

ATTACHMENT A
Mentoring Task Force Preliminary Report and Recommendations



The State Bar of California
Mentoring Task Force

Preliminary Report and Recommendations
July 1, 2015

(This page intentionally left blank.)

STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA MENTORING TASK FORCE PRELIMINARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

BACKGROUND:

The Board of Trustees approved the appointment of the State Bar Mentoring Task Force in September 2014 and President Craig Holden appointed the Task Force in February 2015. (See *Appendix for full roster*) The Task Force was designed to bring together the State Bar Sections, the California Young Lawyers Association (“CYLA”), the Council on Access & Fairness and the Board of Trustees to explore, create and develop mentoring programs and initiatives for young and new lawyers. The Task Force was charged with coordinating the past and present efforts of each group, and exploring and promoting best practices to be implemented in mentoring programs. The aim of mentoring of young and new lawyers is to increase the education and training of these attorneys and to promote competency, professionalism and ethics.

Further, the Task Force was asked to consider and identify funding sources for any ongoing effort, but additional funding was not required to support the work of the Task Force. The activities of the Task Force are funded with voluntary sources of revenue.

The Task Force held a series of in-person meetings of the full group and conference calls for its working groups to develop this preliminary report. The Task Force will request authorization from the Board of Trustees to publish the preliminary report for a 45-day public comment period. Feedback from public comment will be reviewed and incorporated in the final report with recommendations submitted to the Board of Trustees in October 2015.

PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Program Name: The proposed program will be called the “Attorney Mentoring Program” (“**AMP**”)

Program Slogan: The proposed slogan would be “***AMP Up Your Career With The Attorney Mentoring Program!***”

Mission Statement: The Proposed Mentoring Program Mission Statement is as follows:

“The goal of the State Bar Attorney Mentoring Program is to further public protection through mentoring, education, and the training of young lawyers to promote the pursuit of excellence, professionalism, and ethics in the practice of law.”

Program Goals: The Proposed Program Goals are as follows:

A formal mentoring program would help to achieve the following:

- Support the State Bar’s public protection mission by helping to develop new lawyers’ practical skills, and educating new lawyers in professionalism, civility and ethical issues
- Avoid and reduce the number of complaints concerning services provided by new lawyers
- Provide training in law practice management skills
- Prevent isolation of new lawyers, especially those in solo practice
- Promote strong, professional relationships within the legal community
- Encourage support for and delivery of pro bono services
- Provide role models of professional behavior to new lawyers
- Build skills for maintaining good attorney-client relationships
- Support underserved areas, especially where new lawyers do not have access to training and mentoring services

Pilot Program:

The Task Force agreed that whatever the final program recommendation, the program should be implemented initially on a pilot basis, with ongoing review and evaluation and ultimate program revisions to ensure ongoing effectiveness and stability. For the pilot program, the Task Force recommends that the potential pilot include 100 mentees and either one or two mentees per mentor.

Program Features:

1. The final State Bar mentoring program should be mandatory for new lawyers.
2. There should be a mentoring certification fee for support and educational programs provided to new lawyers.
3. The preference is for the mentor-mentee matches to be one-to-one or one-to-two, but given the potential numbers of new lawyers who will be required to participate (estimated an annual average 4,000 new lawyers) and the geographic regions to be served, it is also contemplated that group mentoring, e-mentoring, tech platforms and social media be made available for mentor-mentee meetings and communications.

4. The matching process could incorporate a number of options including (a) a centralized administrator approving the pairings based on data provided by mentors and mentees, (b) mentor selection of mentees from a potential pool of mentees, (c) mentee selection of mentors from a potential pool of mentors, or (d) a combination of any of the above options. In determining the option(s) to employ, the State Bar should consider potential program liability resulting from the program mentor-mentee matches, as well as a process for reassigning mentors and mentees in potential conflict of interest situations.
5. The program should incorporate data collection and outcomes measures for ongoing program evaluation including annual review of the effectiveness of the mentor-mentee relationships; periodic feedback from mentors and mentees about the relationship; compliance with program requirements and certifications; to the extent possible, impact of mentoring on mentees' professional conduct and practice; and reporting and monitoring of mentee MCLE credits.
6. Use of online technology will be necessary to collect program data, facilitate mentor-mentee relationships, coordinate and distribute program offerings and conduct program performance evaluations.
7. A new lawyer could opt out of the mandatory State Bar Program if s/he (a) is enrolled in or has completed another State Bar approved mentoring program, (b) is employed in a law firm or other organization that provides a comparable approved mentoring program or (c) has participated in a State Bar-approved mentoring program sponsored by a bar association or other professional organization for lawyers.
8. A new lawyer would be exempt from the State Bar Mentoring requirement if s/he (a) has practiced in another state or jurisdiction for more than 5 years or (b) has completed a comparable State Bar-approved mentoring program in another state.
9. The program should incorporate a combination of centralized features including staffing and other program resources to ensure support for program operations, compliance and standardized recordkeeping and evaluation, as well as localized features to provide feedback from geographic areas throughout the state and the flexibility to meet program needs of new lawyers statewide.
10. Initial mentor qualifications would include: a minimum number of years in practice (e.g. more than 5 years); no disciplinary record; State Bar membership "in good standing"; no suspension or disbarment in any state; completion of the basic mentor training; and, in some instances, meet additional requirements for designation as a "certified mentor".

11. Mentor recruitment would incorporate a focus on incentives including: MCLE credit for certain mentor activities, waiver of the first year of membership fees for State Bar Section membership, mentor certifications, judicial recommendations, recognition/awards for mentor contributions, professional development, public service and role in influencing the next generation of lawyers.
12. Orientation would be provided to mentors and mentees regarding program goals, outcomes, and expectations.
13. Additional mentor trainings would focus on attributes of good mentors, the mentor-mentee relationship, and creating mentoring plans.
14. Additional mentee training would be provided to focus on how to be a mentee and on practical, professional, and ethical aspects of the practice of law.
15. Marketing strategies would be employed to recruit mentors and outreach would be implemented through key entities and organizations including the CYLA network, State Bar Sections, local/minority/specialty bar associations, and leadership in law firms, governmental entities, and key institutions that employ lawyers.
16. The State Bar would have to determine sources of funding and secure such funding and resources to support the program on an ongoing basis.

**STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
MENTORING TASK FORCE**

**PRELIMINARY REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
(Full Report)**

BACKGROUND:

Over the last several years, the legal profession has experienced a number of rapid and dramatic changes impacting young lawyers in the legal marketplace, including a dearth of employment opportunities, crushing law school debt, and increased instances of young lawyers starting their own solo law practice directly out of law school, without the benefit of any training, experience, or mentoring. However, that is not due to a lack of interest in mentoring.

There is a strong demand by young lawyers to find mentors to help them improve their competency and professionalism as they enter the profession. Results from a June 2015 California Bar E-Journal Survey show the importance of mentoring in the early career of lawyers.

How Important was mentoring in your early career as a lawyer?	
Not Important	15.6%
It helped me get up to speed faster	30.1%
It was crucial to my success	54.3%

There is a corresponding need to protect the public from lawyers not suitably trained in the practicalities and ethics in the practice of law. Helping further educate and train these young lawyers to become effective and responsible lawyers can contribute to and is an essential part of the public protection mandate of the State Bar.

A recent unpublished study by the State of South Carolina noted a reduction in serious disciplinary sanctions among new attorneys who participated in a State Bar mandated mentoring program.

The following data was compiled by South Carolina and reported to the South Carolina Supreme Court. Note that no data has been compiled on minor sanctions (public reprimands, etc).

Serious Disciplinary Sanctions (Suspensions, Disbarment) Imposed on South Carolina Lawyers Admitted to Practice 5 Years or Less, Pre- and Post- Mentoring

TIME PERIOD	TOTAL SANCTIONS	AVERAGE/YEAR
1995-1999	146	29.2
2000-2004	143	28.6
2005-2009	47	9.4
2010-2014	18	3.6
2012-2014 (2 years, 9 months)	3	1.1

Mentoring Time Line

First Pilot Program: 2006 (last names A-F)

Second Pilot Program: March 2009 – January 1, 2011

Permanent Program: April 2012

Sanctions in First Pilot Program Participants

Last Name A-F (all mentored): No Sanctions

Last Name G-Z (nor formal mentoring): 5 Sanctions

BOARD OF TRUSTEES MANDATE:

To address issues facing new and young attorneys, the Board of Trustees created the State Bar Mentoring Task Force in September 2014. President Craig Holden appointed members to the Task Force in February 2015. (*See Appendix for full roster*) The Task Force was designed to bring together the Sections, the California Young Lawyers Association (“CYLA”), the Council on Access & Fairness and the Board of Trustees to explore, create and develop mentoring programs and initiatives for young and new lawyers. The Task Force was charged with coordinating the efforts of each group, and exploring and promoting best practices to be implemented in mentoring programs. The aim of mentoring young and new lawyers is to increase the education and training of these attorneys and to promote competency, professionalism, and ethics.

Further, the Task Force was asked to consider and identify funding sources for this effort, but funding was not required to support it. The Task Force held meetings and public hearings and is expected to make a report to the full Board of Trustees during the current Board year. The activities of the Task Force are funded with voluntary sources of revenue.

INITIAL TASK FORCE BRIEFINGS:

The Task Force received and reviewed background information and identified the potential young and new lawyers to be served by a mentoring program, prior efforts between California Young Lawyers Association (CYLA) and the State Bar Business Law Section, and national resources and expertise to assist in the work of the Task Force. Information included the following:

Demographics/numbers of potential new lawyers each year:

State Bar data shows that there are over 40,000 lawyers that qualify as CYLA members. CYLA membership requires that the lawyer be 36 years old or under, or in practice under five years. Bar exam passage data for the past three years shows the following number of new lawyers each year: 2012 (5,007 passed the bar exam); 2013 (4,716 passed the exam) and 2014 (3,887 passed the exam). (*See Appendix for Complete Data*)

Mentoring Efforts through the State Bar Business Law Section and CYLA:

The Business Law Section memorandum that appears in the Appendix describes the program, experience, and recommendations from the Joint Mentoring Program of the Business Law Section and the California Young Lawyers Association.

National Legal Mentoring Consortium:

The National Legal Mentoring Consortium consists of administrators and contributors of mentoring programs sponsored by:

- Law schools
- Bar associations
- State supreme courts
- Law firms
- Other organizations

The Consortium is an invaluable resource for legal professionals aspiring to develop and implement a mentoring program. Through the free exchange of ideas, the Consortium hopes to invigorate existing mentoring programs across the country.

The National Legal Mentoring Consortium:

- encourages mentoring in the legal profession;
- provides a venue for the exchange of ideas related to mentoring in the legal profession;
- provides resources to aid in the successful creation and operation of mentoring initiatives within law firms, bar organizations, law schools, courts, and other entities within the legal profession.

The Consortium has an extensive listing of mentoring programs at <http://www.legalmentoring.org/mentoringprograms.php?id=0>. The listings include State, Local, Ethnic, Law Firm, Law School, and Organizational programs. The Mentoring Task Force used this list to conduct its initial review of existing programs.

INITIAL TASK FORCE RESEARCH:

At its initial meeting, the Task Force reviewed its charge and created four working groups focused on surveying current state, local and other mentoring programs and identifying key issues that will need to be considered as it develops recommendations for new and young attorney mentoring programs in California.

The four working groups focused on: (1) statewide mentoring programs, (2) mentoring programs associated with local bars, minority bars, specialty bars, law firms, law schools and other law related mentoring programs, (3) online platforms and (4) marketing and recruitment. *(See Appendix for Working Group Rosters)*

Initial Working Group findings were as follows:

STATEWIDE MENTORING WORKING GROUP: ***(see Appendix for full report)***

At the February 19, 2015, meeting, the Working Group decided to survey existing statewide programs that had been identified in materials provided as part of the initial meeting of the Task Force. The Working Group surveyed the following states:

Arizona	Idaho	Nevada	South Carolina
Arkansas	Illinois	New Hampshire	South Dakota
Colorado	Indiana	New Jersey	Tennessee
Connecticut	Louisiana	New Mexico	Texas
Delaware	Maryland	North Carolina	Utah
Florida	Massachusetts	Ohio	Vermont
Georgia	Michigan	Oregon	

For each state, the Working Group researched the following:

- How many people are in the program?
- What subject areas are covered?
- Is there a curriculum developed and, if so, what is it?
- Is the program voluntary or mandatory?
- Is CLE credit provided?
- Is there any training or expectation setting of mentors and mentees prior to the program?
- Are the mentors and mentees required to meet, and, if so, how often?
- How is the program funded, and what is the cost per attorney?
- Has the program resulted in any drop in disciplinary actions?
- What particular challenges has the program faced, and what advice could be given to us?

The research was conducted by reviewing applicable websites, and following up with email communications and telephone conversations. The Group assessed the results of the survey, and outlined the following major issues to be considered by the Task Force:

- **What are the goals of the mentoring program?**

The Working Group generally believes that the mentoring program should focus on the education and training of attorneys on subjects “not taught in law school.” These include such items as practice management, trust accounting, business development, and work-life integration. Additional training should focus on promoting the pursuit of excellence in service to clients, connections of new lawyers to the legal community, access to experienced attorneys equipped to teach practical skills and model seasoned judgment, and sensitivity to ethical and professional values necessary to practice law.

The Working Group believes measurable goals need to be articulated to guide the Task Force. The Task Force should consider adopting goals that lend themselves to objective analysis, e.g., reducing disciplinary actions pertaining to trust fund accounting, and malpractice claims against new attorneys. The Working Group recognizes that some subjects, e.g., trust fund accounting, might be better handled through tailored CLE courses rather than through mentoring. Once the goals are established, the Working Group should define strategies that will enable California to satisfy these goals.

- **Should the program be voluntary or mandatory?**

Programs reviewed varied in terms of mandatory or voluntary participation by young lawyers. A number of factors will ultimately need to be evaluated to determine the feasibility of requiring mentee participation, including the sheer volume of approximately 4,000 new lawyers per year in California, the challenges in recruiting sufficient numbers of mentors to meet the various needs of the mentees, the overall scale and potential costs of the program, and the purpose of the mentoring program (e.g. substantive training, professionalism, ethics, competency, and other professional and management skills).

- **What are the challenges to program implementation?**

The Working Group noted that most of the programs surveyed were in states that had far fewer lawyers than California. California’s program may need to operate on a regional basis given the size of the state and the variety of regional differences in practice. This raised the issue of whether the program should be managed in a centralized or decentralized manner. If a decentralized approach is adopted, the Task Force will need to consider how to coordinate programs in different locations.

- **How should performance be measured?**

The Working Group also discussed how performance of the program could be objectively measured. It noted the strong relationship between defining

measurable indices for success and the objectives for the program. As discussed above the Working Group believes that deep and objective criteria are required. The Working Group also discussed the extent to which a baseline of quantifiable indices could be developed and used to measure program performance.

The Working Group believes that data must be gathered to assist in analyzing program success. One critical set of data points should focus on the program's impact on the State Bar's disciplinary activities. Data should be collected to track and compare disciplinary actions against attorneys who participated in a mentoring program compared to attorneys with the same number of years of practice who did not. Another metric is to determine any increased participation in Bar or pro bono activities among mentor program participants. The Working Group welcomes input from the Task Force concerning possible performance metrics for the program.

In the course of its discussion, the Statewide Mentoring Working Group also identified other issues for review as follows:

- **Program Operation:** The Task Force received input from existing programs, particularly in the states of Illinois and Colorado, that ongoing operation of the program requires significant staff time. Programs are not self-operating; staff is required to ensure smooth and appropriate operation and adjustment of the program where required.
- **Program Resources:** The Task Force will need to consider the extent to which program management and operation should be centralized, and whether a fee-based approach is feasible and equitable. The Task Force will also need to formulate methods to reduce the burden on staff in managing and operating the program.
- **Electronic Resources:** It was noted that better organized groups had program materials available online, including forms, manuals, curricula, and mentor-mentee plans. Although most of the programs surveyed encouraged or required face-to-face meetings, some are currently exploring the use of Skype or other web-based capabilities. The Task Force will need to make recommendations to the State Bar regarding materials and website functionality to assist the mentoring program.
- **Mentor Recruitment:** The Working Group noted that many of the States with better organized programs provide CLE credit for the mentors, and, often, for the mentees. Other creative recruitment methods were also used. The Task Force will need to determine whether CLE credit should be provided to the mentor, mentee, or both, and other ways to recruit high quality mentors.

OTHER MENTORING PROGRAMS WORKING GROUP:
(See Appendix for full report and research))

The Working Group was assigned the review of mentoring programs from Local/Minority Bars, Law Schools, Law Firms and Other Organizations. The programs reviewed are noted in the Appendix.

The Working Group findings were as follows:

- **Overall Program Focus:** The program's focus should be to promote professional pride and identity in the legal profession; to promote the pursuit of excellence in service to clients; and to promote strong relationships between the bar, courts, law schools, and the public through personalized education and training of new lawyers. The program should provide new lawyers meaningful access to experienced attorneys equipped to teach practical skills, seasoned judgment, and sensibility to ethical and professionalism values necessary to practice law.
- **Target Audience:** New lawyers admitted within the past two years. Also group sessions should be considered for attorneys admitted for 3+ years
- **Mentor Qualifications:** To qualify as a mentor, an attorney must be a practicing attorney in California for a minimum of five (5) years, in good standing, never suspended or disbarred from practice of law in any state or jurisdiction and with no formal disciplinary complaint pending.
- **Mentor and Mentee Training/Orientation:** Mentors and mentees should attend training/orientation sessions.
- **Compensation/Incentives** (MCLE, Billable hours etc.): MCLE credit should be provided for both the mentor and the mentee. Agencies that employ MCLE exempt attorneys should consider additional incentives, such as:
 - outreach to encourage agency buy-in about the importance of mentoring
 - agency focus groups to consider their input about incentives
 - awards and recognition
 - encouraging in-house mentoring programs
 - promotion of outreach so that greater legal community may benefit from mentor relationship with governmental agency attorneys
 - section fee reduction
- **Best Practices:** The Working Group identified a number of best practices for delivery of services including:

- One-on-one in person (the most popular model), by telephone and by email sessions;
 - Group sessions;
 - E-mentoring: a series of short videos featuring judges and lawyers who answer various questions about the legal profession and the law;
 - HELP-line: featuring a hotline of experienced attorneys who answer questions on legal and professional matters; and
 - Implement Pilot Program (include diverse legal communities (i.e. metropolitan and rural)
- **Other Issues for Consideration:**
 - What outcomes the program expects to achieve and how will these be measured?
 - Who would oversee the program and how would the program be funded?
 - What incentives can be offered to mentors who are exempt from MCLE and/or billable hours?

ONLINE PLATFORMS WORKING GROUP:
(See Appendix for full report)

Part of the Working Group's task was to explore the inclusion of an online component as part of a potential state-wide mentorship program. The Working Group explored and researched other state and local programs that have an online component to their mentorship program, and spoke to vendors who provide electronic "matching" software used to pair up mentors and mentees.

State Programs:

Although many states have enacted some type of mentorship program for new and young lawyers, few states included an additional online training component comprised of basic skills and issues encountered by young lawyers. However, implementation of an online video series component as part of a mentoring program is easy to administer and has potential for better results than an in-person component alone. These videos seem like a natural fit to a program in California, given their success and easy administration. Because CYLA currently is running a program based on the content and speakers presented at the State Bar Annual Meeting, we recommend continuing the program and making it a component of our recommendations for a larger program.

Online Vendors:

The bulk of our time was spent researching vendors who are developing electronic programs to match mentors with mentees. We believe that if California implements a state-wide program that includes a pairing component, utilizing software for matching is essential. However, one of the largest outstanding questions that must be resolved is how to administer such a program. More experienced, successful programs have high administrative support demands with costs paid out of mandatory dues and/or program registration fees.

Before we can make any online vendor or program decisions, this Task Force needs to determine the number of staff and other resources needed to meet the administrative demands for a recommended program and the source of funds to cover the program costs.

Key Issues for Consideration:

- We need to explore the ability of partnering software with online social media communities to provide for both a business base (i.e. LinkedIn) as well as a social base (i.e. Facebook) to assist in well-rounded pairs/matches.
- We need to investigate whether additional liability is created for the State Bar if we are technically responsible for the “matching”. There are three “selection” options – mentee selects mentor from mentor pool; mentor selects mentee from mentee pool, or administrator does the pairing.
- We need to address situations where potential conflicts of interest are identified on cases handled by the mentor and mentee.
- We need to determine whether the program will be regionally or globally administered.
- We need to investigate whether local bar associations can administer State Bar approved mentoring programs. Factors to be considered include the degree of supervisory authority that can be delegated to local bar associations and whether conflicts will arise between the State Bar and local programs.

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT WORKING GROUP:

(See Appendix for full report)

The Marketing and Recruitment Working Group reviewed potential strategies for marketing the State Bar mentoring program and recruiting mentors for the program. The Working Group determined that if the mentoring program is ready to implement in late 2016, marketing and recruitment efforts should begin in early 2016.

Marketing and Publicity:

- **Overall Marketing Strategy**

The Working Group agreed that aside from widely publicizing the existence and details of the new mentoring program, the main challenge will be to recruit qualified and dedicated mentors for the program. It is expected that with the present attorney job market, it should be fairly easy to recruit new lawyers to participate as mentees.

As part of the marketing strategy, the Working Group formulated a name for the new program: “**AMP**,” Attorney Mentoring Program.

The Working Group also formulated a proposed slogan:

“AMP Up Your Career With The Attorney Mentoring Program!”

- **State Bar Outreach**

Marketing and publicity for the mentoring program should take place through all State Bar publications and dissemination of information to the members. In addition, the State Bar Sections, including CYLA, and the various specialty sections, including Litigation, Criminal Law, Business Law, and Family Law, will be instrumental in recruiting mentees and mentors.

- **Specialty and Minority Bar Organizations**

The Bar should be utilizing statewide and local bar organizations throughout California to publicize the program and to recruit participants. Public Sector, Governmental Legal Organizations (such as District Attorney Offices, Public Defender Offices, Municipalities, City Attorney Offices), and public interest lawyers should be encouraged to participate in the program as mentors.

To the extent the specialty, minority bar and governmental legal organizations have mentoring programs of their own, those programs could become part of the State Bar Mentoring program, depending upon the State Bar’s final criteria and requirements for its program.

- **Kick-Off Event**

The Working Group recommends the launching of the State Bar’s Mentoring Program with a widely publicized and well-attended Kick-Off Event, perhaps over the summer of 2016 or at the 2016 State Bar Annual Meeting, featuring a prominent legal figure such as Attorney General Kamala Harris or Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye.

- **Social Media Outreach**

Social media will be key in recruiting new members for the program disseminating information, obtaining feedback, and ongoing communications. Social media will be important in conducting outreach to new lawyers. In addition to the mentoring program’s website, the program should maintain a LinkedIn

Group, Facebook page and a Twitter account. Depending on the parameters of the program, the mentoring program could consider a “Match.com” type website to match mentors with mentees.

- **Importance of Successful Messaging**

A key factor in the success of marketing efforts will be crafting successful messages that convey the attractiveness and benefits of being involved in the mentoring program. Such messages could be distributed through videos, publications, and presentations containing true stories of mentoring success and benefits.

The obvious benefits for the mentee include obtaining guidance, instruction and advice from a more senior attorney (not necessarily in her or his area of specialty); introduction to new careers and job opportunities; and networking for future job opportunities and referrals.

For mentors, the mentoring program can be used to train young lawyers in their own firms and to recruit new lawyers. In addition, many senior lawyers hone their skills and gain a greater reputation for their expertise in serving as mentors to young lawyers.

Recruitment:

Providing attractive incentives will be important in recruiting new mentors for the program. The Working Group believes that given the influx of new lawyers and the paucity of attractive job opportunities, it will not be difficult to find mentees. The challenge will be to offer significant incentives for more senior attorneys, who are busy with their careers and personal lives, to participate in the program. (*See Appendix for Business Law Section/CYLA Mentoring Program Memo*)

Some of these incentives include:

- **MCLE Credit:** One easily implemented idea would be to offer MCLE credit to bar members acting as mentors. In particular, the Bar could offer a certain number of hours of MCLE credit per year towards the 25 hours of mandatory MCLE required every three years for each member. The credit would be conditioned upon spending a successful year as a mentor, including positive feedback from the mentee and documented participation in the program. The mentoring program could be structured to be conducive to offering MCLE credit. This incentive has proven effective in other state programs examined by the Task Force. The Task Force needs to develop precise criteria to allow mentors and mentees to qualify for MCLE credit.
- **Discount on Bar or Section Dues:** The Working Group also discussed the idea of offering a discount on State Bar or State Bar Section dues for documented and

successful participation in the mentoring program. However, because of the potential impact of such a discount on the State Bar and Section operating budgets, this was determined not to be a viable approach. The group also considered offering qualified mentors the first year of any new Section membership for free.

- **Pro Bono Credits:** Also discussed was the idea of instituting a pro bono hours requirement for each member, with the ability to fulfill that requirement through participation in the mentoring program. However, the Working Group understands there would likely be considerable resistance to implementing an annual pro bono requirement for all members. An alternative would be to include qualified structured mentoring by attorneys as a way to meet the current State Bar aspirational pro bono goal of 50 hours per year.
- **State Bar Certified Mentor:** Among the benefits of serving as a mentor in the program could be the potential for becoming recognized as a “State Bar Certified Mentor.” Criteria for this distinction would have to be developed. The distinction could be advertised on the State Bar website and other materials, and could be used in attorney or firm websites as a recruitment tool for young lawyers.
- **Mentoring Awards and Ceremony:** The State Bar could recognize excellence in mentoring at an annual Mentoring Awards Ceremony, likely held at the State Bar’s Annual Meeting. Awards could be offered for the best mentor in each district based on nominations by mentees. In addition, to individual awards, awards could be offered for the best mentor or mentoring program in the following categories: Non Profit, Small Law Firm (1-50), Large Law Firm (100+), Corporate, Local Level, Local or Specialty Bar. Additionally, partnership with the Attorney General’s Office could include mentoring awards as part of its internal recognition programs.

Other Ideas re: Mentoring Program:

Although somewhat outside the Working Group’s purview, the Working Group discussed the following ideas regarding implementation of the final mentoring program.

- **Pod Mentoring:** Rather than have one mentor responsible for one mentee, the idea would be to have 2 or more mentors responsible for 5-8 mentees in a pod. If a mentor is unavailable to attend a meeting because of work or other commitments, other mentors can fill in. This pod structure would also permit mentees to benefit through interaction with a number of mentors from diverse backgrounds. The pods could be organized geographically and by subject area. The pod meetings could be set on a regular monthly or bi-monthly basis, and organized around specific topics for discussion or MCLE offerings.

- **Operations:** The day-to-day operation of the mentoring program and the program's website need to be administered by an office at the State Bar. This office and the website can also serve as a clearinghouse for information about mentoring opportunities and resources throughout the state.
- **Funding:** Funding the mentoring program will be challenging. The mentoring program would be part of the State Bar's primary role of public protection and the education and training of attorneys, so it would be possible to fund the program through mandatory dues. Another option would be to ask each new member to pay a small fee to fund the program. The State Bar could also solicit donations from private companies and foundations.

ISSUES FOR FURTHER TASK FORCE DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based on the review and discussion of the Working Group reports and recommendations, the Mentoring Task Force developed the following proposals and list of issues for further discussion as it develops its final program recommendations.

Pilot Program:

The Task Force agreed that whatever the program recommendation, the program should be implemented on a pilot basis, with ongoing review and evaluation and ultimate program revisions to ensure ongoing effectiveness and stability. The group recommends that the potential size of the pilot be at least 75 to 100 mentees with one or two mentees per mentor.

In addition to the one-on-one or one-to-two matches, the pilot program could also consider group mentoring, e-mentoring (to meet via something like Skype, etc). Tech platforms and media could be made available for mentor-mentee meetings and communications. Existing mentoring programs through employers, bar associations, etc. could be incorporated so long as they meet State Bar program standards. Local trainers and coordinators could be trained to support and expand the program.

The Task Force could consider using the State Bar MCLE system as one model for how the mentoring program might be set up (using administrative staff structure, costs, etc. as benchmarks for comparison)

The Task Force could also consider expanding pro bono requirements and credits for mentor services, if approved by the State Bar.

DRAFT Program Mission Statement:

The Task Force developed the following draft mentoring program mission statement:

“The goal of the State Bar Attorney Mentoring Program is to further public protection through mentoring, education, and the training of young lawyers to promote the pursuit of excellence, professionalism, and ethics in the practice of law.”

Program Goals:

A formal mentoring program would help to achieve the following:

- Support the State Bar’s public protection mission by helping to develop practical skills, and educating new lawyers in professionalism, civility and ethical issues
- Avoid or reduce the number of complaints about new lawyer services
- Provide training in law practice management skills
- Prevent isolation for new lawyers
- Promote strong, professional relationships
- Encourage support for and delivery of pro bono services
- Give new lawyers role models of professional behavior
- Build good client relation skills
- Support underserved areas, especially where new lawyers do not have access to training and mentoring services

New Lawyer Participation:

Discussion focused on whether the program should be mandatory or voluntary for new lawyers and is summarized below.

Mandatory Program:

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure mentoring support provided to all new lawyers.• All new lawyers would be a captive audience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sheer size (3,000 to 4,000 new lawyers each year) would make the program hard to manage• There would be huge resistance to a mandatory program• It would be difficult to recruit enough mentors to support the needs of the large numbers of new lawyers• Costs would be increased• Mandatory program would require major oversight to ensure compliance or would run the risk of non-compliance

Voluntary Program:

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fewer numbers would make the program more manageable• Fewer mentors would be needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of participation by and support for all new lawyers• Waiting list for mentors• Difficulties implementing the program in rural areas

Opting Out of Program:

Certain instances were identified where the new lawyer could opt out of the program including:

- The new lawyer is enrolled in or has completed another State Bar approved mentoring program
- The lawyer has practiced in another state or jurisdiction for more than 5 years

Alternatives to Direct Participation in the State Bar's Mentoring Program:

- The new lawyer participates in a State Bar-approved mentoring program sponsored by the law firm or workplace where she/he is employed and completes the program in compliance with State Bar requirements

- The new lawyer participates in a State Bar-approved mentoring program sponsored by a bar association or other professional organization for lawyers and completes the program in compliance with State Bar requirements

Program Structure:

Whether the program should be centralized, localized or a hybrid was discussed with the following pros and cons identified:

Benefits of a Centralized Program	Benefits of a Localized or Hybrid program
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Able to maintain standards • Economic efficiency/fiscal management • Ability to ensure mentoring services for rural areas • Efficient and standardized recordkeeping • Single manageable database • Training provided through the State Bar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More feasible given size of California geographic, organic needs • Help to generate local buy-in and participation • Facilitate economic pass-throughs • More difficult for program evaluation • Disparity in quality of matches

Online Features:

The Task Force agreed that program effectiveness would require some level of online support and resources as follows:

- The matching process would require an online platform taking into consideration geographical location/zip code, areas/types of practice and the ability to provide for both a business base (i.e. LinkedIn) as well as a social base (i.e. Facebook) to assist in well-rounded pairs/matches.
- Personality profiles for mentors and mentees could be created and applied through an online database
- Electronic surveys of mentors and mentees could be conducted periodically and/or routinely through email and monitor program success and ease the burden of manual reports
- A “tool box” or library of forms, resources and other materials could be made available
- Compliance logs could be maintained online
- Technology that facilitates mentor-mentee meetings and communications

Measuring Program Performance:

The Task Force agreed it was essential that the program include outcome measures and program evaluation as follows:

- There should be a year-end review of the effectiveness of the mentor-mentee relationship;
- There should be periodic evaluations, feedback during the year re: the mentor-mentee relationship
- Compliance with program requirements and certifications should be evaluated online
- MCLE credits should be reported and monitored online

Mentor Qualifications:

Initial qualifications for mentors were identified:

- Minimum number years of practice (e.g. more than 5 years of practice)
- No disciplinary record
- A member “in good standing”
- Never been suspended or disbarred in any state
- Completes basic mentor training
- In some instances, meets additional qualifications for designation as a “Certified Mentor”

Mentor Training:

Mentor training should include the following elements:

- What is Mentoring?
- How do you mentor?
- What are the requirements for mentors? Attributes of good mentors?
- What are the program expectations?
- Creating a Mentoring Plan:
 - In-Person/Online contact
 - Webinars
 - In-Person contact on a quarterly basis
 - Monthly Contact
 - Tool Kit for mentoring resources
 - Goal setting, “SMART” Goals
 - Listening
 - Advising
 - What will we do together/when not together

Mentee Training:

Mentee training would include the following topics:

- Ethics and Bias issues
- Law practice management skills
- Trust Fund management
- Managing Stress
- Work Life Balance

- Expectations of Mentees – how to be a mentee
- Taking advantage of networking opportunities
- Pro bono services through the mentoring experience
- Giving Back – Being a future mentor
- Partnering with CYLA
- Online Book Club

Mentor Incentives:

The following items were identified as potential incentives for attorneys to volunteer as mentors:

- MCLE Credits for certain mentoring activities
- Free first year membership in a State Bar Section for qualified mentors
- Judicial recommendations of certain attorneys as mentors
- Mentor Certifications
- State Bar Mentor designation
- Increased networking
- Enhanced reputation
- Official Recognition/Awards for mentor contributions
- Additional training
- Professional development
- Public service
- Role in influencing the next generation of lawyers

Marketing Strategy:

The following ideas were identified for marketing the program:

- Ensuring the implementation of the State Bar Public Protection mission
- Getting the word out to voluntary bar associations, the public, etc.
- Identify a high profile, well respected spokesperson (e.g. “Czar” of mentoring)
- Road Show to promote Pilot Program
- CYLA network
- Section network
- Leadership of law firms and government agencies and institutions that employ lawyers

Program Resources:

- Staff and administrative support
- Program Funding/Budget

#####

APPENDIX

- Mentoring Task Force Roster
- Working Group Rosters
- Business Law Section/CYLA Mentoring Program
- Working Group Reports:
 - Statewide Programs Report
 - Other Programs Report
 - Online Platforms Report
 - Marketing and Recruitment Report
- Bar Exam Data/Demographics
- Resources

State Bar of California

2015 MENTORING TASK FORCE ROSTER

OFFICERS:

CHAIR:

Hon. Marguerite Downing
Edelman Children's Court
201 Centre Plaza Drive, D-407
Monterey Park, CA 91754
323-307-8007
mdowning@lacourt.org

CO-VICE CHAIR:

Ida Abbott
5906 Bruns Court
Oakland CA 94611
510-339-6883
IdaAbbott@aol.com

CO-VICE CHAIR

Emily Aldrich
Wells Fargo Law Department
333 S. Grand Ave., Suite 1040
Los Angeles CA 90071
213-253-7121
Emily.aldrich@wellsfargo.com

MEMBERS:

Hon. Diana Becton
Contra Costa County Superior Court
725 Court Street
Martinez CA 94553
925-957-5730
dbect@contracosta.courts.ca.gov

Hon. Chris Brown
Mayor of Hawthorne
Hawthorne City Hall
4455 W. 126th Street
Hawthorne CA 901250
310-349-2901
cbrown@hawthorneCA.gov
310-403-3332
MayorChrisBrown@gmail.com

Otis Bruce
Supervisor, Deputy District Attorney
Marin County, Office of the District Attorney
3501 Civic Center Dr.
San Rafael, CA 94903
415-499-6450/cell: 415-798-1529
obruce@marincounty.org
415-499-6450/cell: 415-798-1529
obruce@marincounty.org

Pamela Clark-Meister
Managing Counsel
Intel Corp
2200 Mission College Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95054
480-715-4973/ cell: 480-236-1599
pamela.clark.meister@intel.com

Miye Goishi

Director and Clinical Professor of Law --
Civil Justice Clinic
University of California,
Hastings College of the Law
100 McAllister St., Ste. 300
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 581-8915 (direct)
goishimi@uchastings.edu

Sonia Gonzales, Executive Director
California Bar Foundation
180 Howard Street, 3rd floor
San Francisco CA 94105
415-856-0780 x 303
sgonzales@calbarfoundation.org

Robert V. Hawn

Strategy Law, LLP
One Almaden Boulevard, Suite 700
San Jose, California 95113
408.478.4100
bhawn@strategylaw.com

Lisa Jacobs

Shartsis Friese LLP
1 Maritime Plaza Suite 1800
San Francisco CA 94111
415-421-6500/cell: 510-703-6605
ljacobs@sflaw.com

Fredericka McGee

Office of the Speaker, General Counsel &
Deputy Chief of Staff
State Capitol Room #219
Sacramento CA 95814
916-319-2078
Fredericka.McGee@asm.ca.gov

Ann Park, Partner

Pond North, LLP
350 S. Grand Ave, Suite 3300
Los Angeles CA 90071
213-617-6170
apark@pondnorth.com

Mark Ressa, CFLS

Law Offices of Mark Ressa
Legacy Plaza San Ramon
2010 Crow Canyon Place, Suite 200
San Ramon, CA 94583
1 925-328-0103
mark@bayareadivorce.com

Trina Saunders

California Office of the Attorney General
300 S, Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles CA 90013
213-361-6755
Trina.saunders@doj.ca.gov

BOARD OF TRUSTEES LIAISONS:

Joanna Mendoza

Law Offices of Joanna Mendoza
PO Box 2593
5955 Granite Lake Dr, Suite 170
Granite Bay, CA 95746
916-781-7600
jmendoza@theiplawfirm.com

David Torres

Attorney at Law
1318 K Street
Bakersfield CA 93301
661-326-0857
dtorres@lawtorres.com

James Fox

308 Devonshire Blvd.
San Carlos, CA 94070
Phone: 650-592-3353
dacosc@comcast.net

STAFF LIAISONS:

Patricia Lee

Special Assistant for Diversity & Bar Relations
State Bar of California
180 Howard Street, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-538-2240
415-407-7220 (cell)
patricia.lee@calbar.ca.gov

Susan Phan

Liaison, Office of General Counsel
The State Bar of California
180 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-538-2333
susan.phan@calbar.ca.gov

Brandi Holmes

Senior Administrative Assistant
Access & Fairness Programs
State Bar of California
180 Howard Street, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-538-2587
brandi.holmes@calbar.ca.gov

State Bar Mentoring Task Force Working Group Rosters

Hon. Marguerite Downing, Chair
mdowning@lacourt.org

State Bar/Sections Model	Online Platforms
Robert Hawn, Chair bhawn@strategylaw.com Ida Abbot IdaAbbott@aol.com Lisa Jacobs ljacobs@sflaw.com Mark Ressa mark@bayareadivorce.com	Emily Aldrich, Chair Aldrich.emily@gmail.com Miye Goishi goishimi@uchastings.edu Sonia Gonzales sgonzales@calbarfoundation.org
Local/Minority Bars, Law Schools, Law Firms and Other Organizations	Marketing/Recruitment
Hon. Diana Becton, Chair dbect@contracosta.courts.ca.gov Otis Bruce obruce@marincounty.org Trina Saunders Trina.saunders@doj.ca.gov	Ann Park, Chair apark@pondnorth.com Mayor Chris Brown cbrown@hawthorneCA.gov Pamela Clark-Meister Pamela.clark.meister@intel.com Fredericka McGee Fredericka.McGee@asm.ca.gov

State Bar Staff Contacts:

Patricia Lee
415-538-2240
patricia.lee@calbar.ca.gov

Brandi Holmes
415-538-2587
brandi.holmes@calbar.ca.gov

Susan Phan
415-538-2333
susan.phan@calbar.ca.gov

BOT Liaisons:

Joanna Mendoza
jmendoza@theiplawfirm.com

David Torres
dtorres@lawtorres.com

James Fox
dacosm@comcast.net

MEMORANDUM

To: Business Law Section Executive Committee

From: Business Law Section/California Young Lawyers Association Mentoring Task Force

Date: August 4, 2014

Re: The BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program - Recommendation

This Memorandum discusses the Mentoring Program operated by the BLS/CYLA and the Committee's recommendations regarding continuing the Program in some other form.

History of BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program

In late 2011, the Business Law Section ("BLS") reached out to the California Young Lawyers Association ("CYLA") to discuss creating a mentoring program in which designated BLS attorneys would serve as mentors to CYLA members. The goals of the Mentoring Program included fostering professionalism, ethics, civility and legal skills among new lawyers.

Following initial discussions, the respective BLS and CYLA representatives created the "BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Guidelines," attached as Appendix A. The Guidelines were intended to serve as a rough outline of the program and a basis for discussion and approval by the BLS Executive Committee and the CYLA Board.

In early 2012, both the BLS Executive Committee and CYLA Board formally approved the BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Guidelines and the creation of a joint mentoring program. A joint committee made up of both BLS Executive Committee members and CYLA Board members was established. This BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Committee was charged with the task of creating and implementing the Mentoring Program.

Following a number of preliminary (telephonic) meetings, the BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Committee made several key decisions regarding how the program would be launched and operated:

- (1) The program would be open to any CYLA member interested in practicing business law. A CYLA member is defined as an attorney who has been in practice for five years or fewer or is under the age of 36.
- (2) Mentors would be any attorney licensed in California with at least five years of experience who practices business law, whether or not a member of BLS.
- (3) Mentoring would be done in groups, where three to five mentees would be matched with one mentor.
- (4) Matching of mentoring groups would be done on the basis of practice area interest first and geographic proximity second.¹

¹ Note, after soliciting feedback from program participants, geographic location was given priority in forming mentoring groups as both mentees and mentors expressed a preference for being able to meet in person and the importance of understanding the local bar.

(5) The program would be launched and then would continue on a rolling basis. In other words, mentee applications would be received, mentors solicited, and additional mentoring groups formed on an ongoing basis.

(6) Under the program, the formal mentoring relationship would last for one year, and would ideally include 6 meetings, in person or telephonic, during the year. Mentors would typically hold meetings jointly with the mentees assigned to them.

The BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Committee then prepared the forms necessary to run the program, including:

- (1) a mentee application form;
- (2) a mentee application transmittal cover letter,
- (3) a mentor questionnaire;
- (4) a mentor questionnaire transmittal cover letter,
- (5) a “match letter” informing the mentee of acceptance into the program and the identity of the mentor to whom he/she was matched;
- (6) a “match letter” to the mentor providing him/her the names of and contact information for the mentees assigned to him/her; and
- (7) publicity materials announcing the program.²

The program and the above-described materials were approved by the State Bar’s Office of the General Counsel before the program was launched. Versions of documents 1 through 4 were uploaded into the BLS Hummingbird site.

In approximately June 2012, the mentoring program formally began. An announcement about the program was added to CYLA’s webpage, CYLA sent out an e-news blast, Facebook post, and tweet soliciting mentees, and BLS sent out an e-news blast soliciting mentors. Mentee applications began pouring in shortly thereafter.

The BLS actively solicited mentors. During the duration of the program, a solicitation article was placed in each issue of the E-News, BLS’ monthly email newsletter. An ad was also run in the BLS’ flagship publication, the Business Law News. Last, a reception was held during the State Bar Annual Meeting held in October, 2013, honoring current mentors.

A BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Committee member took responsibility for tracking incoming mentee applications and mentor questionnaires. The first three mentoring groups (each consisting of 1 mentor and 5 mentees) were launched in July 2012. After the initial launch, mentee applications continued to roll-in on a steady basis. Other than the static webpage about the program, CYLA never did any additional promotion of the program (no additional emails, Facebook posts or tweets). BLS continued to advertise in order to solicit additional mentors.

From an administrative standpoint, once the program was launched, the Committee was responsible for soliciting additional mentors, tracking incoming mentee applications, responding to communications from potential mentees and mentors, vetting mentors (checking their state bar

² With the exception of the publicity materials, these forms are attached hereto as Appendix B.

status), and matching mentees with mentors. For a significant portion of the Program's existence, these tasks were largely handled by one member of the Committee, with the exception of soliciting mentors and matching, the responsibilities of which were shared by the Committee.³

Tracking mentee applications as they came in, and responding to interested potential mentees, became an important and time consuming task as far more mentee applications were received than mentors were available. The Committee attempted to give priority to mentees who had been on the de facto waiting list the longest, while also accommodating geographic proximity and practice area compatibility.

Between the program's public launch and the end of its first year, approximately 13 mentoring groups were launched. Mentee applications continued to come in at a steady pace over that time. However, finding mentors willing to serve became increasingly challenging. In the Program's second year, only 5 mentoring groups were launched. On average there were 15-20 potential mentees on the waiting list. When the program ended in June 2014, mentoring had been provided to approximately 89 mentees. Another 18 potential mentees were still on the waiting list, some having submitted their applications over a year earlier.

Challenges Experienced

The BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program faced a number of challenges throughout its history.

Mentor Recruitment

The most significant challenge was in recruiting mentors. Because of the lack of any credit or income from the program, it was extraordinarily difficult to add mentors to the program. The psychic return in helping to foster professional development among new lawyers proved to be an insufficient draw. The task force tried a number of approaches, including a recognition reception at the Annual Meeting, personal emails to prospective mentors, personal appeals, and advertising in the monthly electronic E-News and the quarterly print Business Law News. Even with these efforts, the number of mentors never exceed 16. The lack of mentors severely constrained the growth of the program and prevented the assignment of a number of qualified mentees.

Geographic Proximity Issues

In the beginning of 2013, the program conducted a survey of the mentees using survey monkey, and of the mentors using email and direct conversations. One of the universal responses was the need for face to face communications and for matching of mentors and mentees practicing in the same legal community where their shared experiences were most relevant. This required mentors and mentees to be in close geographic locations and further constrained the ability to create groups. Certain geographic areas, particularly Los Angeles, contained strong mentee demand but no mentors.

³ In 2014, in order to share the administrative burden of the Program, the Committee members began rotating all responsibilities. Those responsibilities are outlined in Appendix C, hereto.

Administrative Burden

The administration of the program was conducted by members of the task force, who handled the significant time commitment in various ways. In particular, one member was fortunate to have the administrative support to be able to send out applications, and letters, to prospective mentees, and another to send out the same to mentors (which, of course, were far fewer). Other members were required to match mentors and mentees on a rotational basis.

The amount of time required to prepare individual letters and materials for the matching process and to respond to the numerous requests for mentors, including follow up with mentees not yet assigned a mentor, was extraordinary. Most members of the Committee did not have administrative support for this work, and struggled to balance the time commitment with the requirements of their full time jobs. To spread the burden, records were often passed from member to member by email. Loading up many of the forms into Hummingbird has eliminated the need to pass forms to one another, but the administration of the program, particularly in communicating with mentees, is significant, as was the learning curve each time the responsibility rotated. It was a universal experience among the committee members that the time commitment was excessive and not feasible, especially when combined with other BLS Commitments.

Curriculum

There was no unified curriculum for the groups. One mentor, Paul Pascuzzi, developed materials based on online searches, and these materials were made available to others. Mentoring programs of other states were reviewed, using online searches, and a suggested course curriculum was designed and loaded onto Hummingbird. However, there was not necessarily consistency among the mentoring groups as a result. At inception, the lack of strict or formal structure was seen as a positive to allow the mentors to tailor the mentoring to the specific needs to that mentoring group (within guidelines in terms of what would and would not be appropriate). But, feedback from mentors later indicated that more formal structure and materials would be helpful.

Mentee Involvement

Some mentors reported that mentees would join the program hoping that it would lead to employment. These mentees would find that the program was, in the short-term, not tailored for this purpose and leave the program. This resulted in a small number of cases of having groups reduced in size at the same time the demand for space in these groups continued. The task force responded by creating language in mentee application materials stating that the program was ill-suited for short term job search purposes. Notwithstanding, those mentees that put time into the program found it helpful for career development. In one case, a mentee was able to find a new position more in keeping with her desires for her career.

Success of the Mentoring Program

Despite the time commitment required to operate the program, demand for mentors remains very strong among new lawyers. All members of the Committee agreed that the program was valuable and should be supported if it could be operated by Bar Staff or some other administrative office that can devote the time needed to run the program.

The BLS has been operating the Mentoring Program in coordination with the CYLA for over two years. Since July, 2012, the Program successfully matched 89 mentees with experienced mentors. The Program also collected materials to help structure the relationships and make the experience rewarding for mentors as well as mentees. The feedback from mentors and mentees in the program has been positive.

Value of the Mentoring Program

I like the program, I like my mentees, I like the opportunity to further my own professional development in this interesting way.

*As we look back on our first years as lawyers (which may have been painful for a number of reasons – type of work, pay, hours, stress), it takes on a whole different light when you see such a talented and large group who have little or no opportunity to develop their skills in a structured setting. This is my line, but you are free to use it: **we are losing a generation of lawyers, and should not let that happen.** [emphasis added]*

--Holden Stein, Mentor

The mentoring program benefits three groups of stakeholders: mentors, mentees, and the general public.

Mentees involved in the program have, anecdotally, been successful in crystalizing their career objectives and, in one case, making a career change to a more attractive path. Although the program has had to caution mentees that the program is not a job seeking service, those mentees that have put in the time, and been involved, have appeared to benefit. The need for the program is evidenced by the continued stream of mentees requesting program applications, notwithstanding minimal outreach to the mentee population.

The benefits to mentors derive from the psychic satisfaction of helping to improve the profession. As Mr. Stein's quote indicates, there is real joy in assisting in the growth of a young lawyer and providing a contribution to the growth of the profession as a whole.

The greatest benefit of a wide ranging mentoring program, however, is to the consumer of legal services. The glut of lawyers, coupled with heavy law graduate debt, could force lawyers into positions where mentoring opportunities are not available, resulting in practitioners that may not have the requisite practical skills to offer to their clients.

The well-known lawyer glut has hit new graduates especially hard. In 2012, California graduated 5,465 law students, at a time when there were only 2,227 fulltime salaried and self-employed jobs available. (<http://www.economicmodeling.com/2014/01/10/the-oversaturated-job-market-for-lawyers-continues/>) Forbes Magazine reported that, nationwide, in 2012, there were 46,565 new law graduates for an estimated 21,460 job openings. (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/emsi/2014/01/10/the-job-market-for-lawyers-side-work-on-the-rise-amid-continuing-glut-of-new-grads/>). The Forbes article noted that the only growth area was in the contract, or part-time employment, areas.

At the same time that the labor market for new lawyers softens, law graduates are faced with an enormous debt burden. Notwithstanding that payment deferrals are available, any new graduate will want to relieve themselves of their debt burden as soon as possible.

The combination of low lawyer employment and individual debt burden will likely force many lawyers to work as solo practitioners, or in contract positions, neither of which offers the mentoring opportunities typically found in more stable employment environments. The lack of mentoring means that newly minted lawyers will be required to serve clients without the benefit of the experience provided by a senior lawyer. The lack of experience could, in turn, result in less skilled practitioners providing legal services, with the corresponding reduction in protection for many consumers of legal services.

Much of law practice revolves around finding effective resolution to client problems, and experience in the practice, and training by someone experienced in the practice, greatly contributes to client service. Without the training provided by effective mentoring, there is a much higher probability that lawyer error could result, with negative consequences to both young attorneys and their clients.

It is no wonder that so many states offer state-wide mentoring programs. These include Illinois, Nevada, Louisiana, Ohio, and Oregon, among others. We hope that our experience in the BLS will provide the necessary foundation for the State Bar of California to offer a mentoring program to all new attorneys for the sake of our profession and our public.

Recommendation

The Program to some extent has been the victim of its own success in that the demands of administering the program have far exceeded available volunteer time. We have found that mentee requests for mentors have far exceeded available volunteer mentors, and this is particularly true with respect to matching Los Angeles area mentees with Los Angeles area mentors. We have also found that the administrative burden of managing the program has far exceeded available volunteer time. For that reason the BLS very reluctantly has decided to terminate the BLS-CYLA Mentoring Program.

We remain more convinced than ever that a mentoring program would be an invaluable part of the mission of the State Bar and its Sections. The members of the Task Force would be delighted to assist in setting up a mentoring program, and to share our experiences and the materials we have prepared.

The Task Force recommends that the Mentoring Program, in its current form, be suspended (and this occurred in Spring 2014). The Task Force strongly recommends and supports the continuance of this excellent program by other means, or in another form, with appropriate Bar Staff support, funding, and advertising.

Appendix A

BLS/CYLA Mentoring Program Guidelines

Appendix B

Program Forms

Appendix C

Committee Member Responsibilities

*Note: appendices not included—
for copies contact Laila Bartlett at Laila.Bartlett@calbar.ca.gov*

Mentoring Task Force Working Group Reports:

STATEWIDE PROGRAMS WORKING GROUP REPORT

MEMORANDUM

To: State Bar of California Mentoring Task Force
From: Statewide Programs / State and Local Bar Sections Working Group
Re: Research of Statewide Programs and Issues to be Considered
Date: March 31, 2015

The Statewide Programs / State and Local Bar Sections Working Group is tasked with surveying current state and local mentoring programs, and identifying those issues that will need to be considered by the Task Force as California designs a mentoring program for new attorneys. The Working Group, is composed of Ida Abbott, Lisa Jacobs, Joanna Mendoza, Mark Ressa, and Robert Hawn, with staff support from Patricia Lee and Susan Pham. It first met as part of the Mentoring Task Force meeting on February 19, 2015, and then again on March 30, 2015.

Methodology

At the February 19, 2015, meeting, the Working Group decided to survey existing Statewide programs that had been identified in materials provided as part of the initial meeting of the Task Force. Mentoring programs from the following states were surveyed:

Arizona	Idaho	Nevada	South Carolina
Arkansas	Illinois	New Hampshire	South Dakota
Colorado	Indiana	New Jersey	Tennessee
Connecticut	Louisiana	New Mexico	Texas
Delaware	Maryland	North Carolina	Utah
Florida	Massachusetts	Ohio	Vermont
Georgia	Michigan	Oregon	

The following subjects were researched for each state:

- How many people are in the program?
- What subject areas are covered?
- Is there a curriculum developed and, if so, what is it?
- Is the program voluntary or mandatory?
- Is CLE credit provided?
- Is there any training or expectation setting of mentors and mentees prior to the program?

- Are the mentors and mentees required to meet, and, if so, how often?
- How is the program funded, and what is the cost per attorney?
- Has the program resulted in any drop in disciplinary actions?
- What particular challenges has the program faced, and what advice could be given to us?

The research was conducted by reviewing applicable websites, and following up with email communications and telephone conversations. Research continues for those programs for which complete information was not available as of the date of this memorandum.

The results of the research are attached on spreadsheets included with this memorandum.

Analysis

The Working Group met on Monday, March 30, 2015, to analyze and discuss the results of its research, and to determine issues to be considered by the Task Force. The Group assessed the results of the survey, and outlined the following major issues to be considered by the Task Force:

- **What are the goals of the mentoring program?**
- **Should the program be voluntary or mandatory?**
- **What are the feasibility challenges to program implementation?**
- **How should performance be measured?**

There was also a substantial amount of discussion over various attributes of the programs in each of the States surveyed.

Program Goals

The Working Group noted that the Task Force is charged with building a program to encourage professionalism, competency, and ethics. The Working Group generally believes that the mentoring program should be covering those subjects “not taught in law school”. These include such items as practice management, trust accounting, business development, and work life integration.

The Working Group believes measurable goals need to be articulated to guide the Task Force. The Task Force should consider adopting goals that lend themselves to objective analysis, e.g., reduction of disciplinary actions pertaining to trust fund accounting, or malpractice claims against new attorneys. The Working Group recognizes that some subjects, e.g., trust fund accounting, might be better handled through tailored CLE courses rather than through mentoring. In any event, once the goals are established, the Working Group should define those strategies that will enable California to satisfy these goals.

Voluntary vs. Mandatory programs

Programs reviewed varied in terms of mandatory or voluntary participation by young lawyers. A number of areas will ultimately need to be evaluated to determine the level of mentee participation, including the sheer volume of the average number of 4,000 new lawyers per year in California, the challenges in recruiting sufficient numbers of mentors to meet the various needs of the mentees, the overall scale and potential costs of the program, and the purpose of the mentoring program (e.g. substantive training, professionalism, ethics, competency, and other soft skills).

Feasibility

The Working Group noted that most of the programs surveyed were in States that had far fewer lawyers than California. California's program may need to operate on a regional basis given the size of the state and the variety of regional differences in practice. This raised the issue of whether the program should be managed in a centralized or decentralized manner. If a decentralized approach is adopted, the Task Force will need to consider how to coordinate programs in different locations.

Measuring Performance

The Working Group also discussed how performance of the program could be objectively measured. It noted the strong relationship between defining measurable indices for success and the objectives for the program. As discussed above the Working Group believes that deeper and more objective criteria is required. The Working Group also discussed the extent to which a baseline of quantifiable indices could be developed and used to measure program performance. The Working Group noted that it was unable to find another Statewide program that had measured its performance, much less set up objective criteria for success. The Working Group welcomes input from the Task Force concerning possible performance metrics for the program.

Other Issues

Other issues were identified during the discussion, including Program Resources, Electronic Resources and Mentor Recruitment

Program Resources

The resources required to manage a mentoring program were also considered.

- First, the Working Group considered leveraging State Bar resources by decentralizing the management and operation of the program. Although decentralization can result in quality inconsistency, it has the advantage of

leveraging the resources of different organizations, from local Bars to larger firms and agencies, to operate a program. On the other hand, centralizing program management and operation with the State Bar allows consistency and quality, but is costly in resources, particularly staff time.

- Second, the Working Group discussed a fee based approach, noting one state, Utah, requires the mentee to pay \$300 when signing up for its mandatory program.
- Third, except for initial costs associated with form creation and program design, the Working Group's research found that most programs are not costly to operate except in terms of staff resources. Much of the staff time is used in matching mentors to mentees. The Working Group found two methods that have been adopted to reduce the staff resource burden: using specialized software to allow matching, and requiring the mentee to choose a mentor from an approved list.

The Task Force will need to consider the extent to which program management and operation should be centralized, and whether a fee based approach is feasible and equitable. The Task Force will also need to formulate methods to reduce the burden on staff in managing and operating the program.

Electronic Resources

The Working Group discussed the use of electronic technology. It was noted that better organized groups had many forms and resources, including manuals, curricula, and mentor-mentee plans, available online. Although most of the programs surveyed encouraged or required face to face meetings, some are currently exploring the use of Skype or other web-based capabilities. The Task Force will need to make recommendations to the State Bar regarding those materials and the State Bar website functionality which can assist the mentoring program.

Mentor Recruitment

Recruiting mentors was also discussed. The most common approach was to award CLE credit. The Working Group noted that many of the States with better organized programs provide CLE credit for the mentors, and, often, for the mentees. Other creative methods were used. One state, Ohio, started its program by having members of the judiciary solicit attorneys as mentors, resulting in professional prestige for any mentor so chosen. Another State, Indiana, conducts leadership training programs from which mentors are recruited. The Task Force will need to determine whether CLE credit should be provided to the mentor, mentee, or both, and other ways to recruit high quality mentors.

OTHER PROGRAMS WORKING GROUP REPORT

The Group Charge:

The Working Group was charged with reviewing mentor programs for local/minority bars, law schools, law firms and other organizations to identify key program issues and best practices.

The key questions asked about each entity included:

- Name of Program
- Target Audience
- Voluntary or Mandatory
- Primary Focus of Program (e.g. competency, professionalism, ethics...)
- Outcomes/Outcome Measures
- How Services Delivered (e.g. group, individual, in person, phone, online, etc)
- Duration of Relationship
- "Compensation" and Incentives (MCLE, Billable Hours, other)
- Mentor Training Provided
- Program Administration
- Revenue Stream; Sustainability
- Best Practices

The Working Group reviewed the entities listed below and arrived at the following recommendations:

Key Program Focus:

Promote professional pride and identity in the legal profession; to promote the pursuit of excellence in service to clients; and to promote strong relationships between the bar, courts, law schools, and the public. Provide new lawyers meaningful access to experienced attorneys equipped to teach practical skills, seasoned judgment, and sensibility to ethical and professionalism values necessary to practice law.

Target Audience:

New lawyers admitted within past two years. Also consider group sessions for attorneys admitted for 3+ years

Mentor Qualifications:

Practicing attorney in California for a minimum of five (5) years; In good standing; never suspended or disbarred from practice of law in any state or jurisdiction; and no formal disciplinary complaint pending.

Mentee Qualifications:

New lawyers admitted less than two (2) years

How Services Can Be Delivered:

- One-on-one is the most popular model, in person, by telephone and by email
- Group sessions

- E-mentoring in a series of short videos featuring judges and lawyers who answer various questions about the legal profession and the law
- HELP-line: a hotline of experienced attorneys who answer questions on legal and professional matters

Compensation/Incentives (MCLE, Billable Hours, Other):

- MCLE credit for both the mentor and the mentee.
- Outreach to encourage governmental agency buy-in about the importance of mentoring
- Hold governmental agency focus groups to consider their suggestions that might encourage participation
- Consider awards and recognition
- Encourage in-house mentoring programs
- Promote outreach so that greater legal community may benefit from mentor relationships with government agency employees

Mentor Training: Mentors and mentees attend separate training/orientation sessions.

Best Practices:

- One-on-one sessions
- Group sessions
- Mentor/mentee training
- Virtual mentoring by video
- Courthouse sessions led by judges
- Duration: nine months to one year
- Develop suggested list of tasks and goals

Program Implementation:

Implement Pilot Program that includes diverse legal communities

Questions for further consideration:

- What outcomes the program expects to achieve and how will these be measured?
- Who would oversee the program and how would the program be funded?

The following programs were reviewed:

Local/State Bar Organizations		
Oregon State Bar Mentor Program	American Bar Association	Seventh Circuit Bar Association, Illinois
San Antonio, TX Bar Association	Jefferson County Alabama Bar Association	Alameda County Bar Association

Minority/Ethnic Programs		
Alameda County Bar East Bay Diversity Bar Coalition	Anchorage Alaska Bar Association	Austin Bar Mentoring Program
Houston Bar Association	Charleston County, SC	Chicago Federal Bar Association
Columbus Ohio Bar Association	Contra Costa County Bar Association	Dade County FL Bar Association
Dallas TX Bar Association	Denver CO Bar Association	Federal Bar Association, Orange County CA Chapter
Florida Young Lawyers Division	Hartford Bar Association	Jefferson County Alabama Bar Association
Lake County Bar Association	Los Angeles Consumer Attorneys Association	McLean County Bar Association
Memphis TN Bar Association	Middlesex County Bar Association	Washington, D.C. Bar
Westchester County NY Bar Association	Whatcom County Bar Association	Wichita Kansas Bar Association
Cuban American Bar Association	Mentor Program of the Korean American Bar Association of San Diego	University of Nebraska College of Law
Villanova Law Minority Mentoring Program	Asian American Bar Association	

Law Firms		
Alston & Byrd	Arnold & Porter	Baker Melsor
Cravath, Swain & Moore	Davis Polk & Wardell	Dickstein Shapiro
Duane Morris	Frost Brown & Todd	Gray Plant & Moody
Latham & Watkins		

Organizations		
ABA Mentoring Program for Lawyers with Disabilities	American Association for Justice	American Inns of Court Protégé La Students Mentoring Program
California Women Lawyers	Lesbian & Gay Lawyers Association Mentorship Program	Practicing Attorneys for Law Students

Law Schools		
Brigham Young University	New England Law – Boston	Cooley Law School
Loyola University School of Law – Chicago	University of Nebraska College of Law	Ave Maria School of Law
Georgetown Law	Gonzaga School of Law	John Marshall Michigan Law Organization of Public Interest
Michigan State University	New Jersey Law Firm Group	New York Law School
Northern University College of Law	Pepperdine School of Law	Rutgers School of Law
Sanford University	SMU Dedman School of Law	Southwestern School of Law
Stanford Public Interest Mentoring Program	Sturm College of Law (University of Denver)	Touro Law
Suffolk University School of Law	Texas Tech School of Law	Texas Tech School of Law
UC Irvine School of Law	UCLA School of Law	Valparaiso School of Law
Wake Forrest School of Law	West Virginia University Law Alumni Association	William Mitchell (St. Paul, MN)
Boston University School of Law		

ONLINE PLATFORMS WORKING GROUP REPORT

Summary:

Our subcommittee is tasked with exploring the online component of a potential state-wide mentorship program for California. We focused our efforts from the last meeting on both exploring and researching other state and or local programs that have an online component to their mentorship program, as well as speaking to different vendors who provide electronic "matching" software that is being used to pair up mentors and mentees in different mentorship programs and scenarios.

State Programs:

Although many states are enacting some type of mentorship program for new and young lawyers, few states have an online component to their programs. What appears to be most successful and easy to implement in conjunction with an in-person type pairing program, are electronic video series, aimed at providing an overview in basic skills and issues for young lawyers. For example, Florida produces a "Mentoring with Masters" video series, run by a YLD (young lawyers division) Transition to Practice Committee, to bridge local programs to a state level. Similarly, the Seventh Circuit produces short informative videos from judges and other well-seasoned lawyers, and makes them available to young lawyers on its website.

These videos seem a natural fit to a program in California, and something that takes relatively little administration. Because CYLA currently is running this program based off of the content and speakers presented at the annual meeting, we recommend continuing the program and making it a component to our recommendations for a larger program.

Online Vendors:

The bulk of our time was spent researching vendors who are developing electronic programs to match mentors with mentees.

One program we reviewed is called LawGives, which was developed by two lawyers who attended Standard business school led by Tony Lai. This program originally developed in the space of pairing firms with clients, as well as pro bono service requests with the appropriate attorneys or firms. This program is expanding to include pairing for mentors and mentees, and we were able to view a brief demo. This program needs to be set up with the basic parameters of our program (ie scope of service, what is expected, etc.), and then uses a portal to establish a space where people can "bid" on a particular project or work for a mentor, who then picks the appropriate candidate. While this program is only recently attempting to enter the mentorship space, the two founders are eager to work with us and estimated that they could out together a pilot to begin exploring our capabilities for a deep discount -- approximately \$5,000.00.

The other program we explored is MentorCliQ. This platform has a lot more experience in the mentoring space. While we did not see a demo., Andy George spent a long time with us talking us through what facets of our program we need to decide on order for the platform to be customized to our needs. He was very focused on making our program scalable, and suggested we start with a smaller group and pilot program to ensure we are able to administer the program and work out any kinks before rolling it out state wide. Regarding our concern with QA, Andy suggested including a component where the program elicits periodic reviews from the participants in an e-summary format to monitor satisfaction. We were very impressed with Andy and believe that once we establish our program parameters and goals, he will be able to assist us in pitting together a pilot or demo., so we can review our options.

We believe that if California implements a state-wide program that includes a pairing component, utilizing a software for matching is essential. However, one of the largest outstanding questions that needs to first be resolved is how to administer such a program. This Taskforce needs to decide a recommendation on how we will staff or collect resources in order to make administration of a program like this possible.

Miscellaneous:

We also spoke to Lori Keating, Secretary for the Commission on Professionalism, Supreme Court of Ohio. Ohio has a voluntary mentoring program, and as part of it, they utilize matching software that they developed in house. They match approximately 800 pairs per year, and have not had issues finding mentors due to the fact that they provide CLE credit to both the mentees and mentors. They have a very high success rate but the administrative burden of such a program is high. There is a full-time Director of the program, and the costs associated with the program are paid out of mandatory dues. These elements, again, are things that we need to determine as a Taskforce before we can move on the online vendor or program piece.

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT WORKING GROUP REPORT

The Marketing and Recruitment Subcommittee of the State Bar Mentoring Task Force (“Subcommittee”) is pleased to present this initial report of its discussions and conclusions regarding potential strategies for marketing the California State Bar Mentoring Program and in recruiting mentors for the program.

I. Marketing and Publicity

The Subcommittee determined that if the Mentoring Program is ready to implement in late 2016, marketing and recruitment efforts should begin in early 2016.

A. Overall Marketing Strategy

The Subcommittee agreed that aside from widely publicizing the existence and details of the new mentoring program, the main challenge will be to recruit qualified and dedicated mentors for the program. We expect that with the present attorney job market, it should be a fairly easy matter to recruit new lawyers to participate as mentees in the program.

As part of the marketing strategy, the Subcommittee formulated a name for the new program:

“AMP,” standing for Attorney Mentoring Program.

The Subcommittee also formulated a proposed slogan:

“AMP Up Your Career With The Attorney Mentoring Program!”

B. State Bar Outreach

Marketing and publicity for the new Attorney Mentoring Program should take place through all State Bar publications and dissemination of information to the members.

In particular, the State Bar can publicize the new program on its website, in its monthly electronic e-journal to members, in materials that are distributed with members’ State Bar membership cards in early 2016; in newsletters of COAF and the various State Bar sections (e.g., CYLA Newsletter); in advertisements in *California Lawyer* magazine, in direct emails sent to each member, and in a letter to be sent by the State Bar President to law firms, house legal departments, public sector and public interest law organizations, and corporate legal departments.

In addition, the State Bar Sections, including CYLA, and the various specialty sections, including Litigation, Criminal Law, Business Law, and Family Law, will be instrumental in recruiting mentees and mentors for the program.

C. Specialty and Minority Bar Organizations

In addition, the Bar should be utilizing statewide and local bar organizations, such as the California Women Lawyers Association, the Bar Association of San Francisco, the Los Angeles County Bar Association, and the San Diego County Bar Association; and specialty and minority bar organizations, such as ABOTA, the Inns of Court, Queens' Bench, Women Lawyers of Los Angeles, California Minority Counsel Program (CMPC), the Langston Bar Association in Los Angeles, the Asian Pacific Bar Association of the Greater Bay Area, and La Raza organizations throughout California to spread word about the program and to recruit participants.

Also, public sector lawyers, governmental legal organizations (such as City Attorneys' offices), and public interest lawyers, need to be part of the network spreading the word and participating in the program.

To the extent the specialty, minority bar organizations, and governmental legal organizations have mentoring programs of their own, those programs could become part of the Attorney Mentoring Program, depending upon the final criteria and requirements for the program.

D. Kick-Off Event

The Subcommittee believes it would be a good idea to launch the Attorney Mentoring Program with a widely publicized and well-attended Kick-Off Event, perhaps over the summer of 2016 or at the 2016 State Bar Meeting, featuring a prominent legal figure such as Attorney General Kamala Harris or Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye.

E. Social Media Outreach

Social media will be key in recruiting new members for the program disseminating information, obtaining feedback, and communications. Social media will be important in conducting outreach to new lawyers.

In addition to the Mentoring Program website, the program should maintain a Facebook page and a Twitter account.

Depending on the parameters of the program, the Mentoring Program could consider a "Match.com" type website to match mentors with mentees.

F. Importance of Successful Messaging

A key factor in the success of marketing efforts will be to craft successful messages conveying the attractiveness and benefits of being involved in the mentoring program.

Among such messages could be videos, publications, and presentations conveying true stories of successful mentoring, highlighting the true stories of successful mentoring, and the benefits of mentoring for both mentor and mentee.

The obvious benefits for the mentee include: obtaining guidance, instruction and advice from a more senior attorney in her or his area of specialty; introduction to new careers and new job opportunities; networking for future job opportunities and referrals.

In addition, mentors can use the Attorney Mentoring Program to train young lawyers in their own firms and to recruit new lawyers. In addition, many senior lawyers hone their skills and gain a greater reputation for their expertise in serving as mentors to young lawyers.

II. Recruiting

Providing attractive incentives will be important in recruiting new mentors for the program. The subcommittee believes that given the influx of new lawyers and the paucity of attractive job opportunities, it will not be difficult to find mentees. The problem will be to offer significant incentives for more senior attorneys, who are busy with their careers and personal lives, to participate in the program.

A. MCLE Credit

One fairly easy to implement idea would be to offer MCLE credit to bar members acting as mentors. In particular, the Bar could offer a certain number of hours of MCLE credit per year toward the 25 hours of mandatory MCLE hours required every three years for each member.

The credit would be conditioned upon spending a successful year as a mentor, including positive feedback from the mentee and documented participation in the program.

The Attorney Mentoring Program could be structured to be conducive to offering MCLE credit. For instance, the program could be structured so that mentors and mentees review specific MCLE-approved videos, webinars, or audiotapes on specific subjects of interest to their group, and then meet in person or in conference call to discuss the content of the MCLE presentation.

The Task Force needs to develop precise criteria to allow mentors and mentees to qualify for MCLE credit.

B. Discount on Bar or Section Dues

The Subcommittee also discussed the idea of offering a discount on State Bar or State Bar Section dues for documented and successful participation in the Attorney Mentoring Program. However, because of the potential impact of such a discount on the State Bar and Section operating budgets, this was determined not to be a promising idea.

C. Pro Bono Requirement

Also discussed was the idea of instituting a pro bono hours requirement for each member, with the ability to fulfill that requirement through participation in the Attorney Mentoring Program.

The Subcommittee understands that the Supreme Court is presently considering a November 2014 recommendation of the Task Force on Admissions Regulation Review, approved by the Board of Governors of the State Bar, that each new member fulfill at 50-hour pro bono requirement. However, the Subcommittee understands there would likely be considerable resistance to implementing an annual pro bono hours requirement for all members.

D. State Bar Certified Mentor

Among the benefits of serving as a mentor in the program could be the potential for becoming recognized as a "State Bar Certified Mentor."

Criteria for this distinction would have to be developed. Among the requirements would be experience of a minimum of one year as a mentor, positive evaluations from one or more mentees (can be performed online), and interviews by State Bar staff to evaluate the mentor's expertise and participation in the program.

The distinction could be advertised on the State Bar website and other materials.

E. Mentoring Awards Ceremony

The State Bar could recognize excellence in mentoring at an annual Mentoring Awards Ceremony, likely held at the State Bar's Annual Meeting.

Awards could be offered for the best mentor in each district, based on nominations by mentees. In addition, to individual awards, awards could be offered for the best mentor or mentoring program in the following categories:

- Non Profit
- Law Firm- Small 5-50
- Law Firm- Large- 100+
- Corporate
- Local Level- Local or Specialist Bar

III. Ideas re: Mentoring Program

Although somewhat outside the Subcommittee's purview, the Subcommittee discussed several ideas regarding implementation of the actual mentoring program.

A. Pod Mentoring

Rather than have one mentor responsible for one mentee, the idea would be to have 2 or more mentors responsible for 5-8 mentees in a pod. That way, if a mentor is unavailable to attend a meeting because of work or other commitments, the other mentors can fill in. This also allows mentees to interact with a larger number of mentors and benefit from the different perspective and experience of each.

The pods could be organized geographically and by subject area.

The meetings of the pod could be set on a regular basis; monthly or bi-monthly, and could be organized around specific topics for discussion or MCLE offerings.

B. Operations

The day-to-day operation of the mentoring program and the program's website need to be administered by an office at the State Bar. This office and the website can also serve as a clearinghouse for information about mentoring opportunities and resources throughout the state.

Funding the mentoring program will be challenging. The mentoring program would be part of the State Bar's primary role of public protection, so it would be possible to fund the program through mandatory dues. Another option would be to ask each new member to pay a small fee to fund the program. The State Bar could also solicit donations from private companies and foundations.

BAR EXAM DATA/DEMOGRAPHICS

July Bar Exam Statistics 2012-2014

*Source: State Bar Office of Admissions data
based on voluntary information provided by exam takers*

July 2012 Bar Exam Statistics (Combined data for first time and repeat takers)			
Groups	# Takers	# Passing and Pass Rate ithin each group	% of Total Number Passing
White	4941	3121 (63.2%)	67.3%
Black	510	141 (27.6%)	3.0%
Asian	1323	690 (52.2%)	14.9%
Hispanic	948	400 (42.2%)	8.6%
Other Minorities	615	286 (44.0%)	6.2%
Totals	8337	4638 (55.6%)	100.0%

July 2013 Bar Exam Statistics (Combined data for first time and repeat takers)			
Groups	# Takers	# Passing and Pass Rate Within each group	% of Total Number Passing
White	4859	3093 (63.65%)	65.58%
Black	479	129 (26.93%)	2.73%
Asian	1456	753 (51.72%)	9.27%
Hispanic	999	437 (43.74%)	15.97%
Other Minorities	677	304 (44.9 %)	6.45%
Totals	8470	4716 (55.68%)	100.00%

July 2014 Bar Exam Statistics (Combined data for first time and repeat takers)			
Groups	# Takers	# Passing and Pass Rate Within each group	% of Total Number Passing
White	4452	2524 (56.7%)	64.9%
Black	555	138 (24.9%)	3.6%
Asian	1352	579 (42.8%)	14.9%
Hispanic	1010	376 (37.2%)	9.7%
Other Minorities	705	270 (38.3%)	6.9%
Totals	8074	3887 (48.1%)	100.0%

RESOURCES

MENTORING ORGANIZATIONS

National Legal Mentoring Consortium See <http://www.legalmentoring.org/>

MENTORING PROGRAMS

Colorado Attorney Mentoring Program (CAMP) see <http://coloradomentoring.org/>

- Program Information see <http://coloradomentoring.org/programs/>
- Rules and Policies see <http://coloradomentoring.org/programs/mentoring-plans/>
- Mentoring Plan Template for Designing Your Own Plan
See <http://coloradomentoring.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/SAMPLE-Mentoring-Plan-Template-for-Designing-Your-Own-Program.pdf>
- Sample Forms See <http://coloradomentoring.org/programs/forms/>
- Mentoring Tips Tool box
see <http://coloradomentoring.org/mentoring-resources/mentoring-tool-box/>
- Mentoring Resources
See <http://coloradomentoring.org/mentoring-resources/>

Georgia State Bar Transition Into Lawyer Practice Program (TILPP)

- See <http://www.gabar.org/membership/tilpp/index.cfm>
- Materials for Other Bar Associations see
<http://www.gabar.org/membership/tilpp/other-bars.cfm>

Illinois State Bar Association (SBA) Lawyer-to-Lawyer Mentoring Program

See <http://www.isba.org/mentoring>

Oregon State Bar New Lawyer Mentoring Program See <http://www.osbar.org/nlmp>

- New Lawyer Mentoring Program Manual
See <https://www.osbar.org/docs/NLMP/NLMPManual.pdf>
- Program At a Glance
See <http://www.osbar.org/docs/NLMP/NLMPAtAGlance.pdf>

ARTICLES/RESOURCES

Illinois State Bar Association (SBA) Lawyer-to-Lawyer Mentoring Program

See <http://www.isba.org/mentoring>

Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism

How to Survive BigLaw, see <http://www.2civility.org/survive-biglawn/>

Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism

20 Professionalism Tips for Millennial Attorneys

see <http://www.2civility.org/20-professionalism-tips-millennial-attorneys/#comment-234597>

Illinois Supreme Court Commission on Professionalism

Professional Responsibility Education Guide

See <http://www.2civility.org/programs/cle/professional-responsibility-cle-guidelines/>

ONLINE PLATFORMS

National Legal Mentoring Consortium,

Website and Technology Committee

See <http://legalmentoring.org/page.php?pg=7>

MentorCliQ

See <http://www.mentorcliq.com/>

LawGives

See <https://www.lawgives.com/>

See <http://www.lawgives.net/blog/flat-fee-legal-services-revolution>

#####