

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION
Committee on Women in the Law

GENDER EQUITY IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION - A Survey, Observations and Recommendations -

I. INTRODUCTION

In the late spring of 2001, the Committee on Women in the Law (hereinafter “the Committee”) of the New York State Bar Association (“NYSBA”) commissioned a special member survey to respond to questions and concerns regarding gender equity among those in the legal profession. The survey examined factors of gender equity affecting career and professional development and quality of life for attorneys in New York State. The project was intended to assist the NYSBA in addressing the needs and interests of its membership.

The Committee convened a survey project task group and selected Anita Baker, an independent consultant, to work together with the task group to develop and administer the questionnaire and analyze the results. The project focused on women attorneys and their male counterparts in the following areas of practice: government, in-house counsel, judiciary, public interest and private practice, but addressed issues of gender equity and general professional well-being common to attorneys in any practice setting.

The project brought practical action to the resolution adopted by the Executive Committee in 1986 to promote full and participation of women and persons of color in the legal profession, as well as the Association’s long-standing efforts to foster open, supportive workplaces that promote professional development. Results of the project are expected to inform the NYSBA membership and help guide future efforts of the NYSBA, the Committee and other NYSBA entities.

The Committee’s Mission

Established in 1986, the Committee has a two-pronged mission, charged with examining and seeking action on gender concerns affecting women in society and women in the profession. The first report of this Committee (then known as the Committee on Women in the Courts) observed that the Chief Judge’s Task Force on Women in the Courts had identified as major problem areas “gender-related limitations on professional opportunities for women attorneys and the lack of the requisite professional acceptance of women attorneys in the courtroom environment....”¹ Among measures, the Committee recommended that:

The Association should encourage its members to review their own personnel policies and procedures to promote equality of professional opportunity. Consideration should be given to equal employment opportunity in promoting associates to partners and to policies regarding employees who are primarily responsible for child care. Policies regarding child care leave, part-time employment, flex time, on-site child care facilities, and child care subsidies

1 1987 Committee report, at 46-47.

should also be reviewed.²

The report was adopted in 1987 by the House of Delegates. While that report dealt with gender concerns confronting women litigants, witnesses, and court personnel, as well as those in the profession, a number of the recommendations have relevance to this current survey project and are helpful in reviewing what steps were proposed at that time and what progress has been made. Accordingly, relevant recommendations from the earlier report are set out as Appendix A.

Since its formation, the Committee has prepared studies including the periodically issued status report on membership and participation levels of women in the Association. Among other activities, the Committee has conducted educational programs for attorneys and students on career development issues and produced a series of sample workplace policies for law offices.

The Committee is composed of members of the profession in locations throughout the state at different points of their careers who are involved in various fields of law and who bring experience in private practice in offices of various sizes, government service, legal aid programs, corporate law departments and in the judiciary. A roster of the Committee is provided as Appendix B of this report.

The Project: A Natural Next Step

This project is a natural next step in the work of the Committee. Some 15 years after the issuance of the reports of the Task Force and the Committee and in view of the increased numbers of women in the NYSBA³ and the profession and the increased demands in the nature of practice today, it is an appropriate time to take the temperature of workplace procedures and concerns.

This report is presented in six sections, including this Introduction. The second section provides a description of the survey methodology. Section III through Section V provide the findings, and the final section is the Conclusion. The findings sections present results of the survey overall, by gender and work-setting, and by other relevant partitions: Section III presents demographics; Section IV includes gender equity findings and Section V includes professional well-being findings. Section VI, the Conclusion, lists issues for further consideration or follow-up, and suggested action steps. A copy of the survey instrument appears as Appendix C.

While the respondent sample did not fully represent all those selected for the survey, the Committee agreed that the respondent group is both large enough and broadly representative enough to allow for both summary statements and generalizations to the subgroups and the membership overall.

2 Id. at 53.

3 In 1987, women constituted 19.4% of the membership; as of the spring of 2002, that figure increased to 28.4%. Of attorney members, the percentage of women was 17.9 in 1987, increasing to 26.8 in 2002.

II. METHODOLOGY

About the Survey

The NYSBA member survey was developed specifically for this project. In preparation, the Committee and the consultant reviewed previous survey projects of the American Bar Association, other bar associations including those in Minnesota, Kansas, North Carolina, and Colorado, and other entities, including Catalyst. Appendix D is a full listing of these references. Those previous efforts had been conducted during the past five years, and all had shown notable differences between males and females. Throughout the report, NYSBA results are compared to results from those surveys where applicable.

The NYSBA survey covered 10 areas of interest with multiple questions in each area. To increase validity, most of the questions (and response choices) were taken directly from the previously-used instruments described above. Others represented variations on pertinent themes. The 10 topic areas included demographics (age, race/ethnicity, marital status, dependents, parent leave, annual income, and hourly billing rate for those in private practice); other background information, (dues, other Bar or professional association memberships, age when admitted to bar and number of years in practice, numbers of employers, reasons for changing jobs, reasons for choosing law as a profession, and likelihood of career retention); current work status (work setting, current position, geographic location, telecommuting, full-time/part-time status, area of concentration, supervision and supervisory data, hours, committee memberships, and effect of child care on concentration and amount of hours worked); gender equity (gender ratios, interaction, gender equity and access perceptions at work); job and career satisfaction; equity-related policies/practices at work; mentoring and networking (including questions about what is available, access, and effect of child care on networking, and a scale regarding the value of mentoring and professional development); quality of life (scales about both personal and work quality of life, and the balance between the two); gender discrimination (questions about inappropriate behaviors in court or chambers, or among attorneys outside of court).

The survey was developed through a collaborative process. After related literature was reviewed, topic areas were outlined and items were identified by the consultant. During a draft process, the task group approved all items, response selections and the order and format of the survey. While no official test was conducted, all members of the task group and Committee represented respondent groups and so provided an informal pilot opportunity.

Survey Administration

The survey was administered by the Committee, developing camera-ready copy and a cover letter and producing the survey booklets which contained the instrument in final form. A stratified random sample of members was specified by the consultant and drawn by the NYSBA from its existing member data base. This included a total of 968 females (384 from government/public interest, 200 from in-house counsel, 184 from the judiciary, 200 from private firms) and 1,000 males (400 from government/public interest and 200 from each of the other categories). Copies of the survey and a pre-addressed envelope for direct, anonymous return to the consultant were sent to all those selected

on September 4, 2001. Two postcard reminders were sent to all selected respondents requesting completion of the surveys.

Survey Response

A total of 705 surveys were returned. This included responses from 363 females and 289 males, and 53 respondents who did not identify their gender. The following table shows sampling and return information.

Table A: Survey Response Rates by Work Setting

	# females sampled	% ret.	# males sampled	% ret.	TOTAL #	TOTAL % RETURN
Private	200	59%	200	50%	400	54%
In-house Counsel	200	30%	200	24%	400	27%
Govt./Public Interest	292	47%	292	32%	584	39%
Judiciary	92	41%	92	48%	184	45%
TOTAL	784	45%	784	36%	1568	40%

* Note the total response rate was actually 45%, but 53 respondents did not identify their gender so they are not counted above.

As shown in the table, about 40% of those who received the survey returned it, including 45% of the selected female attorneys and 36% of the selected male attorneys.⁴ While these numbers are somewhat lower than desired, as stated previously, all members of the task group agreed they broadly represent the selected membership groups and are sufficient in number to allow for both summary statements and some generalizations to group members overall. In fact, while the group is slightly over-represented by private firm respondents and there is some under-representation of those in in-house counsel, the proportion of respondents from the judiciary and public/interest government work settings were equivalent to those initially identified as respondents (34% of the sample, but only 26% of the population were from private firms; 17% of the sample but 26% of the population were in-house counsel; 36% of the sample and 37% of the population were from government/public interest; and 13% of the sample and 12% of the population were from the judiciary - see Table B).

While subgroups must be considered cautiously, the data set is certainly robust enough to make generalizations about NYSBA members overall.

The responses to the survey were entered into an SPSS database for analysis. Full verification for data entry errors was conducted on 33% of the records and no systematic data entry errors were found. Standard data cleaning strategies were used to eliminate all other known errors and basic frequency calculations showed that there was minimal missing data. Where missing data

⁴ Unfortunately, the survey was administered only one week before the national upheaval of September 11th. Additionally, problems with the U.S. mail following the disasters thwarted attempts by the New Jersey consultant to determine a true and accurate response rate as it was unclear how many surveys ever reached their respondents and how many were returned but not received for analysis.

compromised efforts to accurately report findings (i.e., questions were unanswered by more than 5% of respondents), questions were eliminated or subgroup calculations were not reported. An analysis plan was developed for the survey prior to administration and reviewed and approved by the task group. This plan was followed during the analysis process and augmented by a few special requests to explore issues further. Additionally, at the Committee's request, the NYSBA data were compared to the previous survey reports used to develop the NYSBA survey.

A preliminary summary of findings was presented to the Committee in mid-March 2002. This findings report was developed thereafter, in consultation with the task group.

Table B: Current Work Status for Survey Respondents N = 705

	Female n= 363	Male = 289	TOTAL=705*
PRIMARY CURRENT WORK SETTING			
Private	33%	35%	33%
In-house Counsel	17%	17%	18%
Government/Public Interest	39%	33%	36%
Judiciary	11%	16%	13%
WORK LOCATION			
New York City	49%	39%	43%
Urban Area, but outside NYC	22%	30%	27%
Suburban	23%	22%	23%
Rural area	6%	9%	7%
CURRENT STATUS			
Full-time	88%	94%	91%
Part-time	12%	6%	9%

* A total of 53 respondents did not identify their gender. Their responses are included in the totals.

** Private includes: private practice, sole practitioner, associates, equity partner/shareholder; In-house includes: In-house Counsel, Of Counsel, Corporate Counsel, Trade/Professional Association, Of Counsel; Public = Government, Public Interest, Legal Services, Non-Profit, Public Defender; Judiciary includes local, state and federal judges.

III. FINDINGS : DEMOGRAPHICS AND OTHER BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This section of the report presents a selection of the results of the survey for the respondents overall, by gender and work setting, and by other relevant partitions. This includes a comprehensive description of the respondents and discussions of similarities and differences between male and female respondents in different work settings. Comparative results address demographics, children and other dependents, effects of child care, and other professional background factors.

Background of Survey Respondents: Demographics

A total of 705 NYSBA members completed the special member survey. This included 363 women, 289 men and 53 respondents who did not identify their gender. The survey asked respondents to identify their age group, racial/ethnic group, marital status and whether they had any conditions requiring accommodations at the workplace. A full display of the data is presented in Tables 1a and 1b. Key findings include the following.

- **Age group representation is substantially different.** As predicted, proportionately more women are in the youngest age groups and proportionately more men are in the oldest. Specifically, 60% of women, but only 35% of male respondents are 44 or younger; 30% of the men but only 9% of women were more than 54 years of age.
 - Regarding work settings, the survey shows that, as expected, the youngest attorneys are in private practice or public interest/government, the oldest in the judiciary. **The survey also shows that in all cases, the youngest groups of attorneys are disproportionately female. Age/gender disparities were least pronounced in the public interest/government work setting:** 26% of the women and 18% of the men were 35 or younger; 10% of the women and 21% of the men were 55 or older. The age/gender distributions of the other three work settings were similar.
- **The racial/ethnic background of respondents did not vary much by gender.** Slightly more female respondents than male respondents were from non-white minority groups (17% compared to 12%).
 - **Race/ethnicity/gender differences were slightly more pronounced in the specific work settings except in-house counsel** where there were few minority lawyers and not much racial/ethnic/gender disparity. In the three other work settings, there were proportionately more minority women than minority men.
- **A relatively small proportion of both women and men (3% and 6% respectively) identified themselves as having disabling conditions that require accommodations.**
 - Differences were seen within the work settings, however, with the judiciary, and public interest/government lawyers, especially males, having slightly higher proportions of members who indicated they have disabling conditions that require accommodations.

- Marital status data showed interesting differences. **While the proportion of both men and women attorneys who are divorced or separated was about the same (10% for women, 6% for men), the proportion of single female attorneys was much greater than the proportion of single male attorneys (21% compared to 10%); the proportion of married female attorneys was much smaller than the proportion of married male attorneys (63% vs. 82%).** These differences are probably at least somewhat explained by the age differences described above, and they are *almost identical to differences cited in a recent American Bar Association survey (the ABA 2000 survey showed that 65% of women compared to 83% of men were married; 21% of women compared to 10% of men were single)*. It is also interesting to note that about 10% of the female attorneys but only 4% of the males reported they were living with either a member of the same or the opposite sex.
- Work setting differences were also notable. Proportionately more members of the judiciary (82%) were married as compared to any of the other groups, especially those in the public interest/government setting (only 66%). The gender differences seen for the group as a whole were mirrored in all the work settings except the judiciary where the proportions of both males and females who were married was predictably more similar.

Table 1a: Demographics of Survey Respondents

	Female n= 363	Male n= 289		Female n= 363	Male n= 289
AGE GROUP			DISABILITY ACCOMMODATIONS	3%	6%
Less than 35	29%	14%			
Between 35-44	31%	21%			
Between 45-54	30%	36%			
More than 54	9%	30%			
RACE/ETHNICITY			MARITAL STATUS		
African American	7%	3%	Single	21%	10%
Asian American	4%	5%	Living w/ op. sex	6%	3%
Hispanic	3%	1%	Living w/same sex	4%	1%
White	83%	88%	Married	63%	82%
Other	4%	5%	Separated/Divorced	10%	6%

Table 1b: Demographics of Survey Respondents, by Work Setting

Demographics by Work setting	Private		In-house		Public		Judiciary	
	Females n= 117	Males n=100	Females n=59	Males n=47	Females n=134	Males n=91	Females n=37	Males n=43
Oldest Group (54+)	4%	26%	2%	29%	10%	21%	32%	56%
Youngest Group (<35)	46%	18%	22%	13%	26%	18%	3%	2%
Minority Grp. Members*	20%	14%	11%	12%	17%	8%	15%	12%
Single	20%	9%	24%	6%	24%	16%	5%	7%
Married	62%	83%	64%	92%	60%	73%	76%	88%
Separated Divorced	12%	5%	7%	2%	9%	8%	10%	5%
Living Together**	14%	6%	7%	0%	7%	4%	24%	2%
Disability Accommodations	1%	3%	2%	6%	5%	6%	0%	11%

* Includes African American, Asian American, Hispanic, and those identifying as “other”

**Includes those living with persons of the same or opposite sex. Living arrangements total more than 100% due to rounding errors and some dual reporting.

Background of Survey Respondents: Dependents

Survey respondents were asked whether they had children or other dependents, and to identify the number and ages of their children. A full display of the data is presented in Table 2. Key findings include the following.

- **The presence of dependents was similar for both female and male attorneys.** Specifically 81% of female and 80% of male respondents indicated they had children living at home; 5% of females and 3% of male respondents indicated they had aging parents at home and another 12% of females and 10% of males indicated they had aging parents who did not live with them, but were dependent. A total of 9% of females and 13% of males indicated they had another dependent adult to care for.
- **The age groups of dependent children, however, were very different.** Although the average number of children was about the same (2.1 for females and 2.4 for males), a total of 23% of the females but only 6% of males had children who were less than 2 years old. **Although this was predictable, given the age differences of female and male attorneys, it has important policy implications for the NYSBA.** Additionally, overall three-fourths (75%) of the female respondents and almost two-thirds (61%) of the male respondents had minor children with school and supervisory needs; 10% of female and 12% of males had college-aged children.

Table 2: Children and Other Dependents Among Survey Respondents

	Female n= 363	Male n = 289	TOTAL=705*
DEPENDENTS			
Children Living at Home	81%	80%	80%
Children - Joint Custody	3%	7%	5%
Aging Parents at Home	5%	3%	4%
Aging Parents Elsewhere	12%	10%	11%
Other Dependent Adult	9%	13%	12%
YOUNGEST CHILD-AGE	Female n= 206	Male n = 206	TOTAL=412
Less than 2	23%	6%	15%
Between 2-6	19%	17%	18%
Between 7-12	19%	20%	20%
Between 13-18	14%	18%	16%
Between 19-24	10%	12%	11%
Aged 25 and Older	15%	27%	21%

* A total of 53 respondents did not identify their gender. Their responses are included in the totals.

** Children includes all adopted, biological, foster and step children.

Background of Survey Respondents: A Special Look at Child Care-Related Issues

Table 2b highlights some important differences among female and male attorneys with minor children. As shown in the table, **there are substantial disparities regarding parental leave-taking, and the effects child care has on legal practice including the choice of field of concentration, the number of hours worked, and the amount of participation in informal networking.** Specifically, while the availability of leave was reportedly the same, almost three-fourths of women attorneys with minor children took parental leave, while less than 20% of men did. Additionally, more than half of the female attorneys with minor children, but less than 20% of male attorneys with minor children reported that child care affected their choice of field of concentration, and substantially more women than men with minor children indicated child care affected the number of hours they could work (95% compared to 74%), and whether they could participate in informal networking (94% compared to 69%). Table 2b also shows that **smaller proportions of female attorneys with minor children work in settings where flexible schedules with full benefits are offered, and proportionately more work in settings with flexible schedules but reduced benefits.** *While these findings are similar to those found in other bar surveys (Kansas Bar Survey 1992, North Carolina Bar Association Survey 1993), the differences between men and women on this issue in New York State are particularly pronounced (29% of women and 4% of men in Kansas, 1992, took parental leave; 79% of women but only 47% of men in North Carolina indicated child care affected the number of hours they could work).* It is clear that addressing gender inequities will require addressing direct and indirect child care needs, especially for female attorneys. (The impact child care-related choices on income will be discussed in a subsequent section.)

Table 2b: Child Care Issues Among Survey Respondents With Minor Children

	Female n= 152	Male n = 125
PARENTAL LEAVE		
Took Leave	73%	17%
No Leave Available	4%	5%
CHILD CARE RESPONSIBILITIES....		
Affected Choice of Area of Concentration	55%	19%
Affects Hours	95%	74%
On Average Work 40 or Fewer	47%	26%
On Average Work 51 or More	14%	33%
Affect Participation in Informal Networking	94%	69%
BENEFITS AVAILABLE		
Flex Schedules/Full Benefits	48%	63%
Flex Schedules/Reduced Benefits	51%	39%
Part-time Schedules	74%	69%

** Children - includes all adopted, biological, foster and stepchildren.

Background of Survey Respondents: Other Characteristics

In addition to questions about demographics and family composition, the survey also asked respondents to share some other professionally-related characteristics. This included: membership in the NYSBA and other professional associations, some career history and why they had chosen legal careers. A full display of the data is presented in Tables 3a and 3b. Key findings include the following.

- **The five most common areas of concentration for women and men were fairly similar.** Specifically through a comparison of the female attorney's top choices it was shown that about 22% of the women and 25% of the men identified litigation-general, civil as one of their areas of concentration; 20% of women and 15% of men identified family law; 16% of women and 19% of men identified administrative/regulatory; 15% of women and 16% of men identified real property; and 13% of women and 17% of men identified corporate law as one of their fields of concentration. Analysis of male top choices revealed a very similar list to the one described above - litigation administrative/reg, corporate law and real property were most common, family law was not on the top five list, and litigation-commercial and business law were also commonly identified. Additionally, the survey showed that **female and male attorneys were working in all of the identified areas.**
- **Bar and other professional association membership, including payment of NYSBA dues, was about the same for female and male attorneys.** While about three-fourths of both female and male respondents indicated they were members of local bar associations and about half were members of the ABA, (in addition to all being members of the NYSBA), **fewer than one-third of the females indicated they were involved in any other professional women's organizations.**
 - **Several interesting differences are apparent when work setting is explored.**
 - ① While in all other areas roughly equal proportions of men and women pay their own NYSBA dues, this was true for 84% of women but only 66% of men in public interest/government settings; proportions paying their own dues in the other settings ranged from about 20% (in-house counsel) to about one-third (private practice), to almost all in the judiciary.
 - ② The proportion of those with membership in the ABA varied from about one-third among public interest/government layers, to about half of those in private practice or in-house counsel settings, but there were no gender disparities. In the judiciary, however, 41% of the males, but only 31% of the females are ABA members.
 - ③ Fewer than one-third of women in private practice, in-house counsel or public interest/government settings compared to more than half (57%) of women in the judiciary belong to other professional women's organizations.
- **While the average age first admitted to the bar and the average number of employers was about the same for both females and males, the average number of years in practice was significantly different.** Both females and males were first admitted to the bar, on average, before they turned 30. The average number of employers was 3.1 for females and 2.8 for males. Not surprising given the age group data, there was, however, more than a 60 percent difference in experience: the average number of years of practice for females was 12.5 compared to 20.3 for males. *Data from the ABA 2000 survey were similar,*

although experience discrepancies were somewhat less pronounced than for members of the NYSBA (the average bar admission age of female respondents to the ABA survey was 29.2 and for male ABA respondents it was 27.7; the average number of years in practice for female ABA survey respondents was 12.4 and for male ABA respondents was 17.6; the average number of employers for female ABA respondents was 2.5 and for male ABA respondents was 2.8).

- The NYSBA professional average findings were very similar within the various work settings, with one exception. **Experience discrepancies were most pronounced within private practice** (average years in practice for females was 9.5, for males it was 19.5) **and least pronounced in public interest/government settings** (average years in practice for females was 13.1 and for males it was 17.3).
- **The number of years working in the current setting and the reasons for employer changes were different for female and male attorneys.** On average, male respondents had been in their current settings almost 10 years, females had an average of about 7 years. While roughly equal proportions of women and men had changed employers to earn more money (37% of female attorneys and 36% of male attorneys); proportionately more female attorneys (33% of women compared to 27% of men) had changed jobs because they were dissatisfied with advancement opportunities or with the work overall (33% of women compared to 25% of men), or because they reportedly had faced discrimination (7% of women but only 2% of men). *The ABA 2000 survey showed similar results, but with less pronounced differences except those regarding reported discrimination (5% of women, but none of the men had changed jobs due to discrimination).*
- **The reasons why women and men joined the legal profession varied.** While explanations such as prestige, family influence, and desire to change society were about equally common for females and males, a total of 46% of males, but only 38% of females reported they sought legal careers for income potential. More than half of the females (53%) indicated they had become lawyers to ensure justice/fair play, while fewer than half of the men did (43%). While it was not noted often, twice as many males indicated they became lawyers because it was a lead in to politics. *The 2000 ABA survey also showed significant differences between males and females regarding reasons behind the choice of law as a profession. Women were much more likely than men to be interested in changing their careers, working with clients and changing society.*
- **Reasons for becoming lawyers were very different by practice-setting and there were also some definite gender disparities.** About one-third or more of those in private practice, especially the females, became lawyers for the prestige. About half or more of those in private practice (more women than men) or in-house counsel (more men than women) were attracted to the profession due to income potential; only about 35% of the men and 24% of the women in public interest/government jobs were there due to income potential; that was true of 44% of males, but only 26% of females in the judiciary. Only about one-third of those in private practice compared to about a quarter or less of those in in-house counsel positions became lawyers to change society. In contrast, about 40% of women and 46% of men in public interest/government legal positions had become lawyers to change society as had

more than half of the females in the judiciary (53%) but only about one-quarter of their male counterparts (males in the judiciary = 26%). The desire to ensure justice was more common among women in all work settings except in-house counsel, especially in the judiciary (79% of women compared to only 47% of men).

- **Projected retention also showed some interesting differences.** While the vast majority of both females and males plan to stay in the legal field for five years (80% and 79% respectively), substantially fewer females as compared to males thought they would stay lawyers for the rest of their careers (61% compared to 71%). *Although it did not directly address projected retention, a related study by the Colorado Bar Association showed that the vast majority of respondents indicated they would still choose law if they had to make the choice again.*
- **The retention data arrayed by practice-setting indicated that discrepancies were among those in private practice.** While roughly equal proportions of men and women in in-house counsel and public interest/government work settings (about two-thirds) were very likely to stay in the law for the rest of their careers, and almost all of those in the judiciary thought they would, but only about half of the women in private practice and 72% of the men indicated they were likely to stay for the rest of their careers.

Table 3a: Other Background Information for Survey Respondents

	Female n= 363	Male = 289	TOTAL=705*
5 MOST COMMON CONCENTRATIONS _			
Litigation - General, Civil	22%	25%	23%
Family Law	20%	15%	18%
Administrative/Reg.	16%	19%	16%
Real Property	15%	16%	16%
Corporate Law	13%	17%	15%

* A total of 53 respondents did not identify their gender. Their responses are included in the totals.
Concentration data were determined for women only, male figures are comparative to women's responses.
Respondents were asked to select up to 5 areas from a list of 52.

Table 3a: Other Background Information for Survey Respondents (Con't)

	Female n= 363	Male = 389	TOTAL=705*
BAR/OTHER PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS			
NYSBA Dues Paid by Respondent	60%	55%	58%
Member of ABA	43%	43%	43%
Member of Local Bar Association	71%	76%	73%
Member of Speciality/Ethnic Bar Assn.	39%	30%	35%
Other Professional Women's Organization	30%	NA	NA
PROFESSIONAL AVERAGES			
Age When First Admitted to the Bar	29.0	28.0	
Years in Practice	12.5	20.3	15.9
Number of Employers	2.8	3.1	2.9
Average Number of Years in Current Setting	6.9	9.6	8.4
REASONS FOR EMPLOYER CHANGES			
Dissatisfied With Advancement Opportunities	33%	27%	
Dissatisfied With Type of Work	33%	25%	
Earn More Money	37%	36%	
Faced Discrimination	7%	2%	
WHY A LEGAL CAREER?			
Prestige	26%	25%	25%
Income Potential	38%	46%	41%
Family Influence	20%	20%	20%
Desire to Change Society	36%	35%	35%
Ensure Justice/Fair Play	53%	43%	49%
Lead in to Politics	6%	12%	9%
WILL STAY IN FIELD 5 YEARS	80%	79%	80%
WILL STAY FOR REST OF CAREER	61%	71%	65%

* A total of 53 respondents did not identify their gender. Their responses are included in the totals.

Table 3b: Other Background Characteristics of Survey Respondents, by Work Setting

Other Background Characteristics * Work Setting	Private		In-house		Public		Judiciary	
	Females n= 116	Males n=100	Females n=59	Males n=47	Females n=136	Males n=92	Females n=38	Males n=44
MEMBERSHIPS								
Pays Own NYSBA Dues	35%	40%	25%	21%	84%	66%	97%	97%
Member of ABA	53	56	49	47	33	28	31	41
Member of Women's Organization	27	**	28	**	29	**	57	**
PROF. AVERAGES								
Age Admitted to Bar	28.2	28.0	28.7	27.8	30.3	28.5	27.9	27.2
Years in Practice	9.5	19.5	11.7	19.6	13.1	17.3	22.1	28.9

Number of Employers	2.6	2.5	3.1	3.3	2.7	3.0	3.2	3.3
REASONS FOR LAW								
Prestige	39	29	27	33	16	17	18	23
Income	53	46	50	66	24	35	26	44
Change Society	34	32	20	27	40	46	53	26
Ensure Justice	47	34	34	33	62	53	79	47

IV. FINDINGS: GENDER EQUITY

Gender and Income Differences

The survey included questions about annual income, spouse income, spouse profession, average hourly billing rate (for those in private practice) and distinctions between billable and non-billable hours. A full display of the data about income is presented in Tables 4a and 4b, including comparisons by experience levels. Key findings include the following.

- **Most responding attorneys had incomes above \$80,000, but there were gender disparities, especially at the highest salary levels.** As shown in the table, 59% of full-time male attorneys but only 41% of full-time female attorneys had an annual income in 2000 of \$100,000 including salary, bonuses and stock options. Conversely, 42% of female attorneys, but only 30% of male attorneys earned \$50,000 or less.
 - **These disparities were most pronounced among those in private practice (71% of males and 48% of females earned \$100,000 or more), and to a somewhat lesser degree in in-house counsel settings. (81% of females and 67% of males).** Disparities were not reported by those in public interest/government settings or as expected, in the judiciary.
- **When these data are corrected for years in practice, the disparities remain.** Specifically, for those working 16-20 years, 62% of males but only 51% of women earned \$100,000 or more during 2000; for those working 21 or more years, 76% of males but only 68% of women earned \$100,000 or more during 2000. *In a study conducted by the Minnesota Bar Association in the mid 90's, seniority, not gender, was the greater predictor of income.* This is clearly not the case among NYSBA members.
 - **When the data are corrected for region, disparities were seen in New York City and other urban areas, and in rural areas.** A total of 76% of the males in New York City, but only 53% of females earned \$100,000 or more in 2000; a total of 49% of males in other urban areas, but only 28% of females earned \$100,000 or more in 2000; a total of 29% of males, but only 12% of females in rural areas earned \$100,000 in 2000 (caution: small n's).
- **For those in private practice, the average hourly billing rate was about 16 percent smaller for women than for men** (\$206.80 compared to \$238.93). Among only those working full-time there was also a disparity, although it was somewhat smaller (\$215.40 for women compared to \$235.86 for men). *A study by the Colorado Bar Association found very similar levels of income disparities* (average hourly billing rate differences there were 15%).
- **Distribution of time use was also very different for women and men, particularly in the areas of non-billable hours and community activities. Males reported substantially more hours than women on every distribution category.** Specifically, female respondents reported spending about 1104 hours on average on billable client work, males indicated they spent 1217 (about 10% more); females reported spending about 375 hours on non-billable

tasks, while males spent an average of 1348 hours (a 360% difference); pro bono work was conducted on average for about 90 hours/year by males and about 75 hours/year by females (about a 20% difference); other community work was done on average for about 70 hours/year by females and about 250 hours/year by males (a 360% difference). Males reported spending about 37% more time on administrative/management tasks than females, about 26% more on business development and about 29% more on bar-related activities. *A very similar trend was seen in a North Carolina Bar Association study of its membership: with the exception of non-billable client work, men reported more hours in every category of time use.*

Table 4a: Income Information for Survey Respondents Working Full-Time

	Female n= 297	Male = 261	Difference
ANNUAL INCOME 2000**			
\$49,000 or less	12%	9%	3
\$50,000-\$79,000	30%	21%	9
\$80,000-\$99,000	17%	12%	5
\$100,000 or more	41%	59%	-18
ANNUAL INCOME = \$100,000+			
For those working FT 1-5 years	25% n= 78	30% n=40	-5
For those working FT 6-15 years	35% n= 38	29% n=20	6
For those working FT 16-20 years	51% n=51	62% n=45	-11
For those working FT 21+ years	68% n=36	76% n=88	-8
AVERAGE HOURLY BILLING RATE	\$206.80 n=82	\$238.93 n =84	15.5%
FT AVERAGE HOURLY BILLING RATE	\$215.40 n=63	\$235.86 n =76	9.5%
AVG. TIME USE DISTRIBUTIONS			
Client Work - Billable	1104	1217	-10%
Client Work - Non-billable	375	1348	-360%
Pro Bono Work	75	90	-20%
Community Activities	70	250	-360%
Administrative/Management	330	451	-37%
Business Development	84	103	-26%
Bar-related Activities	49	63	-29%

** Income includes salary, bonuses, stock option value.

Table 4b: Income Differences of Survey Respondents, by Work Setting and Region

	Private		In-house		Public		Judiciary	
	Females n= 84	Males n=88	Females n=52	Males n=41	Females n=119	Males n=90	Females n=35	Males n=42
ANNUAL INCOME 2000								
\$100,000 or more	48%	71%	67%	81%	17%	20%	77%	83%
	New York City		Urban Other		Suburban		Rural	
	Females n= 144	Males n=103	Females n=72	Males n=78	Females n=61	Males n=55	Females n=17	Males n=23
\$100,000 or more	53%	76%	28%	49%	41%	47%	12%	39%

** Income includes salary, bonuses, stock option value

Differences and Similarities in Work Settings

The section of the survey that addressed work settings included questions about positions, supervision, office composition, hours devoted to legal work, committee memberships, gender ratios, and interaction between men and women in the workplace. A full display of the data about work settings is presented in Tables 5a and 5b. Key findings include the following.

- **There are predictable gender differences for different positions.** As also seen in the ABA 2000 survey, more NYSBA women than men are associates (16% vs. 9%) and more men than women are partners (14% vs. 6%). Similar proportions of women and men identified as supervising attorneys, solo practitioners, judges and all other position categories.
- **There are interesting and disparate patterns of supervision among the responding attorneys.** For example, most female respondents (54%) reported they were supervised by male attorneys, but this applied to a substantially smaller proportion of male respondents (31%). A much larger proportion of male attorneys (38%) than female attorneys (17%) indicated they were supervised by no one. **These features - male attorneys supervised by no one, female attorneys supervised by male attorneys - were seen in the data regardless of experience (i.e., there were proportionately more males who indicated they were supervised by no one, in each of the years experience groups).**
- **The female attorneys who answered the survey performed more supervisory duties than their male counterparts.** On average women supervised 4 or 5 other attorneys (male and female) or other non-attorney staff members compared to 3 or 4 for males.
 - **Supervisory trends were seen in all of the different work settings, even the judiciary, but were particularly pronounced in private practice.** A total of 66% of male respondents in private practice but only 29% of the female respondents indicated they were supervised by no one; a total of 64% of female attorneys in private practice, but only 23% of males indicated they were supervised by male attorneys.
- **While the average number of partners/supervising attorneys in the offices of female and male respondents was the same, the average number of other attorneys and the overall size of the offices varied for female and male respondents.** Specifically, both females and males reported that there are about 13-14 partners/supervising attorneys in their offices; women also work with about 40 other attorneys on average, while men work with about 32 others on average. The average staff size for women was 48.5 attorneys, while for men it was 40.7. *In the ABA 2000 survey, this trend also was noted: women tend to work in larger offices with more women (see also gender ratio data below).*
- **Regarding work hours, most full-time respondents work more than 40 hours per week with proportionately more male respondents working slightly longer hours.** Specifically, 19% of males but only 10% of females worked 50-59 hours per week; however, 40% of women but only 30% of men worked 41-49 hours/week. It is also interesting to note that the proportions of men and women working the longest - 60 or more hours per week (10% for women compared to 7% for men) or the least - 40 or fewer hours per week (26%

of women and 25% of men worked 40 or fewer hours/week) were roughly equivalent. *These figures were fairly comparable with those reported in a Colorado Bar Association study – when just looking at 40 or more hours combined, the amount of time devoted to legal work was the same for women and men.*

- The same gender similarities and differences were seen by work setting, but they were much more pronounced for those in private practice. Specifically, 51% of the men, but only 27% of the females worked 50-59 hours/week; 30% of women, but only 20% of men worked 41-49 hours/week; 33% of women, but only 20% of men worked 40 or fewer hours/week; 11% of the women but only 9% of the men worked 60 or more hours/week.
- **Committee memberships were particularly disparate and in ways likely to have substantial impact on salary.** Specifically, women, especially in private practice, were more likely to be on committees addressing diversity and associates, but much less likely to be on executive management committees, partnership selection, or business development/marketing committees. *A 1997 survey by the Minnesota State Bar Association showed similar results. Women were more often involved with personnel matters and men were more often dealing with compensation and management.*
- **Reported gender ratios in the offices of both female and male respondents were similar. As stated above, however, the average total numbers of females and males varied.** Specifically, on average, women worked with about 21 other women and 30 other men; men tended to work with slightly smaller attorney staffs, about 19 other women and 26 other men.
- While interactions between male and female attorneys were at similar and productive levels, and ratios among non-partner attorneys were fairly close, one other major disparity is apparent on Table 5a. **A total of 45% of females, but only 9% of males reported that they had been mistaken for an assistant rather than an attorney.**

Table 5a: Differences and Similarities in Work Settings, for Survey Respondents

	Female n= 363	Male = 289
PRIMARY CURRENT POSITIONS*		
Associate on Partnership Track	11%	6%
Permanent Associate	5%	3%
Supervising Attorney	6%	6%
Staff Attorney	3%	11%
Solo Practitioner	6%	7%
Equity Partner	4%	12%
Non-equity Partner	2%	2%
Corporate Counsel/Of Counsel	11%	16%
Legal Service/Public Defender	7%	3%
Teacher/Admin. in Law School	<1%	5%
Judges	11%	16%
WHO ARE RESPONDENTS' SUPERVISORS**		
No One	17%	38%
Male Attorney	54%	31%
Female Attorney	23%	17%
Self	10%	12%
AVERAGE # RESPONDENTS SUPERVISED		
Male Attorney	5.4 n = 74	3.7 n= 84
Female Attorney	5.0 n = 89	3.8 n= 81
Male Non-attorney	4.0 n = 61	2.8 n= 48
Female Non-attorney	5.0 n = 107	4.2 n= 98

* A total of 26% of females and 16% of males identified their positions as “other “ than the positions shown above.

**Note the total percentages for respondent supervisors exceeds 100 due to multiple supervisors.

Table 5a (Con't): Differences and Similarities in Work Settings, for Survey Respondents

	Female n= 363	Male = 289
AVERAGE OFFICE COMPOSITION		
# of Partner/Supervising Attorneys in Office	13.4	13.9
# of Other Attorneys in Office	40.0	31.8
Total # of Attorneys in Office	48.5	40.7
AVG # OF HRS/WEEK DEVOTED TO WORK (FT Only)		
40 or fewer	26%	25%
41-49	40%	30%
50-59	10%	19%
60 or more	10%	7%
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS	n=96	n=103
Compensation	10%	14%
Executive/Management	31%	41%
Diversity	19%	8%
Business Development/Marketing	6%	20%
Partnership Selection	1%	8%
Technology	17%	15%
Associates	22%	12%
GENDER RATIOS IN THE WORKPLACE		
Female Partners/Male Partners	4/11	5/11
Female Other Attorney/Male Other Attorneys	20/24	16/19
Average # of Females and Males for Females	21.0	30.1
Average # of Females and Males for Males	18.5	25.6

Table 5a (Con't): Differences and Similarities in Work Settings, for Survey Respondents

	Female n= 363	Male = 289
REGULAR WORKPLACE INTERACTION WITH		
Male Partner/Supervising Attorneys	80%	75%
Female Partner/Supervising Attorneys	59%	61%
Other Male Attorneys	81%	81%
Other Female Attorneys	75%	75%
RESPONDENT HAS BEEN MISTAKEN FOR ASSISTANT RATHER THAN AN ATTORNEY	45%	9%

Table 5b: Differences and Similarities in Work Settings, by Work Setting

	Private		In-house		Public		Judiciary	
	Females n= 116	Males n=100	Females n=59	Males n=47	Females n=136	Males n=92	Females n=38	Males n=44
SUPERVISION								
No One	29%	66%	10%	21%	7%	10%	32%	48%
Male Attorney	64%	23%	58%	38%	54%	42%	24%	18%
Female Attorney	20%	8%	17%	17%	33%	31%	11%	7%
AVG WK HRS/WEEK								
40 or fewer	33%	20%	26%	26%	45%	38%	16%	26%
41-49	30%	20%	45%	30%	41%	33%	41%	33%
50-59	27%	51%	22%	35%	38%	33%	38%	33%
60 or more	11	9	7%	9%	5%	7%	5%	7%

COMMITTEES	n=33	n=44	small n	small n	n=35	n=29	NA	NA
Compensation	6%	21%	**	**	17%	7%	NA	NA
Executive/Management	18%	34%	**	**	42%	38%	NA	NA
Diversity	9%	7%	**	**	33%	10%	NA	NA
Business Dev./Mketing	3%	34%	**	**	NA	NA	NA	NA
Partnership Selection	0%	18%	**	**	NA	NA	NA	NA
Technology	12%	11%	**	**	22%	28%	NA	NA
Associates	49%	25%	**	**	NA	NA	NA	NA

Responses to the Gender Equity Scale Items

Respondents to the survey were asked a series of questions about their perceptions of gender equity and access in their firms or offices. This included 9 items addressing expectations and treatment (equity items), and 8 items addressing opportunities and access (e.g., to court, senior partners, business decisions, client contact). Full displays of the data about gender equity and access are presented in Tables 6a -6b. Key findings include the following.

- **Perceptions of equity vary considerably by gender. For 8 of the 9 equity perception items there was more than a 5 percentage point difference between the proportions of women and the proportions of men who agreed with statements of fairness.** For 6 of those 8 items there were differences of 15 percentage points or more. Additionally, the overall agreement of women with equity statements was low. For example, 86% of the males but only 67% of females agreed that female and male lawyers are treated the same; 93% of males but only 70% of females agreed that female lawyers are compensated the same as male lawyers for comparable work. Conversely, while almost half of the female respondents (44%) agreed that female lawyers have to work harder than male lawyers to get the same results, only about 9% of the males agreed; 36% of females, but only 10% of males agreed that female lawyers have difficulty getting important clients due to prejudicial attitudes. The one item where there was a similar level of agreement between men and women addressed expectations to work late hours. *The ABA 2000 survey had similar findings - relatively large gender disparities on most items, comparable agreement on the issue of expectations to work late.*
 - **Reported perception differences were seen in each of the four work settings under study, including the judiciary. The differences were more pronounced in private settings and least pronounced in public interest/government settings or the judiciary.**
- **On issues of access, although many items applied mostly only to those in private practice, similar trends were seen. There was more than a 5 percentage point difference in the proportions of females and males agreeing with all 8 items of the scale. Again, many of these differences were considerable (greater than 15 percentage points).** For example, 96% of the male respondents but only 69% of the female respondents for whom it applied, agreed that opportunities to engage in activities out of their office (i.e., social or sporting events) were equally available for women and men; almost all male respondents (94%), but less than three-fourths of women (72%) agreed that high level responsibilities are equally available for male and female lawyers at their workplaces. *With the exception of out of the office activities, findings from the ABA 2000 study were almost identical.*
 - **Many of the access items were not relevant in many of the public interest/government settings or in the judiciary. For those items, it can be seen that both private practice and in-house counsel showed similar disparities, but private practice always was somewhat more disparate.** It also can be seen that some of these disparities were considerable. For example, almost all male attorneys in private

practice (94%), but only slightly more than half of the females (57%) indicated they have opportunities to engage in activities out of the office. Similarly 81% of the males in private practice and 85% of the males in in-house counsel, but only 54% and 64% of their female counterparts agreed that prospects for advancement are equal.

Table 6a: Responses to the Gender Equity Scale Items, by Gender

EQUITY STATEMENTS % who <i>agreed</i> with the following about their firms/offices.....	Female n=260	Male n=205	Differences
a. Female and male lawyers are treated the same.	67%	87%	19
b. Female lawyers have to work harder than male lawyers to get the same results.	44%	9%	25
c. Female lawyers are compensated the same as male lawyers for comparable work.	71%	94%	23
h. Work pressures apply equally to males and females.	71%	86%	16
i. Expectations to work late hours/weekends applies equally to female and male lawyers.	87%	87%	0
m. Female lawyers have difficulty getting important clients because of prejudicial attitudes of male managers. *	36%	10%	26
n. The work of female lawyers is more scrutinized.*	25%	4%	20
o. Female lawyers are expected to fail.*	6%	1%	5
q. This is a good place for female lawyers to work.	88%	96%	8

Table 6a (Con't): Responses to the Gender Equity Scale Items, by Gender

EQUITY STATEMENTS % who <i>agreed</i> with the following about their firms/offices*	Female n=212	Male n=174	Differences
d. High level responsibilities are available equally for male and female lawyers.	73%	94%	21
e. Prospects for advancement are available equally for male and female lawyers.	66%	88%	22
f. High salaries are available equally for male and female lawyers.	68%	90%	12
g. Opportunities for direct client contact are available equally for male and female lawyers.	85%	97%	12
j. Access to senior partners is the same for female and male lawyers.	85%	96%	11
k. Opportunities to appear in court are equal for female and male lawyers.	89%	96%	7
l. Opportunities to engage in activities out of the office, such as sports outings or social events are equally available for male and female lawyers.	69%	96%	27
p. Opportunities for involvement in office management (e.g., partner selection) are equal.	64%	84%	20

*All items but the first apply mostly only to those in private practice or in-house counsel settings.

Table 6b: Differences and Similarities in Gender Equity and Access Perceptions, by Work Setting

	Private		In-house		Public		Judiciary	
	Females n= 87	Males n=71	Females n=42	Males n=34	Females n=106	Males n=73	Females n=20	Males n=26
** treated same	58%	86%	67%	85%	74%	85%	80%	96%
* have to work harder	50%	11%	57%	13%	34%	7%	39%	4%
** compensated same	57%	93%	55%	90%	86%	94%	85%	96%
work pressures equal	67%	85%	73%	88%	81%	63%	77%	96%
= expected to work late	82%	89%	84%	84%	94%	87%	**	**
prejudicial attitudes of *	39%	11%	**	**	**	**	**	**
* work more scrutinized	32%	7%	26%	7%	15%	3%	**	**
* expected to fail	12%	1%	9%	3%	2%	0%	**	**
good place for * to work	81%	93%	88%	97%	95%	100%	95%	100%

high level responsibility. =	67%	93%	72%	91%	79%	93%	74%	100%
prospects for advanc. =	54%	81%	61%	85%	79%	94%	**	**
high salaries =	68%	90%	60%	83%	75%	91%	**	**
Opps. for client contact =	80%	96%	86%	92%	91%	98%	**	**
access to senior partners =	82%	97%	84%	100%	89%	94%	**	**
Opps. for court =	85%	96%	**	**	95%	98%	**	**
opps for outside act. =	57%	94%	67%	96%	79%	96%	**	**
opps for ofc. mgmt =	56%	82%	63%	80%	74%	91%	**	**

Observed/Experienced Discrimination Among Attorneys

The final gender equity area addressed by the survey was discrimination. As shown in the following table this included issues such as telling of demeaning jokes and lack of respect paid toward female attorneys, as well as issues of actual physical battery. Table 7 shows the percentage of female and male respondents who either observed and/or experienced these issues, by gender, and by location including outside court and in court or chambers. The following can be seen in the table.

- **High and disparate proportions of female and male attorneys have observed and/or experienced discriminatory statements or behaviors among attorneys outside court.** Note that while proportionately fewer males reported they had observed or experienced women being discriminated against, their responses provided additional confirmation of such statements and events.
- **Smaller but alarmingly high proportions of female attorneys have been subjected to unwanted actions including some involving physical contact.**
- **At least a few female respondents had, among attorneys outside court, observed or experienced every form of discrimination listed.**
- **Although the proportions are reduced by about half, similar responses were seen for questions about discriminatory statements and behaviors in court or chambers.** Note especially that about one-third of female respondents and almost 20% of males indicated that they had observed or experienced condescending treatment of female attorneys by judges. More than one-fourth of female respondents and about 15% of males also noted condescending treatment of female attorneys or witnesses or litigants by others in the court.
- **Again, with the exception of actual battery or rape of a female attorney,⁵ at least a few female respondents had, in court or chambers, observed or experienced every form of discrimination listed.**

These same scales were used in studies conducted by both the Kansas and the North Carolina Bar Associations. Their findings were very similar for issues/actions among attorneys, but there were fewer reported incidents in court or chambers, and there was slightly less disparity between the impressions of women and men. For example, regarding the question of condescending treatment of female attorneys, 67% of female Kansas Bar Association representatives, but only 29% of males reported it. Where 18% of males and 39% of female NYSBA members observed or experienced female attorneys being treated with less respect than males in court or chambers, the same was true for only 7% of male Kansas Bar Association members and 20% of female members.

⁵

One respondent had observed/experienced the actual battery or rape of a female attorney.

Table 7: Percent of Respondents Who Indicated They Observed or Experienced Discrimination

	Outside Court		In Court or Chambers	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
a. The telling of sexist or demeaning jokes.	65%	58%	29%	21%
b. Condescending treatment of female attorneys by male attorneys.	70%	39%	38%	21%
c. Females attorneys accorded less respect than male attorneys.	64%	34%	39%	18%
d. Inappropriate use of names like “dear,” or “sweetie,” toward female attorneys.	66%	32%	36%	21%
e. Inappropriate comments on the dress or appearance of female attorneys.	53%	28%	29%	12%
f. Clients complaining because an attorney is female.	27%	12%	11%	4%
g. Condescending treatment of female attorneys by judges	**	**	33%	18%
h. Condescending treatment of female attorneys by litigants or witnesses	**	**	28%	13%
i. Condescending treatment of female witness or litigants	**	**	26%	16%
Female attorneys subjected to unwanted:				
j. Sexual teasing, jokes or questions	47%	22%	18%	7%
k. Sexual looks or gestures	42%	23%	15%	8%
l. Touching, pinching, cornering	14%	2%	6%	0
m. Letters of phones calls of sexual nature	8%	2%	3%	0
n. Pressure for dates	15%	2%	5%	0
o. Pressure for sex	6%	1%	3%	0
p. Verbal advances made toward female attorneys.	30%	11%	9%	3%
q. Actual battery or rape of a female attorney.	2%	0	0*	0
r. Female attorneys offered professional benefit in return for sexual favors.	5%	1%	2%	0

* Note, 1 respondent had observed or experienced actual battery or rape in court or chambers.

V. FINDINGS: PROFESSIONAL WELL-BEING

This section of the report also presents the results of the survey for the respondents overall, by gender and practice area, and by other relevant partitions. Comparative results in this section address: career and position satisfaction and pro bono opportunities, equity-related policies and practices, mentoring, informal networking, and professional development, work stress, and work-related and personal quality of life ratings.

Career and Position Satisfaction.

Table 8 shows responses to career and position satisfaction items, by gender. The following are key findings.

- With the exception of financial remuneration, which is lower and more disparate, large proportions of **both female and male respondents indicated they are at least somewhat satisfied with every listed feature of their legal careers**. For example, 91 percent of females and 90 percent of males indicated they were satisfied with their work overall; 87% of females and 91% of males were satisfied with the intellectual challenge of the work, and most were also satisfied with their ability to help others (86% for females and 88% for males). **While the proportions were still relatively high and not disparate, fewer respondents were satisfied with their work-related quality of life, opportunities to contribute to the social good, the work distribution system, and balancing time spent on work and family.** *High and similar levels of satisfaction were also found among respondents to the ABA 2000 survey, but not for lawyers in Colorado. The Colorado bar study showed that their female members earned less and were less satisfied than their male counterparts.*
 - With the exception of in-house counsel, disparities in satisfaction were also minimal across practice-settings. Specifically, there were sizeable differences between female and male in-house counsel attorneys regarding quality of work life, balancing work and family, and work distribution. These differences were not seen for the other settings.
- **Despite clearly different perceptions of gender equity and experiences of discrimination, most female and male respondents indicated that they experience high levels of collegiality, have substantial control over their work, and have adequate potential for advancement in the legal profession.**
 - While gender disparities were not seen for the other three work settings, **proportionately more males than females from private practice indicated that they had substantial control over their work (99% vs. 83%) and potential for advancement (93% vs. 83%).**

- **Responses to questions about pro bono work were both low and disparate.** More than half of the males (58%), but only 46% of females reported that pro bono work is encouraged; only about a third (32%) of males, and even fewer females (27%) reported that pro bono work is rewarded. Only those in private practice could answer the questions about the contributions of pro bono work to promotions and billable hours requirements. Here again, relatively small and somewhat disparate proportions indicated that pro bono work could be counted.

Table 8a: Responses to Career and Position Satisfaction and Pro Bono Items, by Gender

CAREER SATISFACTION STATEMENTS % <i>Somewhat or Very Satisfied</i> With The Following About Their Careers	Female n= 261	Male n=195
a. Your work overall	91%	90%
b. Intellectual challenge of the work	87%	91%
c. Financial remuneration for the work you do	65%	73%
d. Your ability to help others	86%	88%
e. Your work-related quality of life	78%	83%
f. The balance between the time spent on work and on family responsibility	72%	79%
g. Opportunities to contribute to the social good	77%	82%
i The work distribution system (how cases/projects get assigned)	73%	79%
j. Among of time in court/litigating	85%	84%
POSITION SATISFACTION STATEMENTS % indicating the following were <i>sometimes or usually true</i> about their careers.		
a. The level of collegiality is high	93%	95%
b. I have substantial control over my work	91%	96%
c. There is adequate potential for advancement/professional development.	77%	79%
d. The level of pressure/tension on the job is relatively low.	53%	59%
PRO BONO WORK		
e. Pro bono work is encouraged	46%	58%
f. Pro bono work is rewarded	27%	32%
g. Pro bono work is counted towards billable hours requirements	17%	31%
h. Pro bono work is part of promotion considerations	17%	17%

Table 8b: Responses to Career and Position Satisfaction and Pro Bono Items, by Gender

% Who Were Satisfied or Very Satisfied With	Private		In-house		Public		Judiciary	
	Females n= 110	Males n=97	Females n=58	Males n=46	Females n=119	Males n=81	Females n=95	Males n=98
Work Overall	89	87	91	89	92	88	95	98
Intellectual Challenge	83	89	91	85	89	94	95	98
Financial Remuneration	71	84	69	72	56	67	73	62
Ability to Help Others	75	79	85	89	93	93	94	98
Work-rel. Qlty. of Life	73	76	83	99	78	85	92	93
Balance Work/Family	61	68	72	83	76	84	87	93
Contrib. to Social Good	62	71	64	73	91	90	92	93
Work Distribution	68	77	65	74	78	78	83	91
Amt. of Time in Court	78	82	**	**	91	85	**	**

% for Whom the Following Usually True								
Collegiality Level High	90	94	95	96	96	97	91	95
Substantial Control Over Work	83	99	95	100	90	91	94	98
Potential to Advance	83	93	76	73	72	73	**	**
Pro Bono Encouraged	42	70	44	41	50	50	**	**
Pro Bono Rewarded	29	38	23	23	29	27	**	**

** Double asterisk indicates amount of missing data was too large for analysis. Other pro bono-related items were not included due to missing data.

Equity-Related Policies and Practice at Work

Table 9 shows the proportion of female and male respondents who indicated that important equity-related policies are in place in the firms or offices where they worked. The following can be seen in the table.

- **There was relatively little gender disparity in terms of equity-related policies, but there were large differences regarding which policies were more common.** Specifically, policies regarding family medical leave, sexual harassment, anti-discrimination, disability accommodations, and performance evaluations were reportedly in place at most of the respondents' workplaces. Many fewer respondents indicated there were policies in place regarding criteria for partnership/promotion, failure to meet billable hour expectations, and leadership selection. **The fewest respondents indicated that child care assistance policies were in place.** *Similar results were found in the Minnesota State Bar Association study of private law firms. Most firms (97%) had sexual harassment policies (although attorneys reported not receiving training regarding them) and family medical leave policies. Far fewer had child care assistance (only 2 of the 31 in the study), and fewer than one third had special safety policies such as weekend/evening parking or safety escorts.*
 - Missing data compromised efforts to look at policy data for practice-settings and regions. Review of available data showed that while the commonness of other policies was similar, proportionately fewer attorneys in private work settings had equity-related policies at their workplaces. There were no discernable trends regarding location.
- **Regarding benefits, a similar pattern was seen. There was little gender disparity, but large differences in what was offered. Additionally very low proportions of respondents had access to important equity-related benefits such as safety escorts and flexible work schedules with full benefits. The most common benefits were pre-tax deductions for health care, part-time scheduling and flex time.**
 - **Types of benefits varied by work setting.** Specifically, fewer attorneys in private practice or in-house counsel had options for job sharing; substantially fewer attorneys in private settings (41%) had access to pre-tax deductions for child care (three-fourths or more of the attorneys in the other three settings had this benefit); safety escorts and weekend/evening parking were much more common for those in the judiciary than for any of the other groups (e.g., 46% had safety escorts compared to 19% or fewer from the other three groups); pre-tax health care options were also less common in private practice than in the other three settings. Domestic partner benefits were most common among public interest/government attorneys.

- **A few regional differences were also apparent** (note that the rural respondents were too few to disaggregate their data.) Specifically, proportionately fewer attorneys in suburban settings than in New York City or other urban settings had access to flexible schedules with full-time benefits. Additionally, more attorneys from urban sites (not New York City) had access to child care assistance, and to safety escorts. Domestic partner benefits were most common among lawyers in New York City.

Table 9: Equity-related Policies/Practices, at Work

POLICY IN PLACE	FEMALE	MALE
a. Sexual Harassment	87%	87%
b. Family Medical Leave	91%	88%
c. Impact of Leave on Compensation and Partnership	67%	67%
d. Compensation Procedures	77%	77%
e. Leadership Selection	33%	41%
f. Committee Membership	37%	42%
g. Flexible and/or Reduced Work Schedules	65%	70%
h. Child Care Assistance	29%	33%
i. Disability Accommodations	81%	82%
j. Standard/Reasonable Billable Hour Expectations	60%	61%
k. Failure to Meet Billable Hour Expectations.	39%	37%
l. Anti-discrimination	89%	85%
m. Performance Evaluation	81%	77%
n. Criteria for Partnership/ Promotion/Advancement	44%	45%

Table 10: Benefits Available at Work, by Gender

	FEMALE	MALE
a. Flexible Work Schedules With Full Benefits	51%	61%
b. Flexible Work Schedules With Reduced Benefits	52%	48%
c. Part-time Schedules	76%	70%
d. Job Sharing	27%	31%
e. Telecommuting Options	35%	29%
f. Pre-tax Deductions for Child Care	71%	60%
g. Safety Escorts	18%	18%
h. Weekend/Evening Parking	47%	52%
i. Pre-tax Deductions for Health Care	83%	82%
j. Domestic Partner Health Benefits	58%	51%

Mentoring, Informal Networking and Professional Development

In addition to items about career and job satisfaction, policies and benefits, respondents were also asked to reflect on mentoring, informal networking and professional development. Responses to those questions are shown in Table 11. The following are key findings.

- **Relatively low, but similar proportions of female and male attorneys (10-20%) are being mentored at work. About half of both female and male respondents indicated that no mentoring is available at their firm/office.** For those who indicated they might need mentoring, about 15% of the women and 13% of the men reported they were being mentored by a male attorney at work; 5% of women and 3% of men are being officially mentored by a female attorney. About 15% of women and 20% of men indicated they were being unofficially mentored by a male attorney, and about 10% of both men and women respondents indicated they were being unofficially mentored by a female attorney. *The Minnesota State Bar Association study showed that 90% of the firms they surveyed had some form of mentoring – only half are formal.*
- **Regarding opportunities for informal networking (such as golf outings, book clubs, social events) most female and male attorneys reported that they both have options and participate in opportunities for informal networking.** Additionally about 61% of females and 52% of males received financial support for workshops and other networking opportunities.
- **Questions about access to networking did show disparities.** Specifically, 11% of females but only 4% of males reported they had been denied access to an informal networking event; 16% of females but only 9% of males reported they had ever been discouraged from participating in an event.
- **Responses to all five of the questions about professional development showed substantial disparities.** Proportions agreeing to questions about professional development were also relatively low. Specifically, 59% of males, but only 41% of females reported that assistance with professional development is actively provided; 64% of males but only 50% of females reported they are in the career/professional development “loop;” 51% of females and 66% of males reported that mentoring is valued. Fewer than half of the female respondents agreed that voluntary women’s networks are valued by participants (41%) and/or management (34%).
- Missing data compromised any further analyses of mentoring, informal networking, and professional development.

**Table 11: Responses to the Mentoring, Informal Networking,
and Professional Development Items, by Gender**

	Female n=339	Male n=265
RESPONDENTS RECEIVING MENTORING *		
By Male Attorney at Work	15%	13%
By Female Attorney at Work	5%	3%
By a Male Attorney At Work, but Unofficially	15%	20%
By a Female Attorney at Work, but Unofficially	10%	10%
No Mentoring Is Available	47%	52%
INFORMAL NETWORKING **		
Opportunities Available	94%	95%
Participate in Opportunities	98%	99%
Received Financial Support for Workshops Etc.	61%	52%
Been Denied Access to Informal Networking Event	11%	4%
Been Discouraged From Participating tn Event	16%	9%
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT % WHO AGREE THAT...		
Assistance Is Actively Provided	41%	59%
They Are in the Career/Professional Development Loop	50%	64%
Mentoring Is Valued	51%	66%
Voluntary Women's Networks Are Valued by Participants	41%	68%
Voluntary Women's Networks Are Valued by Management	34%	61%

* These responses were summarized only for those who indicated they might need mentoring.

** Informal networking includes golf outings, squash or tennis, book clubs, investment clubs, social events, workshops.

Quality of Life and Work Stress

The final section of this report summarizes the findings from the quality of life and work stress scales. Key findings for this section are shown in Table 12.

- **Females and males in similar proportions agreed with all five of the quality of life statements. About one-third to one-half of the respondents agreed that their work responsibilities were overshadowing their personal lives.** For example, 50% of females and 44% of males reported that they do not allocate enough time for their personal lives; about 27% of males and 30% of females agreed that they are expected to focus mostly on their professional lives. **Only about one-third, however, agreed with the statement that they would trade a reduction in income for an increase in free-time.** *In contrast, the ABA survey of young lawyers (those at the beginning of their careers) found that much greater proportions of both men and women were spending too much time on work and not balancing the professional and personal features of their lives.*
- **Additional quality of life statements did elicit gender differences.** About 63% of males, compared to 53% of females reported that they miss meals with their families because of work; about 42% of males and 36% of females indicated they miss family social occasions because of work. About half of both female and male respondents did acknowledge that they have time to dine out, to go to the movies, or to read books and just relax.
- **Regarding work stress, there were low proportions of respondents who indicated that work stress was interfering in their lives.** About 24% said that job tensions/personalities were definitely reducing their work-related quality of life; fewer than 15% of respondents identified any other stress.
- Overall, 61% of females and 68% of males reported that their personal life overall was very good/excellent. Additionally, 55% of females and 59% of males reported that their work-related quality of life was very good/excellent.

Table 12: Responses to the Quality of Life and Work Stress Items, by Gender

QUALITY OF LIFE STATEMENTS % who <i>strongly agreed or agreed</i> with the following quality of life statements	Female n= 330	Male n=264	DIFF
a. I spend too much time on work-related activities	42%	40%	2
b. I do not allocate enough time to my personal life.	50%	44%	6
c. I feel that I am expected to focus mostly on my professional life	30%	27%	3
d. I spend more time than necessary on my work	24%	31%	-7
e. I would trade a reduction in income for an increase in free time	35%	29%	6
QUALITY OF LIFE STATEMENTS % who reported the following occurred <i>often</i>			
a. I miss meals with my family because of work	53%	63%	-10
b. I miss family social occasions because of work	36%	42%	-6
c. I have opportunities to dine out socially with friends	48%	49%	1
d. I have opportunities to go to movies, plays or concerts.	49%	52%	3
e. I have opportunities to read books or just relax	40%	50%	10
WORK STRESS STATEMENTS % who reported the following were definitely reducing their work-related quality of life.			
a. Job tensions/personalities	24%	23%	1
b. Substantive area of law currently practiced	7%	5%	2
c. Pressure to bill hours	14%	8%	6
d. Desire to leave the practice of law	3%	5%	-2
e. Racial, gender or sexual orientation bias	4%	1%	3
f. Pro bono/public work is discouraged	7%	2%	5
g. Bar activities are discouraged	2%	1%	1
OVERALL RATINGS LIFE QUALITY ARE VERY GOOD/EXCELLENT			
Personal Life Overall	61%	68%	7
Work Life Overall	55%	59%	4

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The survey provides valuable information to aid in confronting problems of gender equity and in advancing opportunities for full participation in the profession. The findings have implications for both the NYSBA and the profession as a whole. The survey results provide insight in two broad areas. The first area of interest is the demographic information that shows the changing face of the NYSBA membership and therefore, the profession. The second area focuses on issues of practice that include pay equity, discrimination and perception of equity.

Overall, the survey found the following:

- Discrimination and inequality of treatment based on gender are still prevalent in the profession to a degree that is not acceptable. Women are paid less than men, have less opportunity than men and advance at slower rates than men.
- More than 50% of women experienced or observed some form of gender discrimination involving either the spoken word or demeaning treatment; in some cases, this involved unwanted physical contact.
- Women in the profession are younger than men, many with children under the age of six. Child care issues have a significant impact on women's ability to advance and interact in the profession.

The efforts to address these issues should be ongoing and multi-dimensional and should involve cooperative efforts of law offices, the NYSBA and other bar associations, the courts, and members of the profession. These issues and initiatives to address them should be assessed periodically to gauge progress. Below are observations and conclusions based on the survey findings, followed by recommended means of actions.

Observations

A. Demographics

1. The sample group was randomly selected and large enough to give some insight into the faces of NYSBA members and some of the major issues affecting the membership in relation to gender equity.
2. Women are disproportionately younger – 60% of women attorneys are under age 44. This younger age is especially true in the private firm setting. Additionally, women have less years experience than men.
3. A higher proportion of women attorneys are single.
4. There is a high proportion of men and women who have dependent children, but women have much younger children, and issues related to children have a greater impact on their careers – 42% of women have children under the age of 6.

5. Child care-related issues have a greater impact on women.
 - a. Though most reported the availability of parental leave, 73% of women took leave while only 17% of men did so.
 - b. The majority of women reported that child care-related issues impact their participation in their careers, affecting their choice of field of concentration, hours worked and ability to participate in networking opportunities.
6. There are some clear differences in the reason men and women decided to become lawyers. Most women joined the profession to ensure justice and fair play. Helping women attorneys achieve their goals might aid in retaining women attorneys in the profession. A greater number of women attorneys indicated that they would not likely stay in legal careers for the rest of their working time. Greater focus should be placed on confronting obstacles to retention.

B. Gender Equity

1. There is significant income gender disparity at income levels more than \$100,000. This disparity is more pronounced in private practice settings. The survey found 59% of men and 41% of women earned \$100,000 or more; but in private practice, the disparity grew to 71% for men and 48% for women. **This disparity remains even when years in practice is factored into the equation. Gender, not seniority, is an element in income levels at the high end.** This issue needs further examination and action.
2. Within all work settings, there is a disparity among the kinds of activities in which women are involved and the connection those activities might have to advancement and salary increases. Women are more often involved in committees in their law offices that address diversity and associates; they are less likely to be involved in compensation, management, partnership and business development committees.
3. There is a disparate perception of women's roles in the profession. For example, 45% of women attorneys reported that they had been mistaken for an assistant, but only 9% of men indicated this experience.

C. Perceptions of Gender Equity and Access to Activities

1. There are significant differences between what men and women perceive as issues of gender equity. Most women think they have to work harder than men, and that they are not treated or paid the same as men.
2. The disparity in perception occurs in every practice setting, including the judiciary.
3. More often in private practice settings, there is greater disparity in access to activities that would affect women's growth potential. For example, men have greater access

to activities outside the office and greater access to high-level responsibilities within the office setting.

D. Experience or Observed Discrimination

1. **Blatant gender discrimination, including demeaning jokes or comments, and condescending behavior by judges and lawyers was observed or experienced by more than 50% of women. Situations of unwanted physical contact also were reported.**
2. Though men observed this occurrence at much lower rates, **still, more than 25% of men indicated they, too, had seen this blatant discrimination.**

E. Professional Well-being

1. Most attorneys, regardless of gender, indicated a high level of career satisfaction overall.
2. The areas of least satisfaction include: income, balance between family and job, and work distribution systems.
3. Almost all employers have formal policies on discrimination, medical leave and other major issues. Most do not have policies that address equity-related issues, such as flex time with full benefits, safety escorts, and child care assistance.

Existing sample policies should be revised or policies developed when necessary to address equity issues. Educational resources should be made available and steps taken to promote the actual utilization of such policies.

4. Low numbers of both men and women indicated that they have access to mentoring and professional development. Additional mentoring services should be made available through law offices and bar associations.
5. Both groups reported access to informal networking, yet a higher number of women reported having been discouraged or denied access and 94% noted that child care issues affect their ability to participate.

Recommendations

Issues of gender equity, in addition to the personal impact on women, affect the profession as a whole. With more women entering the profession in greater numbers than ever before, we must ensure that policies and practices are in place that address issues of gender equality and that address the realities that face women attorneys. Issues such as child care greatly impact a woman attorney's ability to interact and to advance in her career. Blatant discrimination, pay inequity and mistreatment will affect whether women attorneys choose to stay in the profession. We offer recommendations to enhance resources for law offices on policy and procedures and to advance NYSBA outreach and opportunities for participation.

A. Resources for Law Offices

1. A questionnaire should be developed that can be used by law offices to assess their policies and procedures and to identify factors affecting gender equity and revise provisions where needed. An example of such an approach is the Minnesota State Bar Association's self-audit for law offices.
2. The Committee previously prepared a series of reports and sample workplace policies for law offices, specifically Childbirth and Parenting Leave, Sexual Harassment, and Alternative Work Schedules. The Committee reiterates its position, stated in these reports, that the availability of written policies promotes understanding and planning by attorneys and other members of the office and consistency in application. Each of these resources should be updated, with provisions modified or added to address the concerns raised in the survey responses, i.e., the impact of child care on women attorneys' ability to participate in their careers. Law offices should be encouraged to go beyond the major types of policies and address other issues identified in the survey, such as flex-time with full benefits, procedures setting compensation and partnerships, leadership selection, child care assistance, and, in appropriate locations, safety escorts.
3. Both the assessment tool and the series of reports and sample policies should be widely publicized and made available to law offices.
4. In addition to efforts to promote diversity in hiring and advancement, more attention should be directed to eliminating the obstacles to retention. In reviewing procedures, consideration should be given to factors such as assignments, law office culture, mentoring, balance of professional and personal responsibilities, and opportunities for pro bono service and involvement in professional organizations.
5. These issues and means of addressing them should be discussed in NYSBA forums and also in Section law office management programs with respect to meeting needs and concerns in the particular fields of concentration. These subjects also should be the subject of dialogue in law offices in management meetings and in forums for attorneys.
6. Steps should be taken by the NYSBA, its Sections and by law offices to promote the effective use of mentoring.
 - a. Sample plans should be developed to aid law offices in instituting mentoring programs.
 - b. Programs should be presented for women attorneys by the Committee in conjunction with the NYSBA on means of honing leadership skills in the workplace, in the NYSBA and other bar association activities, and in the community. Plans for such a program are under way by the Committee.

- c. Consideration should be given to developing additional mentoring services for NYSBA members, building on the existing mentor program conducted by the Young Lawyers Section. Sections should be encouraged to establish mentor programs for their members that are geared to the particular field of concentration.
- 7. Reference materials describing best practices should be created on workplace policies and procedures that promote gender equity. This information should be included in law office management programs.
- 8. In pursuing the NYSBA's long-standing efforts to facilitate voluntary pro bono service and building on the work of the President's Committee on Access to Justice and the Committee on Legal Aid, law offices should be informed of the survey findings that opportunity to participate in pro bono and professional service activities is a factor in workplace satisfaction and retention. As such, law offices should be encouraged to consider these elements in the development of their policies and procedures.

B. NYSBA Procedures and Participation

- 1. The Committee is aware that promotion of diversity has been an area of examination of the Special Committee on Association Governance and expects that the Special Committee will be making recommendations on this subject. Therefore, the Committee on Women in the Law has not proposed specific steps with respect to selection and related governance procedures for the NYSBA Executive Committee, House of Delegates, or Nominating Committee. We look forward to the Special Committee's report.
- 2. The Committee offers the following general recommendations and considerations in shaping NYSBA services and procedures:
 - a. The Committee recommends that the NYSBA review its procedures to ensure that there are opportunities for male and female, experienced and younger attorneys to actively participate and advance in the Association. These areas include speaking, writing, committee work, development of programs and projects, and governance. The opportunities should be well publicized to the membership and outreach efforts undertaken to encourage participation of the NYSBA's various constituencies.
 - b. The Committee commends the Business Law Section for its efforts in developing a statement of diversity in its Bylaws and taking related initiatives to promote opportunity and involvement. The Committee encourages other NYSBA entities to take similar actions.
 - c. As a resource, the Committee will continue to prepare its periodic reports on NYSBA membership and participation of women. Meanwhile, the Committee urges NYSBA entities to examine, within their particular groups,

the levels of membership and involvement by women and by younger members.

- d. In reviewing procedures, consideration should be given to the time, location and mode of participation in meetings and educational programs, taking into account the survey findings of the number of younger members and those with child care responsibilities which can limit their ability to attend events at great distance or for extended periods. Some Sections and Committees offer conference calling for certain meetings, facilitating broader involvement. Also to promote access, some Sections have institutionalized the presentation of certain programs within driving distance and in locations rotated throughout the state.
- e. As indicated above in the resource segment of these recommendations, the Committee, with NYSBA officers, plans to conduct programs on leadership skills. These programs will include descriptions of procedures to seek opportunities in the NYSBA.
- f. The NYSBA should reaffirm two recommendations from the Committee's initial report: (1) "that the Association make known to law students its institutional commitment to combating gender bias in the legal system"⁶ and (2) that the issues of gender equity be discussed in meetings with the Deans of New York's law schools. The Committee urges that the survey findings be shared with law school educators. As stated in that report, it is vital to impart, at this early point in the development of the future generation of members of the bar, that discriminatory treatment in the profession is unacceptable.
- g. Exemplary efforts of NYSBA entities should be cited as effective practices and shared at the Conference for Section Leaders and in correspondence and meetings with Section and Committee Chairs, and should be publicized to the membership.

Implementation of Initiatives

To facilitate implementation and coordination of these initiatives, the Committee proposes the development of a task force composed of Committee representatives and designees from the Sections and other relevant Committees to create action plans that address concerns in the various work settings and fields of concentration.

⁶ Supra, Note 1 at 63.

Conclusion

The Committee thanks members for taking the time to share their experiences and perspectives on these important issues of gender equity. The resulting information will be invaluable in continuing the initiatives of the Committee and the NYSBA to ensure that the Association and the profession are inclusive and offer full opportunity for participation.

As the findings indicate, progress has been made since the initial reports of the Chief Judge's Task Force and the Committee, but much work remains to be done. Through coordinated and cooperative efforts, strides can be made. The NYSBA is in a position to address many of these issues by providing leadership and opportunities for change to occur. The Committee remains a resource and partner to the NYSBA in this work.

APPENDIX A
Relevant Recommendations from the 1987 Report
Of the NYSBA Committee on Women in the Courts
(N/A in electronic version)

APPENDIX B
Roster of the NYSBA Committee on Women in Law
2001-2002

Carla M. Palumbo, Chair*
Sarah J. Stewart, Vice-Chair*

Miriam R. Adelman
Claire S. Ancona-Berk
Patrice S. Barton
Michelle Englander
Barbara Fifield-Guzman*
Hon. Evelyn Frazee
Stacy P. Goldschmidt
Diane L. Graf
Kristin Koehler Guilbault
Patricia J. Howard
Phyllis A. Klein
Janet Phillips Kornfeld
Sybil H. Landau
Carolyn H. Mann
Jill Miller
Toni Anne Nichels
Katie C. O'Connor
Donna M. Petrucelli*
Hon. Ann T. Pfau
Faye M. Polayes
Connie A. Raffa
Edith I. Spivack
Nicole R. Tzetzso
John F. Werner

Bernice K. Leber, Executive Committee Liaison*

** Members of the Survey Project Task Force*

APPENDIX C
NYSBA Gender Equity Survey Form
(N/A in electronic version)

APPENDIX D

References

ABA Commission on Women in the Profession: Report to the ABA House of Delegates on the Status of Women in the Legal Profession. ABA House of Delegates, 1988.

ABA Young Lawyers Division, Career Satisfaction, 2000.

Cassens, Debra, 2000. *Changes Achieved, Challenges Ahead*. ABA Journal, September 2000: 29-39.

Catalyst, 2001. *Women in Law: Making the Case*.

Donnell, C., 1995. *Colorado Bars Provide Proof of Male and Female Lawyers' Disparate Earnings*. Commission on Women in the Profession, Spring 1995.

Hoenack, Stephen and Kleiner, Morris, 1992. *Results of a Survey and Analysis of the Earnings of Male and Females MSBA members*. [Minnesota State Bar Association]

Klein, 1996. *Women's Progress Slows at Top Firms*, National Law Journal, May 1996.

North Carolina Bar Association, 1993. *Final Report of the Commission on the Status of Women in the Legal Profession in North Carolina*.

Report of The Kansas Bar Association Task Force on the Status of Women in the Profession. The Journal, February 1992: 35-50.

Research USA, 2000. Women in the Law Survey. Conducted for ABA Journal.

State Bar of New Mexico, Supreme Court of New Mexico, 1991. Summary Report : Task Force on Women and the Legal Profession.

Rhode, D. L., 2001. *The Unfinished Agenda: Women and the Legal Profession*. American Bar Association.