar Journal more often and completely when it was in a printed form.

I really wish the bar would investigate the feasibility of providing FastCase as a member benefit.

I stated that required MCLE substance abuse courses/units are not helpful. My reasoning is that substance abuse (along with bias) are social issues that all members of society are aware of. Whereas a subject matter such as ethics actually enhances our legal knowledge.

I strongly feel that the state bar does not serve or help its members but acts as police force to justify itself

I teach and practice part time.

I think my marital status, sexual orientation, income, etc. is none of the State Bar's business. Keep the fellow attorneys honest, reduce costs and avoid the political commentary which there is plenty.

I think sections should be given more information about their members, and committees or interest groups should have more information about their members so as to better understand and serve them. Sections should have more data about where and how people enter web pages and register for things.

I think the bar fees should be graduated based on type of practice.

I think the State Bar dues are a bit high and would like to see the annual dues be decreased a bit.

I think the State Bar should consider a limited focus, the most important of which is attorney discipline. I think the whole MCLE business is a waste of time and money and the whole issue should be reconsidered.

I think the State Bar should consider eliminating the MCLE requirements for substance abuse prevention and elimination of bias in the profession. These are not useful at all.

I think there's an issue about women in partnership positionsand women balancing family and work without resorting to expensive childcare.

I think this is the 2nd time I've done this...

I thought the inquiry about sexual orientation might be offensive to some. While it doesn't bother me, per se, I found it surprising and perhaps inappropriate coming from the State Bar of California.

I understand not wanting to mail paper journals but it is inconvenient to read them on line and hard to find something in them later

I want to see an expansion of the Certified Specialist Program. I'd like to see attorney discipline handled by regular courts and not burden the State Bar.

I was uncertain about the drug abuse CLE because it's not been part of my CLE curriculum.

I wasn't sure what you were asking about re: member discount / insurance programs. My professional liability insurance carrier claims that it is working with the State Bar, in some way or another that is not clear to me.

I will be inactive after this year

I will quit practicing and eliminate my 500+ pro bono hours if you stop the medical fee waiver

I wish the California Bar Journal was more like the Wisconsin Bar Journal.

I wish you still mailed a hard copy of the Bar Journal. When I received the hard copy I read it cover to cover. I don't even bother looking at it online because I detest trying to read lengthy documents on line.

I work approx. half-time in my practice; I also serve in my state legislature as an elected official part-time.

I work for a court.

I would like the State Bar to release the data requested by the law professor at UCLA so that we can better understand if affirmative action is working in the area of legal education.

I would like to have known more about how this survey will be used – that would have given me some more context for answering the questions, and I think I could have done a better job of providing information if I'd known more about what you were looking for. Relatedly, I would have appreciated knowing why you asked the questions at the end of the survey – about income, sexual orientation.

I would really like the State Bar site to offer info on typical salary ranges for attorneys in the Bay Area as well as other geographical areas broken down by practice area, region, and years in practice (as well as other applicable factors). Also, I would like relevant links posted, including contact information of local agencies (headhunters and recruiters) where accurate, up to date information can be obtained. Thanks.

I'd be interested in knowing how this survey will be used. Particularly, I think CA's MCLE requirements are excessive; I'm a member of another state (IL) with much less onerous requirements.

I'd like to see the results of the survey.

I'm retired and act part-time as a mediator.

I'm surprised that nothing was asked about State Bar's performance in connection with discipline.

I'm glad that CA Lawyer is still being published in print and has not yet been made a 'zine.'

I've been a member of the bar since 1989 and this is the first survey I've been asked to participate in – what took you so long? Additionally the bar needs to disbar the bad apples better than what they currently do. By not policing yourselves better you give "all" attorneys a bad rep instead of just those who deserve it. For example, I represented myself during my California divorce 17 yrs ago. The attorney representing my wife was very unprofessional. I turned in 1/2 to 1 inch thick document on this attorney's unethical behavior. I subsequently contacted the bar to see what if any action was being taken against him and was told none. About a year or two later (maybe more) the bar contacts me and tells me he isn't even a member of the California Bar (or had ever been one) and asked me to respond to some questions. This query though is not a result of my input but because of someone else's complaint. To say the least I was extremely disappointed in the bar not being more conscientious and taking my complaint more serious as no one even attempted to verify he was a member of the bar when I submitted my information.

If I am inactive and/or not currently practicing law; there should be a category for that and the amount received from law work should have a \$0.

If it wasn't mandatory, what advantage would there be to being a member?

If the State Bar is going to ask about our race or ethnic background it should be willing to provide that information to academic researchers!

In asking about my employer, I didn't see a category for courts. I picked government agency, but I really think there should have been a separate way to designate court employees.

In this economy the state bar fees are too high. I, and many of my colleagues, work as a contract attorney without a steady source of income.

Inactive dues are too high.

Income and sexual preference are out of line

Is there a government attorneys section to the State Bar?

It is not well designed for someone who earns his living in some way other than the active practice of law.

It is ridiculous to have mandatory questions on a voluntary survey

It might be nice for the State Bar to inform its membership more transparently of how the budget breaks down, why various costs are necessary, and how it compares to other Bar Administrative/Governing bodies in the US. The basic CLE on governing lawyers from a broader perspective. Why don't you have sub-committees or consultants? Why are the bar's interactions with members either disciplinary or otherwise punitive, or binary, such that there is no room for ambiguity or additional options to be discussed?

It occurs to me that there are some niche legal specialties that could benefit from legal publications or newsletters – such as CA election law, etc.

It sounded very self serving.

It would be helpful for the bar to make it easier to participate in sections and committees. I pay for membership and am not really certain how I can utilize my membership to my advantage beyond staying licensed in this state.

It would have been preferable if more opportunities for narratives were made available. I am very frustrated with the State Bar, and not being able to explain answers de-motivates me from responding to future surveys.

Just want the State Bar to go away or, at least, leave me alone.

Keep up the good work

Left out the topics of how we feel concerning the state of the profession. Law schools continue to increase class sizes, and unaccredited law schools are thriving, flooding most major legal markets. Standards are down, unemployment is up and the state of the profession is in the toilet. Acknowledge it and ask about it

Less MCLE requirements. They are a useless time wasting pain in the ass.

Like magazine subscription program

Lower the dues, poor value.

Lower the price to what it actually costs to administer the bar in California. My other state dues are commiserate with actual expense and that state actually helps attorneys. This state seems to do no more than collect money for no purpose that I can divine.

May want to include "n/a - inactive" as an optional response for additional questions

MCLE – not required of Judges or state government attorneys, is required of subordinate judicial officers (referees/commissioners) Why? JES – not required of judges, is required of SJO's. Why require both JES and MCLE of SJO's who choose to keep active bar membership, and require neither of judges who choose to keep active bar membership?

MCLE requirements need to be made stronger and more stringent; it helps weed out the incompetents.

More people would do the survey if you offered a reward – MCLE or discount on dues...

My retirement has affected some of the responses. I was covered by malpractice insurance when I was actively practicing. My MCLE was covered by my employer until my retirement and paid by me after my retirement.

Need to make the ethics hotline a true service about ethical issues and not just a "go read this" advisable thing; I know how to go and read things on my own – I want to know answers from MY BAR so MY BAR doesn't screw me for not knowing the answers!

New attorneys need assistance with job placement, advice assistance, and financial assistance as this economy is very difficult for us to practice in

No category for non-profit law firm in practice category.

No. This is a good survey, as surveys go.

Not necessarily something discussed here but it seems clear that the state bar disciplinary process focuses largely on the sole practitioner rather than law firms

Not sure why marital status or sexual orientation is relevant

Not sure why you are sending this to inactive members.

Nothing comes to mind.

Nay sexual orientation???

Ought to be a level of dues somewhere between inactive status and actively practicing law (the little discount is just a pittance). I paid so much for my legal education, I feel compelled to keep it "active", with costs of MCLE and bar dues – but I don't even practice law any more. I am a veterinarian.

Perhaps up-to-date MCLE should be provided free of charge or at a minimal charge to lawyers through the website, which would allow the bar to ensure the MCLE content was sufficiently engaging and useful, and lawyers wouldn't have to pay so much for programs. I don't have a problem with the annual bar dues, probably because my employer pays it for me, but I object to the cost of required MCLE through private providers, when the content is rarely useful. Of course, if MCLE is already available through the website, you can see that I don't know much about the website!

Please be aware that I am now retired from active practice.

Please do everything in your power to limit the State Bar activities and lower the bar dues – they are outrageous! Thank you!

Please make the Court Priority Access Program permanent. I find it very useful and convenient, and helps me save between 0.2 and 0.3 client billable hours per appearance in LA Superior Court Central.

Please offer option of getting a paper version of the Bar Journal. It's too hard to read online.

Please reduce State Bar fees entirely or reduce the fees for attorneys who are paying the entire cost themselves without contribution by their employers.

Practicing law takes too much time away from having a happy home life. With my husband being an attorney too, we just couldn't manage both of us working. Since opportunities are much greater for him, we chose to have him work. Question on income should have a \$0 answer for those of us who are inactive. It might be helpful to know why members are inactive e.g. medical issues, other business interests, out of state or country.

Reducing the fees. Our incomes have all dropped, yet, the fees keep on going up

Regarding current income from practicing, there was no option to select "None," which would be accurate for me, given that I retired several years ago.

Seems kind of useless.

Seriously reconsider the value, or lack thereof, of the required MCLE.

Sexual preference is an irrelevant question to ask because how one conducts their personal life is of no consequence to one's legal/professional accomplishments.

Share the wealth with legal services attorneys.

Should have don't answer option.

Should not ask about compensation

Since I am inactive, or for those not practicing, the question about \$\$ received from practice should include a \$0 option.

Some of my answers are neither "No" or "Yes" to several of your questions. I needed other options for my answers. So, I was unable to give you an accurate picture of my needs as an attorney or what I do.

Some of the optional questions were highly personal and I question the need for them.

Some questions and/or the choice of answers were too narrow. For example, I am not "inactive" but I am mostly retired. There wasn't any category offered for "retired" but still an active member.

Spend more time and invest more bar money in promoting and protecting the interests the bar members who defend the poor and lower-income people who could not otherwise afford legal services.

Start checking law school tuition.

State Bar discipline is poorly handled – sentencing guidelines offer to few choices and the cost of defense forces you to give in to unmeritorious or marginal claims; and, the State Bar costs too much for the benefits received

State Bar dues are entirely too high. There is no rational relationship between the dollar amount and the benefit conveyed by the (mandatory) membership.

State Bar dues are too high, especially for those that have limited income (or solo practitioners). Bar should ensure that dues waiver stays in place.

Stop sending these surveys.

Substance abuse education is a waste of time

Substance abuse – I am a recovering alcoholic (13+ years sober). The Subst. Abuse MCLE programs I have attended were very misleading. To understand and talk about substance abuse (drugs or alcohol) you should be a recovering alcoholic or druggie.

Survey assumes you are working or looking for work. I am retired. Hope this doesn't skew your results.

Survey design was irksome: yes/no/not certain. Just because a yes or no is not accurate doesn't make one uncertain.

Survey too long

Take the online State Bar discipline off the State Bar website. If someone has been disciplined it should be mentioned and if someone wants to order a copy let them but allowing instant download abuses the system and hurts the profession. Was and is a stupid idea. Scarlet letters do not work.

Thank you for your hard work.

The annual fee is too high. I became a member in July 2011, so I just paid about \$200 a couple of months ago, now I'm being required to pay \$400. Mind you, in this economy, I am still unemployed. It's tough. I understand some fee must be required, but \$400 seems too onerous. There should be a hardship exemption, or some way where a person isn't required to pay 2 times within a 12 month period.

The annual fees are way too high, especially for lawyers, like me, who are unemployed or underemployed. Additionally, penalty terms for late payment are too onerous.

The bar dues are too high for out of state lawyers. I will be going inactive this year. I get nothing for my bar membership.

The bar dues are too high. The active vs. inactive status if a member should not be publicized on the website because it penalizes women who take time to raise children.

The bar dues discount for someone making less than \$40,000 is not enough. That's poverty wages for most of California, especially in the Bay Area, and to have to come up with even the \$300 can be a hardship. I think you should raise the amount for fee waiver, as well. I've been in both positions when under or unemployed and it's tough to come up with the money but you have to in order to be able to continue to get whatever work you can.

The bar should have a low cost malpractice insurance for attorneys who have no disciplinary record.

The bar should negotiate with other state bars on behalf of its members from non-ABA law school for fair admission rules.

The cost of CLEs is absurd given their relative benefit. The 1 hour CLEs in the Bar Journal for \$25 should be encouraged and expanded.

The e-journal is difficult to read and the MCLE tests are very difficult to access, pay for and use. I used to use them all of the time, but have stopped using them.

The fees are too high for someone who keeps their license active but does not practice law. There is no use of the services.

The fees are way too high.

The first questions were fine. The last were invasive and objectionable. Also the survey system was very slow.

The last substance abuse class I took included information on how to evade a DUI, not sure that's what was intended, found it troubling.

The pre-recorded online MCLE classes are nearly always more compelling when there is video (visual) of the presenters and / or the live audience.

The questions are disconnected. Early in the survey I stated that I don't practice law, yet at the end there was a question that asked whether I had malpractice insurance and how much income I had from the practice of law.

The questions in this survey were incredibly personal and I think rude. What does my sexual orientation have to do with anything?! Really?

The race/ethnicity question was not useful in terms of your data collection – if a person marks mixed race/ethnicity, none of their ethnicities are counted. The bar should track this information so we know how well we reflect the public we serve.

The salary question assumed employment.

The sexual orientation question is offensive.

The State Bar does a very poor job of policing its members. Attorneys have a well-deserved reputation among the community at large as being morally bankrupt: willing to say and do anything to "win," regardless of right and wrong, the cost to their client, the cost to their opponent and society at large.

The State Bar fee should be eliminated for attorneys in government service. The fee is not deductible as we do not operate a practice that can deduct the cost of the fees. Private practitioners write off the fee as a business expense. Major firms pay the fee out of their operating funds. Highly recommend that the State Bar eliminate bar fees for any government attorney who is exempt from the MCLE requirements. Adjust the bar bill to be \$0 or alternatively, equal to the amount charged for inactive membership.

The State Bar is a waste of money. It should be scaled back and only do discipline or rather eliminated.

The State Bar of California seems to be a poorly run and highly dysfunctional organization.

The State Bar should concentrate on discipline and stop all other activities. Other groups or associations can handle the non-discipline activities of the State Bar.

The State Bar should take a lesson from the medical profession on how to serve its members rather than try to appease the public with pronouncements of discipline and enforcement.

The subject or purpose of the survey should be made more clear. State Bar Member survey days nothing of why one should participate in this survey, I was asked to by e-mail, otherwise I would have not participated.

The survey needs to include a question about whether bar members consider the State Bar valuable to members and/or the profession. But I can quite understand why you'd be reluctant to ask that question.

The yearly dues are far too high, particularly for those with a part time practice, even when fee scaling is involved.

There are too many attys in ca

There has been no opportunity to explain that I have been an administrative law judge for most of my career and that I am now retired, but working part-time as a judge.

There seems to be much that the State Bar could do for its members, other than advocacy, and doesn't – for example, bargain and secure options for group health plan for solos and small firms? How has the rising cost of this expense affected the practice – the ability of small firms to stay in business, employ others? How about paying very qualified attorneys to be available for practitioners to speak with regarding delicate and complex ethical issues and questions that arise in our practice?

There survey seems more like a way to drive revenue than provide real purposeful benefits. Another great use of our annual fees.

This survey struck me as utterly useless. Please find a better way to spend the bar's money. Perhaps increased legal assistance to the poor.

This survey was too long. I will probably delete future survey emails.

To justify public funding of an essentially private, non profit organization, services to lawyers should be the first priority. That would ensure far less need for the cumbersome and bureaucratic disciplinary process. The fee should include insurance.

Topics could reflect whether practice is full or part time/semi retired. Inference is made through several questions.

Under types of law practice, you should add "tax".

Unemployment for new attorneys is ridiculous.

What difference does it make to the validity of your survey whether the person responding is white, black or otherwise, or whether or not they are gay or straight?

What is the purpose of the survey other than what was included in the e-mail. Will the survey results be published, where?

When will you discipline that extreme flake and blot on the California bar – the "Birther Queen" Orly Taitz? She has had disciplinary referrals from at least two district courts yet she continues to stink up the bar membership. WHY?

While the survey could be useful, it does not ask real questions about what lawyers want from the State Bar that could assist the legal profession in doing a better job and by keeping the public informed that lawyers must follow the law even if it goes against the client(s) ideas of what is fair. The State Bar does not educate the public that lawyers are subjected to scrutiny and must pass vigorous tests during their career.

Why are the bar dues so expensive? I honestly do not understand why California charges roughly 300% more than other bars. I maintain my license so I can practice law. I do not utilize any other feature or aspect of the association, nor do I want or care to.

Why are the bar fees so high?

Why are you asking about sexual orientation and income? I declined to answer those because it is no one's business even if the survey is confidential.

Why do inactive, retired attorneys need to pay dues?

Why is sexual orientation anyone's business, especially the State Bar? I found that question to be invasive, to say the least!!!!!!

WHY STILL NO ANSWER HOW BAR WAS EMBEZLED, DIDN'T CATCH THE PROBLEM TILL TOO LATE, THEN PASSED OFF THE COSTS TO ATTORNEYS. MOST OF THE STATE BAR FUNCTIONS CAN BE VOLUNTARY AND MOST OF YOUR STAFF COULD (AND SHOULD) BE LAYED OFF SO MY BAR DUES CAN BE A REASONABLE AMOUNT!!!

Would be more likely to join a section if they were not an added expense

Would be nice to have an annual email about the benefits and products the State Bar offers so would not just have to learn about by searching around on the bar website.

Would like to see group health plan for small firms.

Would like to see the State Bar eliminate the requirement that attorneys who only do mediations must maintain active status.

Yes – I completed this survey a short time ago and was again requested to do so on 12/7/2011, today. Is there a software problem?

Yes, at age 60, it is difficult to obtain employment as insurance defense counsel, as most ads discriminate based on age (indirectly) by asking for 2-5 years, etc. Experience....

Yes, I am a UCLA law professor and many California law professors are members of the California bar. There was no way of indicating that on the survey re practice or income.

Yes, I don't know why you would ask whether I am a heterosexual or gay, etc. Seems odd and intrusive without any real benefit.

Yes, I have written that certain questions render it almost useless. When you ask questions based on "practice law", as you have throughout (your first question for example), you render them unanswerable for those of us who are professors of law courses or who work in law-related areas. I do not practice law now yet I have worked in law related areas and taught law for over

20 years. No way for me to answer if I use intelligent English. You needed more help in formulating your questions, but I wish you well, and good luck.

Yes, something needs to be done at the State Bar level about judges – there needs to be some BONA FIDE way that attorneys can report bad judges without any repercussions.

Yes: keep my information anonymous

Yes. In the past three years, I have transitioned from an international law firm (>2000 attorneys), to solo practice and finally to an in-house position. Other than the expected vagaries of the economy and the inherent uncertainties of client development as solo practitioner, the number one reason I decided to go in-house was the awful options for health insurance as a solo practitioner. I continue to be astounded that a State Bar organization of our size cannot muster the power to collectively bargain for group health insurance for its solo and small firm members. If you did a really good job, you might even get mid-sized firms to sign on. If you truly want to benefit your membership, don't just provide CLE, articles and benefits of limited value like discounts to boutique hotel chains. We absolutely need group health insurance for our members at a reasonable price if you expect the legal community to provide legal services at reasonable costs to the general public. Most people are avoiding using the legal system because of cost, and this is one of the reasons for the high billing rates that make our services too high for the general public.

You did not list Assistant United States Attorney as an option. I'm an AUSA but had no way to indicate that.

You forgot to make "widow" an option for status.

You should also be collecting data on what percent of a bar member's time is actually spent on legal matters, as compared to non-billable time spent on 1) firm administrative issues, 2) trying to collect fees and costs from clients, 3) dealing with gamesmanship and downright incivility from opposing counsel, and 4) dealing with court staff bureaucracy. All of these are critical problems for solo practitioners and small firms.

You should ask if people are licensed in other states and ask some comparative questions in the areas of bar fees, MCLE, on-line v. live CLE requirements, etc.

You should check to see whether the person receiving this survey is Active or Inactive. If Inactive, I suggest you offer choices that reflect this status.

Your questions about practice area and pro bono work do not seem to take into account non-profit attorneys. Essentially all of my work is pro bono because I work for a non-profit organization that provides free legal services to low-income litigants.

Your survey inquired about MCLE courses involving drug / substance abuse. These are a waste of time. Attorneys that abuse drugs already know it but refuse to do anything about it. Those that aren't drug users aren't suddenly going to be drug users – so it's a waste of their time. You solve

the problem not by teaching courses, but suspending / disbarring abusers. As a second comment, I would like to see internet MCLE package courses that offer me more choices of what I can take – the package offerings restrict course selection to courses that sometimes are of interest, but are mixed in with courses of no interest. It would be preferable to have a large selection of courses to choose from in order to meet the CLE hours – give me the choice to pick and choose courses that appeal to my particular situation. I have no problem with the concept of MCLE, but I almost always have to take courses of no interest and no value to meet that obligation. That is a disservice to the membership and (in my opinion) reflects politics more than a desire to serve membership.