

Widener University Delaware Law School

From the Selected Works of Michael J. Slinger

Spring 2015

The Career Path, Education, and Activities of Academic Law Library Directors Revisited Twenty-Five Years Later

Michael J. Slinger

Sarah C. Slinger, *Widener University Delaware Law School*



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/michael_slinger/12/

The Career Path, Education, and Activities of Academic Law Library Directors Revisited Twenty-Five Years Later*

Michael J. Slinger** and Sarah C. Slinger***

This comprehensive study of the education, experiences, and activities of sitting academic law library directors in 2012 compares current findings with Michael Slinger's previously published 1986 study: The Career Paths and Education of Current Academic Law Library Directors, 80 LAW LIBR. J. 217 (1988).

[The law librarian] must command the respect of those with whom he associates constantly, through his ability, intelligence, and knowledge, legally, culturally and scholarly, and through his ability as a librarian to make the law library an effective educational instrument.

Harry Bitner¹

Contrary to popular opinion, directors do not sit in their offices all day, dreaming up ideas to keep everyone else in the library busy. In reality, an academic law library director is running a multimillion-dollar, not-for-profit service organization. Our law libraries are pretty sizeable businesses that require solid administrative abilities as well as the talents that are necessary for achievement in an academic environment.

Janis L. Johnston²

Introduction	177
How We Conducted the Research	178
General Information	179
General Information Profile	179
Master of Library Science Degree or Graduate Level Equivalent Awarded	180

* © Michael J. Slinger and Sarah C. Slinger, 2015. The authors wish to thank acting Dean Erin Daly of Widener University's Delaware Law School for awarding Michael Slinger a sabbatical leave to undertake this study. We also wish to thank University of Arizona Law Library Director Michael Chiorazzi and Abigail Leigh Deese, a recent law library fellow at the University of Arizona Law Library, for unselfishly providing us with their information from a similar research project. We thank Mary Marzolla, Maggie Stewart Adams, and Marge Gubitosa of the Widener University Delaware Law Library for their assistance. The authors also express their gratitude to Cheryl Blaney-Slinger and Rebecca Slinger for their support and encouragement. We also wish to thank all of the law school library directors who provided us with information for this study.

** Associate Dean, Director of the Legal Information Center & Professor of Law, Widener University Delaware Law School, Wilmington, Delaware.

*** Juris Doctor Candidate, Widener University Delaware Law School, Wilmington, Delaware.

1. Harry A. Bitner, *The Educational Background of the University's Law Librarian*, 40 LAW LIBR. J. 49, 52 (1947).

2. Janis L. Johnston et al., *Rebuilding the Profession: Recommendations for Librarians Interested in Becoming Academic Law Library Directors*, 99 LAW LIBR. J. 101, 104, 2007 LAW LIBR. J. 6, ¶ 11.

Juris Doctor Degree 181

Law Degree Awarded Before M.L.S. Degree..... 182

Other Advanced Degrees 182

Member of a State Bar 183

Experience Prior to First Directorship 183

 Years of Professional Law Library Experience Prior to First
 Permanent Directorship 183

Number of Professional Law Library Positions Prior to First
 Directorship 184

Law Library Title Immediately Prior to First Directorship 184

Public Services or Technical Services Experience 185

Geographic Moves Prior to First Directorship 186

Working as a Professional Librarian While Attending Law School 186

Law Library Left Immediately Prior to First Directorship 187

Professional Experience in a Non-Law School Law Library Prior
 to First Directorship 187

Non-Law Library Professional Library Experience Prior to
 First Directorship..... 188

Law Practice Experience Prior to First Directorship..... 188

Internal Promotion to First Directorship..... 188

Courses Taught Prior to First Directorship 189

Experience and Activities on Attainment of Directorship 189

 Was First Directorship Acting or Interim 189

 Age Upon First Permanent Directorship 190

 Number of Years at First Directorship 190

 Total Number of Directorships 191

 Average Number of Years as Director..... 192

 Age of Sitting Director in 2012 192

 Years at Current Directorship 193

Status and Activities of Current Directors 193

 Current Academic Rank on the Law Faculty..... 193

 Holds Title of Associate Dean or Equivalent..... 195

 Responsibility for Technology in the Law School 195

 Courses Taught as Director 196

 Publications..... 197

Comparisons 199

 1986 Composite of the Average Academic Law Library Director 199

 2012 Composite of the Average Academic Law Library Director 200

 Notable Differences Between the 1986 and 2012 Studies..... 200

Conclusion..... 202

Tables 203

Introduction³

¶1 In 1986, I was a relative newcomer to the profession of law librarianship having been employed full-time as an academic law librarian for just two years. Despite my inexperience, I had already set a goal for myself of someday becoming the director of a law school library. I wished to embrace the challenge of leadership in my chosen profession and join the ranks of the law faculty, but had very little idea what I needed to do to accomplish this goal.

¶2 In attempting to find answers that would inform my future professional activities in support of becoming a director, I searched the existing literature but did not find much overall guidance.⁴ I decided people with similar ambitions would benefit from a serious and comprehensive study of the education, skills, experiences, and duties that transform one into a candidate that a law school would want to hire as its law library director. With the encouragement of my then director Roger Jacobs, I undertook just such a study. I crafted my research into an article that was chosen as one of the winning entries in the 1987 AALL *Call for Papers* competition and was then published in *Law Library Journal*.⁵ The article was well received by colleagues and was even read by law school deans. Some of these deans also contacted me to ask questions about the findings.

¶3 For years after I published the study, colleagues often asked me whether I was going to update the article.⁶ I always intended to do a follow-up study but found my own career path, which has included the directorship at three law school libraries, left me with insufficient time to focus on a new study.

3. Introduction written by Michael J. Slinger.

4. Articles published prior to my original study that contained useful information include James F. Bailey & Matthew F. Dee, *Law School Libraries: Survey Relating to Autonomy and Faculty Status*, 67 LAW LIBR. J. 3 (1974); Bitner, *supra* note 1; Connie E. Bolden, *Educational and Experience Backgrounds of College and University Law Librarians*, 57 LAW LIBR. J. 58 (1964); Donald J. Dunn, *The Law Librarian's Obligation to Publish*, 75 LAW LIBR. J. 225 (1982); Frank G. Houdek, *Career Development in Law Librarianship: Thoughts on the Occasion of Becoming a Law Library Director*, LEGAL REFERENCE SERVICES Q., Fall/Winter 1986, at 81; Arthur S. McDaniel, *The Educational and Cultural Background of a Law Librarian*, 23 LAW LIBR. J. 68 (1930); Kathleen Price & Nancy Kitchen, *Degree-Oriented Study Among Law Librarians*, 64 LAW LIBR. J. 29 (1971); Miles O. Price, *The Law School Librarian's Educational Qualifications: A Statistical Study*, 10 J. LEGAL EDUC. 222 (1957); William R. Roalfe, *Status and Qualifications of Law School Librarians*, 8 AM. L. SCH. REV. 398 (1936).

5. Michael J. Slinger, *The Career Paths and Education of Current Academic Law Library Directors*, 80 LAW LIBR. J. 217 (1988).

6. A number of articles discussing some of the relevant aspects related to the career paths of academic law library directors include Rhea Ballard-Thrower, Dwight King & Grace M. Mills, *Profiling Minority Law Librarians: An Update*, 101 LAW LIBR. J. 267, 2009 LAW LIBR. J. 16; Carol Bredemeyer, *What Do Directors Do?*, 96 LAW LIBR. J. 317, 2004 LAW LIBR. J. 20; Richard A. Danner, *Managing the Law Library in the 1990s*, 81 LAW LIBR. J. 181 (1989); Jonathan A. Franklin, *Why Let Them Go? Retaining Experienced Librarians by Creating Challenging Internal Career Paths: Introducing the "Executive Librarian"*, 88 LAW LIBR. J. 352 (1996); Christopher J. Hoeppepner, *Trends in Compensation of Academic Law Librarians, 1971-91*, 85 LAW LIBR. J. 185 (1993); Susan P. Liemer, *The Hierarchy of Law School Faculty Meetings: Who Votes?*, 73 UMKC L. REV. 351 (2004-2005); Katherine E. Malmquist, *Academic Law Librarians Today: Survey of Salary and Position Information*, 85 LAW LIBR. J. 135 (1993); Tim Matheson, *Career Paths and Education of Academic Law Library Directors in the Southeast*, SOUTHEASTERN LAW LIBR., Spring 1990, at 8; James Milles, *New Career Paths: From Computing Services to Library Director*, AALL SPECTRUM, Nov. 2002, at 14.

¶4 However, several things recently came together enabling me the time and motivation to finally undertake and complete a new study. These included:

1. Many of the duties, and even the status, of the academic law library director have changed significantly since the original study. Finding out with certainty exactly what those changes are will help to determine how they have (and will) impact the director position.
2. My employer, Widener University Delaware Law School, was willing to grant me a semester-long sabbatical to undertake the research.⁷
3. My daughter and coauthor, Sarah Slinger, was in the process of completing her second year as a law student at Widener and is planning a career as a professional law librarian. I very much wanted to include her as my co-researcher/author with the ultimate goal of her continuing to update this study after I retire.⁸

¶5 In conducting this new study, our goal is to provide useful information to the profession and guidance to future law library directors. We also think that by examining the director position we can provide a window into how the profession of academic law librarianship is evolving. Some of the changes we uncovered we see as positive. However, other changes are of concern, including an emerging trend at some institutions to remove full faculty status from the director. This is alarming to those of us who think retaining full partnership with the law faculty is crucial for the future effectiveness of the law library.

How We Conducted the Research

¶6 The original study relied exclusively on published information found in two resources:

1. *Directory of Law Teachers, 1986–1987* (West Publishing Co. and Foundation Press Inc.).
2. *American Association of Law Libraries Biographical Directory* (West Publishing Co. 1984).

¶7 One of the advantages of using these sources in 1986 was that both directories contained such substantial career information about those who were directors that there was no need to look for additional sources. However, when we began our research in 2014 with the *Directory of Law Teachers 2011–2012*,⁹ we discovered that the information we could glean from this publication concerning each director was in many cases now incomplete. Many directors only partially completed the infor-

7. One of the best perks of obtaining a position that includes full membership on the law faculty is to be granted the opportunity to occasionally apply for a sabbatical leave to conduct research.

8. Although my retirement is not imminent, it would make me quite happy to see this study continue well into the future.

9. We decided to conduct our research by examining those who served in 2012 as law library directors at ABA accredited law schools. We picked 2012 because it was the most recent year in which the *Directory of Law Teachers* had been published.

mation categories requested by the *Directory*. Some provided nothing more than their names and places of employment. In addition, we discovered a phenomenon not encountered in 1986; a significant number of directors were not included in the *Directory* at all. This was probably due to a status issue that was not present when the 1986 study was completed, that is, because their position no longer holds a faculty appointment with the law faculty.

¶8 In addition, because the *American Association of Law Libraries Biographical Directory* was no longer being published, it could not be used in our new study. However, the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) now offers an online directory of membership information on their AALLNET site that, although somewhat sporadically completed by many members, was a useful substitute.

¶9 Unfortunately, even with access to these tools, we were not very far into our research before we discovered gaps in the information we were seeking for many of the directors. We then turned to the Internet to find the additional information we needed about the directors. The wealth of information found on the Internet enabled us to gather more complete information using a wider variety of sources than was available in the 1986 study. We found the website of each employing law school to be particularly useful because it often provided relevant biographical information about its law library director. Providentially, we found many of the directors' complete resumes on their law school websites.

¶10 The discovery of these online resumes made us realize how much more complete our information would be if we had the resume of every director in hand. Therefore, we contacted via e-mail every director whose resume we did not yet have and asked him or her to supply us with a vitae. Validating that our profession is filled with great colleagues, the vast majority of directors who were asked did promptly provide us with their resume.

¶11 The results of all of our information-gathering efforts are that we were able to investigate many of the categories more comprehensively than in the original 1986 study.

¶12 A major difference in how we approached the new study is that the 1986 study gave us a baseline to compare its data with our new research. By doing this, we were able to discover how each of the categories had evolved since 1986. For example, by examining gender differences in each 2012 category, we could observe whether female directors made any significant strides since 1986.

¶13 It is our hope that by providing a true analysis of the data we will eliminate the need to rely on anecdotes or speculation. We think our study will assist the profession in understanding and addressing important trends that in turn will help determine the future direction of academic law librarianship.

General Information

General Information Profile

¶14 In 1986, there were 173 American Bar Association (ABA) accredited law schools in the United States. By 2012, the number of ABA accredited law schools had increased to 203.

¶15 Despite our efforts to search as comprehensively as we could for information about each sitting director, it was not possible to include all 203 directors in the study. As was the case in 1986, we omitted from the study any director who did not hold a *permanent* position as law library director in 2012.¹⁰ In other words, those holding acting or interim titles were excluded from this study. Additionally, we were forced to exclude a relatively small number of permanent directors because we were unable to find sufficient information about them in numerous categories.¹¹ We also excluded two directors because they are not professional librarians but rather full-time teaching professors who have been given the title of library director by their institutions.¹²

¶16 The 1986 study included 160 directors representing 92% of all ABA accredited law schools. In 2012, we were able to find complete information for 177 directors representing 87% of all ABA accredited law schools. (See table 1.)

¶17 In 1986, 98 of the directors or 61% of all directors in the study were males. In 2012, there were 87 male directors representing 49% of directors in the study: a decrease of 12%.

¶18 Reflective of the overall decrease of male directors is the corresponding significant increase in female directors. In the 1986 study, 62 women represented 39% of all directors. In 2012, the 90 women included in the study constituted 51% of all directors: an increase of 12%.

¶19 The fact that women now constitute a majority of academic law library directors is a substantial change from the 1986 study and may indicate markedly increased opportunities for women in the field now and in the future.

¶20 It is interesting to note, only 28 of the directors (16%) who were included in the 1986 study continued to hold the position of director in 2012. This demonstrates that during the past twenty-five years most director positions became vacant and were filled by those who were not directors in 1986.

Master of Library Science Degree or Graduate Level Equivalent Awarded

¶21 In the 1986 study, 92% of all directors held the M.L.S. degree or equivalent. In 2012, this increased to 100% of all directors, signifying that holding a professional library degree became *de facto* mandatory. (See table 2.)

¶22 The 1986 study proved that one could become an academic law library director by obtaining an M.L.S. degree from *any* American Library Association (ALA) accredited program. In 1986, directors obtained an M.L.S. degree from 45 different programs. This trend continued in 2012, with directors earning their M.L.S. degree from 52 different programs.¹³

10. The law school libraries with acting or interim directors in 2012 were Charlotte, Denver, District of Columbia, Faulkner, Florida A&M, Gonzaga, Hamline, Harvard, Maine, Northwestern, Santa Clara, Thomas Jefferson, Tulsa, USC, Western State, West Virginia, and Willamette. Also excluded was the Judge Advocate General School because it does not award J.D. degrees.

11. These directors were from Barry, California–Davis, John Marshall (Illinois), Liberty, Loyola–Chicago, Massachusetts School of Law, and Regent.

12. These directors were from Iowa and Seton Hall.

13. This shows that whatever program one chooses to attend to earn an M.L.S. degree is not a significant factor for gaining employment as a director. An interesting fact is that although there were

¶23 Despite the fact that a director may choose to obtain his or her M.L.S. from any one of a number of accredited programs, in 2012, as was the case in 1986, one program does stand out as a principal educator of academic law library directors. The University of Washington's Master of Law Librarianship Program continues to set the standard by producing the highest number of academic law library directors. In 1986, Washington was the M.L.I.S. alma mater of 21 directors. In 2012, the number of its graduates who serve as academic law library directors increased to 25.

¶24 Other programs¹⁴ providing the M.L.S. to multiple directors in the 2012 study included the University of Illinois (13 directors), University of Michigan (11 directors), Indiana University–Bloomington (9 directors), and Simmons College (8 directors).¹⁵

Juris Doctor Degree

¶25 Until the ABA promulgated the 2014–2015 changes to its *Standards for Legal Education*, academic law library directors were mandated to hold both law and library science degrees.¹⁶ However, new Standard 603(c) does not require any specific education but rather states a law library director “*shall have appropriate academic qualifications*.”¹⁷ The new standard will likely result in some law schools choosing to hire a law library director who does not possess the educational requirements for a faculty appointment.¹⁸ Over time this new standard may lead to the weakening of full faculty status for law library directors.¹⁹

¶26 The 2012 study makes clear that academic law library directors are overwhelmingly required by their employers to hold a U.S. Juris Doctor, with 98% of directors possessing this degree. (See table 3.) This was an increase of 9% (89% of directors held J.D. degrees in 1986).²⁰

fewer ALA accredited M.L.S. programs in 2012 than in 1986, directors in the new study graduated from even more M.L.S. programs. This demonstrates flexibility on the part of hiring committees in evaluating the library science credentials of candidates.

14. See table 2 for a list of all other M.L.S. programs that produced one or more directors.

15. In addition to the University of Washington, the University of Arizona, Catholic University and the University of Texas specifically offer programs that educate future law librarians. Also, a number of other programs offer the opportunity to obtain a joint J.D./M.L.S. degree.

16. The previous standard stated: “A director of a law library should have a law degree and a degree in library or information science and shall have a sound knowledge of and experience in library administration.” AM. BAR ASS’N, 2013–2014 ABA STANDARDS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR LAW SCHOOLS 46 (2013) (Standard 603(c)).

17. “A director of a law library shall have appropriate academic qualifications and shall have knowledge of and experience in law library administration sufficient to support the program of legal education and to enable the law school to operate in compliance with the Standards.” AM. BAR ASS’N, 2014–2015 ABA STANDARDS AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR LAW SCHOOLS 40 (2014) (Standard 603(c)).

18. A J.D. degree is mandatory for a faculty appointment at virtually every ABA accredited law school.

19. Even under the previous standard, several law schools hired or appointed law library directors who lacked one or both of the required educational credentials. This has apparently not resulted in the ABA imposing sanctions.

20. Also of note, the number of directors holding foreign law degrees decreased from 8 in 1986 to 3 directors in 2012.

¶27 In contrast to the dominance of the University of Washington's M.L.S. Program in producing law library directors, there is no equivalent law school educating such a large number of directors.²¹ Ninety-eight individual law schools provided a J.D. to one or more directors in 1986 and 94 individual law schools supplied directors in the 2012 study. In 2012, 41 schools produced two or more directors, while 57 schools produced only a single director.

Law Degree Awarded Before M.L.S. Degree

¶28 The order in which a director receives his or her J.D. and M.L.S. degree may point to a person's initial career orientation. In other words, did one begin his or her career initially as a librarian and later decide to undergo legal training, or did he or she first aspire to be a lawyer, but after obtaining legal training decided to transition into law librarianship?

¶29 Attracting candidates to the law library profession as a first choice is traditionally somewhat difficult because law librarianship as a career is relatively unknown to the majority of persons who seek a J.D. degree. Therefore, for many directors, law librarianship once discovered becomes a second career choice. Our study affirms this point because, in 2012, 62% of the directors obtained their J.D. first, while only 35% earned the M.L.S. degree first. An additional 3% earned J.D. and M.L.S. degrees concurrently.²² Only 2 of the directors in the 2012 study did not hold a J.D. degree. (See table 4.)

¶30 The 2012 study represents a significant increase of 13% in J.D. first degrees from the 1986 study (49% to 62%). An examination by gender indicates in 2012 far more males earned their J.D. first with 75% doing so. In a comparison by gender, only 48% of females earned their J.D. first, a male-female difference of 27%. In the 1986 study, 65% of males earned their J.D. first, but only 24% of females did so.²³ This was a remarkable increase in 2012 of females who earn their J.D. first, doubling the percentage in the 1986 study.

¶31 The large gender disparity in this category seems to indicate that far more males select law librarianship as their second career than do females. In other words, many more female directors start their professional lives as librarians rather than as lawyers.

Other Advanced Degrees

¶32 Considering the time, effort, and expense required to earn both a J.D. degree and an M.L.S. degree, it is probably not surprising that the majority of law library directors end their formal education after the receipt of those two degrees.

21. Interestingly, the University of Washington also leads in the number of directors (6) who hold a J.D. from its university. Other schools providing the most directors with the J.D. degree are University of Michigan and University of North Carolina (5 each); and Indiana University–Bloomington, University of Mississippi, and Washburn University (4 each). Only Indiana University–Bloomington is represented as a leading provider of J.D.s for directors in both the 1986 and 2012 studies.

22. Those choosing to earn both the J.D. and M.L.S. degree concurrently may be among the few to make a deliberate choice to immediately embark on a career as a law librarian.

23. In 1986, only 2 directors earned J.D. and M.L.S. degrees concurrently.

¶33 The position of law library director is part of an academic profession that attracts lifelong learners. As the duties and responsibility of a director have become more sophisticated and challenging, directors have increasingly participated in continuing education and a number have sought additional graduate degrees.

¶34 In 2012, 36 (20%) of the directors had obtained an additional graduate degree beyond the M.L.S. and J.D. Six of these directors earned more than one additional graduate degree. This data is consistent with the numbers from the 1986 study in which 28 directors or 18% had earned additional graduate degrees. (See table 5.)

¶35 An examination by gender demonstrates similar numbers between the 1986 and 2012 studies. In 1986, 23% of males and 9% of females earned additional graduate degrees. In 2012, the numbers were 28% for males and 13% for females. We note that male directors earned additional graduate degrees at a much higher rate than do females in both the 2012 and 1986 studies.

Member of a State Bar

¶36 Membership in a state bar is not a requirement for employment as a law library director. Nonetheless, a majority of directors in both the 1986 and 2012 studies hold membership in a state bar. In 1986, 73% of directors held membership, by 2012 bar membership decreased to 70%. (See table 6.)

¶37 An examination by gender shows that in 2012 males held a slight increase over their female counterparts in bar membership with 75% of males and 71% of females holding bar membership. In the 1986 study, 80% of males and 63% of females held bar membership. Therefore, we note in 2012 a 5% decrease in bar membership among males, and an 8% increase among female directors.

¶38 We speculate that the smaller number of female directors who are members of state bars may reflect the fact that many more females than males obtain their M.L.S. degree before their J.D. degree. Since most of these individuals are not seeking careers in legal practice, they possibly do not consider bar membership to be critical to their future career plans.

Experience Prior to First Directorship

Years of Professional Law Library Experience Prior to First Permanent Directorship

¶39 The 2012 study revealed a major difference in this category. In the 1986 study it took an average of only 5 years of professional law library experience for a person to obtain his or her first permanent directorship. (See table 7.) By 2012, the average number of years of experience required had doubled to 10. We think this reflects at least two factors: (1) increased sophistication in the duties of a law library director now requiring additional years of experience and training; and (2) a higher level of competition for a directorship in 2012 due to the presence of significantly more qualified individuals holding both a J.D. and M.L.S. degree than was the case in 1986.

¶40 Gender comparison for 2012 indicates males average 9 years of experience while females average 10 years of experience. In 1986, the figures were males averaging 4 years and females averaging 6 years of experience.

Number of Professional Law Library Positions Prior to First Directorship

¶41 An academic law library director leads an organization that requires him or her to exercise significant supervisory, technical, and academic responsibilities. To prepare for these responsibilities, one normally first works in a subordinate role at one or more law school libraries. Reflective of the increased sophistication and talents required to successfully accomplish the duties of a director, the number of individuals who achieved their first permanent directorship without having prior work experience in a law school library position declined from 18% (28 directors) in 1986 to 4% (7 directors) in 2012.²⁴ (See table 8.)

¶42 In working toward their first directorships, the vast majority of directors (97% in 2012, 82% in 1986) had prior experience in one or more law school libraries. In both 1986 and 2012, the greatest number of directors (39%) had worked for only one previous law school library employer.

¶43 In the 2012 study, 35% had worked for two previous law school library employers. This was an increase of 7% over the 1986 study (28%).

¶44 Sixteen percent of directors in the 2012 study worked for 3 law school library employers prior to achieving their first permanent directorship, a 2% increase from 1986 (14%). Six percent of directors in 2012 had worked for 4 previous law school library employers, a 5% increase over the previous study (1%).²⁵ We found that gender differences in 2012 are unremarkable in this category.

¶45 We also analyzed this data to determine whether we could identify if the previous employing law school libraries point to a pattern in which certain employers prove to be more successful in preparing or promoting their staff for future directorships. In the 2012 study, we found that current directors had previously worked for 126 different law schools.²⁶ However, the top 14 previous law school employers had employed 54% of all directors.²⁷ We conclude from this data that some law school libraries can indeed be identified as “feeders” that more often produce future directors.

Law Library Title Immediately Prior to First Directorship

¶46 While all directorships require an individual to possess many diverse talents, the core function of a director is to serve as an administrator. Accordingly, it

24. By 2012, it had become extremely uncommon for an individual to be hired as a law school library director without prior working experience in another law school library. We wonder whether the change in educational requirements in the new ABA Standard 603(c) will reverse this trend.

25. A single director held positions with 6 previous law school library employers in 2012.

26. Seventy-eight law schools produced 2 or more directors. Forty-eight law school libraries produced a single future director.

27. The University of Texas had the highest number of directors as previous employees with 13. They were followed by Duke University and Georgetown University with 9 directors each; Columbia University with 8 directors; Nova Southeastern University and University of Toledo with 7; Georgia State University and Lewis & Clark University with 6 each; and New York Law School, Louisiana State University, University of Southern California, University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, and University of North Carolina each with 5 directors.

is logical to expect that hiring committees will seek out individuals who have some level of demonstrated administrative experience and expertise in their previous employment. Those holding senior administrative titles such as associate director, deputy director, or assistant director will, therefore, constitute the majority of those moving into permanent director positions. In 2012, 68% of all directors held one of these administrative titles immediately prior to assuming their first permanent directorships. This was an increase of 9% from the 1986 study (59%). (See table 9.)

¶47 The largest increase in the number of directors ascending from a specific administrative title came from those who previously held the title of associate or deputy director. In 1986, only 26% of directors had moved immediately to a directorship from one of these titles. However, by 2012 those immediately moving from these titles constituted 58% of all directors, an increase of nearly a third (32%).

¶48 We also saw a significant decrease in 2012 among those moving from the title of assistant director. In 1986, a third of all directors were elevated from this title, but by 2012 that number had been reduced to only 10% of directors.²⁸

¶49 It remains possible to move to a directorship from a non-senior administrative title, and 32% of directors did so in the 2012 study. Traditionally, the vast majority of directors have come from the public services areas of the law library, possibly due to the prevalence of joint degrees (J.D./M.L.S.) held by these law librarians. The J.D. degree is not a credential typically held by technical services librarians. In 2012, 23% (38 directors) were elevated from public services positions but only 4% (7 directors) from technical services or collection development positions. In the 2012 study we found that a new category of titles emphasizing technology services appeared for some ascending directors. We discovered that 4% (7 directors) were elevated from titles labeled as technology positions. This is identical to the number promoted from technical services/collection development titles.

Public Services or Technical Services Experience

¶50 Below the rank of director, most law librarians specialize in either public services or technical services.²⁹ Traditionally, most directors worked exclusively in the areas of public services before becoming a director. However, the 2012 study revealed that a significant number of directors have had prior experience in both public services and technical services. This is a major change from the 1986 study where only 8% of directors had experience in both areas. By 2012, that number rose to more than a quarter of all directors (26%). (See table 10.) The increase in directors having experience in both specialties may reflect the desire to become a better-rounded candidate for directorship, possessing facility in all aspects of library operations.

¶51 Despite the emergence of a significant number of directors with both public services and technical services experience, in 2012 we found that the majority of directors (73%) have continued to come exclusively from a public services background. It remains unlikely that individuals will become academic law library

28. We found gender numbers to be close in these categories, making the difference unremarkable.

29. More recently, an emerging subspecialty has been in the area of technology services.

directors if they possess only technical services experience since just 1% of directors were elevated with exclusive experience in this area.

Geographic Moves Prior to First Directorship

¶52 Geographic movement from one law library employer to another may reflect the desire to assist career advancement by working in a variety of different professional experiences.

¶53 However, while future directors do indeed move to advance their careers, our study shows these moves are relatively infrequent. In 2012, 132 directors or 75% made one or more moves prior to their first permanent directorship. But the average number of moves, when all directors are included, is only 1.4 moves per director.³⁰ Forty-five individuals or 25% of all directors obtained their first directorship without making any professional moves. (See table 11.)

¶54 Females moved prior to their first permanent directorship only slightly more frequently than their male counterparts, averaging 1.5 moves per female as opposed to 1.3 moves per male.³¹

¶55 Analyzing the number of moves per director in the 2012 study, we found that among those who did move, 30% made 1 move, 25% made 2 moves, 14% made 3 moves, 4% made 4 moves, and 1% made 5 moves.

¶56 In the 1986 study, the average number of moves per director was 1.1, and among those directors who did move, the average was 1.6. The number of directors who never moved prior to obtaining their first permanent directorship was 52 or 33%.

¶57 These numbers led us to conclude that, prior to obtaining their first directorship, future directors' moves are fairly infrequent. Therefore the majority of directors have, at most, experience at one or two law school library employers prior to obtaining their first permanent directorship.

Working as a Professional Librarian While Attending Law School

¶58 We speculate that the results in this category reflect the fact that the majority of directors obtain their law degree before attending library school. Obtaining an M.L.S. degree is the standard requirement to be considered to be a professional librarian in virtually all types of libraries.

¶59 A comparison between the 1986 and 2012 studies reveals similar percentages of directors who worked as professional librarians while attending law school. In 2012, 28% did so, whereas in 1986, 31% did. (See table 12.) More females than males work as professional librarians while attending law school. In 2012, 34% of female directors and 22% of male directors served as professional librarians while attending law school. A comparison between the two studies demonstrates a marked difference. In the 1986 study, 48% or nearly half of female directors had worked as professional librarians while attending law school. However, in the 2012 study only

30. The average number of moves among those directors who actually did move is 1.9.

31. The average number of moves among those directors who actually did move is 1.8 for males and 2 for females.

34% had done so. The male numbers were much less dramatic, with 19% doing so in 1986. That number rose slightly to 22% of males having done so in 2012.

Law Library Left Immediately Prior to First Directorship

¶60 Probably the most important professional experiences garnered before achieving the first permanent directorship are those gained with the employer immediately prior to directorship. The directors in the 2012 study worked at 99 separate law school employers prior to assuming their first permanent directorship.³² This was an increase from the 1986 study in which there were 78 prior employers. (See table 13.) An examination of the identity of these prior employers may answer the question as to whether some employers are more successful than others in seeing their staff members appointed to directorships. In 2012, the top “feeder” employers were Georgetown University with 8 directors, University of Texas with 7 directors, Duke University with 6 directors, and the University of California–Berkeley and the University of North Carolina with 4 each.³³

Professional Experience in a Non-Law School Law Library Prior to First Directorship

¶61 This category explores the question whether it is typical for directors to gain experience in other types of law libraries in addition to their prior academic law library experience.

¶62 In 2012, 42 or 24% of all directors had experience in nonacademic law libraries. This was an 8% increase over the 1986 study. Males and females had an identical 24% rate of this experience in 2012. In 1986, these numbers were 16% for males and 15% for females. (See table 14.) The average number of years of this experience was identical in 2012 and in 1986 (4 years).

¶63 An examination of the type of library employer indicated law firms were the leading employer, with 15 directors having this experience in 2012.³⁴

¶64 These numbers lead us to conclude that although this type of experience is undoubtedly useful, only about a quarter of directors have non-law school law library experience, and to date it does not appear to be an important factor in bur-nishing one’s credentials to help achieve a permanent academic directorship.

32. In addition to the law school employers, two directors came from law firms, one from the National Judicial College Law Library, one from the U.S. Supreme Court Library, and one from a state court library. Three directors did not come from a law library immediately prior to their first permanent directorship.

33. In the 1986 study, the top “feeders” were the University of Texas with 7 directors, Harvard University and the University of Michigan with 5 directors each, Yale University and Villanova University with 4 directors each. Therefore, the University of Texas is the only law library employer to be among the leaders in both the 1986 and 2012 studies.

34. For 2012, county law libraries employed 7 directors, federal law libraries 6 directors, court libraries 5 directors, state law libraries 5 directors, and other private law libraries employed 4 directors. In the 1986 study, county law libraries employed 7 directors, law firm libraries 7 directors, state law libraries 6 directors, federal law libraries 4 directors, bar association libraries 2 directors, corporate law libraries 1 director, legal services libraries 1 director, Library of Congress 1 director, National Judicial College Law Library 1 director, and state court libraries 1 director.

Non-Law Library Professional Library Experience Prior to First Directorship

¶65 Law librarianship is a very distinct specialty. Both the 1986 and 2012 studies show that experience in other types of libraries is not very typical for law library directors. We speculate that having such experience is not considered to be an overly valuable trait in the minds of hiring authorities.

¶66 In 2012, 19% of directors had experience as professionals in non-law school libraries. Although this is not a high number, it is interesting to note that it more than doubles the number of directors with such experience in the 1986 study, where only 8% had non-law school library experience. (See table 15.)

¶67 It is far more typical for female directors to have had experience in non-law libraries. In 2012, 29% of females had this experience versus only 9% of males.³⁵

¶68 The average number of years of professional experience as a non-law librarian was 5 years in 2012 and 6 years in 1986. Males averaged 5 years of experience in 2012 and females 6 years. In 1986, males averaged 4 years and females 8 years of experience.

Law Practice Experience Prior to First Directorship

¶69 Although 70% of directors were members of a state bar, our research revealed that only 40% of directors had legal practice experience. This may indicate that a significant number of directors became members of a state bar without the corresponding desire to practice law. However, it is interesting to note that in the 1986 study only 14% of directors had practice experience.³⁶ (See table 16.)

¶70 In 2012, practice experience averaged 4 years, with males averaging 5 years and females 4 years. In 1986 the average number of years of practice experience was 3 years, with both males and females averaging 3 years.

¶71 We also conclude that, as is the case with most law professors, years of practice experience for directors may be limited due to the corresponding desire to move into the academic world as quickly as possible.

Internal Promotion to First Directorship

¶72 Seeking the opportunity to be elevated to a permanent directorship by one's current employer can be a double-edged sword. While some employers are eager to promote from within, others are adamant in looking for "new blood" to infuse an organization with fresh experiences and enthusiasm.

¶73 The 2012 study shows that approximately one-third (34%) of directors assumed their first permanent directorship as the result of an internal promotion. The gender breakdown is 30% for males and 39% for females.³⁷ (See table 17.)

35. In 1986, the gender breakdown was 11% for females and 6% for males.

36. The small number of directors in 1986 with legal practice experience may partially be a result of a higher number of directors without J.D. degrees and a higher number of directors with foreign law degrees.

37. This category was not included in the 1986 study.

Courses Taught Prior to First Directorship

¶74 Law library directors, like their counterparts on the full-time teaching faculty, are usually required to excel in three areas: (1) scholarship, (2) service, and (3) teaching.³⁸ Therefore, law school hiring authorities do look to determine whether a prospective director has experience, success, and/or potential as a teacher. Therefore, it is to the advantage of the director candidate to have demonstrated prior teaching experience in law school courses. In examining this category, we looked for courses in which the director had primary teaching or coteaching responsibility, and we did not count guest teaching or any informal teaching experiences in this category.

¶75 In the 2012 study, only 31 directors (or 17% of the total) did not teach any law school courses prior to assuming their first permanent directorship. The number of males who did not teach was twice the number of females. Twenty-four percent of all males but only 12% of females did not teach. (See table 18.) Nineteen percent of future directors taught a substantive law course, while 81% taught a research-related course.

¶76 Teaching multiple distinct courses was also examined in our study. We found that prior to their first permanent directorship 8 directors taught two substantive law courses each, one director taught 3 substantive courses, and one taught 4 substantive courses. Thirty-one directors, or 18% of the total, taught multiple distinct research courses.

Experience and Activities on Attainment of Directorship

Was First Directorship Acting or Interim

¶77 On-the-job training with your current employer in the position to which you aspire sounds like an ideal scenario in moving to your first permanent directorship. These internal opportunities are usually accompanied by the title of either acting or interim director. In some instances, these opportunities arise simply because the permanent director is taking a leave of absence, and in these cases an acting or interim experience does not usually lead immediately to a permanent directorship at the same institution.

¶78 On the other hand, acting or interim responsibilities are also often undertaken when the current director leaves his or her position permanently. This creates a true vacancy, which a current staff member is asked to fill until a permanent appointment is made. In either scenario, the acting or interim director gains extremely valuable experience by assuming the duties of a permanent director for some period of time.

¶79 In 2012, 31% of directors previously served as acting or interim directors. This was a 14% increase from the 1986 study, in which only 17% served as acting or interim directors. The gender breakdown for 2012 was 24% of males and 38% of females³⁹ serving in these capacities. (See table 19.)

38. Of course, law library directors must add excellence in administration to this portfolio.

39. In the 1986 study, 25% of females served as acting or interim directors. Unfortunately, we did not have figures available for males serving in these positions in the 1986 study.

¶80 One question that we examined in 2012 was not part of the 1986 study: did those serving in an acting or interim capacity move immediately to a permanent directorship, or did they return to their former duties? We discovered that 30 of the interim or acting directors moved immediately to permanent director positions at their same schools. Five acting or interim directors moved immediately to permanent directorships at different law schools. Twenty directors returned to their former nondirector positions. In 1986, only 4 (15%) returned to nondirector positions. By contrast, in 2012, 36% of the acting or interim directors returned to their former positions.

Age Upon First Permanent Directorship

¶81 We found a major increase from 1986 to 2012 in the age at which an individual attains his or her first permanent directorship. This strongly suggests that becoming a director is now a significantly longer process. In 1986, the average age of a new director was 33, but by 2012 the average age had risen 10 years to 43. (See table 20.)

¶82 In 2012, males assumed their first permanent directorship at a slightly younger age (42) compared to females (44). Ironically, we found that the age at which the greatest number of males (6 directors) achieved their first permanent directorship was 33, the same average age as in the 1986 study. In 2012, the age with the highest number of females becoming directors (10 directors) was 47.

Number of Years at First Directorship

¶83 For some directors, the institution that hires them for their first directorship is their lifelong professional home. For others, the initial employer represents only the first in a series of directorships. We found that the average number of years spent at the first directorship was nearly identical between 1986 (8 years) and 2012 (9 years). In 2012, males spent an average of 10 years at their first directorship while females served an average of 8 years. (See table 21.)

¶84 In the 1986 study, 65% of directors remained employed at their first permanent directorship. In 2012, only 50% of directors still remained at their first permanent directorship. The gender differences in this category are striking. Males saw a 10% decrease in those who remained at their first directorship, from 55% in 1986 to 45% in 2012. One of the most dramatic differences from our 1986 study is the decreased rate at which females remained at their first directorship. In 1986, it was nearly universal for females to remain at their first directorship, and 81% did so. However, in 2012, the number who remained at their first directorship had decreased by 25% with only 56% remaining at their first directorship. This seems to be clear evidence that female directors have become far more mobile since 1986.

¶85 In this category it is also instructive to look at the ranges of time spent at the first directorship. We found that in 2012, 50% of directors spent 5 or fewer years at their first directorship. This was a 14% decrease from the 1986 study.

¶86 It is far less common for a director to spend 25 or more years at his or her first directorship. We found that in 2012, only 9% had spent 25 or more years. This was a 5% reduction from the 14% who had done so in 1986.

Total Number of Directorships

¶87 As detailed above, in 2012, 89 individuals or 50% of directors remained at their first permanent directorship, a 15% decrease (65% or 56 directors) from the 1986 study. This also indicates that 50% of directors in 2012 had moved from their first director position to one or more subsequent directorships. In 2012, 39 males or 45% and 50 females or 56% had served in only one directorship. (See table 22.)

¶88 Sixty directors or 34% of all directors had served in two directorships in 2012. The gender breakdown was 31 males or 36% of all males, and 29 females or 32% of all females. In 1986, 38 persons (24%) had served in two directorships, a nearly identical percentage to the 2012 statistic. In 1986, 30 males representing 31% of all male directors and 8 females representing 13% of all female directors served in two directorships. This indicates a 5% increase for males and a 19% increase for females.

¶89 For 2012, 19 directors or 11% served in 3 directorships. The gender breakdown was 11 males or 13%, and 8 females or 9% served in 3 directorships. In 1986, 7 males or 7% and 3 females or 5% served in a third directorship. This indicates a 6% increase for males and a 4% increase for females in the 2012 figures.

¶90 In 2012, 8 directors or 5% of all directors served in a fourth directorship. There were 5 males or 6% and 3 females or 3% serving in a fourth directorship. The 1986 gender breakdown for those serving at a fourth directorship was 6 males or 6%, and 1 female or 2%. This indicates that in 2012 there was no increase for males and only a 1% increase for females. In both 1986 and 2012, 1 director (1%) had served a fifth directorship.

¶91 We found that the average number of years spent at the first directorship was nearly identical between 1986 (8 years) and 2012 (9 years). In 2012, males spent an average of 10 years at their first directorship while females spent an average of 8 years.

¶92 The average number of years spent at the second directorship in the 2012 study was 9 years. In the 1986 study, the average number of years spent at the second directorship was 8. Therefore, in 2012, directors spent, on average, an additional year at the second directorship. Males spent an average of 9 years at the second directorship in 2012, whereas in 1986 males spent an average of 8 years. For females in 2012, 8 years were spent at a second directorship and in 1986, 6 years were spent. This marks an increase of 2 years for females.

¶93 The average number of years spent at the third directorship in 2012 was 7 years, which was identical to 1986. The breakdown for males in 2012 was 8 years, which was also identical to 1986. In 2012, females averaged 6 years at a third directorship and in 1986 4 years, a 1-year increase.

¶94 For a fourth directorship, the average number of years in 2012 was 5 years. In 1986 it was 7 years, a decrease of 2 years. In 2012, males spent an average of 4 years, whereas in 1986 males spent an average of 7 years. This marks a decrease of 3 years. Females, in 2012, spent an average of 6 years as opposed to an average of 5 years in 1986, a 1-year increase.⁴⁰

40. The only director in 2012 who moved to a fifth directorship had spent 5 years in the position. In 1986, the one director who moved to a fifth directorship spent 2 years in the post. Both of these directors are males.

¶95 The data from both studies indicates that although at least half of directors have moved to a second directorship, movement beyond this was not as common. This contradicts a popularly held idea that academic law library directors move frequently from employer to employer.

Average Number of Years as Director

¶96 In 2012, directors averaged 14 years of directorship experience. This marks an increase of 2 years from the 1986 study. Male directors averaged 14 years, up from 13 years in 1986. Females averaged 12 years, up from 10 years in 1986. (See table 23.)

¶97 An important conclusion in examining the 2012 statistics results from the fact that of the 54 directors with 5 years or less of experience, 20 are males (23% of all male directors) and 34 females (38% of all female directors). This shows that significantly more females than males in the past 5 years are now being hired as law school library directors. One can expect that if this trend continues, there will be a substantial majority of females serving as directors in the near future.

¶98 We determined that the number of newer directors (those with 5 years or less of director experience) was 20% less than the 1986 study. In 2012, 31% of directors had 5 years or less of experience in contrast to the 51% of directors in 1986. We conclude this is a result of sitting directors staying longer in their current positions than in the earlier study. However, we also anticipate that because directors are now on average at an age much closer to retirement,⁴¹ a high number of vacancies in the next few years will provide significant additional opportunities for new directorships.

Age of Sitting Director in 2012

¶99 We found a significant increase in the average age of sitting directors in 2012 when compared with 1986. In 2012, the average age of a sitting director was 57. This was a 12-year increase from 1986, where the average age was 45. In 2012, 45% of sitting directors were 60 or older. (See table 24.) The highest number of directors in any one age group is 62, which was the age of 15 directors. The next most common ages, each of which represented 13 directors, were 58, 59, 60, and 64 years of age. By comparison, only 4 directors were under the age of 40.⁴² These figures, taken together, indicate that we can expect numerous retirements leading to substantial numbers of vacancies that must be filled by new directors during the next decade.

¶100 An interesting finding regarding gender is that, in 2012, male and female directors are on average nearly identical in age. Males average 58 years of age and females 57 years of age. This contrasts with the 1986 study where there was a 6-year age gap between males and females, with males averaging 47 years of age and females 41 years of age.

41. See the section below titled "Age of Sitting Director in 2012."

42. Thirty-one directors were between 40 and 49 years of age. Sixty-two directors were between the ages of 50 and 59. Seventy-seven were between the ages of 60 and 69. Two directors were between the ages of 70 and 74.

Years at Current Directorship

¶101 We found little difference in this category between 1986 and 2012. In 1986, directors averaged 9 years at their current directorship and in 2012 directors averaged 10 years, an increase of just 1 year. There was a 2-year increase for males who, in 1986, averaged 9 years, a number that increased to 11 years for males in 2012. (See table 25.) However, females remained the same, averaging 9 years in both studies.

¶102 In the 2012 study, we discovered that nearly one-half of all directors (46%) have been employed in their current position for 5 years or less. This indicates there was significant job movement in the 5 years preceding 2012. We also discovered that 30 directors (19% of all directors) in 2012 were in their first year at their current positions. Of this number, 24 (27%) were females and only 6 (7%) were males. This may indicate increasing opportunities for females in obtaining directorships.

Status and Activities of Current Directors

Current Academic Rank on the Law Faculty

¶103 For the purposes of the study, we interpret those holding a regular law faculty rank as either a professor of law, an associate professor of law, or an assistant professor of law. We excluded anyone holding the title of instructor, those who indicated their rank is with the library faculty, anyone with an adjunct rank, those who hold some other specialized rank that indicates they are not regular members of the law faculty, and those who indicate they hold no rank whatsoever.

¶104 This category represents one of the most controversial topics among academic law library directors. The *ABA Standards for Legal Education* state, "Except in extraordinary circumstances, a law library director shall hold a law faculty appointment with security of faculty position."⁴³ This standard remains unchanged in the ABA revised standards of 2014–2015. However, despite the clear language and intention of this standard to compel ABA-accredited law schools to grant full faculty status to their law library directors, our 2012 study found that only 75% (132) of law schools are in compliance. The 25% (45) of law schools in noncompliance represents a 14% increase over the 11% of law schools who were not in compliance in the 1986 study. (See table 26.) This appears to be a clear sign that full faculty status for law library directors has been significantly eroding. Taken in combination with the changed 2014 Standard 603(c),⁴⁴ which no longer explicitly requires that a law school library director hold both a law and library science degree, it is reasonable to predict that increasing numbers of law schools will hire new directors with less than full faculty status.⁴⁵ Further validating our conclusions

43. AM. BAR ASS'N, *supra* note 17, at 40 (Standard 603(d)).

44. See *supra* notes 16 & 17 for the text of the previous and current versions of Standard 603(c).

45. Some law schools have ignored the plain intent of the ABA standard either because the ABA does not appear to be enforcing the standard or because the term "extraordinary circumstances" appears to be so liberally construed as to make the standard meaningless.

is that in the 2012 study, among directors with 1 to 5 years of experience, 40% (18 directors) have no law school rank.⁴⁶

¶105 In the 2012 study, among the 75% of academic law library directors who held rank with the regular law faculty, we found that 62% had earned the rank of professor, 30% held the rank of associate professor, and 8% held the rank of assistant professor. Comparing these results with the 1986 study, we noted 57% of those holding academic rank were professors, an increase of 5% in those holding the rank of professor.⁴⁷ Among those holding the rank of associate professor in 2012 (39 or 30%), we note an increase of 1% (42 or 29%) from the 1986 study.⁴⁸ In 1986, 19 directors or 13% of those holding academic rank were assistant professors, but in 2012 only 11 directors or 8% held that rank.⁴⁹

¶106 An examination of rank by gender demonstrates several important points. Males holding the rank of professor changed only slightly between 1986 and 2012. In 2012, 68% of males with academic rank were full professors, a 2% increase over the 66% who held this rank in 1986. However, we note a substantial difference among females holding the rank of professor. In 1986, 39% (18) of female directors who had an academic rank were professors, whereas that number increased to 54% (32) in 2012. This means that 15% more females held the highest law faculty rank in 2012 than was the case in 1986.

¶107 Examining those at the rank of associate professor, we found that 25% (18) of males in 2012 who had an academic rank held this rank. This was a 1% decrease from the 26% (25) that held the rank of associate professor in 1986. Among those females who had an academic rank in 2012, 21 directors or 36% were associate professors, a decrease of 1% from the 37% (17) of female directors holding this rank in 1986.

¶108 The rank that experienced the greatest reduction is assistant professor. Seven percent (5) of males who had an academic rank were assistant professors in 2012, a decrease of 1% from the 8% that held this rank in 1986. Female assistant professors dropped by 14% (6) in 2012 with 10% (6) holding this rank in 2012 versus 24% (11) in 1986.

¶109 We conclude that, among those holding rank with the law school faculty in 2012, the majority has achieved higher rank than was the case in 1986. We observe there has been a particularly noteworthy increase among females who hold the rank of professor (39% in 1986 versus 54% in 2012).⁵⁰

46. Among directors with 6 to 10 years of experience, 22% did not hold rank with the law faculty. For those with 11 to 20 years of experience, 27% held no rank. For those with 20 or more years of experience, only 11% held no rank.

47. The 1986 study indicates 51% of all directors in the study held the rank of professor.

48. In 1986, 26% of all directors in the study held the rank of associate professor.

49. The reduction in the number of assistant professors may correlate to the increased number of years of experience represented by those obtaining their first permanent directorship. More years of experience prior to the first directorship likely indicates more teaching experience and more scholarship. These are significant factors in establishing rank among the law school faculty. Another factor may be the increased age of sitting directors, which is normally consistent with higher rank. Of course, the decreasing number of directors holding faculty rank may also affect the decline of those holding this title.

50. Despite the substantial gains, we note that females still lag well behind males at the rank of professor where there are 14% fewer female professors than males (male professors' equal 68%, female professors' equal 54%).

¶110 Unfortunately, our study also demonstrates substantial increases (14% more than the 1986 study) among those not holding rank with the law school faculty. This number increased for male directors from 1% in 1986 to 16% in 2012. Among female directors, the increase of non-rank directors increased by 8% (34% in 2012 versus 26% in 1986).

Holds Title of Associate Dean or Equivalent

¶111 Reflective of the greater responsibilities and challenges undertaken by many law library directors since the 1986 study is the emergence of decanal titles assigned to many directors. In 1986, virtually no director had the title of associate dean, assistant dean, or equivalent. However, we found that in 2012, 75 individuals or 43% of all directors now held a decanal title. (See table 27.) The statistics show that females hold decanal titles more frequently than male directors, with 46% of females holding such a title compared to 39% of males.

¶112 A breakdown by specific title indicates that 92% (69 out of 75 total) of the directors who hold a decanal title are associate deans. The gender breakdown for associate deans is 30 males and 39 females. We found two additional decanal titles in usage: four directors hold the title of assistant dean (two males and two females); two directors are also vice deans (one male and one female).

¶113 The abundance of decanal titles held in 2012 is likely indicative of law library directors assuming responsibilities beyond their traditional duties in the law library. In particular, we speculate the rise in use of this title by directors is consistent with the fact that many law library directors have assumed responsibility for aspects of technology services at their law schools. We also believe these titles demonstrate that because of their skill as administrators, law library directors are often asked to assume responsibilities for aspects of the overall administration of the law school. The value of directors participating in leadership roles beyond the confines of the law library is a positive step for the future of the profession.

Responsibility for Technology in the Law School

¶114 Assigning responsibility to the law library director for law school technology was uncommon in 1986. However, law library directors were pioneers in the use of information technology (IT) at many law schools due to the introduction of the computer-assisted legal research systems LexisNexis and Westlaw. When librarians plunged fearlessly ahead to introduce this technology to faculty and students, the library staff earned a reputation as technology innovators in the law school.⁵¹ As the use of technology increased in the law school, many deans searched for someone to take administrative control in promoting technology use and providing instruction and support. Library directors, because of their administrative expertise and willingness to fill this gap, were often selected for this important role.

¶115 The 2012 study revealed that 38% of all directors have administrative responsibility for IT services at their law school. There is no gender distinction in this category; both males and females hold this responsibility at a rate of 38%. (See table 28.)

51. Candidly, we confess that much of this reputation may be due to the fact that librarians were less intimidated by using technology than was the law faculty in general.

¶116 We wonder whether the anticipated arrival of new directors due to retirements in the next decade may expand the 38% figure. We think this is likely to be the case because younger directors have grown up with technology and therefore often have greater comfort and facility in these areas than many of the current directors who are close to retirement.

Courses Taught as Director

¶117 In this category, we count courses taught in the law school by individuals while they hold the position of law library director. We divided the courses taught into either research courses or substantive law courses.

¶118 We included as research courses any class taught to law students for academic credit in which the major focus was on research, legal research, or legal writing.⁵² We included among law courses all those taught for academic credit to law students on any substantive legal subject matter.⁵³

¶119 Directors who are members of the law faculty are, in almost all cases, required to teach courses in the law school. Even among those directors who are not afforded faculty status in the law school, teaching is common. Law librarians are recognized as experts in all types of research, especially legal research. Since legal research is an essential skill for law students to master, it makes sense for law librarians to participate in teaching this important skill. It is also the case that as a member of the law faculty, a substantial number of directors are expected, or at least afforded the opportunity, to teach substantive courses in other aspects of law.⁵⁴

¶120 Our 2012 study found that only 11 directors or 6% of the total did not teach any courses in the law school. The 94% of directors who did teach is nearly identical to the 1986 study, which found that 92% of directors taught one or more courses in the law school. (See table 29.) Gender differences are not substantial in this category, with 91% of the females and 96% of the males teaching courses in the law school. It is interesting to note that many directors have taught multiple courses in the law school. In 2012, we found 61% of directors had taught two or more distinct courses.

¶121 As experts in legal research, it is not surprising that in 2012 89% of all directors have taught one or more research courses in the law school: 91% of male directors and 86% of female directors. Fifty percent of directors have taught only a single research course, while 37% have taught two or more research courses; a total of 87%. In 1986, 85% of directors taught one or more legal research courses in the law school (86% of males and 84% of females).

¶122 What may be surprising to many is that nearly half (46%) of directors have taught a substantive law course, a number unchanged from 1986. The 2012 gender breakdown is 60% of male directors and 33% of female directors. In 1986, males

52. For example, Introduction to Legal Research, Legal Methods, Legal Research & Writing, Advanced Legal Research, topic-specific legal research. We counted only distinct course titles, not how many times the same course was taught by an individual director.

53. For example, torts, legal history, contracts.

54. In this era of shrinking student enrollment in law schools resulting in smaller faculties and less use of adjuncts due to budget restrictions, it may be the case that in the future library directors will be asked to teach more substantive law courses.

teaching substantive law courses constituted 57% and females 29% of all directors.⁵⁵

Publications

¶123 Law librarians have established a long history of contributions to scholarly writing, with particular emphasis on the topics of legal research and law librarianship. Creating published scholarship is one of the three core activities expected of a faculty member.⁵⁶ Since many law library directors are members of the law faculty, they are expected to produce scholarship, and this section of our study examines the scholarly record of directors.

¶124 In the 2012 study, we evaluated scholarship in the following ways: (a) To be counted, the writing had to be included in a traditional print publication.⁵⁷ (b) We made no distinction for counting purposes between various types of printed scholarship. For example, a book counted as one piece of scholarship, as did a single journal article.⁵⁸ (c) To make a more precise determination as to the types of scholarship being produced by law library directors, we divided all of the publications into six categories: (1) librarianship; (2) substantive law; (3) legal research, law school related, or how-to-teach articles; (4) book reviews; (5) chapters in books; and (6) monographs.

¶125 We discovered that, in 2012, 94% of directors on whom we were able to find information had produced one or more publications. This represented a 19% increase over the 1986 study (75% of directors had one or more publications). (See table 30.)

¶126 Examining the breakdown by gender we found in 2012, 96% of male directors and 92% of female directors had one or more publications. These figures represent substantial increases from 1986, where we found that 82% of males and only 61% of females had one or more publications.

¶127 In 2012, the average number of publications per director was 12. This was an increase of 25% over the 1986 study (9 publications per director). By gender, in 2012, males averaged 13 publications and females averaged 12, while in 1986, males averaged 12 publications and females only 4.

¶128 An examination of the number of publications by director in 2012 revealed that 24% of directors produced 1 to 5 publications. Breaking down this figure by gender, we found that 46% of males produced 1 to 5 publications, as did 13% of females.⁵⁹

55. We are unsure why female directors continue to lag far behind male directors in teaching substantive law courses, but this warrants additional investigation.

56. The other two core activities are considered to be teaching and service.

57. We included articles found in legal journals, law reviews, and professional library science journals. We also counted book reviews, chapters in monographs, and stand-alone publications such as books. We do not mean to denigrate writing found in other media such as blogs. Some people believe this may become a standard form of recognized scholarship in the future; however, we attempted to evaluate traditional print publications to retain the equivalent standard with which most law schools judge faculty scholarship.

58. We also did not attempt to evaluate or rank any of the publications for quality or any other factors.

59. The 1986 study did not break down this category by range of number of publications; therefore, we do not have comparative numbers.

¶129 In 2012, 29% of directors produced 6 to 10 publications. The gender breakdown is 17% of male directors and 53% of female directors.

¶130 Eleven to 16 publications were produced by 18% of directors (males 17% and females 20%). Seventeen to 30 publications were produced by 3% of directors (males 5% and females 1%). Finally, 8% of directors produced 30 or more publications (males 10% and females 6%).

¶131 The 2012 study demonstrates that male directors, on average, are likely to have produced between 1 to 5 publications. Female directors, on the other hand, most often produce between 6 and 10 publications.

¶132 Examining the pattern of publications by type, we found that 76% of directors in 2012 had produced one or more titles on the topic of librarianship. The gender split is nearly identical: 76% of males and 77% of females. The average number of librarianship articles produced by directors is 5 (males produced 4, females 5). These are significant increases from the 1986 study, where we found only 48% of directors (47% of males and 56% of females) produced librarianship articles.

¶133 The next category we examined were articles produced on substantive law topics. This category may be particularly of interest in supporting faculty status because publishing outside of the field of librarianship demonstrates subject expertise equivalent to that of the other members of the law faculty. In 2012, we found that 50% of directors produced one or more articles on topics of substantive law. The gender breakdown was 48% of males and 52% of females. Among those who have published substantive law articles, the average was 4 pieces. In the 1986 study, only 16% of directors produced substantive law articles (males 18% and females 4%). We can conclude from these comparative figures that both male and female directors increasingly appear to be integrated with the other members of the law faculty in producing substantive law articles. This increase is particularly profound for female directors and likely represents a major difference in their professional orientation from what was found in 1986.⁶⁰

¶134 Law library directors can be expected to produce numerous articles on the topics of legal research, teaching, and other articles related to legal education since the position requires expertise in all of these fields. This was confirmed in the 2012 study, which revealed that 77% of directors produced one or more articles in these categories. The average, per director, published in these areas was 5 articles. Both male and female directors averaged 5 articles. Again, we see substantial increases from the 1986 study, in which 48% of directors had published in the comparable category of library articles (47% of males and 56% of females).

¶135 Today, there are fewer opportunities to publish book reviews than in 1986 due to the fact that fewer outlets for this type of scholarship are currently available. However, traditionally this has been an often-used scholarly outlet for law library directors. In the 2012 study, 37% of directors had produced one or more book reviews. The average among those who had produced one or more book review was 5. The gender average was evenly split at 37%. Surprisingly, given fewer outlets for

60. More integration into the scholarly mission of the law school makes the director more accepted as a full member of the law faculty.

book reviews, the 37% of directors producing book reviews is a 13% increase over the 1986 study (24%). We posit this is another sign of the increased importance of all kinds of scholarly publications to law library directors.

¶136 Law librarians, by nature, enjoy working in a collaborative fashion with other professionals. Therefore, participating in the production of a work that requires separately authored chapters in a larger publication is a frequently undertaken project by many directors. The 2012 study delineates that 46% of directors have produced one or more book chapters. The gender split is: 38 males and 40 females.⁶¹ The average number of book chapters per director in this category is 3.

¶137 The type of publication that normally requires the most work and often yields the greatest recognition is the self-contained monograph or book. In 2012, the study revealed that 35% of directors had produced one or more monographs or books (41% of males and 29% of females). The average number among the directors who had produced a monograph or book is 2. When compared with the 1986 study, we found a 23% increase in the production of monographs in 2012.⁶²

¶138 Based on our examination of all these categories, we concluded that in 2012 publications by law library directors have become far more common and are of increased type and number than was the case in 1986. This leads us to hypothesize that directors, either by requirement or inclination, are now more scholarly oriented than in the past.

Comparisons

1986 Composite of the Average Academic Law Library Director

¶139 Our 1986 study produced the following composite portrait of the average sitting academic law library director.

¶140 The average director was likely to be male, hold graduate degrees in both law and library science, and have earned a law degree before the M.L.S. degree. The average director was unlikely to hold advanced degrees beyond the J.D. and M.L.S. The director was likely to be a member of a state bar but unlikely to have practiced law. The director probably did not work as a professional law librarian while attending law school, but once employed as a professional law librarian had served five years in this capacity, holding two distinct positions, and had moved twice prior to attaining his or her first permanent directorship. The director's professional specialization was in the area of public services, with almost no experience in technical services. It was unlikely that the director had worked in another law library except a law school library or held a professional position in any other type of library.

¶141 In 1986, a sitting director was more often than not still serving in his or her first permanent directorship and had been in this position for 9 years. The director probably did not ascend to this directorship from an acting director's position. The

61. Delineation by book chapters was not included in the 1986 study.

62. Twelve percent of directors produced monographs (9% produced library monographs and 3% law monographs) in 1986.

average director had not often moved for the purpose of obtaining additional directorships. A sitting director averaged 12 years of experience as an academic law library director. He or she was overwhelmingly likely to be a member of the law school faculty and, if male, to hold the rank of professor. If female, the director was just as likely to hold the rank of associate professor as to hold the rank of professor. As part of his or her duties, the director taught at least one course in the law school and produced one or more publication. The director was young, having risen to his or her first directorship at the tender age of 33 and was currently only 44 years of age.

2012 Composite of the Average Academic Law Library Director

¶142 Our 2012 study revealed the following composite portrait of the average sitting academic law library director.

¶143 The average director was slightly more likely to be female than male and to hold graduate degrees in both law and library science; about half earned their law degree after their M.L.S. degree. The average director was unlikely to hold advanced degrees beyond the J.D. and M.L.S. The director was likely to hold membership in a state bar but was unlikely to have practiced law. The director probably did not work as a professional law librarian while attending law school; this was particularly the case if male. He or she served 10 years as a professional law librarian, holding no more than two distinct positions, and had moved approximately twice prior to attaining his or her first permanent directorship. The director's professional specialization was in the area of public services, but he or she was increasingly likely to have experience in both public and technical services. It was unlikely that the director had worked as a librarian in other than a law school library or held a professional position in another type of library.

¶144 In 2012, half of sitting directors were still serving at their first permanent directorships and had been in these positions for 9 years. Only about a third ascended to their first directorships from an acting or interim director position. The average director had not moved often for the purpose of obtaining additional directorships. Sitting directors averaged 14 years of experience as an academic law library director. They were likely to be members of their law school faculty, and females, as well as males, most often held the rank of professor. As part of their duties, they taught at least two courses in the law school and had produced an average of 12 publications. The 2012 directors had aged considerably over their 1986 counterparts. The average age upon their first directorship rose to 43, and current directors were on average 57 years of age.

Notable Differences Between the 1986 and 2012 Studies

¶145 The most notable differences in the various categories between the 1986 and 2012 studies were as follows.

- There was a major increase in the number of female directors, who in 2012 now constituted a majority of those holding directorships. In 1986, 62 females constituted 39% of the law library directors. But in 2012, the number of females rose to 90 or 51% percent of all directors. Correspondingly, male directors decreased from 98 or 61% in 1986 to 87 or 49% in 2012.

- Holding a U.S. J.D. degree had become nearly universal for directors by 2012. The greatest increase was seen among female directors; those holding this degree rose from 84% in 1986 to 97% in 2012.
- The number of female directors obtaining a J.D. degree before their M.L.S. degree doubled from 24% in 1986 to 48% in 2012.
- The average number of years of experience prior to obtaining the first permanent directorship doubled from 5 years in 1986 to 10 years in 2012.
- Those who held the title of associate director immediately prior to assuming their first permanent directorship more than doubled. In 1986, only 26% held the title of associate director immediately prior. This number rose to 55% in 2012.
- The 2012 directors evidence more diverse specialization experience than in the previous study. In 1986, only 17% had any experience in technical services, whereas in 2012 27% had added this background to their public services experience.
- In 1986, only 14% of directors had legal practice experience. In 2012, 40% had such experience.
- Non-law library professional library experience for female directors rose from 11% in 1986 to 29% in 2012.
- There was a 14% increase (17% in 1986 rising to 31% in 2012) among those serving as an acting or interim director prior to attaining the first permanent directorship.
- The age of directors upon assuming the first permanent directorship increased by 10 years, from 33 in 1986 to 43 in 2012.
- In 1986, the vast majority of females remained at their first permanent directorship (81%). However, in 2012, only 56% remained at their first directorship. This was a decrease of 25% and a clear indication that female directors have become much more mobile and interested in seeking additional directorships.
- The average age of current sitting directors rose from 45 in 1986 to 57 in 2012.
- In 1986, 89% of law library directors held academic rank with their law faculty. In 2012, only 75% percent held academic rank with their law faculty, a 14% decrease. Most concerning is that the 2012 study shows that among directors with 1 to 5 years of experience, 40% (18 directors) have no law school rank.
- In 1986, only 29% of female directors held the rank of professor. In 2012, the percentage of female directors holding the rank of professor increased to 36%.⁶³ In 1986, virtually no directors held a decanal title, but by 2012, 43% percent had achieved a dean's title.
- A major additional duty assumed by 38% of directors was responsibility for technology services in the law school. This duty was uncommon in 1986.
- In 1986, 61% of female directors produced one or more publications. The 2012 study showed a 31% increase in female directors who have published (92%).

63. In 2012, 54% of female directors who held an academic rank were full professors.

Conclusion

¶146 Any type of successful leadership role requires the employment of an individual of rare talents, temperament, drive, and vision. The profession of academic law librarianship, which has been an integral part of the educational and scholarly mission of every law school for generations, has benefited from a pool of highly educated, service-oriented, and skilled individuals who have excelled in the difficult role of law library director.

¶147 Like nearly every profession, change has proven to be constant for academic law library directors. The duties of this position evolve due to changes in the use of technology, increased responsibilities of the director and staff, the transition from print to online resources, and a myriad of additional challenges. While many of these changes have proven to be positive, some are not. Academic law library directors must meet the challenge of remaining successful in the face of severely shrinking budgets, reductions in staff, complex and sometimes competing demands from their law school and university administration, and, at some institutions, criticism from the misinformed as to the continuing value of the work of the law library and its staff. Additionally, some in the legal academy wish to turn the position of the law library director from its historic status as a full member of the law faculty into some type of nonfaculty administrative status, which strips away important voting rights, affects tenure protection,⁶⁴ and lessens the value of the law library in the eyes of many of its constituents.

¶148 It is the responsibility of present and future academic law library directors to continue to demonstrate their unique and important value in serving the law school community. We hope our study will provide valuable information for current and aspiring law library directors and will encourage law school deans and faculty to better appreciate the tremendous diversity of talents that a law library director brings to the law school.

64. Tenure protection for the academic law library director is critically important if the director is to exercise the best professional judgment without undue concern that an unpopular decision may lead to his or her termination.

Table 1

General Information Profile—2012

Total ABA Accredited Law Schools	Total Directors in Study	Males in Study	Females in Study
203	177 or 87%	87 or 49%	90 or 51%

General Information Profile—1986

Total ABA Accredited Law Schools	Total Directors in Study	Males in Study	Females in Study
173	160 or 92%	98 or 61%	62 or 39%

Table 2

M.L.S. Degree or Graduate Level Equivalent Awarded—2012

	Hold	Do Not Hold
Male	87	0
Female	90	0
Total	177 or 100%	0

M.L.S. Degree or Graduate Level Equivalent Awarded—1986

	Hold	Do Not Hold
Male	90 or 92%	8 or 8%
Female	58 or 94%	4 or 6%
Total	148 or 92%	12 or 8%

M.L.S. Granting Institution—2012

School	Number
Washington	25 or 14%
Illinois	13 or 7%
Michigan	11 or 6%
Indiana—Bloomington	9 or 5%
Simmons	8 or 5%
Catholic, Florida State, Oklahoma, Pratt, Texas	5 or 3% each
California—Berkeley, Columbia, Denver	4 or 2% each
Chicago, DePaul, Kentucky, LSU, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Pittsburgh, South Carolina, Southern Connecticut	3 or 2% each
Alabama, Clark (ATL), Emory, Kent State, Northern Texas, Rutgers, San Jose, Southern Florida, Southern Mississippi, SUNY—Buffalo, UCLA, Wayne State, Wisconsin—Madison	2 or 1% each
16 schools ^a	1 or 1% each
Total	52 schools

^a California—Fullerton, California State, Case Western, East Carolina, Emporia State, Iowa, Maine, Memphis, Minnesota, Peabody, Puerto Rico, Rosary, SUNY—Geneseo, Syracuse, Western Michigan, and Wisconsin—Milwaukee.

Table 2 continued
M.L.S. Granting Institution—1986

School	Number
Washington	21 or 13%
Columbia, Michigan	10 or 7% each
Texas	8 or 5%
Rutgers	6 or 4%
California–Berkeley, Florida State, Illinois, Simmons, Wisconsin	5 or 3% each
Drexel, LSU, Oregon, Pratt	4 or 3% each
Alabama, BYU, Catholic, Indiana, North Carolina, Pittsburgh	3 or 2% each
Chicago, Maryland, Peabody, Southern California, Southern Connecticut, Syracuse, UCLA, Villanova	2 or 1% each
17 schools ^a	1 or 1% each
Total	45 schools

^a Atlanta University, Denver, Fullerton State, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Northern Texas, Puerto Rico, Rosary, Southern Mississippi, SUNY–Buffalo, SUNY–Albany, St. John’s, Texas Women’s, Utah, Wayne State, and Western Michigan.

Table 3
Juris Doctor Degree—2012

	U.S. Law	Foreign Law	None
Male	85 or 98%	1 or 1%	1 or 1%
Female	87 or 97%	2 or 2%	1 or 1%
Total	172 or 98%	3 or 2%	2 or 1%

Juris Doctor Degree—1986

	U.S. Law	Foreign Law	None
Male	90 or 92%	7 or 7%	1 or 1%
Female	52 or 84%	1 or 2%	9 or 14%
Total	142 or 89%	8 or 5%	10 or 6%

Law Schools Attended—2012

Schools	Number
Washington	6 or 7%
Michigan, North Carolina	5 or 6% each
Indiana–Bloomington	4 or 4% each
Mississippi	4 or 4% each
Washburn	4 or 4% each
Alabama	3 or 2% each
Duke	3 or 2% each
Idaho	3 or 2% each

Table 3 continued

Law Schools Attended—2012 continued

Schools	Number
Minnesota	3 or 2% each
Northern Kentucky	3 or 2% each
Nova Southeastern	3 or 2% each
Oklahoma	3 or 2% each
Seattle	3 or 2% each
Temple	3 or 2% each
Tennessee	3 or 2% each
Western New England	3 or 2% each
24 schools ^a	2 or 1% each
54 schools ^b	1 or 1% each

^a Boston College, BYU, Cleveland–Marshall, Denver, DePaul, Florida, Gonzaga, Harvard, Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Lewis & Clark, Mercer, Missouri, New England, Puerto Rico, Richmond, Southern Texas, Southwestern, Stanford, Suffolk, Valparaiso, Washington–St. Louis, and Willamette.

^b Albany, Arkansas–Fayetteville, Boston University, California Western, Campbell, Catholic–Puerto Rico, Chicago–Kent, Cincinnati, Connecticut, Cornell, Creighton, Duquesne, Fordham, Franklin Pierce, Georgetown, George Washington, Georgia, Georgia State, Louisville, Loyola–New Orleans, LSU, Maine, Marquette, Maryland, Miami, Nebraska, North Carolina Central, North Dakota, NYU, Pepperdine, Puget Sound, Quinnipiac, Regent, Rutgers–Camden, Rutgers–Newark, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, St. Louis, St. Mary’s, St. Thomas–Florida, South Carolina, SUNY–Buffalo, Syracuse, Texas Southern, Texas Wesleyan, Tulane, Tulsa, UMKC, USC, Utah, Wayne State, William Mitchell, and Wisconsin.

Law Schools Attended—1986

Schools	Number
Indiana–Bloomington	5 or 4%
Houston	4 or 3%
Texas	4 or 3%
Wisconsin	4 or 3%
Boston	3 or 2%
DePaul	3 or 2%
Michigan	3 or 2%
Puget Sound	3 or 2%
Tulane	3 or 2%
Washington	3 or 2%
Yale	3 or 2%
25 schools ^a	2 or 1% each
62 schools ^b	1 or 1% each

^a Alabama, Connecticut, Detroit, Duke, Florida, Georgetown, Harvard, Howard, Illinois, Iowa, Lewis & Clark, Loyola–New Orleans, McGeorge, Minnesota, NYU, Ohio State, Oregon, Santa Clara, Southern Illinois, SUNY–Buffalo, Taiwan, Temple, UMKC, Villanova, and Western New England.

^b Baltimore, California–Berkeley, Capetown, Catholic, Catholic–Puerto Rico, Chicago–Kent, Cleveland–Marshall, Columbia, Cornell, Delaware, Delhi, Denver, Franklin Pierce, Georgetown, George Washington, Georgia State, Golden Gate, Gonzaga, Havana, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Korea, Loyola–California, Loyola–Chicago, Mercer, Mississippi, Memphis State, Miami, Melbourne, Maine, Notre Dame, North Carolina, National Chung Shing, New England, NYLS, Oklahoma, Pepperdine, Puerto Rico, Pittsburgh, Pace, Rutgers–Camden, Rutgers–Newark, St. Louis, San Diego, Southwestern, South Carolina, Syracuse, St. Mary’s, Stanford, Seton Hall, St. John’s, Toledo, Utah, UCLA, USC, Virginia, Washington–St. Louis, Washington & Lee, and William & Mary.

Table 4

Juris Doctor Degree Awarded Before M.L.S. Degree*—2012

	J.D. First	M.L.S. First	Concurrent
Male	65 or 75%	17 or 20%	4 or 5%
Female	43 or 48%	44 or 49%	2 or 2%
Total	108 or 62%	61 or 35%	6 or 3%

* Two directors do not hold a J.D. degree.

Juris Doctor Degree Awarded Before M.L.S. Degree*—1986

	J.D. First	M.L.S. First	Concurrent
Male	64 or 65%	24 or 25%	2 or 2%
Female	15 or 24%	37 or 60%	0 or 0%
Total	79 or 49%	60 or 38%	2 or 1%

* Nineteen directors held only one degree.

Table 5

Other Advanced Degrees—2012

Total Directors Holding Other Advanced Degrees	36 or 20%
--	-----------

Breakdown by Gender—2012

Gender	Additional Degree	2 or More Additional Degrees
Male	24 or 28%	5 or 6%
Female	12 or 13%	1 or 1%

Other Advanced Degrees—1986

Total Directors Holding Other Advanced Degrees	28 or 18%
--	-----------

Breakdown by Gender—1986

Gender	Additional Degrees
Male	20 or 23%
Female	8 or 9%

Table 6

Member of a State Bar—2012

Gender	Yes	No
	64 or 75%	22 or 25%
Female	60 or 71%	29 or 29%
Total	124 or 70%	51 or 29%

Member of a State Bar—1986

Gender	Yes	No
Male	78 or 80%	20 or 20%
Female	39 or 63%	23 or 37%
Total	117 or 73%	43 or 27%

Table 7

Years of Professional Law Library Experience Prior
to First Permanent Directorship—2012

Gender	Average Number of Years
Male	9
Female	10
Total	10

Years of Professional Law Library Experience Prior
to First Permanent Directorship—1986

Gender	Average Number of Years
Male	4
Female	6
Total	5

Table 8

Number of Professional Law Library Positions Prior to First Directorship—2012

Number of Prior Positions	Number
0	7 or 4%
1	68 or 39%
2	61 or 35%
3	28 or 16%
4	10 or 6%
6	1

Breakdown by Gender—2012*

Number of Positions	Male	Female
0	5 or 6%	2 or 2%
1	29 or 34%	39 or 43%
2	33 or 39%	28 or 31%
3	12 or 14%	16 or 18%
4	6 or 7%	4 or 4%
6	0	1

* We were unable to find sufficient information in this category for 2 male directors.

Number of Professional Law Library Positions Prior to First Directorship—1986

Number of Prior Positions	Number
0	28 or 18%
1	63 or 39%
2	44 or 28%
3	23 or 14%
4	2 or 19%

Breakdown by Gender—1986

Number of Positions	Male	Female
0	20 or 20%	8 or 13%
1	34 or 35%	29 or 46%
2	28 or 29%	16 or 26%
3	15 or 15%	8 or 13%
4	1 or 1%	1 or 2%

Table 9

Law Library Title Immediately Prior to First Directorship—2012*

	Associate/Deputy Director	Assistant Director	Other or None
Male	49 or 56%	9 or 10%	29 or 33%
Female	49 or 54%	8 or 9%	33 or 37%
Total	98 or 55%	17 or 10%	62 or 35%

* Breakdown by type of titles: public services 23% (38 directors); technical services/collection development 4% (7 directors); technology services 4% (7 directors). Seven directors came from non-law school library employers, and 3 were non-categorizable.

Law Library Title Immediately Prior to First Directorship—1986

	Associate Director	Assistant Director	Other or None
Male	26 or 27%	33 or 34%	39 or 39%
Female	15 or 24%	20 or 32%	27 or 44%
Total	41 or 26%	53 or 33%	66 or 41%

Table 10

Public Services or Technical Services Experience—2012

	Public Services	Technical Services	Both
Male	65 or 77%	0	19 or 23%
Female	60 or 68%	2 or 1%	26 or 30%
Total	125 or 73%	2 or 1%	45 or 26%*

* There was insufficient information to categorize 5 directors.

Public Services or Technical Services Experience—1986*

	Public Services	Technical Services	Both
Male	29 or 30%	4 or 4%	4 or 4%
Female	21 or 34%	11 or 18%	8 or 13%
Total	50 or 31%	15 or 9%	12 or 8%

* We have no comparison data for the categories “none” or “noncategorized” in the 2012 study. Therefore, we eliminated these categories from the 1986 table. However, under “noncategorized,” the 1986 numbers were 41 males or 42%; 14 females or 22%; the total was 55 directors or 34%. Under the “none” category, the numbers were 20 males or 20%; 8 females or 13%; the total was 28 directors or 18%.

Table 11

Geographic Moves Prior to First Directorship—2012*

	One Move	Two Moves	Three Moves	Four Moves	Five Moves	Total Moves
Male	31 or 36%	21 or 24%	12 or 14%	3 or 3%	0	67 or 77%
Female	22 or 24%	24 or 27%	13 or 14%	4 or 4%	2 or 2%	65 or 72%
Total	53 or 30%	45 or 25%	25 or 14%	7 or 4%	2 or 1%	132 or 75%

	Average Moves Including All Directors	Average Moves Among Those with One or More Moves
Male	1.3	1.8
Female	1.5	2
Total	1.4	1.9

* Forty-five directors or 25% obtained their first directorship without making any moves. Gender breakdown: 20 males or 23% and 25 females or 28%.

Geographic Moves Prior to First Directorship—1986*

	Average Moves	Total Moves
Male	1.1	112
Female	1.0	65
Total	1.1	177

* In the 1986 study, we did not have statistics that allowed us to calculate a breakdown beyond what appears in the table.

Table 12

Working as a Professional Librarian While Attending Law School—2012

	Yes	No	No J.D.
Male	19 or 22%	67 or 78%	1 or 1%
Female	30 or 34%	59 or 66%	1 or 1%
Total	49 or 28%	126 or 72%	2 or 1%

Working as a Professional Librarian While Attending Law School—1986

	Yes	No	No J.D.
Male	19 or 19%	79 or 81%	N/A
Female	30 or 48%	32 or 52%	N/A
Total	49 or 31%	101 or 63%	10 or 6%

Table 13**Law Library Left Immediately Prior to First Directorship—2012***

Schools	Number
Georgetown	8 or 5%
Texas	7 or 4%
Duke	6 or 3%
California–Berkeley, North Carolina	4 or 2% each
Chicago, Connecticut, Georgia State, Louisville, Michigan, Nova Southeastern, Oklahoma City, Yale	3 or 2% each
28 schools ^a	2 or 1%
59 schools ^b	1 or 1%

^a Boston University, California–Hastings, Case Western, Colorado, Columbia, Fordham, Georgia, George Mason, Illinois, Lewis & Clark, LSU, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi College, NYLS, North Dakota, Northeastern, Northwestern, Northern Illinois, Northern Kentucky, Notre Dame, Oklahoma, Rutgers–Camden, Seattle, SUNY–Buffalo, Toledo, Western New England, and William Mitchell.

^b Akron, Alabama, Baltimore, Baylor, Brooklyn, Boston College, BYU, Campbell, Catholic–Puerto Rico, Chicago–Kent, CUNY, Cooley, Cornell, Creighton, Emory, George Washington, Golden Gate, Gonzaga, Harvard, Houston, Indiana–Bloomington, Kansas, Loyola–California, Marquette, Mercer, Miami, Missouri–Columbia, Montana, Nebraska, New England, New Mexico, NYU, Ohio Northern, Pace, Pittsburgh, Quinnipiac, St. Louis, St. Thomas–Florida, SMU, Southern Illinois, Southwestern, Stanford, Temple, Texas Southern, Texas Tech, Texas Wesleyan, Thomas Jefferson, Tulsa, UCLA, USC, Valparaiso, Vanderbilt, Villanova, Wake Forest, Washburn, U. Washington, Washington & Lee, Wayne State, and William & Mary.

* Nine directors were not employed by an academic law library prior to their first directorship.

Law Library Left Immediately Prior to First Directorship—1986*

Schools	Number
Texas	7 or 4%
Harvard, Michigan	5 or 3% each
Villanova, Yale	4 or 3% each
Chicago, Columbia, Illinois, NYU, Oklahoma, Southern Illinois, SUNY–Buffalo, USC	3 or 2% each
Akron, Connecticut, Duke, Georgetown, Illinois, Indiana– Bloomington, Maine, McGeorge, Oregon, SMU, Texas Tech, Wayne State	2 or 1% each
53 schools ^{ab}	1 or 1% each

^a Alabama, Baltimore, California–Berkeley, Boston University, Catholic, Cornell, CUNY, Delaware, DePaul, Detroit, Dickinson, Florida, Florida State, Franklin Pierce, George Washington, Georgia State, Houston, Idaho, Kentucky, Lewis & Clark, LSU, Louisville, Loyola–California, Loyola–New Orleans, Mercer, Miami, Mississippi, Missouri–Columbia, North Dakota, Notre Dame, NYLS, Ohio State, Richmond, Rutgers, South Carolina, Southern, Southwestern, St. Louis, Touro, UCLA, USC, Pennsylvania, Washington, Valparaiso, Washington–St. Louis, Washington & Lee, Whittier, and William & Mary.

^b The 1986 study erroneously omitted five institutions from the above list.

* Nine directors left nonacademic law libraries for their first directorship.

Table 14

Professional Experience in a Non-Law School Law Library Prior to First Directorship—2012

	Experience in a Non-Law School Library	No Experience in a Non-Law School Library
Male	21 or 24%	66 or 76%
Female	21 or 24%	66 or 76%
Total	42 or 24%	132 or 76%

Average Number of Years in a Non-Law School Library*	
Male	5
Female	4
Total	4

* Breaking down the number of directors per years of experience in a non-law school library we found 10 directors spent only 1 year, 8 directors spent 2 years, 5 directors 3 years, 8 directors 4 years, 2 directors 5 years, 2 directors 6 years, 1 director 7 years, 3 directors 8 years, 1 director 10 years, 1 director 18 years, 1 director 29 years.

By Type—2012

	County	Private Law Firm	State Law Library	Federal	Other Private Law Library	Court Law Library
Male	5	6	3	2	2	3
Female	2	9	2	4	2	2
Total	7	15	5	6	4	5

Professional Experience in a Non-Law School Library Prior to First Directorship—1986

	Experience in a Non-Law School Library	No Experience in a Non-Law School Library
Male	16 or 16%	82 or 84%
Female	9 or 15%	53 or 85%
Total	25 or 16%	135 or 84%

Average Number of Years in a Non-Law School Library	
Male	4
Female	4
Total	4

By Type—1986

	County	Private Law Firm	State	Federal Agency	Bar	State Court
Male	4	4	5	2	1	0
Female	3	3	1	2	1	1
Total	7	7	6	4	2	1

	Legal Services	National Judicial College	Library of Congress	State Government	Corporate	Total
Male	0	1	1	0	1	16
Female	1	0	0	1	0	9
Total	1	1	1	1	1	25

Table 15

Non-Law Library Professional Library Experience Prior to First Directorship—2012*

	With Experience	Average Years	No Experience
Male	8 or 9%	5	77 or 91%
Female	25 or 29%	6	61 or 71%
Total	33 or 19%	5	138 or 81%

* Of the 40 directors with non-law library experience, 22 worked in academic libraries (5 males, 17 females); 9 in public libraries (2 males, 7 females); 4 in school libraries (4 females); 2 in a state library (2 females); 1 in a medical library (female); 1 in a military library (male); and 1 in a private library (female). We do not have a breakdown by type of library for the 1986 study.

Non-Law Library Professional Library Experience Prior to First Directorship—1986

	With Experience	Average Years	No Experience
Male	6 or 6%	4	92 or 94%
Female	7 or 11%	8	55 or 89%
Total	13 or 8%	6	147 or 92%

Table 16

Law Practice Experience Prior to First Directorship—2012*

	Practice-U.S.	Average Years	No Practice Experience
Male	33 or 39%	5	51 or 61%
Female	35 or 41%	4	51 or 59%
Total	68 or 40%	4	102 or 60%

* By years of practice experience, the 2012 study revealed 12 directors (6 males, 6 females) had 1 year of experience; 13 directors (4 males, 9 females) had 2 years of experience; 7 directors (4 males, 3 females) had 3 years of experience; 6 directors (3 males, 3 females) had 4 years of experience; 1 director (female) had 5 years of experience; 5 directors (3 males, 2 females) had 6 years of experience; 6 directors (3 males, 3 females) had 7 years of experience; 5 directors (3 males, 2 females) had 8 years of experience; 3 directors (males) had 9 years of experience; 2 directors (1 male, 1 female) had 10 years of experience; 2 directors (females) had 12 years of experience; 1 director (male) had 13 years of experience; and 1 director (female) had 17 years of experience. We were unable to establish the years of practice experience for 4 directors.

Law Practice Experience Prior to First Directorship—1986

	Practice-U.S.*	Average Years	No Practice Experience
Male	13 or 13%	3	85 or 87%
Female	9 or 15%	3	53 or 85%
Total	22 or 14%	3	138 or 86%

* Because there is no comparison data in the 2012 study, we have omitted the category of foreign practice from this table. In the 1986 study, 3 directors or 2% (all were males) had foreign law practice experience. The average number of years of foreign practice was 6.

Table 17

Internal Promotion to First Directorship—2012*

	Internal Promotion	Not Promoted Internally
Male	26 or 30%	61 or 70%
Female	35 or 39%	55 or 61%
Total	61 or 34%	116 or 66%

* This category was not studied in 1986.

Table 18

Courses Taught Prior to First Directorship—2012*

	One or More Course Taught	Did Not Teach
Male	67 or 77%	20 or 24%
Female	79 or 88%	11 or 12%
Total	146 or 82%	31 or 17%

Type of Course	Male	Female	Total
Research & Writing	63 or 72%	80 or 89%	143 or 81%
Substantive Law	11 or 13%	22 or 24%	33 or 19%

Type of Course	By Number of Courses Taught	Male	Female	Total
Research & Writing	1	47 or 54%	57 or 63%	104 or 59%
	2	13 or 15%	18 or 20%	31 or 18%
Substantive Law	1	8 or 9%	15 or 17%	23 or 13%
	2	2 or 2%	6 or 7%	8 or 5%
	3	1 or 1%	0	1 or 1%
	4	0	1 or 1%	1 or 1%

* This category was not studied in 1986.

Table 19

Was First Directorship Acting or Interim—2012

	Yes	No
Male	21 or 24%	66 or 76%
Female	34 or 38%	56 or 62%
Total	55 or 31%	123 or 69%

Was First Directorship Acting or Interim—1986

	Yes	No
Male	11 or 11%	87 or 89%
Female	16 or 25%	46 or 75%
Total	27 or 17%	133 or 83%

Table 20

Age Upon First Directorship—2012

	Average Age in Years
Male	42
Female	44
Total	43

Age Upon First Directorship—1986*

	Average Age in Years
Male	N/A
Female	N/A
Total	33

* A gender breakdown was unavailable for the 1986 study.

Table 21

Number of Years at First Directorship—2012

	Average Number of Years
Male	10
Female	8
Total Average	9

Number of Years at First Directorship—1986*

	Average Number of Years
Male	N/A
Female	N/A
Total Average	8

* A gender breakdown was unavailable for the 1986 study.

Table 22

Total Number of Directorships—2012

Number of Directorships	Male	Female	Total
1*	39 or 45%	50 or 56%	89 or 50%
2	31 or 36%	29 or 32%	60 or 34%
3	11 or 13%	8 or 9%	19 or 11%
4	5 or 6%	3 or 3%	8 or 5%
5	1 or 1%	0	1 or 1%

* In 2012, 50% of directors were still employed at their first permanent directorship.

Average Years Spent at Each Directorship—2012

Number of Directorships	Average Years – Male	Average Years – Female	Total
1	10	8	9
2	9	8	9
3	8	6	7
4	4	6	5
5	5	0	5

Total Number of Directorships—1986

Number of Directorships	Male	Female	Total
1	54 or 55%	50 or 81%	104 or 65%
2	30 or 31%	8 or 13%	38 or 24%
3	7 or 7%	3 or 5%	10 or 6%
4	6 or 6%	1 or 2%	7 or 4%
5	1 or 1%	0	1 or 1%

Average Years Spent at Each Directorship—1986

Number of Directorships	Average Years – Male	Average Years – Female	Total Average
1	N/A*	N/A*	8
2	8	6	8
3	8	4	7
4	7	5	7
5	2	0	2

* Gender calculations for the first directorship were not done in the 1986 study.

Table 23

Average Number of Years as Director—2012

	Average Number of Years as Director
Male	14
Female	12
Average Total	14

Gender Breakdown by Range of Years—2012

Years	Male	Female	Total
1–5	20 or 23%	34 or 38%	54 or 31%
6–19	36 or 41%	37 or 41%	73 or 41%
20 or More	30 or 34%	19 or 21%	49 or 28%

Average Number of Years as Director—1986

	Average Number of Years as Director
Male	13
Female	10
Average Total	12

Gender Breakdown by Range of Years—1986*

Years	Total
1–5	81 or 51%

* Additional breakdowns in this category were not calculated in the 1986 study.

Table 24

Age of Sitting Director—2012

	Average Age in Years
Male	58
Female	57
Total	57

Age of Sitting Director—1986

	Average Age in Years
Male	47
Female	41
Total	45

Table 25

Years at Current Directorship—2012

Average Years at Current Directorship	
Male	11
Female	9
Total	10

Years at Current Directorship by Range of Years—2012

Range of Years	Male	Female	Total
1–5*	32 or 37%	49 or 54%	81 or 46%
6–14	28 or 32%	22 or 24%	50 or 28%
15 or more	27 or 31%	19 or 21%	46 or 26%

* Thirty directors were in their first year at their current position: 6 males or 7% and 24 females or 27%.

Years at Current Directorship—1986

Average Years at Current Directorship	
Male	9
Female	9
Total	9

Years at Current Directorship by Range of Years—1986

Range of Years	Male*	Female*	Total
1-5	N/A	N/A	81 or 51%
6-14	N/A	N/A	50 or 31%
15 or More	N/A	N/A	29 or 18%

* A gender breakdown was unavailable for the 1986 study.

Table 26

Current Academic Rank on the Law Faculty—2012

	Academic Rank with Law Faculty	No Academic Rank with Law Faculty
Male	73 or 84%	14 or 16%
Female	59 or 66%	31 or 34%
Total	132 or 75%	45 or 25%

Rank Held Out of All Directors—2012

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Male	50 or 57%	18 or 21%	5 or 6%
Female	32 or 36%	21 or 23%	6 or 7%
Total	82 or 46%	39 or 22%	11 or 6%

Rank Held Out of All Ranked Directors—2012

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Male	50 or 68%	18 or 25%	5 or 7%
Female	32 or 54%	21 or 36%	6 or 10%
Total	82 or 62%	39 or 30%	11 or 8%

Rank by Years of Experience as Director—2012*

	Male—Professor	Female—Professor	Total
1–5	4 or 5%	5 or 6%	9 or 5%
6–10	9 or 10%	3 or 3%	12 or 7%
11–20	11 or 13%	14 or 17%	25 or 14%
21 or more	27 or 31%	10 or 11%	37 or 21%

	Male—Associate Professor	Female—Associate Professor	Total
1–5	8 or 9%	10 or 11%	18 or 10%
6–10	5 or 6%	4 or 4%	9 or 5%
11–20	4 or 5%	5 or 6%	9 or 5%
21 or more	1 or 1%	3 or 3%	4 or 2%

	Male—Assistant Professor	Female—Assistant Professor	Total
1–5	4 or 5%	6 or 7%	10 or 6%
6–10	0	0	0
11–20	0	0	0
21 or more	1 or 1%	0	1%

* We did not have comparative breakdown figures for these ranges of years in the 1986 study.

Table 26 continued

Current Academic Rank—1986

	Academic Rank with Law Faculty	No Academic Rank with Law Faculty
Male	97 or 89%	1 or 1%
Female	46 or 74%	16 or 26%
Total	143 or 89%	17 or 11%

Rank Held Out of All Directors—1986

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Male	64 or 65%	25 or 26%	8 or 8%
Female	18 or 29%	17 or 27%	11 or 18%
Total	82 or 51%	42 or 26%	19 or 12%

Rank Held Out of All Ranked Directors—1986

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Male	64 or 66%	25 or 26%	8 or 8%
Female	18 or 39%	17 or 37%	11 or 24%
Total	82 or 57%	42 or 29%	19 or 13%

Table 27

Holds Title of Associate Dean or Equivalent—2012*

	Holds a Decanal Title	Does Not Hold a Decanal Title
Male	33 or 39%	54 or 62%
Female	42 or 46%	48 or 53%
Total	75 or 43%	102 or 58%

* This category was not included in the 1986 study.

Type of Decanal Title Held

	Associate Dean*	Assistant Dean	Vice Dean
Male	30 or 34%	2 or 2%	1 or 1%
Female	39 or 43%	2 or 2%	1 or 1%
Total	69 or 39%	4 or 2%	2 or 2%

* 92% of all those who hold a decanal title hold the title of Associate Dean. 5% of all those holding a decanal title hold the title of Assistant Dean. 3% of those holding a decanal title hold the title of Vice Dean.

Table 28

Responsibility for Technology in the Law School—2012*

	Yes	No
Male	30 or 38%	49 or 62%
Female	34 or 38%	55 or 62%
Total	64 or 38%	104 or 62%

* This category was not included in the 1986 study. In the 2012 study, 168 or 95% of directors in the total study were included; there was insufficient information for 9 directors.

Table 29
Courses Taught as Director—2012*

	One or More Course Taught	Did Not Teach
Male**	81 or 96%	3 or 4%
Female	82 or 91%	8 or 9%
Total	163 or 94%	11 or 6%

Number of Courses*	Male	Female	Total
1	21 or 25%	36 or 40%	57 or 33%
2 or More	61 or 73%	46 or 51%	107 or 61%

* This category includes combined courses from both research & writing and substantive law.

Type of Course	Male	Female	Total
Research & Writing	77 or 91%	77 or 86%	154 or 87%
Substantive Law	50 or 60%	30 or 33%	80 or 46%

Type of Course	By Number of Courses Taught	Male	Female	Total
Research & Writing	1	43 or 51%	45 or 50%	88 or 50%
	2	27 or 32%	29 or 32%	56 or 32%
	3	7 or 8%	3 or 3%	10 or 6%
Substantive Law	1	20 or 24%	21 or 23%	41 or 24%
	2	12 or 14%	5 or 6%	17 or 10%
	3	4 or 5%	1 or 1%	5 or 3%
	4	9 or 11%	2 or 2%	11 or 6%
	5	2 or 2%	0	2 or 1%
	6	1 or 1%	1 or 1%	2 or 1%
	9	1 or 1%	0	1 or 1%
	10	1 or 1%	0	1 or 1%

* It is interesting to note that the vast majority of directors are teaching both during their directorships but also pre-directorship (146 or 82%). This is a clear sign of the necessity of teaching as part of the duties of academic law librarians.

** For the 2012 study, we were able to find information sufficient to include 174 directors: 84 males and 90 females.

Courses Taught as Director—1986*

	One or More Course Taught	Did Not Teach
Total	92%	8%

* A gender breakdown was not discernable by examining the 1986 study due to a different method of compiling data.

Type of Course	Male	Female	Total
Research & Writing	84 or 86%	52 or 84%	136 or 85%
Substantive Law	56 or 57%	18 or 29%	74 or 46%

Table 30

Publications—2012

	Have Published	Average Pieces	Have Not Published
Male	80 or 96%	13	3 or 2%
Female	80 or 92%	12	7 or 4%
Total*	160 or 94%	12	10 or 6%

* For the 2012 study, we were able to find information sufficient to include 170 directors. There were 4 males and 3 females not included because of insufficient information.

Publications by Type—2012*

	Librarianship Articles	Substantive Law Articles	Legal Research/Law School/Teach- ing Articles	Book Reviews	Chapters in Books	Monographs
Male	63 or 76%	40 or 48%	70 or 84%	31 or 37%	38 or 46%	34 or 41%
Female	67 or 77%	45 or 52%	61 or 70%	32 or 37%	40 or 46%	25 or 29%
Total	130 or 76%	85 or 50%	131 or 77%	63 or 37%	78 or 46%	59 or 35%

* In the 2012 study, we expanded the types of publications from those examined in the 1986 study, therefore the categories are not identical, but in most cases they are comparable.

Publications by Range of Numbers—2012

Number of Publications	Male	Female	Total
1–5	37 or 46%	10 or 13%	47 or 24%
6–10	14 or 17%	42 or 53%	56 or 29%
11–16	14 or 17%	16 or 20%	30 or 18%
17–30	4 or 5%	1 or 1%	5 or 3%
30 or more	8 or 10%	5 or 6%	13 or 8%

Publications—1986

	Have Published	Average Pieces
Male	82 or 82%	12
Female	38 or 61%	4
Total	120 or 75%	9

Publications by Type—1986

	Law Monographs	Library Monographs	Law Articles	Library Articles	Book Reviews
Male	32 or 3%	79 or 8%	175 or 18%	458 or 47%	225 or 23%
Female	3 or 2%	16 or 11%	6 or 4%	83 or 56%	40 or 27%
Total	35 or 3%	95 or 9%	181 or 16%	541 or 48%	265 or 24%