



The State Bar of California

Malpractice Insurance Working Group Report to Board of Trustees

March 15, 2019

BACKGROUND

STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

The 2018 State Bar Fee Bill (SB 36, Stats. 2017, ch. 422) added section 6069.5 to the Business and Professions Code, directing the State Bar to conduct a review and study regarding errors and omissions insurance, and to report its findings to the Supreme Court and Legislature by March 31, 2019. Specifically, section 6069.5 provides as follows:

6069.5. (a) In recognition of the importance of protecting the public from attorney errors through errors and omissions insurance, the State Bar shall conduct a review and study regarding errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state. The State Bar shall conduct this review and study, which shall specifically include determinations of all of the following:

- (1) The adequacy, availability, and affordability of errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state.
 - (2) Proposed measures for encouraging attorneys licensed in this state to obtain and maintain errors and omissions insurance.
 - (3) The ranges of errors and omissions insurance limits for attorneys licensed in this state recommended to protect the public.
 - (4) The adequacy and efficacy of the disclosure rule regarding errors and omissions insurance, currently embodied in Rule 3-410 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.
 - (5) The advisability of mandating errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state and attendant considerations.
 - (6) Other proposed measures relating to errors and omissions insurance for attorneys in this state that will further the goal of public protection.
- (b) The State Bar shall report its findings under this section to the Supreme Court and the Legislature no later than March 31, 2019.
- (c) The State Bar may consider any past studies, including, but not limited to, any relevant actuarial studies, and any current information that is available to the State Bar from other entities, such as the American Bar Association, regarding errors and omissions insurance.

Business and Professions Code section 6069.5 is provided as Attachment A.¹

WORKING GROUP CREATION

To comply with section 6069.5, the Board of Trustees of the State Bar (Board) authorized the formation of a Malpractice Insurance Working Group (MIWG) in December 2017, appointed a MIWG chair, and directed staff to work with the chair to develop the working group's charter and criteria for membership on the working group. These decisions were subject to the

¹ All subsequent code sections refer to the Business and Professions Code, unless otherwise specified.

approval of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Regulation and Discipline (RAD) Committee. At its February 2018 meeting, the Board approved the MIWG charter and appointed members to the MIWG.

The MIWG charter and roster are provided as Attachments B and C, respectively.

WORKING GROUP MEETINGS

At its first meeting, on March 12, 2018, the MIWG formed four subcommittees, each of which agreed to undertake an in-depth study of one or more of the topics identified in the statute. Each subcommittee presented information to subsequent meetings of the entire MIWG. Extensive materials were provided, with guest speakers contributing information and expertise. Following is a summary of the topics discussed at each of the full meetings of the MIWG:

Meeting Date and Location	Topic(s)
March 12, 2018 Los Angeles	Background and Historical Information
June 4, 2018 San Francisco	Mandatory Insurance – Open Market Model
July 9, 2018 Los Angeles	Availability and Affordability of Malpractice Insurance <i>and</i> Recommended Coverage Levels
August 27, 2018 San Francisco	Measures to Encourage Malpractice Insurance Coverage <i>and</i> Adequacy of the Current Disclosure Rule
November 13, 2018 Los Angeles	Mandatory Malpractice Insurance – Captive Fund Model
January 14, 2019 San Francisco	Discussion of Reports and Recommendations from Subcommittees
February 21, 2019 Teleconference	Review and Discussion of Draft Report to Board of Trustees

The agendas and materials from each of these meetings are provided as Attachments D through J.

WORKING GROUP FINDINGS

The findings of the MIWG are reported below under headings that mirror the language of topics mandated for study by Section 6095.5. It should be noted at the outset that there was sharp disagreement among members of the MIWG regarding fundamental questions raised by the statutory mandate. In one case, the very premise of the topic was the subject of disagreement; some members of the MIWG disagreed with the premise that legal malpractice insurance confers a public protection benefit.

This report has been drafted to reflect the differing points of view of members of the working group. During its study, the working group reviewed a number of materials and heard

testimony from diverse sources. The fact that a publication or study is referenced in this report does not constitute universal endorsement of its respective findings by the working group.

The adequacy, availability and affordability of errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in California.

The MIWG reviewed the insurance market and found that *California has a competitive insurance market* even though many attorneys consider insurance to be unaffordable. There are more than 17 admitted carriers and 18 non-admitted carriers that offer legal malpractice insurance.² The insurance broker on the MIWG confirmed that there is a sufficient number of insurers that offer legal malpractice insurance in California, and that attorneys are able to find coverage, although premiums may be high for those with prior claims, or in a higher risk practice area.

The MIWG considered the issue of affordability, and noted that this is a subjective question. Insurance premiums in California are generally higher than in other states for the same levels of coverage, because tort liability exposure is higher in California. While the rates are commensurate with coverage, the cost is nonetheless considered unaffordable by many attorneys, especially those in solo and small practices.

In early 2018, staff conducted a survey of California attorneys that was specifically directed toward those in firms of ten or fewer attorneys. Solo practitioners and those in firms of two to five attorneys reported that they were uninsured at rates of 39 percent and 12 percent, respectively. In response to a question about why they were not insured, 65 percent indicated that they could not afford it. Unaffordability was also cited by those who provided public comments to the MIWG. Many anticipated that mandatory insurance would be especially harmful to solo practitioners, and would reduce the number of attorneys that provide pro bono and low bono legal services.

Susan Saab Fortney, Professor of Law and Director of the Program for the Advancement of Legal Ethics at Texas A&M University School of Law, disputes this argument. Professor Fortney suggests that attorneys providing pro bono services could do so under the umbrella of legal services programs, which provide insurance coverage to volunteer lawyers. She also believes that premium costs can be absorbed by a relatively modest increase in hourly rates.³ Some members of the MIWG strongly disagreed with the assumptions built into these calculations,

² Admitted carriers are subject to state regulations that govern operations, reporting requirements, rate approvals and claims handling. Non-admitted carriers may sell insurance in California, but their customers are not afforded the same protections as those of admitted carriers.

³ Susan Saab Fortney, *Mandatory Legal Malpractice Insurance: Exposing Lawyers' Blind Spots*. Unpublished manuscript of an article forthcoming in Volume 9, Issue II of *St. Mary's Journal on Legal Malpractice & Ethics*, p. 22-24. Fortney notes that lawyers billing 1,750 hours per year would need to increase rates by \$2 per hour to cover an annual \$3,500 premium; assuming an annual premium of \$5,000 for California attorneys, rates would increase by less than \$3 per hour. An attorney who bills only 1,000 hours per year would need to increase rates by \$5 per hour to cover the cost of a \$5,000 annual premium.

noting that 1,750 hours would be an unusually large number of hours for a solo practitioner to bill in a year and that some attorneys work only a fraction of that number of hours each year.

Although the issue of affordability is difficult to ascertain, as it is dependent on individual attorneys' perceptions of the necessity of coverage, the MIWG concluded nonetheless that legal malpractice insurance is readily available in California, and attorneys are able to obtain coverage at levels and with terms commensurate with their needs. Due to the ready availability on the private insurance market, the MIWG determined that it was neither necessary nor practical to create a captive insurance fund akin to those in Oregon or the Canadian provinces.

Proposed measures for encouraging attorneys licensed in California to obtain and maintain errors and omissions insurance.

The MIWG agreed that attorneys should be encouraged to purchase legal malpractice insurance. The MIWG recommends that a professional communications firm be retained by the Bar to develop a strategy focused on currently uninsured lawyers, to educate them about the benefits of insurance and the risks of remaining uninsured. A communications strategy such as this should provide information about specialized policies offered by insurance carriers, including for newly licensed attorneys, those practicing part-time, and those with limited income from their law practice. A campaign focused on providing legal consumers with clear information about legal malpractice insurance, and about the protection afforded by hiring an insured attorney, would also serve to encourage attorneys to purchase insurance.

Another measure to encourage attorneys to purchase insurance considered by the MIWG was the implementation of Proactive Management Based Regulation (PMBR) similar to the recently implemented program in Illinois. Beginning in 2018, uninsured lawyers in private practice in Illinois are required to complete a self-assessment regarding the operation of their law firm. "The intent of the PMBR is to assist lawyers in developing ethical law practice systems that in turn will improve lawyers' competence and minimize practices that result in malpractice and disciplinary misconduct."⁴ The four-hour interactive self-assessment is completed online, and the attorney receives four hours of MCLE credit at no cost. A voluntary PMBR program was recently implemented in Colorado.

These programs are too new to determine whether they have reduced the incidence of malpractice or had an impact on attorneys' decisions to purchase legal malpractice insurance. However, completion of a self-assessment may draw attorneys' attention to the potential risks of lack of insurance. If they determine that they can bear those risks, attorneys completing a PMBR assessment are likely to take steps to minimize the risk of malpractice by improving the management systems in their practices.

⁴ Illinois Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission, *Annual Report of 2017*. (<https://www.iardc.org/AnnualReport2017.pdf>)

The MIWG also discussed potential legislative changes to tort liability rules to make insurance more affordable and to encourage attorneys to voluntarily buy insurance. For example, a longer statute of limitations could be provided for claims against attorneys who do not purchase insurance, and attorneys who do not purchase insurance could be limited in their ability to enforce fee agreements. There was also a discussion regarding whether the Department of Insurance could require new entrants to the California insurance markets to provide lower cost policies; such a requirement could increase the availability of low-cost insurance products and thus encourage attorneys to voluntarily buy insurance. However, such a requirement also has the potential to discourage new entrants to the insurance market.

The ranges of errors and omissions insurance limits for attorneys licensed in this state recommended to protect the public.

There was fundamental disagreement about the very premise of this topic. At issue was the assertion of some members of the MIWG that malpractice insurance does not actually protect the public: rather, it protects the attorney who carries the malpractice insurance.

With that point of contention in mind, the MIWG reviewed information about minimum coverage requirements in jurisdictions that mandate insurance coverage. While Canada and other common-law and European countries mandate \$1 million or more of minimum coverage for attorneys, minimum coverage in the two U.S. states where insurance is required is significantly lower. Attorneys in Oregon are required to carry a minimum of \$300,000 per claim/\$300,000 annual aggregate coverage, and attorneys in Idaho are required to carry minimum coverage in the amount of \$100,000 per claim/\$300,000 annual aggregate.

California attorneys in certain types of practice are currently required to carry minimum insurance coverage or proof of financial responsibility. Professional corporations are required to provide proof of security in the amount of \$50,000 per claim/\$100,000 annual aggregate per attorney.⁵ Limited liability partnerships are required to carry minimum coverage of \$1,000,000 for up to five attorneys, plus \$100,000 for each additional attorney.⁶

The MIWG reviewed data from the ABA Profile of Legal Malpractice Claims 2012-2015, which summarizes data provided by National Association of Bar-Related Insurance Companies, as well as commercial insurers. Of the 73,206 claims reported, 89 percent involved total costs (expenses and indemnity/settlement payments) under \$100,000; 76% had total costs of \$10,000 or less, and 15% had total costs between \$10,001 and \$50,000.

The MIWG determined that, if legal malpractice insurance were required in California, minimum coverage of \$100,000 per claim/\$300,000 aggregate per year is reasonably sufficient. It is assumed that currently insured attorneys who work in higher risk practices or who

⁵ State Bar Rule 3.158(A)(1), 3.158(C)

⁶ California Corporations Code section 16956(a)(2)(a).

represent clients with potentially greater losses are likely to maintain adequate insurance coverage, regardless of any mandated minimum imposed.

The adequacy and efficacy of the disclosure rule regarding errors and omissions insurance, currently embodied in Rule 1.4.2 of the Rules of Professional Conduct⁷.

Rule 1.4.2 requires lawyers to inform clients in writing if they do not have professional liability insurance. The following exceptions are provided: (1) when the representation is not expected to exceed more than four hours; (2) in emergency situations; and, (3) for government lawyers and in-house counsel. The rule does not require specific language for the disclosure, although it does offer the following language in a comment: “Pursuant to rule 1.4.2 of the California Rules of Professional Conduct, I am informing you in writing that I do not have professional liability insurance.”

In evaluating the adequacy and efficacy of this rule, the MIWG considered two principal possible benefits of the rule: (1) increasing the number of insured attorneys, and (2) increasing information for consumers to make informed decisions when engaging a lawyer. Regarding the first assumed benefit, it is difficult to determine whether mandatory disclosure has a significant impact on attorneys’ decisions to purchase insurance.⁸ As in most states, California does not require attorneys to report to the State Bar whether or not they are insured; absent this information, the impact of mandatory disclosure rule cannot be measured, even if California attorneys were required in the future to report whether they are insured.

With regard to the second assumed benefit, the MIWG questioned whether the current rule is effective in providing information to legal consumers. In considering this question, the MIWG discussed the nature and timing of the disclosure. Concerns were raised about the sufficiency of the notice, and whether clients have enough information to make fully informed decisions. Due to the “claims made” nature of malpractice insurance policies, although an attorney may honestly state that he is insured at the time of engagement, coverage might not be in place at the time a claim is made.

Further, the required disclosure of lack of insurance is often included within the body of a retainer agreement, and specific acknowledgment of this disclosure is not required. The MIWG discussed requiring that the disclosure be provided on a separate page, and that explicit client acknowledgment be obtained. Drafting improved model disclosure language, to provide clear notice to clients, was also discussed.

The timing of disclosure was also a concern. Disclosure is not required until the time of engagement, after the client has decided to retain the attorney. Clients may be less likely to change their mind about hiring the lawyer after the decision has been made, when signing the

⁷ The Rules of Professional Conduct were revised and renumbered subsequent to the enactment of SB 36. Current Rule 1.4.2 corresponds with former Rule 3-410.

⁸ Levin, *supra*, p. 23.

retainer agreement may be considered a formality. Publicly available information on the State Bar's website would provide this information to clients while they are "shopping" for legal services. The American Bar Association (ABA) Model Court Rule on insurance disclosure includes the publication of information by state regulators about attorneys' insurance coverage status.⁹ Following is a summary of the Model Court Rule:

1. Lawyers engaged in private practice must certify annually to their regulator whether they are covered by professional liability insurance and whether they intend to maintain insurance coverage.
 - a. If they report that they are insured, they must notify the regulator if the coverage lapses or is no longer in effect for any reason.
2. Information submitted pursuant to this rule will be made public by such means as may be designated by the regulator.

The MIWG heard testimony from the North Carolina State Bar about their experience with implementation of the ABA Model Rule. Beginning in 2004, North Carolina attorneys were required to report to their state bar on an annual basis whether they were in private practice and whether they were covered by malpractice insurance. Information about attorneys' insurance was made available to the public on the state bar's website. In 2010, the North Carolina State Bar undertook an evaluation of all its programs, including insurance disclosure. This evaluation determined that providing information about insurance disclosure was not valuable, considering the cost (approximately one part-time employee). Among its conclusions, the state bar found that information about malpractice insurance was only valid on the date it was provided, and did not provide sufficient information (e.g., levels of coverage) to be of value. Further, it was found that compliance with requirements to inform the state bar about changes to coverage was very low. The insurance disclosure requirement was eliminated in North Carolina in 2010.¹⁰

To assess public sentiment on the topic, the State Bar engaged the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago to conduct a survey of California residents on issues related to legal malpractice insurance. When asked whether the State Bar should include information on its website about whether attorneys have malpractice insurance, 89 percent responded affirmatively. The NORC report on the survey, as well as a staff presentation that provides additional analysis, is provided as Attachment K.

The MIWG concluded that the current insurance disclosure rule should be modified to provide more comprehensive information to legal consumers, and to allow for publication of attorneys' insurance status on the State Bar's website.

⁹ American Bar Association Standing Committee on Client Protection, *ABA Model Court Rule on Insurance Disclosure*. (2004)
(https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/professional_responsibility/clientpro_migrated/Model_Rule_InsuranceDisclosure.pdf)

¹⁰ Testimony of Alice Mine, Assistant Executive Director of the North Carolina State Bar, to the MIWG on August 27, 2018.

The advisability of mandating errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in California and attendant considerations.

The MIWG reviewed information and testimony both in favor of and against requiring attorneys to carry legal malpractice insurance. The principal argument in favor of such a requirement is that of public protection. Here again, the premise of this argument needs to be considered in the context of disagreement amongst members of the MIWG regarding whether malpractice insurance protects the public or protects attorneys. Keeping this disagreement in mind, this argument goes on to note that clients who are harmed by attorneys' malpractice generally have little recourse if their lawyers are uninsured because plaintiffs' malpractice lawyers are reluctant to pursue claims against uninsured lawyers.¹¹ Even if they are successful, the likelihood of recovering a substantial settlement or judgment is low.¹² The one MIWG member who is a plaintiffs' legal malpractice practitioner confirmed that this was his experience.

The United States is unusual in not mandating that attorneys carry legal malpractice insurance; most European and common-law countries require lawyers in private practice to carry insurance.¹³ In the United States, only Oregon and Idaho currently have such a requirement, although the state of Washington is considering mandating coverage. The task force appointed by the Washington State Bar Association Board of Governors to study the topic concluded that malpractice insurance should be mandated for Washington lawyers. The report determined that attorneys' failure to carry insurance poses a distinct risk to clients, and "uninsured lawyers create an access-to-justice problem," due to their clients' inability to pursue legitimate claims against them.¹⁴ The Board of Governors will consider the task force's final report and recommendations later this year.

Other states have studied the topic of mandatory legal malpractice insurance and chosen not to mandate coverage. The Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the New Jersey Supreme Court to study the issue "determined that a rule requiring mandatory professional liability insurance would be unworkable in the New Jersey marketplace and would not satisfy a current and plain unmet need. The Ad Hoc Committee also concluded that a mandate requiring all attorneys engaged in the private practice of law carry professional liability insurance would be unfairly punitive to small firms, solo practitioners, and to those attorneys engaged in the part-time practice of law."¹⁵

¹¹ Herbert M. Kritzer and Neil Vidmar, *When Lawyers Screw Up: Improving Access to Justice for Legal Malpractice Victims*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2018. p. 5.

¹² Leslie C. Levin, *Lawyers Going Bare and Clients Going Blind*, 68 Fla.L.Rev.1281(2016), p. 32.

<https://scholarship.law.ufl.edu/flr/vol68/iss5/2/>

¹³ Kritzer and Vidmar, *supra*. p. 38.

¹⁴ Washington State Bar Association, *Mandatory Malpractice Insurance Task Force Report to Board of Governors*, February 2019. (https://www.wsba.org/docs/default-source/legal-community/committees/mandatory-malpractice-insurance-task-force/mandatory-malpractice-insurance-task-force-report815766f2f6d9654cb471ff1f00003f4f.pdf?sfvrsn=728e03f1_0)

¹⁵ *Report of the [New Jersey] Supreme Court Ad Hoc Committee on Attorney Malpractice Insurance*, June 2017. (<https://www.njcourts.gov/courts/assets/supreme/reports/2017/attmalpracticeinsurance.pdf>)

The State Bar of Nevada’s Board of Governors implemented the recommendation of its Professional Liability Insurance Taskforce, and in June 2018 submitted a petition to the Nevada Supreme Court to impose a rule requiring Nevada attorneys to carry malpractice insurance as a condition of licensure. The Court, however, denied the petition in October 2018, concluding that “the Board of Governors has provided inadequate detail and support demonstrating that the proposed amendment to SCR 79 is appropriate.”¹⁶

A review of regulations for other licensed professionals in California found that, while professional corporations are required to provide adequate security for claims arising out of the rendering of professional services, very few licensing boards require insurance or other proof of financial security for individual licensees. The following exceptions were identified: licensed contractors are required to have a \$15,000 contractor’s bond,¹⁷ and doctors performing surgical procedures in outpatient settings are required to provide adequate security, either through liability insurance or participation in an indemnity trust, for patient claims.¹⁸ While practical considerations lead many professionals to purchase insurance (e.g., hospitals require doctors to be insured in order to be granted admitting privileges, lenders only work with insured appraisers), insurance is not required as a condition of licensing, except as noted above.

The 2018 attorney survey was directed toward attorneys in firms of ten or fewer. Due to the intentional exclusion of attorneys in larger firms and those not in private practice, solo practitioners made up 62 percent of the respondents to that survey. Solo practitioners reported being uninsured at a rate of 39 percent. An additional 12 percent of attorneys in firms of 2 to 5 lawyers, and 4 percent of those in firms of 6 to 10 lawyers, reported that they were uninsured. The principal reasons provided for not carrying insurance included unaffordability (66%), lack of value for the cost (35%), a belief that they would not be sued (29%), working part-time (23%), and insurance not being necessary for their area of practice (18%).¹⁹

In a 2017 State Bar survey of *all* licensed attorneys, nearly 21 percent of respondents reported being solo practitioners, and about 30 percent of these attorneys indicated that they were uninsured. Another approximately 18 percent of respondents reported working in small firms (defined as firms of fewer than 30 attorneys), and over 3 percent of this group reported that they were uninsured.²⁰ Extrapolating these percentages to the number of active attorneys provides an estimate that over 13,000 California attorneys in solo and small practices are uninsured, as shown in Table 1.

¹⁶ Supreme Court of Nevada, *Order denying Petition for Amendment to Supreme Court Rule 79*. ADKT 534, October 11, 2018.

¹⁷ Business and Professions Code section 7071.6.

¹⁸ Business and Professions Code section 2216.2.

¹⁹ Respondents could select more than one reason, resulting in a total greater than 100%.

²⁰ The State Bar of California, *Summary Results of Five-Year Attorney Survey, 2017*.

<http://www.calbar.ca.gov/Portals/0/documents/reports/ORIA/Survey-2017.pdf>

Table 1. Estimated Number of Uninsured Attorneys²¹

	Attorneys by Firm Size	Estimated Number of Uninsured Attorneys
All Active Attorneys	189,509²²	13,208 (7.0%)
Solo	39,418	12,022 (30.5%)
Small Firm	34,870	1,186 (3.4%)

Quantifying the financial harm suffered by victims of uninsured lawyers who commit malpractice is especially problematic because those claims are allegedly rarely pursued. However, Professor Leslie Levin, using data from an analysis of indemnity payments made to resolve claims against insured solo practitioners and firms from between two and five lawyers, projected that “tens of millions of dollars” would be paid annually to clients of uninsured lawyers, if only they were insured.²³

The NORC survey, referenced in the above discussion of the disclosure rule, asked whether malpractice insurance should be required. Over three-quarters of respondents (78 percent) indicated that all lawyers should be required to have legal malpractice insurance. Of that 78 percent, 86 percent responded that insurance should be required, even if lawyers would charge higher fees to cover the cost of insurance. When asked if they would vote in favor of a proposed law requiring lawyers to have legal malpractice insurance, if it would result in a \$10 increase in hourly fees, 72 percent responded that they would do so. A law resulting in an hourly increase of \$30 would be supported by 60 percent of respondents. Overall, 57 percent of respondents would support such a law, despite an increase in costs.

One of the principal arguments against mandatory malpractice insurance is that would impose an unnecessary financial burden, due to a lack of evidence of harm caused by uninsured attorneys. This financial burden would negatively impact access to justice for the low income population that requires legal services, since lawyers would have to increase their fees to cover the cost of insurance. These claims were supported in a presentation made to the MIWG by San Joaquin School of Law Professor Andrew Kucera. Professor Kucera discussed his “Practice 99” course, which provides practice management guidance for law students who wish to serve clients with incomes that preclude them from eligibility for pro bono services, but who cannot afford to hire attorneys at prevailing hourly rates (the “99%”). Professor Kucera includes malpractice insurance among the expenses that may be unnecessary and can therefore be eliminated, thereby reducing practice costs. Cynthia Chandler, Director of the Bay Area Legal Incubator, also discussed the challenges faced by solo practitioners serving low income clients.

²¹ State Bar surveys found that virtually no firms with ten or more attorneys are uninsured.

²² The State Bar of California, “Licensee Demographics,” active attorneys as of February 7, 2019. (<http://members.calbar.ca.gov/search/demographics.aspx>)

²³ Levin, *supra*, p.32.

Ms. Chandler stated that the requirement that incubator participants carry malpractice insurance presents a significant burden to some of those participants.

The potential negative impact on attorneys in solo and small practices was also considered by the MIWG. Testimony was provided both in person at MIWG meetings and via written comment by attorneys who reported their practices could not sustain a requirement that they carry malpractice insurance. These comments were made by attorneys who are semi-retired or otherwise work part time, and others whose income from their legal practices was very limited. These attorneys reported that they would not be able to pass the cost of mandatory malpractice insurance on to their clients and that if insurance were required, they would be forced to cease practicing law.

Public comment submitted to the MIWG, almost all of which was submitted by attorneys, weighed heavily against mandatory legal malpractice insurance. More than three quarters of the comments (78 percent) opposed mandatory insurance. The reasons cited most often for opposition included the following:

- Insurance is unaffordable for attorneys in small and solo practices;
- Increased costs would negatively impact low income clients;
- Insurance is not required in all circumstances (e.g., certain areas of practice, semi-retired attorneys, attorneys who maintain a license but do not provide legal representation, etc.);
- Attorneys in low-risk practices would effectively subsidize those in high risk practices;
- The State Bar should not impose increased regulations on attorneys; and
- More research is required before any recommendations are made.

The remaining 22 percent of comments favoring mandatory malpractice insurance included 6 percent who supported such a requirement with specific qualifications, including the following:

- A minimum income threshold should be established, below which insurance would not be required;
- Exceptions should be provided for attorneys performing pro bono work, in specified practice types, and those who provide evidence of financial responsibility (e.g., bond or surety);
- Minimum required coverage levels should be low;
- Premium costs should be reasonable; and
- Evidence of harm to clients of uninsured attorneys should be provided.

The MIWG concluded that further study is required before a recommendation can be made with respect to mandatory legal malpractice insurance. The following topics were identified for further study:

- The actual risk to the public posed by attorneys who do not carry malpractice insurance;
- The likelihood that attorneys who currently provide pro bono or low bono services would withdraw from practice if mandatory insurance were imposed;

- The availability of insurance through legal aid groups, and the limitations on obtaining insurance by working with such groups; and
- The potential availability of lower cost options to encourage attorneys who do not currently buy insurance to do so.

MALPRACTICE INSURANCE WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

At its January 14, 2019 meeting, the MIWG considered recommendations related to each of the topics it studied.

Recommendations re Mandatory Legal Malpractice Insurance

More data is required prior to making a recommendation regarding whether mandatory malpractice insurance is necessary.²⁴

- This recommendation was supported by a majority of members present.

Recommendations re Ranges of Coverage to Protect the Public

If legal malpractice insurance is required, minimum coverage of \$100,000 per occurrence/\$300,000 aggregate per year is reasonably sufficient to protect members of the public who are served by attorneys who currently do not purchase insurance.

- This recommendation was adopted unanimously by the MIWG.

Recommendations re Rule 1.4.2 of the Rules of Professional Conduct

1. The State Bar should improve the model disclosure language provided in Rule 1.4.2 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.
 - This recommendation was adopted unanimously by the MIWG
2. Information about an individual attorney's lack of insurance should be included as publicly available information on the State Bar's website.
 - This recommendation was supported by a majority of the MIWG.
3. Attorneys should be required to report on their annual licensing statement whether they are insured.
 - This recommendation was supported by a majority of the MIWG.
4. The State Bar should educate lawyers and the public about legal malpractice insurance, by undertaking educational campaigns and providing information on the State Bar's website.
 - This recommendation was adopted unanimously by the MIWG.

²⁴ The MIWG also considered but rejected a recommendation to require malpractice insurance as a condition for licensing for attorneys who represent private clients; a significant minority supported this recommendation. The MIWG unanimously rejected a recommendation that mandatory insurance should *not* be required as a condition of licensing.

Recommendations re Encouraging Attorneys to Obtain and Maintain Insurance Coverage

The State Bar should encourage attorneys to purchase legal malpractice insurance, in the following ways:

1. Retain a professional communications firm to conduct an education campaign for lawyers about the benefits of insurance coverage and the lack of coverage;
2. Retain a professional communications firm to conduct an education campaign for legal consumers about the benefits of hiring insured lawyer and the risks of hiring uninsured lawyers;
3. Require uninsured lawyers to complete a free loss avoidance program that includes educational tools and self-assessments to ensure effective practice management and risk reduction.
 - This recommendation was adopted unanimously by the MIWG



State of California

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE

Section 6069.5

6069.5. (a) In recognition of the importance of protecting the public from attorney errors through errors and omissions insurance, the State Bar shall conduct a review and study regarding errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state. The State Bar shall conduct this review and study, which shall specifically include determinations of all of the following:

(1) The adequacy, availability, and affordability of errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state.

(2) Proposed measures for encouraging attorneys licensed in this state to obtain and maintain errors and omissions insurance.

(3) The ranges of errors and omissions insurance limits for attorneys licensed in this state recommended to protect the public.

(4) The adequacy and efficacy of the disclosure rule regarding errors and omissions insurance, currently embodied in Rule 3-410 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.

(5) The advisability of mandating errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state and attendant considerations.

(6) Other proposed measures relating to errors and omissions insurance for attorneys in this state that will further the goal of public protection.

(b) The State Bar shall report its findings under this section to the Supreme Court and the Legislature no later than March 31, 2019.

(c) The State Bar may consider any past studies, including, but not limited to, any relevant actuarial studies, and any current information that is available to the State Bar from other entities, such as the American Bar Association, regarding errors and omissions insurance.

(Added by Stats. 2017, Ch. 422, Sec. 26. (SB 36) Effective January 1, 2018.)



**THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
MALPRACTICE INSURANCE WORKING GROUP
CHARTER**

Business and Professions Code section 6069.5, enacted as part of the 2018 State Bar fee bill (SB 36, Stats. 2017, ch. 422) directs the State Bar to conduct a review and study regarding errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in California, and to report its findings to the Supreme Court and the Legislature by March 31, 2019. The Board of Trustees authorized the formation of the Malpractice Insurance Working Group, to conduct this review and develop recommendations for consideration by the Board.

The Malpractice Insurance Working Group shall:

- Conduct a review and study regarding errors and omissions insurance, as specified in Section 6069.5 of the Business and Professions Code, in order to determine each of the following:
 - (1) The adequacy, availability, and affordability of errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state.
 - (2) Proposed measures for encouraging attorneys licensed in this state to obtain and maintain errors and omissions insurance.
 - (3) The ranges of errors and omissions insurance limits for attorneys licensed in this state recommended to protect the public.
 - (4) The adequacy and efficacy of the disclosure rule regarding errors and omissions insurance, currently embodied in Rule 3-410 of the Rules of Professional Conduct.
 - (5) The advisability of mandating errors and omissions insurance for attorneys licensed in this state and attendant considerations.
 - (6) Other proposed measures relating to errors and omissions insurance for attorneys in this state that will further the goal of public protection.
- Consider any past studies, including, but not limited to, any relevant actuarial studies, and any current information available from other states, public entities, and bar associations, such as the American Bar Association, regarding errors and omissions insurance.
- Convene meetings at which information from experienced attorneys, insurance industry representatives, experts and members of the public with knowledge of relevant issues, representatives from other jurisdictions that have implemented, or considered implementation of, regulations regarding malpractice insurance, and other interested parties, will be considered.
- Report its findings to the Board of Trustees
 - The report to the Board of Trustees may include recommendations that the Board may consider in its report of its findings that is due to the Supreme Court and Legislature no later than March 31, 2019.



**THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA
MALPRACTICE INSURANCE WORKING GROUP
CHARTER**

The Malpractice Insurance Working Group shall be appointed by the Board, and shall include the following representatives (in addition to the Chair):

Interest Group/Stakeholder	No. of Members	Nomination/Appointment Source
Board of Trustees	Up to 4	Board of Trustees
Assembly Judiciary Committee	1	Assembly Judiciary Committee
Senate Judiciary Committee	1	Senate Judiciary Committee
California admitted malpractice litigators (one defense, one plaintiffs)	2	California Lawyers Association
Solo/Small Firm practitioner	1	Local Bars
Sections Representative	1	California Lawyers Association
Ethics Attorney	1	Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct
Consumer Advocate (not licensed attorney)	2	To be determined
CA admitted insurance carrier	1	ABA Standing Committee on Lawyers Professional Liability
CA admitted insurance broker (who places policies with solo/small firms)	1	ABA Standing Committee on Lawyers Professional Liability
Affinity Bar	1	Minority Bar Coalition
Judge	1	California Judges Association
Total	14-17	

Attachment C
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
ROSTER

Chair Board of Trustees	Randall Miller Miller Law 411 South Hewitt Street Los Angeles, CA 90013 (213) 493-6401 rmiller@millerlawapc.com	Member California Lawyers Association	Mark Abelson Campagnoli, Abelson & Campagnoli 465 California Street, Suite 222 San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 421-1515 mark@caclaw.com
Member ABA StCee on Lawyers Professional Liability	Scott Barabash Aspen Insurance 135 Main Street, Suite 1950 San Francisco, CA 94105 (646) 289-4926 Scott.Barabash@Aspen-Insurance.com	Member Council on Access and Fairness	Connie Broussard Broussard Law 600 B Street, Suite 2100 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 488-6555 cbroussard@broussardlawgroup.com
Member Board of Trustees	Ruben Duran Best Best & Krieger 300 South Grand Avenue, 25th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 (213) 617-8100 ruben.duran@bbklaw.com	Member Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct	Scott Garner Umberg/Zipser LLP 1920 Main Street, Suite 750 Irvine, CA 92614 (949) 679-0052 sgarner@umbergzipser.com
Member California Lawyers Association	Sabrina Green Stratton & Green, ALC 3703 Camino Del Rio South Suite 100-B San Diego, CA 92108 (619) 718-4820 sgreen@sglawcorp.com	Member Center for Public Interest Law	Kathleen Hamilton 1400 P Street #220 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 476-3650 khamilton1234@att.net
Member Local Bars	Wesley Lowe Mannion, Lowe & Oskendler 655 Montgomery Street, Suite 1900 San Francisco, CA 94111 (415) 733-1053 wes@mlolawyers.com	Member ABA StCee on Lawyers Professional Liability	Dan McKenna Mitchell & Mitchell Insurance Agency, Inc 250 Bel Marin Keys Blvd, E-1 Novato, CA 94949 (415) 883-2525 dmckenna@mitchellandmitchell.com
Member Assembly Judiciary Committee	Joanna Mendoza Law Offices of Joanna R. Mendoza P.O. Box 550 Roseville, CA 95661 (916) 781-7600 jmendoza@theiplawfirm.com	Member Board of Trustees	Jay Mootz McGeorge School of Law 3200 Fifth Avenue Sacramento CA 95817 (916) 739-7385 jmootz@pacific.edu
Member California Lawyers Association	Glen Olson Long & Levit LLP 465 California Street, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 (415) 397-2222 golson@longlevit.com	Member California Judges Association	Hon. Alan Perkins Sacramento Superior Court Department 35 720 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95814 alan.perkins@saccourt.ca.gov

Attachment C
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
ROSTER

Member Board of Trustees	Lisa Perrochet Horvitz & Levy LLP 3601 W. Olive Avenue, 8th Floor Burbank, CA 91505 (818) 995-0800 lperrochet@horvitzlevy.com	Member Senate Judiciary Committee	Heather Rosing Klinedinst PC 501 West Broadway, Suite 600 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 239-8131 x2229 HRosing@Klinedinstlaw.com
Member Board of Trustees	Cathleen Sargent Lawyers' Mutual Insurance Company 3110 W. Empire Avenue Burbank, CA 91504 (818) 565-5512 sargentc@lawyersmutual.com	State Bar Staff Liaison	Marc Shapp Assistant General Counsel Office of General Counsel 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 (415) 538-2517 marc.shapp@calbar.ca.gov
State Bar Staff Liaison	Linda Katz Principal Program Analyst Research and Institutional Accountability State Bar of California 180 Howard Street San Francisco, CA 94105 Tel: (415) 538-2272 Linda.Katz@calbar.ca.gov	Supreme Court Liaison	Greg Fortescue Senior Staff Attorney Supreme Court of California 350 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA 94102-4797 Tel: (415) 865-7126 Gregory.Fortescue@jud.ca.gov



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
Mandatory Malpractice Insurance - Open Market Model
June 4, 2018
San Francisco

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

10:00 Randall Miller, Chair

Call for Public Comment

Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act Training

BACKGROUND

1. California
 - Current Status – Disclosure Requirement
 - History of Past Efforts in California
2. Other States' Efforts
3. Insurance Requirements for California Licensed Professionals

4:00 Adjourn



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
Mandatory Malpractice Insurance - Open Market Model
June 4, 2018
San Francisco

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

10:00 Randall Miller, Chair

HISTORY OF CALIFORNIA'S MALPRACTICE INSURANCE STUDIES

10:15 Hon. Kevin Culhane
Sacramento Superior Court
Former co-chair, State Bar Professional Liability Insurance Committee

STATUS OF MANDATORY MALPRACTICE INSURANCE IN OTHER STATES

10:45 Panel Discussion with Q & A

Diane Minnich
Executive Director, Idaho State Bar

Gene Leverty
President, State Bar of Nevada

Chris Newbold
Executive Vice President, ALPS Lawyers' Malpractice Insurance

12:15 Brief Lunch Break

12:30 Robert Hille (via videoconference)
President, New Jersey State Bar Association

DISCUSSION RE POTENTIAL IMPACT ON LOW INCOME CLIENTS

1:15 Panel Discussion with Q & A

Andrew Kucera
Law Professor, San Joaquin College of Law

Cynthia Chandler
Director, Bay Area Legal Incubator

WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

2:00 Call for Public Comment

2:15 Working Group Discussion

4:00 Adjourn



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
Availability and Affordability of Malpractice Insurance and
Recommended Coverage Levels
July 9, 2018
Los Angeles

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

ADEQUACY AND AVAILABILITY OF INSURANCE COVERAGE

AFFORDABILITY OF INSURANCE COVERAGE

RANGE OF INSURANCE LIMITS RECOMMENDED TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC

LUNCH

WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS FOR PROTECTING CONSUMERS FROM NEGLIGENT PRACTICE?

1:30 Robert Fellmeth
Executive Director, Center for Public Interest Law

CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
Measures to Encourage Malpractice Coverage
Adequacy of the Disclosure Rule
August 27, 2018
San Francisco

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

10:00 Randall Miller, Chair

STATUS OF DISCLOSURE RULES IN CALIFORNIA AND OTHER STATES

10:15 Panel Discussion and Q&A

Mary F. Andreoni
Ethics Education Counsel, Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission

Saul Bercovitch
Director of Governmental Affairs, California Lawyers Association

Andrew Fergel (via videoconference)
Executive Director, South Dakota State Bar

Alice Mine (via videoconference)
Assistant Executive Director, North Carolina State Bar

LUNCH BREAK

12:00

ACADEMIC RESEARCH REGARDING LEGAL MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

12:30 Panel Discussion with Q & A

Jeffrey Watters
Texas Attorney
Author, "What They Don't Know Can Hurt Them: Why Clients Should Know if Their Attorney Does Not Carry Malpractice Insurance," 2010 Baylor Law Review

Herbert M. Kritzer (via videoconference)
Professor of Law and Marvin J. Sonosky Chair of Law and Public Policy, University of Minnesota School of Law
Co-author (with Neil Vidmar), *When Lawyers Screw Up: Improving Access to Justice for Legal Malpractice Victims*, 2018, University of Kansas Press

WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

2:00 Call for Public Comment

2:15 Working Group Discussion

4:00 Adjourn



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
Mandatory Malpractice Insurance – Captive Fund Model
November 13, 2018
Los Angeles

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

10:00 Randall Miller, Chair

Opening Remarks

- Response to Request for Public Comments
- Timeline for Completion of MIWG Report to Board of Trustees

CAPTIVE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

10:10 Carol Bernick
Chief Executive Officer, Oregon Professional Liability Fund (PLF)

STATUS OF MANDATORY MALPRACTICE INSURANCE IN OTHER STATES

11:00 Hugh Spitzer (via videoconference)
Professor, University of Washington School of Law
Chair, Washington State Bar Association Mandatory Malpractice Insurance Task Force

BRIEF LUNCH BREAK

12:00

CAPTIVE INSURANCE PROGRAMS, CONTINUED DISCUSSION

12:15 Dan Pinnington (via videoconference)
President and CEO, LawPro, Ontario Mandatory Insurance Company

1:15 Courtney Claflin
Executive Director of Captive Programs, University of California Office of the President

WORKING GROUP DISCUSSION

2:10 Call for Public Comment
Working Group Discussion

4:00 Adjourn



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
January 14, 2019
San Francisco

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

10:00 Randall Miller, Chair

CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

REVIEW OF PUBLIC SURVEY RESULTS

DISCUSSION OF REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM SUBCOMMITTEES

- A. The advisability of mandating errors and omissions insurance for attorneys
- B. The adequacy, availability, and affordability of errors and omissions insurance
- C. The ranges of errors and omissions insurance limits recommended to protect the public
- D. Other proposed measures relating to errors and omissions insurance that will further the goal of public protection
- E. The adequacy and efficacy of the current disclosure rule
- F. Proposed measures for encouraging attorneys to obtain and maintain errors and omissions insurance

4:00 Adjourn



The State Bar of California
Malpractice Insurance Working Group
February 21, 2019
Conference Call

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

9:00 Randall Miller, Chair

CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

REVIEW OF DRAFT REPORT TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES

State Bar of California Legal Malpractice 2018

Conducted by NORC at the University of Chicago for the State Bar of California

*Interviews: 11/26-12/11/2018
1038 adults*

*Margin of error:
4.17 percentage points at the 95% confidence level among all California adults*

NOTE: All results show percentages among all respondents, unless otherwise labeled.

"" indicates less than 0.5%*

"-" indicates 0%

Q1. First, have you or someone in your household ever experienced a situation where a lawyer was needed?

[MULTIPLE RESPONSES]

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes, myself	48
Yes, someone in my household	30
No	31
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	*

N=1038

If "Yes, myself" or "Yes, someone else in my household" at Q1

Q2. What was the most recent reason [you/someone in your household] needed a lawyer?

[OPEN END RESPONSE]

If "Yes, myself" or "Yes, someone else in my household" at Q1

Q3. Thinking about the most recent time [you/someone in your household] needed a lawyer, which of the following actions did [you/they] take? If [you/they] took no action you can say that too.

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
[Handled on my own/They handled it on their own]	7
Consulted a lawyer but did not hire them	18
Hired a lawyer	68
Consulted a non-legal third party	3
Took no action	4
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	*

N=745

If “Consulted a lawyer but did not hire them” or “Hired a lawyer” at QS3

Q4. How did [you find a/they find a] lawyer or other legal service?

[MULTIPLE RESPONSES]

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Asked family and friends	53
Through a lawyer referral service	15
Used search engines like Google or Bing	19
Through social media platforms like Twitter/Facebook/Instagram/ LinkedIn/NextDoor	2
Searched the State Bar of California website	5
Searched other websites	5
Searched the Yellow Pages	5
Got a recommendation from [my/their] co-worker or employer	8
Got a recommendation from a union [I/they] belong to	1
Got a recommendation from a club or social group [I/they] belong to	3
Advertising on television, radio, or other media	4
Other	17
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	-

N=652

Q5. [When you consulted with or chose to hire a lawyer/Suppose you needed to hire a lawyer], how important [would/were] each of the following factors [be] in making your choice?

NORC 11/26-12/11/2018	Not important at all	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important	DK/SKP /REF
Cost	3	8	22	38	29	1
Experience	1	3	10	44	42	1
Reputation	3	4	14	42	37	1
The information the lawyer presents on their website	14	15	28	25	15	2
That they have legal malpractice insurance	10	14	23	32	20	1
That they are close to my house or office	13	23	37	20	7	1
That they were available during times convenient to me	4	11	28	37	19	1
That the referral came from a lawyer referral service	30	20	26	16	8	1
The reviews online or on social media	19	20	27	22	11	1
That I know them personally	46	17	19	12	6	1
That someone I know has hired or recommended them	12	16	26	32	13	1
The information about the lawyer on the State Bar of California website	11	12	25	33	17	2
Advertisements about the lawyer	37	24	24	9	4	2
That the lawyer specializes in a certain area of law	2	5	19	44	29	2

N= 1038

Q6. For each of the following terms, please choose which statement most accurately describes your understanding of that term.

NORC 11/26-12/11/2018	I have never heard this term	I have heard this term but do not know what it means	I have heard this term and know what it means	DK/SKP /REF
Legal malpractice insurance	12	28	59	*
Professional liability insurance	20	32	47	1
Retainer fees and/or agreements	11	22	67	1
Contingency fees	18	37	44	1
Attorney client privilege	12	17	71	1
Conflict of interest	6	11	82	1
Bar licensing	10	17	72	1

N= 1038

Q7. Based on what you know, are all lawyers currently required to have legal malpractice insurance in order to practice law in the state of California, or not?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes, it is currently required	23
No, it is not currently required	10
Not sure/don't know	65
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	1

N=1038

Q8. If lawyers do not have legal malpractice insurance, should they be required to disclose that information to potential clients, or not?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes, should be required	86
No, should not be required	12
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	2

N=1038

If "Yes, should be required" at Q8

Q9. When should the lawyer disclose that they do not have legal malpractice insurance?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Before the client decides to hire them	84
At the time the client decides to hire them	15
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	*

N=902

Q10. Do you think the State Bar of California website should include information about whether each lawyer has legal malpractice insurance, or not?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes	89
No	10
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	1

N=1038

Q11. Do you think all lawyers should be required to have legal malpractice insurance in order to practice law in California, or not?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes, should be required	78
No, should not be required	21
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	1

N=1038

If "Yes, should be required" at Q11

Q12. Lawyers who have legal malpractice insurance may charge higher fees to clients, to cover the cost of their insurance premiums. Given this information, do you think all lawyers should be required to have legal malpractice insurance in order to practice law in California?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes, should be required	86
No, should not be required	13
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	1

N=787

Q13. Suppose a proposal was on the ballot to require California lawyers to have legal malpractice insurance. If this proposal passed, on average lawyers would increase their hourly fees by [\$10/\$20/\$30/\$40/\$50]. Would you vote favor or against such a proposal to require legal malpractice insurance?

[RESPONSE OPTIONS ROTATED]

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Vote in favor	57
Vote against	41
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	2

N=1038

If "Working – as a paid employee" or "Working – self-employed" at EMPLOY

Q14. Are you employed full-time or part-time?

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Full-time	75
Part-time	23
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	2

N=610

If “Working – as a paid employee” or “Working – self-employed” at EMPLOY

Q15. Would you say your job is a white collar job, a blue collar job, or something else?

White collar work is usually done in an office or other professional environment. Blue collar refers to jobs that involve manual labor.

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
White collar	55
Blue collar	27
Something else	17
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	1

N=610

Q16. Are you or is anyone in your household a lawyer or work for a lawyer?

[MULTIPLE RESPONSES]

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Yes, I am a lawyer	1
Yes, someone else in the household is a lawyer	5
Yes, I work for a lawyer	2
Yes, someone else in the household works for a lawyer	1
No one in the household is a lawyer or works for a lawyer	92
DON'T KNOW/SKIPPED ON WEB/REFUSED	1

N=1038

SURV_LANG. Survey interview language

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
English	93
Spanish	7

N=1038

SURV_MODE. Survey interview mode

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Online	89
Phone	11

N=1038

DEVICE. Device

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Desktop	35
Phone Interview (not online)	11
Smartphone	50
Tablet	5

*N=1038***GENDER. Gender**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Male	49
Female	51

*N=1038***AGE4. Age – 4 categories**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
18-29	22
30-44	28
45-59	24
60+	26

*N=1038***AGE7. Age – 7 categories**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
18-24	12
25-34	20
35-44	19
45-54	14
55-64	17
65-74	12
75+	6

N=1038

RACETHNICITY. Combined race/ethnicity

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
White, non-Hispanic	41
Black, non-Hispanic	6
Other, non-Hispanic	2
Hispanic	35
2+, non-Hispanic	5
Asian, non-Hispanic	12

*N=1038***EDUC. Education (highest degree received)**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
No formal education	1
1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , or 4 th grade	*
5 th or 6 th grade	2
7 th or 8 th grade	1
9 th grade	1
10 th grade	1
11 th grade	3
12 th grade, no diploma	5
High school graduate – high school diploma or equivalent (GED)	23
Some college, no degree	21
Associate degree	8
Bachelor's degree	20
Master's degree	9
Professional or doctorate degree	4

*N=1038***EDUC4. 4-level education**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
No high school diploma	14
High school graduate or equivalent	23
Some college	29
Bachelor's degree or above	34

N=1038

Marit. Are you...

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Married	45
Widowed	4
Divorced	12
Separated	2
Never married	26
Living with partner	11

*N=1038***Emp. Which statement best describes your current employment status?**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Working (NET)	59
Working – as a paid employee	47
Working – self-employed	12
Not working (NET)	41
Not working – on temporary layoff from a job	1
Not working – looking for work	8
Not working – retired	16
Not working – disabled	8
Not working – other	9

N=1038

INCOME. Household income

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Less than \$50,000 (NET)	42
Less than \$5,000	4
\$5,000 to \$9,999	3
\$10,000 to \$14,999	5
\$15,000 to \$19,999	5
\$20,000 to \$24,999	6
\$25,000 to \$29,999	4
\$30,000 to \$34,999	6
\$35,000 to \$39,999	3
\$40,000 to \$49,999	6
\$50,000 or more (NET)	58
\$50,000 to \$59,999	8
\$60,000 to \$74,999	10
\$75,000 to \$84,999	6
\$85,000 to \$99,999	10
\$100,000 to \$124,999	9
\$125,000 to \$149,999	6
\$150,000 to \$174,999	3
\$175,000 to \$199,999	2
\$200,000 or more	5

*N=1038***REGION9. Region – 9 level**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
New England	-
Mid-Atlantic	-
East North Central	-
West North Central	-
South Atlantic	-
East South Central	-
West South Central	-
Mountain	-
Pacific	100

N=1038

REGION4. Region – 4 level

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Northeast	-
Midwest	-
South	-
West	100

*N=1038***METRO. Metropolitan area flag**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Non-metro area	2
Metro area	98

*N=1038***INTERNET. Household internet access**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Non-internet household	16
Internet household	84

*N=1038***HOUSING. Home ownership**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Owned or being bought by you or someone in your household	57
Rented for cash	40
Occupied without payment of cash rent	2

N=1038

HOME_TYPE. Type of building of panelists' residence

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
A one-family house detached from any other house	63
A one-family house attached to one or more houses	9
A building with 2 or more apartments	24
A mobile home or trailer	4
Boat, RV, van, etc.	*

*N=1038***PHONESERVICE. Telephone service for the household**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
Landline telephone only	5
Have a landline, but mostly use cellphone	27
Have a cellphone, but mostly use landline	12
Cellphone only	55
No telephone service	1

*N=1038***HHSIZE. Household size (including children)**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
1	17
2	28
3	13
4	15
5	9
6+	18

*N=1038***HH01. Number of HH members age 0-1**

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
0	97
1	3
2	*

N=1038

Attachment K

HH25. Number of HH members age 2-5

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
0	85
1	9
2	5
3	*
4	*

N=1038

HH612. Number of HH members age 6-12

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
0	79
1	12
2	7
3	1
4	1
5	*
6	*
7	-
8	*

N=1038

HH1317. Number of HH members age 13-17

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
0	81
1	13
2	5
3	*
4	1

N=1038

Attachment K

HH18OV. Number of HH members age 18+

	NORC 11/26-12/11/2018
1	21
2	43
3	16
4	8
5	8
6	1
7	1
8	*
9	*
10	*

N=1038



LEGAL MALPRACTICE 2018 CALIFORNIA STATE BAR AMERISPEAK FIELD REPORT

December 13, 2018

Client Contact: Linda Katz
NORC Account Manager:
Dan Costanzo | Daniel-Costanzo@norc.org
NORC Project Manager:
David Reisner | David-Reisner@norc.org



STUDY INTRODUCTION

NORC conducted the Legal Malpractice 2018 survey on behalf of the State Bar of California using NORC's AmeriSpeak® Panel for the sample source. This research was done to investigate California residents knowledge and experience of the legal system, with an emphasis on knowledge of legal malpractice insurance.

This study was offered in English and Spanish. The survey was administered on web and phone.

This AmeriSpeak Field Report supplements the information provided in the *NORC Card*, which provides an in-depth profile of sample quality metrics for the study, the data collection field period, interview sample size, response rate statistics, the design effect, and sampling margins of error, among other statistics. Please refer to the NORC Card for information useful for compliance with the AAPOR Transparency Initiative, in addition to information provided in this AmeriSpeak Field Report.

For more detailed information on the AmeriSpeak panel recruitment and management methodology, please see the Appendix ("Technical Notes on AmeriSpeak Methodology") attached to this AmeriSpeak Field Report.

STUDY-SPECIFIC DETAILS

Sampling

A general population sample of California residents age 18 and older was selected from NORC's AmeriSpeak Panel for this study.

The sample for a specific study is selected from the AmeriSpeak Panel using sampling strata based on age, race/Hispanic ethnicity, education, and gender (48 sampling strata in total). The size of the selected sample per sampling stratum is determined by the population distribution for each stratum. In addition, sample selection takes into account expected differential survey completion rates by demographic groups so that the set of panel members with a completed interview for a study is a representative sample of the target population. If panel household has one more than one active adult panel member, only one adult in the household is eligible for selection (random within-household sampling). Panelists selected for an AmeriSpeak study earlier in the business week are not eligible for sample selection until the following business week.

For technical information about the AmeriSpeak Panel, including recruitment process and panel management policies, please see the Appendix.

Field

Initially, a recruitment survey was fielded to attain a list of respondents who consented to cognitive interviews. Using this list, respondents were contacted, of which 9 completed cognitive interviews. These were then used to refine the content of the pretest.

A small sample of English-speaking AmeriSpeak web-mode panelists were invited on November 16, 2018 for a pretest. In total, NORC collected 25 pretest interviews. The initial data from the pretest was reviewed by NORC and a delivered to The State Bar of California.

No changes were made before fielding the Main survey to collect the 1,038 interviews.

Please see NORC Card for field period, sample sizes, and the AAPOR response rate documentation.

Survey Completion Rates

The interview stage of data collection was conducted during a single survey session for the respondents. The incidence rate was 100.0%. Among those cases that entered the main study interview, the interview completion rate was 26.6%. The summary statistics on sample performance are shown below.

Sample Performance Summary

Sampled/Invited Panelists	Incidence / Eligibility Rate	No. Survey Interviews Completed	Interview Completion Rate
3,899	100.0%	1,038	26.6%

Please see NORC Card for the AAPOR response rate documentation.

Gaining Cooperation of AmeriSpeak Panelists for the Study

To encourage study cooperation, NORC sent email reminders to sampled web-mode panelists on the following dates:

- Thursday November 29
- Saturday December 1
- Tuesday December 4
- Friday December 7
- Sunday December 9

Panelists were offered the cash equivalent of \$4.

Data processing

NORC prepared a fully labeled data file of respondent survey data and demographic data for The State Bar of California.

Statistical Weighting

Statistical weights for the study eligible respondents were calculated using *panel base sampling weights* to start.

Panel base sampling weights for all sampled housing units are computed as the inverse of probability of selection from the NORC National Frame (the sampling frame that is used to sample housing units for AmeriSpeak) or address-based sample. The sample design and recruitment protocol for the AmeriSpeak Panel involves subsampling of initial non-respondent housing units. These subsampled non-respondent housing units are selected for an in-person follow-up. The subsample of housing units that are selected for the nonresponse follow-up (NRFU) have their panel base sampling weights inflated by the inverse of the subsampling rate. The base sampling weights are further adjusted to account for unknown eligibility and nonresponse among eligible housing units. The household-level nonresponse adjusted weights are then post-stratified to external counts for number of households obtained from the Current Population Survey. Then, these household-level post-stratified weights are assigned to each eligible adult in every recruited household. Furthermore, a person-level nonresponse adjustment accounts for nonresponding adults within a recruited household.

Finally, panel weights are raked to external population totals associated with age, sex, education, race/Hispanic ethnicity, housing tenure, telephone status, and Census Division. The external population

totals are obtained from the Current Population Survey. The weights adjusted to the external population totals are the *final panel weights*.

Study-specific base sampling weights are derived using a combination of the final panel weight and the probability of selection associated with the sampled panel member. Since not all sampled panel members respond to the survey interview, an adjustment is needed to account for and adjust for survey non-respondents. This adjustment decreases potential nonresponse bias associated with sampled panel members who did not complete the survey interview for the study. Thus, the *nonresponse adjusted survey weights* for the study are adjusted via a raking ratio method to 18+ year old California resident population totals associated with the following socio-demographic characteristics: age, sex, education, race/Hispanic ethnicity, and Census Division. The weights adjusted to the external population totals are the *final study weights*.

At the final stage of weighting, any extreme weights were trimmed based on a criterion of minimizing the mean squared error associated with key survey estimates, and then, weights re-raked to the same population totals.

Raking and re-raking is done during the weighting process such that the weighted demographic distribution of the survey completes resemble the demographic distribution in the target population. The assumption is that the key survey items are related to the demographics. Therefore, by aligning the survey respondent demographics with the target population, the key survey items should also be in closer alignment with the target population.

Deliverables

The following files were created for The State Bar of California as part of the study deliverables:

- Survey interview data file in Excel format
- Topline frequencies in Word format
- Codebook in Excel format
- Final programming questionnaire in Word document
- Field report documenting study procedures
- NORC Card

HOW TO DESCRIBE AMERISPEAK AND NORC @ THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

For purposes of publication, when describing AmeriSpeak and its panel methodology, we recommend using the following language:

Funded and operated by NORC at the University of Chicago, **AmeriSpeak®** is a probability-based panel designed to be representative of the US household population. Randomly selected US households are sampled using area probability and address-based sampling, with a known, non-zero probability of selection from the NORC National Sample Frame. These sampled households are then contacted by US mail, telephone, and field interviewers (face to face). The panel provides sample coverage of approximately 97% of the U.S. household population. Those excluded from the sample include people with P.O. Box only addresses, some addresses not listed in the USPS Delivery Sequence File, and some newly constructed dwellings. While most AmeriSpeak households participate in surveys by web, non-internet households can participate in AmeriSpeak surveys by telephone. Households without conventional internet access but having web access via smartphones are allowed to participate in AmeriSpeak surveys by web. AmeriSpeak panelists participate in NORC studies or studies conducted by NORC on behalf of governmental agencies, academic researchers, and media and commercial organizations.

Attachment K

For more information, email AmeriSpeak-BD@norc.org or visit AmeriSpeak.norc.org.

If editors or reviewers are requesting anything more specific or any other detail, please reach out to us to make certain you are using accurate language.

NORC at the University of Chicago is best described as follows:

NORC at the University of Chicago is an independent research institution that delivers reliable data and rigorous analysis to guide critical programmatic, business, and policy decisions. Since 1941, NORC has conducted groundbreaking studies, created and applied innovative methods and tools, and advanced principles of scientific integrity and collaboration. Today, government, corporate, and nonprofit clients around the world partner with NORC to transform increasingly complex information into useful knowledge. Please visit www.norc.org for more information.

APPENDIX

**TECHNICAL OVERVIEW OF THE AMERISPEAK® PANEL
NORC'S PROBABILITY-BASED RESEARCH PANEL**

Updated February 6, 2018

Prepared by J. Michael Dennis, Ph.D.

Funded and operated by NORC at the University of Chicago, AmeriSpeak® is a probability-based panel designed to be representative of the US household population. Randomly selected US households are sampled with a known, non-zero probability of selection from the NORC National Frame and address-based sample, and then contacted by US mail, telephone interviewers, overnight express mailers, and field interviewers (face to face). AmeriSpeak panelists participate in NORC studies or studies conducted by NORC on behalf of NORC's clients.

In 2017, the AmeriSpeak Panel expanded to 27,000 households and will expand to 30,000 households in 2018. The AmeriSpeak Panel includes sample support for surveys of various segments through AmeriSpeak Latino, AmeriSpeak Teen, and AmeriSpeak Young Adult (which includes an oversample of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians age 18-34). AmeriSpeak also supports large-sample size surveys and surveys of low-incidence populations through AmeriSpeak Calibration, which combines probability-based AmeriSpeak and non-probability online samples using calibrating statistical weights derived from AmeriSpeak.

Sample Frame

In order to provide a nationally representative sample, AmeriSpeak leverages the NORC National Frame, which provides sample coverage for over 97 percent of the U.S. households. The 2010 National Frame used a two-stage probability sample design to select a representative sample of households in the United States. The first stage—the sampling unit—is a National Frame Area (NFA), which is either an entire metropolitan area (made up of one or more counties) or a county (some counties were combined so that each NFA contains a population of at least 10,000). The largest NFAs with a population of at least 1,543,728 (0.5 percent of the 2010 Census U.S. population) were selected with certainty; these areas have a high-population density, and are dominated by tracts with street-style addresses. These areas contain 56 percent of the population within 8 percent of the geographic area of the United States. The remaining areas were stratified into areas where street-style addresses predominate, and the remaining areas, which are less likely to have street-style addresses. The latter stratum (“rural” areas) comprises 81 percent of the geographic area, but only 14 percent of the population.

Within the selected NFAs, the second stage sampling unit is a segment, defined either in terms of Census tracts or block groups, containing at least 300 housing units according to the 2010 Census. A stratified probability sample of 1,514 segments was selected with probability proportional to size. For most of the 1,514 segments, the U.S. Postal Service Delivery Sequence File (DSF) provided over 90 percent coverage of the segments in terms of city-style addresses that are geo-codeable. For the 123 segments where the DSF provided insufficient coverage, we enhanced the DSF address list with in-person listing. The National Frame contains almost 3 million households, including over 80,000 rural households added through the in-person listing.

The National Frame involves addresses in almost every state. For the remaining states, AmeriSpeak added some address-based sampling (ABS) addresses in 2016 and 2017 from the USPS DSF to assure AmeriSpeak sample representation for all US States and Washington, DC.

In 2017, a targeted address-based sample was added to AmeriSpeak recruitment in order to develop a new Latino Panel with adequate representation of Spanish-language-dominant Hispanics. Census tracts with high incidence (at least 30%) of Spanish-dominant Hispanics were targeted for this recruitment. Furthermore, within these Census tracts, households that were flagged as Hispanic based on consumer vendor data (that are typically used for direct-mail marketing) were oversampled. This new AmeriSpeak Latino Panel contains approximately 5,400 Hispanic panelists with 24% of those panelists being Spanish-language dominant. As of August 2017, 13% of AmeriSpeak Panel (including the Latino Panel) recruited adults were sourced from the ABS and 87% from the National Frame. Proper weights allow the full use of the combined sample.

Sample Selection for Panel Recruitment

The 2014-2017 AmeriSpeak Panel sample consists of nationally representative housing units drawn from the 2010 NORC National Sample Frame and 14% from address-based sampling (which was primarily to develop AmeriSpeak Latino). The 2010 NORC National Sample Frame is stratified based on segment (Census tract or Census block group) characteristics such as age and race/ethnicity composition of the segment, and then, a stratified simple random sample of housing units is selected. Specifically, based on Census tract-level data, segments were classified as having a higher concentration of 18-24 year old adults or not, and a higher concentration of Hispanics, non-Hispanic African Americans, and other. Based on these strata definitions, 6 strata (2 based on age times 3 based on race/ethnicity) were used to oversample housing units in segments higher in young adults and/or Hispanics and non-Hispanic African-Americans. This is referred to as the initial sample or first stage of panel recruitment.

In the second stage of panel recruitment, initially sampled but nonresponding housing units are subsampled for a nonresponse follow-up (NRFU). At this stage, consumer vendor data are matched to housing units, and housing units that are flagged (based on consumer vendor data) as having a young adult (18-34 years of age) or minority (Hispanic and non-Hispanic African American) are oversampled for the NRFU. Overall, approximately one in five initially nonresponding housing units are subsampled for NRFU. However, as mentioned previously, selection of housing units for NRFU is a stratified simple random sample based on consumer vendor data. Due to NRFU, these initially nonresponding housing units have a much higher selection probability compared to the housing units that were recruited during the first stage of panel recruitment. Note that a small fraction of initially nonresponding housing units are not eligible for NRFU due to these housing units being classified as “hard refusals” or having an appointment for a call back from NORC.

In summary, there are two reasons why the sampling design for AmeriSpeak Panel recruitment deviates from Equal Probability of Selection Method (EPSEM) sampling: (a) oversampling of housing units in segments with a higher concentration of young adults and minorities results in the sample selection probabilities being higher for housing units in these segments; and (b) the nonresponse follow-up effort results in initially nonresponding housing units having a much higher selection probability. Furthermore, oversampling associated with NRFU results in higher selection probabilities for initially nonresponding housing units that are flagged (based on consumer vendor data) as having a young adult or minority.

AmeriSpeak Panel Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment is a two-stage process: initial recruitment using less expensive methods and then non-response follow-up using personal interviewers. For the initial recruitment, sample units are invited to join AmeriSpeak online by visiting the panel website AmeriSpeak.org or by telephone (in-bound/outbound supported). English and Spanish language are supported for both online and telephone recruitment. Study invitations are communicated via an over-sized pre-notification postcard, a USPS recruitment package in a 9”x12” envelope (containing a cover letter, a summary of the privacy policy, FAQs, and a study brochure), two follow-up post cards, and also contact by NORC’s telephone research center for sample units matched to a telephone number.

The second-stage non-response follow-up targets a stratified random sub-sample of the non-responders from the initial recruitment. Stratification is based on consumer vendor data and stratification variables from the initial recruitment stage in order to increase sample representation of young adults (18-34 years of age), non-Hispanic African Americans, and Hispanics. Units sampled for the non-response follow-up are sent by Federal Express a new recruitment package with an enhanced incentive offer. NORC field interviewers then make personal, face-to-face visits to the respondents' homes to encourage participation. NORC field interviewers administer the recruitment survey in-person using CAPI or else encourage the respondents to register at AmeriSpeak.org or call the toll-free AmeriSpeak telephone number to register.

Recruiting Non-Internet and “Net Averse” Households

Under certain conditions, AmeriSpeak gives respondents a choice regarding their preferred mode for future participation in AmeriSpeak surveys. For the 2014-2017 recruitment, 82% of panelists were enrolled in AmeriSpeak to receive online surveys, while 18% of the panelists agreed to participate in AmeriSpeak telephone mode surveys. For the 2016 and 2017 recruitment, respondents provided an option of online or telephone modes include: persons without internet access, persons whose only internet access is via a smartphone, and persons with internet access but unwilling to share an email address. A recruited household can consist of both web-mode and phone-mode panelists residing in the same household.

Impact of Non-Response Follow-up

The non-response follow-up (NRFU) reduces non-response bias significantly by improving the representativeness of the AmeriSpeak panel sample with respect to certain demographic segments, including but not limited to rural and/or lower income households, cell-phone only households, persons age 18 to 34, African Americans, Hispanics, and persons without a high school degree or have only a high school degree (no college). Even though NRFU panelists are more reluctant to complete surveys, the addition of NRFU panelists reduced absolute bias on average 35-40% when compared to the initial stage recruits (among examined surveys). Compared to panelists recruited in the initial stage, panelists recruited via the non-response follow-up campaign are more politically conservative, are less knowledgeable about science, report less interest in current events and topics in the news (such as climate change and energy resources), and are less likely to read a print newspaper (more likely to read the news online and use social media). They are also more likely to attend church, be against gun control, and more likely to eat at a fast food restaurant than the initial stage recruits. Accordingly, NRFU panelists make the substantive estimates in any AmeriSpeak study more representative and accurate.

AmeriSpeak Panel Recruitment Response Rate and Other Sample Metrics

The AAPOR RR3 (response rate) for the 2014-2017 panel recruitment 33.7% (weighted to take into account selection probabilities).¹ The estimated cumulative AAPOR RR3 for client surveys is 10% to 20% (varying according to study parameters and taking into account all sources of non-response including panel recruitment, panel household attrition, and survey participation).² NORC documented the AAPOR response rate calculation methodology for 2014-2015 recruitment.³

Key statistics with respect to the 2014-2017 recruited households are as follows: 52% recruited via the non-response follow-up recruitment using overnight Federal Express mailers and face-to-face methodology (with

¹ The response rate calculation incorporates the selection probabilities of the samples for the initial recruitment and non-response follow-up stages, as calculated by the US Bureau of the Census for the American Community Survey.

² A properly calculated AAPOR response rate for panel-based research takes into account all sources of non-response at each stage of the panel recruitment, management, and survey administration process. A common misapplication of the term “response rate” in online panel surveys is represent the survey-specific cooperation rate as the “survey response rate.”

³ See “Response Rate Calculation Methodology for Recruitment of a Two-Phase Probability-Based Panel: The Case of AmeriSpeak” authored by Robert Montgomery, J. Michael Dennis, Nada Ganesh. The paper is available at amerispeak.norc.org on the “research” page.

NORC field staff visiting households); 18% indicated a preference for the telephone mode of data collection for participating in AmeriSpeak studies; 22% of the recruited households are non-Internet; 80% are cell-phone only or cell-phone mostly; 18% are African-American and 24% Hispanic; and 36% have household income below \$30,000 (compared to CPS benchmark of 26%).

Mixed-Mode Data Collection

Panelists may participate in two to three AmeriSpeak Panel studies per month via online (computer, tablet, or smartphones) or by CATI phone. CATI phone mode respondents represent a population currently under-represented in web panels that exclude non-internet households or “net averse” persons. NORC’s telephone interviewers administer the phone mode of survey questionnaires using a data collection system supporting both the phone and web modes of data collection, providing an integrated sample management and data collection platform. For panelists using smartphones for web-mode AmeriSpeak surveys, the NORC survey system renders an optimized presentation of the survey questions for these mobile users. For general population client studies, approximately 20% of the completed interviews are completed by the telephone mode.

Panel Management Policies

NORC maintains strict rules to limit respondent burden and reduce the risk of panel fatigue. On average, AmeriSpeak panel members typically participate in AmeriSpeak web-based or phone-based studies two to three times a month.

Because the risk of panel attrition increases with the fielding of poorly constructed survey questionnaires, the AmeriSpeak team works with NORC clients to create surveys that provide an appropriate user experience for AmeriSpeak panelists. AmeriSpeak will not field surveys that in our professional opinion will result in a poor user experience for our panelists and in panel attrition.

ABOUT NORC AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

As one of the world’s foremost independent research institutions, NORC at the University of Chicago delivers objective data and meaningful analysis to help decision-makers and leading organizations make informed choices and identify new opportunities. Since 1941, NORC has applied sophisticated methods and tools, innovative and cost-effective solutions, and the highest standards of scientific integrity and quality to conduct and advance research on critical issues. Today, NORC expands on this tradition by partnering with government, business, and nonprofit clients to create deep insight across a broad range of topics and to disseminate useful knowledge throughout society.

Headquartered in downtown Chicago, NORC works in over 40 countries around the world, with additional offices on the University of Chicago campus, the DC metro area, Atlanta, Boston, and San Francisco.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

To learn more about AmeriSpeak or to share an RFP, please contact AmeriSpeak at AmeriSpeak-BD@norc.org. Information about AmeriSpeak capabilities and research papers are available online at AmeriSpeak.NORC.org.



The State Bar of California


Legal Malpractice Insurance Public Survey Responses

Conducted by the National Opinion Research
Center at the University of Chicago
November 26 – December 11, 2018

Linda Katz, Office of Research and Institutional Accountability




- Representative sample of California population
- 1,038 completed surveys
 - 93% English
 - 7% Spanish
- Respondent Household Income






Do you think all lawyers should be required to have legal malpractice insurance in order to practice law in California?




Follow-up to 78% who responded yes:

Do you think all lawyers should be required to have legal malpractice insurance, *even if it means that they may charge higher fees to cover the cost of their insurance premiums?*






Would you vote in favor of a proposed law requiring lawyers to have legal malpractice insurance, if it would result in lawyers raising their hourly fees by [\$10/\$20/\$30/\$40/\$50]?





Would you vote in favor of a proposed law requiring lawyers to have legal malpractice insurance, if it would result in lawyers raising their hourly fees?





Should the State Bar's website include information about whether each lawyer has malpractice insurance?

