



2007 Pro Bono Institute Law Firm Pro Bono ChallengeSM Results

Executive Summary

Introduction

The Pro Bono Institute's Law Firm Pro Bono ChallengeSM is a unique global aspirational pro bono standard. Developed by law firm leaders and corporate general counsel, the Challenge articulates a single, unitary standard for one key segment of the legal profession - the world's largest law firms. Major law firms that become Signatories to the Challenge acknowledge their institutional, firm-wide commitment to provide pro bono legal services to low income and disadvantaged individuals and families and non-profit groups. The Challenge includes an accountability mechanism and an outcome measurement tool through its annual reporting requirement. The following is an executive summary of the 2007 Challenge statistics reported by Challenge Signatories and compiled by the Law Firm Pro Bono Project.

ChallengeSM Performance

“Striving to meet the goals of the Law Firm Pro Bono ChallengeSM, a national aspirational pro bono standard, 135 of the nation’s largest law firms provided almost 1,600,000 hours in donated legal services to the poor and disadvantaged and charitable organizations in 1995, the first year of the Challenge.”

That was the opening paragraph of the Executive Summary issued by the Pro Bono Institute in 1995, when it announced the amount of pro bono legal services contributed by PBI Challenge Signatory law firms in the first year of implementation of the Challenge. Between 1995 and 2007 there have been substantial changes in the size, culture,

management, economics, and staffing of major law firms but arguably one of the most notable changes is the amount and nature of pro bono services performed by these firms. In 2007 (the most recent year for which annual statistics are available) 135 of the nation's largest law firms provided a total of 4,285,684 hours in pro bono legal services – a 170% increase over the 1,584,537 hours donated in 1995. Thirteen firms, slightly under 10% of all Challenge firms, did not report their 2007 numbers in time to be included in this summary.

In addition to establishing progressive benchmarks – 3 or 5% of total billable hours – for overall pro bono participation, the Challenge also asks firms to devote a majority of their pro bono time to persons of limited means or to “charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental and educational organizations in matters which are designed primarily to address the needs of persons of limited means.” In 2007, firms donated 2,756,330 hours of pro bono service to individuals of limited means or organizations serving them, 64% of total pro bono hours. This reflects an increase of more than 161% from 1995, when Signatory firms donated 1,052,806 hours to persons of limited means.

Not only have the number of hours donated by firms grown dramatically but the number of lawyers providing those hours of pro bono service has increased as well. In 1995, 7,270 partners and 10,504 associates (a total of 17,774) participated in the provision of pro bono legal services. In 2007, 17,514 partners and 29,638 associates (a total of 46,798) participated – a substantial 163% increase in participation. Some of the increase in participation is due to the growth in headcount at the participating firms, but that factor does not wholly account for the growth in participation. While there is no specific data available to date on the proportion of pro bono services being provided in litigation-

related versus transactional matters, anecdotally the upsurge in non-litigation pro bono is impressive.

The Law Firm Pro Bono ChallengeSM, developed by law firm leaders and corporate general counsel, articulates a single standard for one critical segment of the legal profession –firms ranging in size from 50 to over 3500 lawyers. The Challenge has become the definitive aspirational pro bono standard for large law firms throughout the world. It is unique for several reasons:

- It uses a progressive standard – i.e., a target of either 3 or 5 percent of a firm’s billable hours (equivalent to 60 or 100 hours per attorney) which ties pro bono performance to firm productivity and profitability.
- It calls for an institutional commitment, rather than an individual lawyer goal, in recognition of the reality that the policies and practices of law firms are key to the ability and willingness of firm lawyers to undertake pro bono work.
- It creates goals not only with respect to the amount of pro bono work to be undertaken, but also with regard to the structural and policy elements that are essential for the creation and maintenance of a pro bono-friendly firm culture.
- It links Challenge firms to the extensive technical assistance resources available from the Pro Bono Institute and its Law Firm Pro Bono Project.

- It includes an accountability mechanism and an outcome measurement through its annual reporting requirement.

This year, for the first time, 55% or 74 of the Challenge Signatory firms met or exceeded their commitment to the Challenge; indeed, 11 firms surpassed their goal by more than 2%. This is a substantial improvement over 1995 when 23% of the firms exceeded their goals. Of the remaining firms who reported, 14 firms or 10% came within .5% of their goal, while 47 firms failed to reach their 3 or 5% goal by a factor of 1% or more.

In addition to the statistical information that Challenge firms are required to report, the firms also provide certain supplemental information, including an optional question regarding their financial contributions to legal services organizations. In 1996 (the first year in which this information is available), 81 firms reported that they had donated a total of \$6,800,902 to legal services organizations. In 2007, donations reported by 87 firms rose to \$30,415,616.

While statistics are clearly an important measurement tool, the ChallengeSM is not limited to quantifiable goals. Rather, it provides a framework, set of expectations, and operational and policy elements that are the key to major law firms' ability to institutionalize and strengthen the culture and operations of their pro bono programs.

Since the inception of the Challenge, the Pro Bono Institute has worked with law firms to promulgate pro bono policies, enhance their relationships with public interest, legal services, pro bono programs and other groups, including the courts and public legal agencies, improve the oversight and staffing of the firm's pro bono work, design and

implement pro bono partnerships with corporate legal departments, improve processes for planning and evaluating pro bono efforts, create more accurate time-keeping mechanisms, incorporate a number of innovative pro bono models – including signature projects, rotation/externship programs, global efforts, integration with other firm goals including professional development, diversity, and associate satisfaction, and more, and successfully encouraged many firms to expand the breadth and depth of their pro bono docket. Most recently, the Challenge’s success in enhancing pro bono culture and performance has led our sister project, Corporate Pro Bono, a joint initiative of the Association of Corporate Counsel and the Pro Bono Institute, to launch the Corporate Pro Bono ChallengeSM in 2005.

With only minimal changes required in the language and principles of the Challenge since its creation, the Law Firm Pro Bono Challenge has become the industry “gold standard” by which firms define, measure, and assess their pro bono achievements. It has also become a rallying point and a catalyst that enable firms to contribute meaningfully to their local communities, to the national justice system, and to communities around the world despite economic cycles and other pressures. We thank and congratulate the 135 Challenge Signatory Firms whose commitment to pro bono is reflected in this report, and we look forward to reporting even greater levels of performance and achievement for 2008.

*Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
Alston & Bird LLP
*Arent Fox LLP
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
Arnall Golden Gregory LLP
*Arnold & Porter LLP
Baker & Daniels LLP
Baker & McKenzie

Baker Botts L.L.P.
Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Beveridge & Diamond PC
*Bingham McCutchen LLP
Blank Rome LLP
Briggs and Morgan, PA
Brown Rudnick LLP
*Bryan Cave LLP

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
*Carlton Fields, P.A.
Carrington, Coleman, Sloman
& Blumenthal, L.L.P.
Chadbourne & Parke LLP
*Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP
Coblentz, Patch, Duffy, and Bass LLP
Cohen, Milstein, Hausfeld
& Toll, P.L.L.C.
Cooley Godward Kronish LLP
*Covington & Burling LLP
Cozen O'Connor
Crowell & Moring LLP
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
Day Pitney LLP
*Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
Dechert LLP
Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP
Dickstein Shapiro LLP
*DLA Piper
*Dorsey & Whitney LLP
Dow Lohnes PLLC
*Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP
Dykema Gossett PLLC
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
Faegre & Benson LLP
Farella Braun + Martel LLP
Fenwick & West LLP
Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett
& Dunner, L.L.P.
Foley & Lardner LLP
Foley Hoag LLP
Foster Pepper PLLC
*Fredrikson & Byron P.A.
Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver
& Jacobson LLP
Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.
*Garvey Schubert Barer
*Gibbons P.C.
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
Goodwin Procter LLP
Goulston & Storrs PC
Graves, Dougherty, Hearon
& Moody, P.C.
*Heller Ehrman LLP
*Hogan & Hartson LLP

*Holland & Knight LLP
Howard Rice Nemerovski Canady Falk
& Rabkin
Hughes Hubbard & Reed LLP
*Hunton & Williams LLP
Husch Blackwell Sanders LLP
*Jenner & Block LLP
Kaye Scholer LLP
K&L Gates
Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
King & Spalding LLP
Washington, DC Office Only
Kirkland & Ellis LLP
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
Latham & Watkins LLP
Leonard, Street and Deinard
Lindquist & Vennum PLLP
Linklaters LLP
New York Office Only
Loeb & Loeb LLP
Lowenstein Sandler PC
Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP
Maslon Edelman Borman & Brand, LLP
Mayer Brown LLP
McCarter & English, LLP
McDermott Will & Emery
McGuireWoods LLP
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
*Miller, Canfield, Paddock
and Stone, P.L.C.
Miller & Chevalier Chartered
Miller Nash LLP
Mintz Levin Cohn Ferris Glosky
and Popeo P.C.
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
*Morrison & Foerster LLP
*Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP
*Nelson Mullins Riley
& Scarborough LLP
Nixon Peabody LLP
Nutter McClennen & Fish LLP
O'Melveny & Myers LLP
Oppenheimer Wolff & Donnelly LLP
*Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler LLP
Patton Boggs

Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP
*Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton
& Garrison LLP
Pepper Hamilton LLP
Perkins Coie LLP
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
*Proskauer Rose LLP
Quarles & Brady LLP
*Reed Smith LLP
Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi L.L.P.
Robinson & Cole LLP
Saul Ewing LLP
Schiff Hardin LLP
Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP
*Shearman & Sterling LLP
*Shipman & Goodwin LLP
Sidley Austin LLP
Simpson Thacher & Bartlett LLP
*Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher
& Flom LLP
Smith, Gambrell & Russell, LLP
Snell & Wilmer L.L.P.
*Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP

*Steptoe & Johnson LLP
Strasburger & Price, LLP
Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP
Thompson Coburn LLP
Tyler Cooper & Alcorn, LLP
*Venable LLP
Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP
White & Case LLP
Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP
Wiley Rein LLP
*Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale
and Dorr LLP
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati
*Winston & Strawn LLP
Womble Carlyle Sandridge
& Rice, PLLC
Zuckerman Spaeder LLP

The following firms did not report in 2007 because it was their first year of participation in the Challenge. We look forward to including their data in next year's report.

Barnes & Thornburg LLP
Boult, Cummings, Connors & Berry, PLC
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Troutman Sanders LLP
Williams & Connolly LLP

These firms did not report in 2007:

Bass, Berry & Sims PLC
*Cummings & Lockwood LLC
*Holland & Hart LLP
Howrey LLP
Locke Lord Bissell & Liddell LLP
McKenna Long & Aldridge LLP
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP

Robinson, Bradshaw & Hinson, P.A.
Rodey, Dickason, Sloan, Akin
& Robb, P.A.
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt
Sheehan Phinney Bass + Green PA
Van Cott, Bagley, Cornwall
& McCarthy

* denotes Charter Signatories to the Challenge