

**Leadership Education Roundtable II:
“Now More Than Ever”
April 16, 2010**

Welcome and Overview Speech by Dean Donald Polden

Donald Polden, Dean of Santa Clara University’s law school, opened the second annual Leadership Education Roundtable by mentioning the importance of discussing leadership in legal education “Now More than Ever.” He outlined his definition of leadership, which consisted of three major ideas. First of all, he stated that leadership is a process, not a position. Secondly, practicing leadership requires creation of a vision or a solution that results in positive and ethical change. Thirdly, leadership requires influence or persuasion of others toward change. Polden referenced a presentation given by Barry Posner during last year’s Leadership Roundtable, in which Posner laid out his five principles of leadership:

1. Leadership is for everyone.
2. It CAN be taught, it is a set of skills.
3. Leaders earn the trust of others through demonstration of their values and beliefs.
4. Leadership is a relationship built on trust and credibility.
5. Last, leadership is a matter of the heart; leaders care about those they lead and others around them.

Dean Polden concluded his introduction by stating that in legal education, educating leaders is our legacy, and it is critically important that we prepare law students and young lawyers for law practice in a “down” economy.

Panel #1: Leadership Education: Now More Than Ever

Moderator: Sandee Magliozzi, Director, SCU Law Professional Development

Sandee Magliozzi initiated the discussion in the first panel by stating that 2008-2009 has been the worst economic year in legal history. She mentioned that the goal of this panel is to discuss the changes that have occurred in the legal professions and their impact on law firms and law firm models. She briefly outlined the panel, indicating that the speakers will discuss how these changes have impacted the set of skills that future lawyers will need and what role leadership skills will play in differentiating individuals.

Panelist: Jim Leipold’s Remarks (Executive Director of NALP in Washington DC)

Leipold started his remarks by reiterating that the legal job market is in a period of rapid and dramatic change and evolution, which signifies for graduating students that the kinds of jobs they will get and their methods for job searching are going to be drastically different in the next couple of years. He foresees more job openings with smaller firms and outsource employers, more non-traditional jobs in areas such as the technology and information management, and fewer entry level jobs at large firms. Although the recession has worsened the job market, Leipold said that most of the

changes, especially those in the large firm settings, were underway before the recession started 18 months ago. Once the recession did hit in 2008, much of the work that used to flow to large firms stopped flowing and 58,500 legal section jobs were lost (according to the U.S. Department of Labor). In the first quarter of 2009 the largest law firms laid off more than 12,000 workers, state court internships were cut, endowments were cut, etc. However, the number of people applying for jobs in the legal force increased; federal clerkship applications hit an all time high. Applications from attorneys who had been out and practicing law exceeded those of graduating students. The types of jobs that law school graduates take on have not really changed; generally 55-58% of graduates work for law firms. However, in the past few years, the number of law graduates who work in business and industry has grown to 13%.

In regards to the distribution of full-time salaries, law students used to earn salaries that were distributed on a bell curve. In 2002, the curve changed when the starting salary at firms reached \$125,000, causing a huge spike on the right side of the graph. Leipold suggested that after 2009, this peak on the right hand side should diminish and the bell curve of salaries should go back to normal.

Leipold gave some statistics to demonstrate how dramatically the legal market has constricted in the past few years. In 2007, the offer rate for students coming out of summer programs from large firms was close to 100%, nationally around 90%, but by 2009 it had dropped to 69%. After these summer programs, only 40-50% of firms go back into the market to recruit 3L students, but in 2009 that number dropped to 30% firms. Also, in 2007 the percent of 2L's that were called back for interviews after going through the OCI program was 60%, but in 2009 only 37% were called back. Lastly, the median number of offers per large firm (large means having 700 people or above) are typically between 30-35 graduates. In 2007, only 30 on average were offered positions per firm, and in 2009 that number fell to just 8. Leipold pointed out that these statistics show a long term change, not just a temporary interruption in the pattern of law school graduates. The change in demand for lawyers is related to the recession, but it also has to do with the shifting balance of power between law firms and corporate clients. Corporations have decided that they are done with the "revolving door of town;" they want predictability as to costs and efficiency, which means no more billable hour. Instead, they want lawyers to become partners with their businesses, so as to develop relationships with them.

Law firms are running the risk of becoming the next auto industry, according to Leipold, producing a product that no one wants to buy. To compensate for this, law firms say that they are adopting competency frameworks for advancement within the firm. The goal now is to hire smaller classes but use more stringent assessments as to whom they should hire. That is not to say that firms are no longer concerned with pedigree; Leipold affirmed that GPA and prestige of undergraduate school are still important criteria for applicants. However, what *has* changed is that firms are starting to use evaluation tools to identify leadership skills that can differentiate between students with similar credentials. Some of the skills that firms are looking for are financial literacy, project management skills, ability to work in groups, and problem

solving skills. Law firms are even implementing new programs to teach leadership training and development for new staff.

So why are these changes in the law market expected to be long-term? According to Leipold, there are external drivers changing the way legal services are delivered. For example, effective in 2011, the UK Legal Services Act allows for investment of outside capital in British Law firms and for the delivery of legal services by people who are not lawyers. This law will drive investment in technology and allow for the development of efficiencies, forcing competitive international law firms to strengthen their skill sets in technology. Part of this change will be an increase in number of jobs for law school graduates in the area of technology because sophisticated technology platforms will act as a bridge between law firms and technology providers. There also will be a strong growth in legal process outsourcers (LPO's) because clients are sourcing solutions to non-legal providers. Legal service providers, or third party privately held companies, will have to contract with legal firms and legal departments in corporations.

Another factor contributing to the long-term change is the rise of large law firms in China with lawyers trained in the west but returning to China to work. Their organizations are able to operate at a much lower price point, especially in regards to deals in Asia. In the past couple of years, Chinese nationals are the single largest group of people taking the Bar exam in New York. It's getting much harder for the US to compete in this market. The old economic model that has supported large law firms in the past is gone, and the US has not figured out what model to replace it with. However, what they do know is that leadership is going to be key. With the current economic situation, many students will have jobs where they don't have opportunities to lead, but a having leadership skill set will distinguish law graduates in the future.

Panelist: Terri Mottershead's Remarks (DLA Piper Development Director)

Terri Mottershead opened her remarks by providing some information about her background. She has spent 26 years in the legal industry in three different countries: Australia for eight years, Hong Kong for thirteen years, and the US for five years. She has a Masters degree in law, but also went on to get an MBA because she felt that her business skills were deficient. The company she works for now, DLA Piper, is the second largest law firm in the US.

Her first point was that US firms and the entire legal industry are not ready for what is coming in terms of international competition and changing structures in the legal system. The main challenge facing the law schools right now is whether or not they are producing students who are prepared to lead firms of the 21st century, given all the changes that are occurring. Motterhead recommended that law schools should look at where the law industry needs to be as a profession, and then work together to figure out how to change the education structure to compensate for the changes. She mentioned Richard Susskind's book on law and technology, *The End of Lawyers? Rethinking the Nature of Legal Services*, in which he discusses how firms will look very different in the near future.

Motterhead pointed out that the purchasing market for legal services is more sophisticated than ever before, resulting from a combination of a very sophisticated buying audience coupled with high demands on in-house counsel. Lawyers are looking at the possibility that that approximately 20-40% of their income will come through alternative fee arrangements, or work other than providing legal services. Business efficiencies are not going to change even if the market improves. However, organizations such as legal outsourcers have provided a collective voice for in-house counsel to band together as one. This approach by in-house counsel is much more sophisticated than it has been in the past; they are looking for big buying power, collective voice, and sophisticated information.

Law firms have tended to look at talent reactively, not proactively. However, given the current changes in the law industry internationally, law firms need to be more proactive in their search for talent. The change in how firms search for talent has led to a shift in the management structure of law firms. According to Motterhead, it is very challenging to run a multi-million dollar business by consensus. Instead, both big and small firms are moving towards a more corporate management structure. That being said, law firms are already multi-disciplinary organizations; they employ professions other than just lawyers, such as marketing, professional development, and HR staff. This distinguishes law firms because they are the only business organizations which employ lawyers and “non-lawyers;” no other industry has a “non” something. Therefore, lawyers are faced with more pressure to take the lead in their industry; they need to be ready and able to truly lead in a multi-disciplinary environment, which means being able to lead people who are specialized in diverse areas.

Part of the changing structure of law firms is the future need to move from amateur management to professional management. Visionary leaders are needed for law firms of the 21st century. The example Motterhead used to illustrate her point was this: If a law firm was advising one of its clients to invest in a multi-million dollar business, but no one in the firm had ever had business management training and decisions were made by consensus, would the firm advise the client to invest? The answer is that it probably would, even though the firm members had never gained experience in that field.

Given the law industry’s future changes towards a multi-disciplinary setting, alternative career paths must be considered. She foresees a plethora of jobs available in non-traditional areas, such as contract staff attorneys, the folks who do the more routine work within the law firms that traditionally is for junior associates, but they are too expensive for firms right now. Another area that will increase is the number of “of counsel” attorneys because they have client connections and excellent technical skills; however they won’t be partners because they don’t want to be in management. Law firms are learning how to be more corporate so that they can deal with all these specialists working in one business model.

Another important issue that Motterhead addressed is how law firms are identifying people that they need. Most recently, the way firms have gone about this is through a huge push towards developing competency models. According to Motterhead, there are two sets of blueprints guiding the development of lawyers. The

first is through practice benchmarks, or specific practice areas and lists of evolving skills for associates to develop. It provides benchmarks of substantive knowledge needed to be a technical lawyer. The second set of blueprints is the competency model, which is based on behaviors that are developed through experience. They usually evolve through experience, so developing leadership competencies would include a different type of training, through supervision, delegation, and getting new students to lead their own teams, for example.

One thing to think about is who law firms should be modeling in terms of leaders. The skill set that got white men to the top of firms will not work in the future; instead, it is essential that there is an over-layer across the broadest cross-section of represented people. A law firm should mirror the community that they are working in and surrounded by. Competencies are pillars of success in firms; they must drive everything in the future. When recruiting graduates, firms won't find these competencies by focusing on the student's GPA or grades. Instead, when they need to be able to test how applicants would respond in certain situations by putting them through assessment centers. This even applies within the firm. Training programs should be completely customized; mentoring and coaching should be a huge part of skill set development.

On top of mentoring and coaching, professional development should involve more directed, transparent discussions on an ongoing basis. Law firms typically are not used to giving feedback. In the past, staff members would be given feedback every five to ten years. The competency model suggests, however, that each time a new member moves between levels there is an opportunity for discussion and feedback about the future of the employee. There should be more individual discussions, advice on how to choose work assignments, what the employee has done wrong or right, etc. Typically, these methods of training have been focused on the high-ranking members of the firms, but in the UK the new phase is to have the exact same leadership training for partners and associates lower down on the chain. On April 1st, DLA Piper began a project feedback program based on this feedback model. They have technology that generates a request for feedback when an associate reaches a certain number of hours on a project. Before they implemented this program, the associates were getting feedback maybe every six to twelve months, but the program transformed the system into an ongoing evaluation.

Motterhead concluded her panel by saying that the changes are here to stay. It is time to change the US's system of employing law students. The bad economy has been a blessing in disguise for the law industry because it has served as a catalyst to start analyzing and addressing some of these issues.

Open to Questions:

Dean Polden referred to a law school recently opened in China by a graduate of a U.S. law school that applied to achieve ABA accreditation. He asked the two panelists about the implications of this on law schools in the US and internationally?

Jim Leipold answered the question by saying that in this case, the decision of the ABA Accreditation Committee is very important. If the school in China gets approved, there will be several schools in countries such as Australia and the UK that will apply as

well. Suddenly, the US will be competing in a very different, global market. In order to be competitive on this new global market, US will need to improve on cross-cultural fluency and lower its price point.

Terri Motterhead answered that the US needs to go back to what competencies it wants students and law school graduates to have, and then it needs to implement those changes in the education system to make sure that students graduate from law school with those competencies. The US need to recognize the shift of competencies from a focus on traditional substantive law and legal skills to a focus on managerial and business skills. The UK is embracing this idea. About 20 years ago, she said, the UK commissioned a study about what competencies a lawyer will need in the upcoming market. The next question to be addressed is how to teach these competencies and where should they be taught, in the law school or in the firm? The UK model, which has been adopted in New Zealand, Australia and somewhat in Canada, has law schools teaching theory with a practical bent. They focus on taking students off-site to focus on practical training with very intensive, simulated models lasting anywhere from 6-12 months. Their adjuncts teach about practical aspects, and full-time faculty gives feedback on files. A big issue in the US, however, is the cost factor; can students afford to pay for a fourth year of law school? In the UK, students get an internship from a law firm and then the firm pays for their fourth year of education. There's a possibility the US could implement a similar structure.

Mary Alexander wanted to hear more about the competencies. She asked Motterhead to expand on the competencies she sees necessary in the future.

Motterhead said that her firm's competency model has four pillars: professional excellence, which included substantive legal knowledge; client impact, which includes client relationship management; interpersonal effectiveness, which includes managerial skills; and leadership. She said that each of these categories can be broken down more specifically, but that is too in depth for the scope of the conference.

What is the effect of dealing with a new generation that does things very differently? How should firms deal with that?

Motterhead responded that people are looking at alternative career tracks because work-life balance is a huge issue for people who are joining law firms now, which impacts succession planning. Firms need to turn their entire training program upside down. In her estimation, approximately 90% of training must focus on technology information, including the use of social media such as blogs, wikis, etc. The rest should be focused on coaching. Every partner in the firm should be a career advisor, and there should be a focus on having advisors sit down with associates to help them plan their career.

Sandee Magliozzi asked the panelists what law schools can do right now to add value to their students:

Leipold responded that law schools should be having conversations with their students similar to the conversations held at the Roundtable, where schools give the

students some mastery of an old economic law firm model and then explain to them how the model is changing. He suggested that law schools need to give their students experiential learning, externships, team work, and mentoring advice. He also mentioned that schools should work on expectation management, encouraging students to have realistic expectations about the future. He quoted a statistic, saying that you are more likely to be picked in an NBA draft than to become a partner in a firm.

Motterhead said that law schools should think about legal practice like any other business, students need to hit the ground running. Students need to learn practical skills, such as how to work with people, lead a team or manage a project. One way she suggested to give them practical experience is to offer them the opportunity to spend time with lawyers in an actual firm before they graduate to get personal experience. Also, law schools should ensure that they have a strong career counseling department that is aware of the changes in the law industry and will empower the students and match them with feasible options. Above all, law schools need to tell their students not to be scared about the changes in the field because it's such an exciting time! They are on the cutting edge of a great opportunity, so schools need to be prepared to help the students take advantage of the opportunities available.

Panel #2: Educating Leaders- Other Perspectives

Panelist: Dr. Larry Richard, Vice President and Chair of the Leadership & Organization Development Practice, Hildebrandt Baker Robbins

Dr. Richard opened his speech by giving a little information about his background. He has worked with almost 800 law firms in the past 30 years and has a PhD in organizational psychology. He said that lawyers are a very different group than the general population. The types of people that become lawyers have different qualities than their clients and the rest of their staff, but lawyers rarely realize this. Approximately 95% of Competency Models are test-less and skill-less; there is no way to test it empirically or to validate it. For example, an arm chair model is illusory; it gives the impression that we have something when in actuality we do not. It can't be used to recruit or predict.

One of the first questions Dr. Richard posed was how to start developing competency models. He proposed using detailed, well-structured behavioral event interviews, in which the interviewer solicits evidence or examples of a specific competency or skill that a candidate or applicant possesses. The interviewer asks four or five specific situational based questions, such as "When you talked to a client, what were you wearing? What was running through your mind?" This model has already been used as a study, and the interviewers completed approximately 30 interviews of lawyers and ended up with 65,000 statements, many of them overlapping issues. The model went through these and found some similar themes, ending up with 120 competencies. Since that was too many, they distilled it down to 12 competencies.

One of the competency models pulled from this study was the Hildebrandt Leadership Competency Model. The first skill in this competency model that a leader must have is the ability to influence others in a specific way. In the legal field, Dr. Richard pointed out, interpersonal influencing skills are extremely important and need

to be very sophisticated. For example, if a lawyer interacts with someone systematically more powerful than them in the firm and wants to influence their behavior, they need to be able to understand what their criteria for influencing are and to figure out how to move that person to a position they want. Secondly, strong leaders should display confidence and resilience. This changes the evaluation process. Each firm should look at the partners and senior associates and ask if they are realistically looking at each individual associate and giving useful feedback. Dr. Richard mentioned a statistic that the average resilience for the general population is 50%, but for lawyers it's only 30%. This means that lawyers are, by nature, thin skinned and defensive; they are influenced more by genetics than by social training. Therefore, for lawyers it's especially important to train partners and associates to evaluate and give feedback in a critical way, putting other lawyers in a psychological discomfort zone. Low resilience shouldn't be an impediment to giving good feedback. The third quality a good leader should demonstrate is a firm-first mentality. Dr. Richard referenced *Good to Great*, a book by Jim Collins. He talks about how there are level 4 and level 5 leaders; level 5 leaders are humble, they don't put themselves first, and have a passionate commitment to the success of enterprise. He also references *Whole New Mind*, by Daniel H. Pink, where Pink talks about the idea that knowledge workers in the last decade were successful because of technical knowledge. In the next decade, however, analytical skills won't drive success. One would need analytics in conjunction with right brain skills, or a high emotional IQ, to be successful.

Dr. Richard presented another competency model from John Kotter's book *What Leaders Really Do*. In the book, Kotter says that leadership and management are two different areas and skill sets, although they have three similarities. Leaders and managers both must do three tasks: decide what needs to be done, create networks of people and relationships that can accomplish an agenda, and try to ensure that those people actually do the job. The difference between the two areas lies in how the tasks are completed. When deciding what needs to be done, management deals with coping with complexity, meaning that they need to be able to manage people with specializations in certain areas. Leaders, on the other hand, must cope with change, uncertainty and unpredictability when deciding what needs to get done. A leader has no more information than those they lead, but they have to be willing to take the risk to predict into the future and make decisions. In terms of the second task, creating networks of people and building effective relationships, managers need to plan and budget, which is more cerebral and analytical. Leaders, on the other hand, must utilize their emotional and passionate side. They have to establish aims for guiding people into the unknown and setting long-term vision and strategies for the future. In terms of the third task, ensuring that people do their jobs, managers are more controlling and problem-solving, whereas leaders should be motivating and inspiring. So, to sum up the differences, management is more left-brain, linear, analytic, data based, cerebral, cognitive and systematic. Leadership, on the other hand, is non-linear, emotional, visceral, creative, interpersonal, visual, people-oriented, forward-looking, and focused on the big picture. Lawyers naturally are more comfortable in the managerial role, but it is necessary that they start to move into the leadership range.

Dr. Richard pointed out that while personality is not a major driver in leadership success, it does play some role because it influences how difficult or easy it will be for a person to master and sustain the most important behaviors of a leader. While a person can't change his or her personality, a good training program can teach people how to manage and work with their own personalities. Lawyers are usually high in Learning Approach, and unusually low in Interpersonal Sensitive and Adjustment. Eighty-eight percent of leaders are in the top half of "Ambition," they influence people to make changes. The other twelve percent of leaders were at the bottom of "Ambition," either saying that they were drafted into their leadership role or ranking high in Conscientiousness. Some key values he found for lawyers are Aesthetics and Hedonism, and some key derailing characteristics of lawyers are that they are excitable, cautious, leisurely, and reserved or emotionally withdrawn.

Panelist: Linda Alepin, Founding Director Global Women's Leadership Network & Professor, SCU School of Business

Linda Alepin started her segment by asking the question: Where is the leverage for leaders? Most people are part of Content and Process, but her belief is that the most leverage is in the realm of Context: how one shifts their own and others' thinking. But what is context? She defined it as all the hidden assumptions, interpretations, background conversation and communications processes that influence an action. Either one has created a context or they have settled for the one they are already part of. In terms of law schools, how do they teach people to shift their contexts? Alepin offered that it has to do greatly with how one listens and asks questions, their vision, and their commitment. One should listen for a change in orientation; it's not the same as critical listening, instead it is listening for the possibility of things. Questions have to elicit responses and challenge people. These types of challenging questions prompt innovative thinking; therefore *leaders* should prompt innovative thinking. In terms of vision, Alepin said that leaders in the law fields need to ask what kind of firms they want to have. Vision is tied to commitment; it changes the context in which people operate.

Panelist: Roland Smith, Senior Faculty, Center for Creative Leadership

Roland Smith talked about the challenge for lawyers to balance multiple priorities, some of which might mean dealing with complex challenge external to the firm. A skill set is critical to new lawyers. In Smith's opinion, there are three buckets: lead self first, lead group or practice, then lead firm. However, not much importance is placed on leading the self first. Firms are not interested in leadership development classes; rather, they are interested in having people learn how to lead and navigate change. Smith asked if the "Leadership market for Lawyers" is a boutique business at best. There is resistance to this concept- Smith said that Dr. Richard disagreed, and he's right! There is a significant increase in working with firms; however they use the term "discovery phase," not competencies.

“The New Normal”: Paul Lippe, CEO, Legal OnRamp Systems, Inc.

Paul Lippe started by listing off a series of terms: modernization, alignment, and value, but he concluded that “leadership” is a better term than all of these. The “new normal” in the law firm is client intimacy, predictable pricing, alternate staffing, defined quality, technology-enhanced, and process innovation. According to Lippe, the notion that you have to get everybody on board is archaic. He encouraged the audience to look at a law firm from the client perspective: there is high complexity, high volume and everything is day by day. Both people processes and information processes have error, however law acts like there is no error. Lippe says that law schools tend to focus on the process of appellate decision making; they think about the rules and not people. Companies also focus on processes and people, yet they perceive that they deal with a lot of complexity. Also, most companies presume that they engage in ethical behavior. The language of the client is feedback and measurement. Law, however, operates as a profession and academy is insulated.

Lippe then discussed the differences between the behaviors of leadership versus lawyerism. For leadership, he used the example:

If we do XYZ, things will be better

Thanks for your idea Y

Here’s why we/you are better off

In lawyerism, however, it looks more like this:

If you do XYZ, things could be worse

If bad things happen it’s your fault

My adverse outcome so bad that takes primacy.

Leadership requires engagement; anybody can sell fear, anybody can succeed unconstrained.

There are a few schools of thoughts for governance in law schools and firms: the first one is consensus. Consensus is a formula for the status quo and perpetuates hierarchy. Basically, it is pro-hierarchy and anti-change. There is a lack of clear objective function; the existing hierarchy lets you decide, yet nothing changes. Lippe asked, how does change happen in most of the world? He stated that 2.5% of people are innovators, 13.5% are early adopters, 34% are early majority, 34% are late majority, and 16% are laggards.

According to Lippe, law schools tend to treat every problem as a Lewis & Clark problem instead of a Google maps problem, meaning that they treat every problem as something unique. Information technology and best practices are already addressed in business, as well as the belief that everyone should be best at something.

Society works based on a reciprocity system instead of a rule system. Law schools, however, operate on a rule system where people are regularly excluded. Lippe believes that law schools will change because they are commercial entities. They will change because their support system will change. He says the law schools should integrate a new policy of engagement, to reintegrate the students as they were historically. He suggests law schools break down work into smaller components and teach students how to research and how to use meta-information.

Lippe says that the job of leaders in the law field is to make the California legal system work better. Students come to law schools with the skills to deal with the “New Normal.” They need to be able to reconnect leadership with clients. Students should be technology savvy, able to collaborate and empathize, curious, and able to use the Web 2.0. Some of the skills necessary for client re-integration are engagement, empiricism, reciprocity, and being the best at something.

Panel #3: Law School Leadership Education Initiatives

Panelist: Georgia Sorenson, Professor at the University of Maryland School of Law

Sorenson was given a grant by the Fetzer Institute to deliver leadership education in law school. She created a class called Leadership and Lawyers, which had both a clinical component and a professional component. Sorenson structured her class less like a typical law school class; for example, everyone had to have a buddy, professors went out to lunch with students, students couldn't sit in the same place each week, and they were required to write a paper about their passion. In her set-up, the professor was in the role of a learner as well. She assumed that the students all had A's, and the responsibility was theirs to keep it. She also taught a class called Leadership Theory- Quest for a General Theory of Leadership, where students begin to ingrate their passionate interests with some aspect of law and leadership. Sorenson stated that it is better to talk about leadership education or competencies rather than 'leadership skills.'

Panelist: Faith Rivers, Professor at Elon University Law School

Rivers said that she started from scratch to integrate engaged learning and leadership into her school's curriculum. She believes that lawyers are called upon to be leaders every day in their professional lives. Her program operated in different stages for each year of law school. In the first year, the students were assessed and then given simulated situations, officially known as Knowing the Self: Theory and Simulations. In the second year, the course was Knowing/Leading Teams, which meant more simulations and hands-on work with clients in teams. Lastly, in the third year the course was called Knowing/Leading the Organization and the Profession, which was integrated into a capstone experience.

Rivers mentioned four pieces of advice for developing meaningful student leadership education. First, she said that awareness of the sea of change is the first step. Law firms are changing, and so as a school we need to serve the general society. Secondly, she said that when a professor teaches a course on leadership, it should be for credit and count as one of the courses for that professor. Thirdly, she said to allow adjuncts to team-teach a course with a regular faculty member with the idea of emphasizing the leadership skills necessary. Lastly, she posed the question: How to get faculty to recognize that leadership scholarship is scholarship for tenure purposes?

In regards to building leadership education into the curriculum through scholarship and case studies, Rivers strongly suggests a leadership class. She said that each school should make it a curriculum transformation project over the summer; just take the existing syllabi and find out ways to integrate in leadership education. She listed off a few suggestions.

1. Hold a grant funded weekend at a resort for faculty, making sure to give a stipend to each faculty member who attends. Bring in an expert to develop leadership objectives that could be incorporated into syllabi in various courses.
 - a. If it's possible, coordinate the grant retreat weekend with three or four schools, that way you can get a joint- grant.
 - b. Get a foundation to bring clients in, perhaps by video, to tell the faculty what they are looking for in law school graduates.
2. Put up a PowerPoint both during faculty meetings and before a class with a quote that inspires leadership.
3. For the business school, make it mandatory that all freshman take a 2 unit leadership course.
 - a. Law students could be invited to attend some of the lectures.
 - b. Make speakers in the law school aware of the emphasis on leadership. Ask them to address what leadership qualities they think have been most significant in terms of their success.
4. Teaching Global Teams- movie in Business School.
5. Property Stories- leadership issues.
6. Take standard cases from each area and do a handbook on integrating leadership concepts in teaching those cases.
7. Have a leadership journal on-line where students and professors can contribute their own articles. These articles will help add credibility.
8. Start a Leadership Center on law schools' campus.
9. Integrate leadership competencies into clinics and externships.
10. Make sure to ask: Are law faculty comfortable teaching what they do not know and have not lived?
11. Possibly hire a Graduate Fellow to put together a program, hopefully with an internal grant.
12. Find a leadership team within the school to create a plan for the next five or ten years.
13. Make adjunct teaching credible by making sure they know what is needed in a leader.

Leadership Education: Moving Forward

Summary: Small group discussions on issues involved in moving leadership education forward.

Group 1:

- 1. Getting buy-in by faculty and others to develop meaningful student leadership education**
- 2. Building leadership education into the curriculum through scholarship and case studies**

The first point mentioned by Group 1 is the importance of getting a buy-in from faculty and from others to develop meaningful student leadership education. In order to educate the faculty, there needs to be an awareness of the sea of change within legal firms and in terms of what clients are demanding. Law schools are educating lawyers

who are going to serve the general society. One idea the group had was to put a quote from one of the many speeches given at the Roundtable Leadership Conference and project it up on the screen before faculty meetings. The idea is that over time, the faculty will become aware that the legal profession is changing. Also, the group reiterated that when a professor teaches a leadership course, they should receive credit for the course and it should count towards their teaching load. Another idea they mentioned is to have adjunct professors team-teach with other professors, with the goal of incorporating leadership skills into the course. Ideally, this would develop a group of people who are very aware of leadership and who could eventually teach leadership competencies in smaller groups to students. And finally, the group acknowledged that it will take time to get law faculty to recognize that leadership scholarship is scholarship for tenure purposes.

The second point this group discussed are means for building leadership education into the law school curriculum through scholarship and case studies. One idea that they mentioned from the previous discussions was a grant-funded weekend where a skilled expert in law and leadership is brought in to teach law faculty. There would be a stipend provided for each attending faculty member, and universities could even work together to get a joint-grant. The objective of this weekend would be to help faculty members develop leadership objectives that they can incorporate into their syllabi. Another idea was to make sure that when outside lecturers come to the law school, they are made aware of the school's emphasis on leadership. Perhaps each speaker could be asked to address what leadership qualities they think have helped them to be most successful. Another idea the group mentioned for incorporating leadership education into law school curriculum was to get clinics to integrate leadership conversation into their training. Also, the group mentioned the possibility of getting the standard cases in each doctrinal course and developing some sort of study guide which incorporates questions relating to leadership; this is similar to "Property Stories." Another idea mentioned was to get professors to ask, "What could good leadership have done to prevent this dispute?" Lastly, the group said that there should be an intellectual journal where professors and students can publish their own articles on leadership.

Group 2: Building Bridges

1. Building bridges to the legal profession through leadership education

2. What skills should be introduced during law school?

In terms of what skills should be introduced during law school, the group identified that students need to learn how to listen, how to give and receive feedback, and how to speak across cultures, etc. Educators, therefore, should make sure that they and other lecturers are communicating clarity and effectiveness. Secondly, educators should make sure they are educating students to take ownership. For example, when an assignment is presented to students, they answer the questions asked, turn it in, and then consider themselves done. However, in a real life situation the students would be expected to expand upon problems found or difficulties the assignment presented to them. They need to learn to take responsibility and initiative for their own work, and

they need to learn how to handle ambiguity. Educators must make an effort to get them away from the “just tell me what I need to know” mentality.

Thirdly, the group discussed the importance of a leadership and strategies course in which professors teach the rule of professionalism: if you behave badly, it will come back to bite you. In this course, the professors must make sure to focus on skills to make their presentation more effective and to build working relationships. To teach this course, educators should use leaders that are relevant to the students, such as local influential attorneys, who students would have an easier time relating to. Also, teachers should teach students to integrate the leadership skill set into their other courses; thereby instilling the idea that education in law school extends beyond the classroom. An emphasis in legal education should be on teaching the business of law with a focus on accounting. Business is everywhere; therefore it would be very helpful to all lawyers in terms of having fundamental understanding of how all businesses operate.

In general, it is important for students to build bridges with law firms as well as in-house council. They should meet and brainstorm ideas. Also, educators should keep in mind that one size doesn't fit all! It's important to identify different tracks in law school and tailor the training per student to those specific tracks.

Group 3:

1. Developing leadership education resources

2. Creating a consortium in support of leadership education for lawyers

In regards to creating a consortium in support for leadership education, Group 3 discussed developing a method of contact between conferences, possibly using some sort of technology to link them. For example, a link server or the internet could serve as a forum and a resource where conferences such as the Roundtable can post their summaries. This is a good way to keep interested parties involved, even if they can't attend the conferences. They emphasized the importance of technology, globalization, and the role of leadership in developing resources that can be available to everyone.

In closing:

Everyone who attended the conference has the responsibility to go back to their universities and institutions and be leaders themselves.