

## How We Did This

Our process is simple: cut, paste, and rank. The National Association for Legal Career Professionals (NALP) maintains a public, online directory of law firm employment statistics – including demographic information, attorney hours, and pro bono participation – to facilitate “legal career counseling and planning.”<sup>1</sup> For every law firm employing more than 100 attorneys in six major markets<sup>2</sup> we collected particular data points from the NALP directory and then sorted the firms from highest to lowest.

Our original plan was to generate rankings on a variety of metrics, including firms’ minimum billable hour requirements, average associate hours worked, demographic diversity, average pro bono hours, and the number of part-time attorneys. Although NALP asks firms to include all of this information in their annual questionnaire, many firms leave one or more sections blank. In addition, for some statistics, firms will use competing criteria when determining their numbers (i.e., different definitions of “part-time” work), and thus this data is less reliable for sorting purposes.

Given these limitations, we decided to prioritize rankings for only on the most cut-and-dry information: diversity and pro bono participation. Billable hours are also ranked, but include a disclaimer about reporting methods. Should firms provide more information to NALP in future questionnaires, we will prepare similar reports based on the new data.

## OUR RANKINGS

We present demographic statistics in three ways. First, our “Diversity Rankings” cover five groups underrepresented in the legal profession: women, African-Americans, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, and openly lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered individuals (LGBT). We rank the firms by the percentage of attorneys they employ from that group, with separate lists for partners and associates. We also include the actual number of attorneys from that minority group immediately to the right of each firm’s percentage. When two or more firms have the same percentage, we rank higher the firm that has a larger raw number of attorneys from that group.<sup>3</sup> When two or more firms have the same number of attorneys from the underrepresented group, we rank higher the firm that has

---

<sup>1</sup> About Us, NALP Directory of Legal Employers, *available at* [http://www.nalpdirectory.com/dledir\\_aboutus.asp](http://www.nalpdirectory.com/dledir_aboutus.asp) (last visited September 8, 2007). The data included in this report is based on the most recent firm-reported information, which was current as of February 1, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> The six major markets are New York City, Washington, D.C., Chicago, Boston, Northern California, and Southern California-LA. The office size constraints were relaxed for Boston (we included all offices of 50+ attorneys) and Northern California (we included 100+ attorney offices in SF, plus the Silicon Valley offices of the Vault “most prestigious in Northern California” firms.)

<sup>3</sup> We think the firm that has 14 black associates out of 200 total associates ought to be ranked higher than one that has 7 out of 100 total.

fewer total attorneys.<sup>4</sup> On the far right side of the page, we divide the firms into quintiles, allowing readers to see if a particular firm falls into, say, the top fifth or the second fifth of the rankings.

The second way we present our demographic data is with a “Diversity Report Card.” This document aggregates the information from our five “Diversity Rankings” pages and presents them in a simple chart.<sup>5</sup> Our process is similar to a professor’s grading system: the firm’s ranking in each diversity chart is assigned a letter grade (A, B, C, D, or F), and then averaged to suggest the firm’s overall diversity. We assign grades based on the quintile in which a firm appears: if a firm is in the top fifth in percentage of female associates, then it receives an “A” for that category; if another firm is in the second fifth, it receives a “B,” and so on. We created one exception to this grading process. If a firm does not have *any* attorneys in a certain category (i.e., if they have zero Hispanic partners or zero LGBT associates), then we automatically gave them an F, regardless of quintile.<sup>6</sup>

To illustrate, if Firm ZYX is in the top quintile for female associates, the second-from-bottom quintile for female partners, and the middle quintile for all other rankings, then its scorecard would have one A, one D, and eight C’s.<sup>7</sup> We then calculate the grades as if it were someone’s GPA: the A is worth 4.0, the D is worth 1.0, the C’s are 2.0 each. This averages to a 2.1 overall or, using the below grading scale, a C. We then rank firms by their overage average. If multiple firms have the same overall average, they are listed in alphabetical order.

The “report card” does not suggest that one firm is “more diverse” than the other simply because it has a higher overall grade, but provides students with a quick reference guide when trying to figure out how well represented certain minority groups are at a particular firm.

### Grading Scale

4.0 - 3.8	A
3.7 - 3.5	A-

---

<sup>4</sup> We think that a firm with 75 attorneys but no Hispanics ones ought to be ranked higher than a firm with 150 attorneys and not a single Hispanic one.

<sup>5</sup> If a firm did not report a category – most often LGBT associates or partners – they are not included in the Diversity Report Card.

<sup>6</sup> In New York, for example, this exception only affects the grades of a few firms in the black partner and the Hispanic partner rankings. In both categories, there are so many firms with zero minority representation that they fill the entire bottom quintile and spill over into the second-to-bottom quintile. Under the normal grading pattern, firms in the penultimate quintile would receive a D; under our exception, firms with no black or Hispanic partners in this quintile receive a F instead. We did not think it fair to reward a firm with anything more than a failing grade when it failed to retain a single minority partner.

<sup>7</sup> The other eight would be: black partners, black associates, Hispanic partners, Hispanic associates, Asian partners, Asian associates, LGBT partners, and LGBT associates.

3.4 - 3.2	B+
3.1 - 2.8	B
2.7 - 2.5	B-
2.4 - 2.2	C+
2.1 - 1.8	C
1.7 - 1.5	C-
1.4 - 1.2	D+
1.1 - 0.8	D
0.7 - 0.5	D-
0.4 - 0.0	F

## **STANDARDS FOR INCLUSION**

Some law firms decline to report office-specific information and only report firmwide data. Other firms include a small, nearby satellite office on their major market NALP form. Several firms did not report their billable hours or the number of openly LGBT attorneys in their office. A discussion of how we treated each of these issues is below, using the New York market as an example.

## **DATA ON THE NEW YORK MARKET**

Using the NALP Directory, we collected data on every firm that has at least 100 attorneys in its Manhattan office. We did not, however, include in our rankings every firm that met this criteria. Although most large firms complete separate NALP questionnaires for each of their regional offices – allowing us to view statistics for just their Manhattan employees – nine provide NALP only with firmwide data. In each of those cases, the Manhattan office made up for only a fraction of the total attorneys covered in the statistics. Accordingly, we excluded the following nine companies:

- Allen & Overy
- Brown Rudnick
- Kasowitz, Benson
- Kenyon & Kenyon
- Linklaters
- Quinn, Emanuel
- Milbank, Tweed
- Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett
- Thacher Proffitt & Wood

When compiling our data, we also found that five firms included information from two or three of their offices in one NALP questionnaire, but that their New York office will employ the overwhelming majority of the lawyers included. For

example, Schulte Roth fills out a single questionnaire for offices in New York and London. However, of the 457 attorneys at the firm, 447 are in New York and 10 are in London. We decided to include those firms in our rankings. Although we acknowledge that demography and diversity-based hiring practices may vary from city to city, and thus that including information from multiple locations can skew rankings, we decided that the number of attorneys at these few firms were so small as to be negligible. We concluded that the benefit of providing a greater number of New York firms in our rankings outweighed the possible harm of a data point skewed slightly by including information from lawyers in a different legal market. To make clear that these firms contain some non-NY data, we marked them with an asterisk (\*) in the rankings:

Cahill Gordon – 283 total; 4 in London, UK; 3 in Washington, DC  
Carter Ledyard – 114 total; 4 in Washington, DC  
Cravath, Swaine & Moore – 484 total; 18 in London, UK  
Pryor Cashman – 114 total; 2 in Los Angeles, CA  
Schulte Roth – 447 total; 10 in London, UK

Similarly, we found that two firms completed a single questionnaire for two or more offices when they have a large office in Manhattan and several smaller branch offices in suburban New Jersey. We decided to include these firms in our rankings, as we concluded that the suburban New Jersey legal market was sufficiently comparable to the Manhattan market so as to have virtually no effect on the rankings. These firms are also marked with an asterisk (\*) in the rankings:

Herrick Feinstein – 174 total; 23 in Newark, NJ; 10 in Princeton, NJ  
Thelen Reid – 253 total; approximately 9 in northern New Jersey<sup>8</sup>

Finally, although all of the firms we included in our rankings provided most of their demographic diversity information, we discovered that five firms did not include statistics on the number of openly gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgendered attorneys in their New York office. These firms were thus left out of the Diversity Ranking for LGBT lawyers:

Cooley Godward  
Epstein Becker  
Greenberg Traurig  
Katten Muchin  
Winston & Strawn

---

<sup>8</sup> In their NALP questionnaire, Thelen Reid does not break down the number of attorneys working in their Manhattan office and their offices in Florham Park and Morristown, New Jersey. A search of Thelen Reid's website suggests that nine of their attorneys are based in New Jersey. See "Attorney Search," available at <http://www.thelenreid.com/index.cfm?section=attorney> (last visited September 8, 2007) (At "Office" pull-down menu, select "Northern New Jersey" and click "Search.")

## **ACCURACY**

We are strongly committed to providing students with data that is 100% accurate. If you believe that we have miscalculated any data in this report, please contact us at [refirmation \(at\) gmail.com](mailto:refirmation@gmail.com) so that we may correct the error.