LOOKING IN &
LEADING OUT

Key Findings on Diversity from the UCLI 2020 Certification Program Survey
INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT. Law is one of the least diverse professions in the country. Utah’s legal community is no exception. We are a profession with worthy aspirations like ensuring access to justice, fairness, and equality before the law. To reach these goals, our legal institutions must represent the communities we serve. Many legal employers and members of the profession recognize this and are working to make Utah’s legal profession more diverse, equitable, and inclusive. This report aims to support that work.

This report is based on data collected from a survey of Utah legal employers participating in the Utah Center for Legal Inclusion’s (UCLI) Certification Program. UCLI’s Certification Program attracts law firms and legal organizations seeking to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) within their organization. The Certification Program offers employers methods, strategies, policies, and standards for addressing DEI. The survey was administered between November 2020 and January 2021 and focuses on understanding the representation of different racial, gender identity, sexual orientation, and disability status groups in Utah’s legal profession. The data capture the demographic makeup and policies of legal employers as of December 31, 2019. This report provides a benchmark that legal employers can use to gauge their success in attracting, retaining, and promoting diverse talent going forward. It is also a resource for employers interested in making their workspaces more diverse, equitable, and inclusive.

For partners, senior attorneys, managers, owners, and others in workplace leadership, this report presents the results of UCLI’s certification survey, identifies trends, and offers best practice suggestions. In large part, this report was drafted with you in mind. Your leadership and commitment are necessary for Utah’s legal field to see sustainable improvement in the hiring, advancement, and retention of attorneys from underrepresented groups.

For diverse lawyers, the data reported here reflect your presence, work, and dedication to improving the field for yourself and people like you. This report recognizes the contributions you have made and will continue to make to Utah’s legal profession. The authors hope this report will, at some level, validate your experiences and support your work.

For lawyers, legal paraprofessionals, law students, and those interested in entering the legal field, this report is a primer on diversity, equity, and inclusion in law in Utah. Many in Utah’s legal profession are working to diversify our ranks, create and promote more equitable workplace policies, and foster an inclusive culture. The authors of this report hope you will join in this work.

---


2 UCLI, UCLI Certification Program Overview (2021), https://www.utahcli.org/certification/
The data and best practices this report presents are not just for legal employers or attorneys from underrepresented groups. They are for everyone in the legal community. We each have a role to play in looking inward at our current practices, understanding what it will take to improve ourselves and the systems in which we operate, and leading out to make Utah’s legal community a welcoming place that’s an example for others to emulate.

ABOUT THE UTAH CENTER FOR LEGAL INCLUSION. UCLI was formed in response to a long-observed pattern in the legal profession: a lack of diversity, particularly of diversity in senior roles. To fully realize the values underlying our American legal system—fairness, representation, access to justice, and equality before the law, among others—it is imperative that the legal profession adequately represent the communities it sets out to serve. Often, advocating for or coordinating the implementation of equitable and inclusive policies falls to the members of underrepresented groups these policies are supposed to support. This can lead to burnout and advocacy fatigue.

UCLI aims to play a critical role in resolving these issues. By coordinating with the Utah State Bar and its affinity groups, legal employers, government agencies, educational institutions, businesses, and community partners, UCLI strives to enhance organizational inclusion, facilitate educational opportunities and professional advancement for students and attorneys with diverse backgrounds, and track the progress of legal inclusion efforts throughout the state. Taking on the role of collecting and presenting benchmark diversity data is just one way in which UCLI is working to advance diverse representation and bring about an equitable and inclusive future for Utah’s legal institutions and justice system.

ABOUT JUSTICE LAB. Justice Lab is an intensive clinical course at the S.J. Quinney College of Law where students engage in public interest legal work. Justice Lab students work on projects related to access to justice, public policy, and systemic change. Small teams of students work directly with government and nonprofit clients to advance social change throughout the semester-long course.

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS. The UCLI survey gives insight into the demographics of Utah’s legal profession. Key findings include:

- **Key Finding #1:** Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) occupy less than 5% of equity partner positions. Proportional BIPOC representation decreases from associate to equity partner.
- **Key Finding #2:** Women and men are hired as associates at similar rates but at each level of advancement women’s proportional representation decreases as men’s increases.
- **Key Finding #3:** Women are twice as likely as men to have part-time schedules.
- **Key Finding #4:** The percentage of LGBTQ+ attorneys is 3.5 times lower than the percentage of LGBTQ+ attorneys nationally.
- **Key Finding #5:** The percentage of attorneys in Utah with a disability is less than 1% of all attorneys, but is almost six times lower than other employed Utahns with a disability.
- **Key Finding #6:** Respondent employers in Utah have fewer DEI and schedule flexibility policies than regional legal employers.

---

3 Due to methodology (particularly employer reporting) data on disabled and LGBTQ+ populations are limited in this survey.

4 Refers to race/ethnicity and includes census categories: Asian, Black or African American, Latinx, Native American or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and multiracial lawyers. References to racial and ethnic representation refer to these same census categories.

WHY DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION MATTER

Many lawyers enter the profession because of an interest in justice, equality, and fairness. As lawyers, we want to contribute to ensuring a just society, equitable outcomes for our clients, and fair legal systems. By promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion, the legal profession can advance these broader goals.7

Beyond advancing worthy community goals, diversity adds value to our relationships and spurs professional growth. It also leads to beneficial business outcomes.7

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION ARE GOOD FOR BUSINESS. Diverse workplaces often produce more innovative ideas,8 greater productivity,9 and happier employees.10 Research has also found that diversity is better for the bottom line when considering diversity of race,11 gender,12 and sexual orientation or identity.13 Not only are employees in diverse and inclusive workforces putting in more discretionary effort (the extra work that employees put in because they want to, rather than are required to),14 they also have greater intent to stay at such workplaces.15 This means that diversity not only increases productivity on the employee level, it may also increase productivity at the organizational level by allowing greater focus on business efforts rather than the time-consuming hiring process. In addition, diverse legal teams “achieve significantly higher performance ratings.”16 Collaboration and team commitment are greater within diverse workforces.17

In addition, business entities that hire law firms are placing market pressure on legal employers to focus on DEI. Many Utah business leaders have publicly recognized the importance of racial DEI.18 Clients want law firms that are embracing diversity.19 In a competitive legal market, those who are committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion not only show potential clients that they are able to attract and retain diverse talent, but also show that they are equipped to handle diverse and complex issues. But promoting diversity on the surface without implementing inclusive policies and best practices can lead to burnout, ostracism, tokenism, and conflict. The benefits of a diverse workplace community are real and employers who are willing to do the work to recruit more diverse talent and build inclusive cultures to retain it are the ones who are investing in the future.


THE UCLI SURVEY

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS. UCLI distributed the 2020 Certification Program Survey to legal employers participating in UCLI’s Certification Program. The survey was sent to 53 employers starting in November 2020 and received 31 unique responses before closing at the end of January 2021.20 The survey collected data from legal employers throughout the state and captured demographic data from more than 1700 Utah attorneys. This report anonymizes all data reported.

The survey was completed by a representative from each employer. This method aimed to ensure that the data accounts for all attorneys at each respondent employer, rather than just those who might respond to a survey sent to individual attorneys and paralegals.

Respondent employer size ranged from 3 to 273 attorneys. Employers included private law firms, government offices, non-profit legal groups, and in-house counsel offices of private companies. The survey focused on four main demographic categories: race and ethnicity, gender, LGBTQ+, and disability status. Law firm demographic data is generally separated into two categories: employee title (including equity partner, non-equity partner, associate, of counsel, summer associate, and paralegal) and employer size (including firms of 2–20, 21–50, 51–100, and 100+ attorneys). The survey also collected information about legal employers’ internal policies. Government offices and other legal organizations that do not follow these categories selected the most similar categories. For example, a senior attorney in a government office was grouped with non-equity partners at private firms.

The purpose of the survey was to create a baseline of demographic information on Utah’s legal community. Participating employers represent a variety of practice areas and specialties, ranging from family law and intellectual property to criminal law and corporate litigation. The employers were on average larger than those that make up Utah’s legal profession as a whole.21 For example, only six percent of the demographic data captured in the survey is from attorneys who work at offices with less than 20 total attorneys, despite more than half of all Utah lawyers working at legal offices with less than 30 attorneys.22 In other words, the data underrepresents attorneys from small firms.

After the data collection stage, Justice Lab students from S.J. Quinney College of Law cleaned the data and analyzed the responses. Responses from all 31 employers are included in the data reported here. Data submitted from employers with significant presence outside of Utah were excluded from the demographic data in each Utah analysis but were included for regional comparison in the policy data in Key Finding #6. Data from a total of 28 legal employers were included in the gender findings and data from 27 legal employers were relied on for the remaining demographic findings in this report. Raw numbers of attorneys were converted into percentages, given the total numbers reported by survey respondents. Responses about policies were sometimes turned into percentages by counting the number of “Yes” responses and “No” responses, indicating whether a given employer had or did not have a listed policy.

ADDITIONAL DATA SOURCES. Data from the National Association for Law Placement’s (NALP) 2020 Report on Diversity in U.S. Law Firms was used to provide a regional comparison to demographic representation in similar states. NALP collects data from metropolitan areas, rather than from entire states. This is a useful comparison to the UCLI responses because the majority of UCLI survey responses were from legal employers in the Salt Lake City metropolitan area. NALP data from legal employers with offices in the Denver, Phoenix, and Portland areas were used to provide the regional comparison. These regions were selected to provide a rough comparison to Utah’s legal market, in both geography and demographics.

Justice Lab students also sought reflections from attorneys and law students from underrepresented groups in Utah. Respondents were asked to share experiences in the legal field where their diverse identity played a role in how they were treated, the type of law they chose to pursue, or whether they considered leaving the profession. It was sent to attorneys through UCLI and Utah State Bar affinity groups (including the Utah Minority Bar Association and Women Lawyers of Utah) and to law students at the S.J. Quinney College of Law. This report draws on the responses to highlight the lived experiences of these attorneys and law students in Utah. Quotes from these responses are included throughout this report.

20 The group of employers that failed to respond did not have any particular characteristics. There was no particular size or type of employer that tended to fail to respond.
22 2020 Utah State Bar Member Survey.
Black, Indigenous, and people of color ("BIPOC") are vastly underrepresented in the legal field. In the United States, members of BIPOC communities make up approximately 40% of the overall population, but only 18% of lawyers. A similar disparity between the representative proportion of BIPOC communities and BIPOC lawyers is present in Utah. Approximately 22% of the population in Utah is BIPOC, but only 9% of attorneys and 13% of paralegals in the Utah legal community were reported as BIPOC.

In the UCLI survey data, BIPOC representation is highest in summer associate (17%) and paralegal (14%) roles and decreases as seniority increases within legal organizations, from associate (8%) to equity partner (4%). The first chart depicts the number of legal professionals by role in the UCLI data.

The UCLI data suggests employer size may play a role in the decrease in BIPOC representation in more senior positions, but also makes clear that regardless of the number of attorneys at an employer, BIPOC legal professionals are underrepresented. Medium-sized employers of 21–50 attorneys had the highest percentage of BIPOC summer associates and associates, but the lowest percentage of BIPOC attorneys in partner positions, perhaps indicating a recent push by employers of this size to add more racial diversity to their staff.

An important method for increasing diversity and inclusion at every level of a legal office's seniority is having BIPOC attorneys or professionals sit on decision making committees. Of the employers in the UCLI survey, 40% require the inclusion of at least one BIPOC attorney on committees related to hiring, 27% require inclusion on committees related to compensation, and 38% require inclusion on committees related to promotion. Several legal employers reported having committees or specific representatives dedicated to matters of organizational diversity and inclusion. Of the legal employers surveyed, about 50% stated they had a committee specifically dedicated to DEI, but only about 30% reported giving billable hour credit to attorneys for work related to diversity and inclusion efforts. If BIPOC attorneys are asked to sit on DEI committees or take on other DEI efforts in addition to the workload expected of other attorneys, BIPOC attorneys may become disproportionately burdened with these well-intentioned obligations.

In general, legal employers whose diversity committees were tasked with writing and reviewing DEI policies were also the ones giving billable credit to attorneys for work related to diversity and inclusion efforts. The responsibilities of other, non-compensated DEI committees were often vague.

Utah's law schools have among the lowest rates of BIPOC student representation in the region at roughly 17 percent. In a 2021 analysis of the 200 Whitest Law Schools, Utah's two law schools ranked 89th (University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law) and 91st (Brigham Young University J. Reuben Clark Law School). However, there is still greater BIPOC representation at Utah law schools (17% BIPOC) than at Utah legal employers (9% BIPOC).

BIPOC Representation by Role in Utah's Legal Profession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Utah</th>
<th>Regional Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paralegals</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Associates</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: Regional comparisons for this and subsequent graphics in this section are based on 2020 NALP data from legal employers with offices in the Denver, Phoenix, and Portland areas. These regions were selected to provide a rough comparison to Utah’s legal market, both in geography and demographics. Paralegal data was not available in the NALP report.


27 Examples of vague responsibilities include “advise on issues related to DEI,” “report on DEI efforts both inside and outside the [organization],” “discussing matters of diversity and inclusion at the firm,” “becoming educated about inclusion and diversity,” etc.

28 ABA Commission on Women in the Profession, Visible Invisibility: Women of Color in Law Firms 38 (2006) (“Women of color should definitely continue to be included in a firm’s diversity and professional development efforts because their voices are critical in these processes, but they should not be relegated to committees that focus on diversity, nor should they assume responsibility for the creation and maintenance of diversity within the firm.”).
BIPOC make up less than 5% of equity partner positions regardless of the size of the legal employer, and representation decreases from associate to equity partner.

**KEY FINDING #1**

**BIPOC Representation by Employer Size**

- 2 - 20 Attorneys
  - Paralegals: 14% BIPOC, 10% White
  - Summer Associates: 10% BIPOC, 5% White
  - Associates: 17% BIPOC, 17% White
  - Partners: 13% BIPOC, 5% White

- 21 - 50 Attorneys
  - Paralegals: 17% BIPOC, 17% White
  - Summer Associates: 17% BIPOC, 17% White
  - Associates: 8% BIPOC, 13% White
  - Partners: 12% BIPOC, 6% White

- 51 - 100 Attorneys
  - Paralegals: 8% BIPOC, 4% White
  - Summer Associates: 4% BIPOC, 5% White
  - Associates: 12% BIPOC, 5% White
  - Partners: 6% BIPOC, 5% White

- 100+ Attorneys
  - Paralegals: 10% BIPOC, 5% White
  - Summer Associates: 8% BIPOC, 4% White
  - Associates: 12% BIPOC, 5% White
  - Partners: 19% BIPOC, 8% White

**Regional Comparison**

- Paralegals: 13% BIPOC, 83% White
- Summer Associates: 17% BIPOC, 8% White
- Associates: 12% BIPOC, 5% White
- Partners: 18% BIPOC, 12% White

---

Note: UCLI and NALP use U.S. Census categories for collecting data on race and ethnicity but the Utah Bar does not. The Census has a reporting category for “White/Non-hispanic” but the Utah Bar lists this option as “Caucasian,” which can be selected along with another racial or ethnic identifier. In the 2020 Utah State Bar Member Survey, 90% of respondents identified as “Caucasian,” while 9% identified as members of a racially and ethnically underrepresented group, and a further 5% preferred not to disclose. 2020 Utah State Bar Member Survey.

BIPOC Attorney Representation by Employer Size
Figures represent percentages of attorneys based on UCLI 2020 survey data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2 - 20 Attorneys</th>
<th>21 - 50 Attorneys</th>
<th>51 - 100 Attorneys</th>
<th>100+ Attorneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native/American Indian</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>93.70%</td>
<td>93.24%</td>
<td>94.15%</td>
<td>93.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UCLI 2020 Certification Program Survey

Note: “BIPOC” refers to race/ethnicity and includes census categories, including: Asian, Black or African American, Latinx, Native American or Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, and multiracial lawyers. References to racial and ethnic representation include these same census categories.

BIPOC Attorney Representation by Professional Role
Figures represent percentages of attorneys based on UCLI 2020 survey data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Paralegal</th>
<th>Summer Associate</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Of Counsel</th>
<th>Non-Equity Partner</th>
<th>Equity Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan Native/American Indian</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>14.10%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>1.98%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
<td>1.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>85.83%</td>
<td>82.00%</td>
<td>91.53%</td>
<td>90.03%</td>
<td>90.32%</td>
<td>96.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UCLI 2020 Certification Program Survey

Percent of White Law Students, 2019–2020

Source: ABA 509 Disclosures

Data not included

Source: ABA 509 Disclosures
KEY FINDING #2

Women and men are hired as associates at similar rates but at each level of advancement women’s proportional representation decreases as men’s increases.

The UCLI survey found that the proportional representation of women decreased at every level of advancement in Utah’s legal field. This finding is consistent with the robust data in the 2020 Women Lawyers of Utah report, Barriers to Advancement. Women are vastly overrepresented in paralegal positions, tend to be underrepresented in junior attorney positions, and are vastly underrepresented in senior attorney positions. The Utah legal field’s representation of women lags behind the region. Women make up roughly 1 out of every 4 partners at law firms in the region, but the average among Utah law firms surveyed was roughly 1 in 6 (17%). Utah is behind national law firms in reaching overall gender parity (29% women lawyers as opposed to 37% nationally).

Although women make up only 29% of lawyers at surveyed employers, the vast majority of paralegals are women (approximately 90%). This disparity in representation of women between lawyers and paralegals tracks with national data. On average at law firms, women made up 44% of summer associates and only 17% of partners.

The UCLI survey did not collect information that allowed for conclusions about women of color (“WOC”) and other intersectional identities, but other industries have found that similar trends are even more significant for WOC.

There is no clear trend in the UCLI data for gender representation and employer size. As the Gender Representation by Employer chart indicates, smaller employers hired greater percentages of women summer associates (71%) compared to the other-sized employers (41%, 50%, 39% at employers sized 21–50, 51–100, and 100+, respectively) and regional employers (60%), but large employers had more women in partner positions (32%) than smaller and medium-sized employers (22%, 14%, 23% at employers sized 2–20, 21–50, and 51–100, respectively).

Women make up 39% of Associates and 25% of Partners (Equity and Non-equity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Women Partners" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Men Partners" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Women Associates" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Men Associates" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 UCLI 2020 Certification Program Survey. But see Barriers to Advancement, 2020 WLU Survey, at 6 (finding that “Utah women comprise . . . only 12% of law firm partners,” or roughly 1 in 8). When factoring in government offices, the number of women in partner-type roles rises to about 25%. For partners in traditional private law firms, that number is approximately 17%.
34 2020 Utah State Bar Survey, at 99.
36 This includes both equity and non-equity partners.
37 Mckinsey & Company & Lean In, Women in the Workplace 2020 9 (2020) (“For every 100 men promoted to manager, only 85 women were promoted—and this gap was even larger for some women: Only 58 Black women and 71 Latinas were promoted.”).
38 The percentage of women in partner roles drops to 17% when including data only from private law firms.
KEY FINDING #2

Gender Representation by Role in Utah’s Legal Profession

- Paralegals
- Summer Associates
- Associates
- Partners


Gender Representation by Employer Size

Figures represent the percentage of women in the designated role.

Note: Regional data for paralegals was unavailable.

Gender Representation in Utah v. Nationwide

- Women
- Men

Source: U.S. Census V2019, Utah State Bar 2020 Member Survey

Key
- Paralegals
- Summer Associates
- Associates
- Partners
KEY FINDING #3

Women are twice as likely as men to have part-time schedules.

On average, 67% of part-time attorneys at surveyed employers in Utah were women and 33% were men. The UCLI data suggests that there are greater percentages of women working part-time at large (100+ attorneys) and small (2–20 attorneys) employers than at medium-sized ones. The percentages of women working part-time at medium-sized employers (55%) was similar to the regional comparison (56%), which was near parity with men.

Part-time Attorneys

Key

Women

Men

Many employers may offer part-time policies as a well-intentioned option, but research suggests taking advantage of these policies can be a double-edged sword for women. Mothers in particular face additional barriers when they opt for part-time schedules. Some mothers may face a “flexibility stigma,” or bias triggered by mothers taking parental leave or working part-time or flexible schedules, after they return. This “flexibility stigma” disproportionately impacts women, as partially evidenced by a higher percentage of men than women “believing that they could ask for flexible work arrangements without hurting their career.”

“A well-meaning [male] attorney told me he would ‘hurry and get approval’ of an agreement from his client ‘so that we can wrap this up and get you back home to your kids.’ I do not have kids, and lived alone at the time. I worked a normal 40–60 hour work week just like any other young professional, but he assumed I was . . . part-time[.]”

41 The data does not address the reason causing this disparity. The relatively small number of employer respondents means even one or two employers with outliers in each size category could meaningfully influence the data. One possible explanation for the difference is that several medium-sized employers in Utah serve large tech clients, who may favor legal representation with the kinds of schedule flexibility policies tech giants are known for. This may encourage both men and women to have part-time schedules at similar rates.

42 The does not address the reason causing this disparity. The relatively small number of employer respondents means even one or two employers with outliers in each size category could meaningfully influence the data. One possible explanation for the difference is that several medium-sized employers in Utah serve large tech clients, who may favor legal representation with the kinds of schedule flexibility policies tech giants are known for. This may encourage both men and women to have part-time schedules at similar rates.

43 Part-time attorneys are predominantly women, but only about 10% of attorneys in Utah work part-time. See Barriers to Advancement, 2020 WLU Survey, at 26 (finding that “12% of women work part-time compared to only 7% of men”).

44 The data does not address the reason causing this disparity. The relatively small number of employer respondents means even one or two employers with outliers in each size category could meaningfully influence the data. One possible explanation for the difference is that several medium-sized employers in Utah serve large tech clients, who may favor legal representation with the kinds of schedule flexibility policies tech giants are known for. This may encourage both men and women to have part-time schedules at similar rates.

45 The data does not address the reason causing this disparity. The relatively small number of employer respondents means even one or two employers with outliers in each size category could meaningfully influence the data. One possible explanation for the difference is that several medium-sized employers in Utah serve large tech clients, who may favor legal representation with the kinds of schedule flexibility policies tech giants are known for. This may encourage both men and women to have part-time schedules at similar rates.

46 This “flexibility stigma” disproportionately impacts women, as partially evidenced by a higher percentage of men than women “believing that they could ask for flexible work arrangements without hurting their career.”

47 A recent survey of policies at Utah companies found that entry-level, part-time schedule policies were common, but those policies were much less common in higher level positions. A metaphor used to describe the loss of women from a field before they reach representative proportions in senior roles is called the “leaky pipeline.” The lack of these schedule flexibility policies for senior roles may contribute to a leaky pipeline because it may pressure women “to forgo promotions or leave their companies rather than transition to full-time roles.”

Schedule flexibility is especially relevant given effects of the COVID-19 pandemic. Many Utah women “left the workforce completely,” “took a leave of absence,” or “downshifted . . . from full-time to part-time work” in 2020.

Part-time Schedules by Employer Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Size</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 20 Attorneys</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 50 Attorneys</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 100 Attorneys</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+ Attorneys</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Comparison</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


41 Commission on Women in the Profession & ABA, You Can’t Change What You Can’t See: Interrupting Racial & Gender Bias in the Legal Profession, ABA 34 (2018).

42 See Barriers to Advancement, 2020 WLU Survey, at 26 (finding that “12% of women work part-time compared to only 7% of men”).


The percentage of LGBTQ+ attorneys in Utah is 3.5 times lower than the percentage of LGBTQ+ attorneys nationally.

Employers in the UCLI survey reported that less than 1% of lawyers identify as LGBTQ+, suggesting LGBTQ+ attorneys are either underrepresented in Utah’s legal community or are not comfortable outing themselves as LGBTQ+ in the workplace. The national rate of LGBTQ+ lawyers is more than three times higher than in the survey data (2.99% vs. 0.85%). In Utah, LGBTQ+ people make up 4.5% of the population. Nationally, the rate is 3.7%.

In its 2020 report, NALP relied on national data on LGBTQ+ law students to conclude “that there is still the potential for additional growth in the presence of LGBTQQI+ associates.” It is not clear if this is the case in Utah because law school data on LGBTQ+ students in the state is not available. Nationally, there seems to be a decrease in LGBTQ+ attorney representation at higher levels of seniority in law offices. LGBTQ+ lawyers nationally made up 2.19% of partners. 7.68% of summer associates, but only 4.66% of associates and 0.85% of associates if this is the case in Utah because law school data on LGBTQ+ students is not available. Nationally, there seems to be a decrease in LGBTQ+ attorney representation at higher levels of seniority in law offices. LGBTQ+ lawyers nationally made up 7.68% of summer associates, but only 4.66% of associates and 0.85% of associates and 2.19% of partners.

The UCLI survey may not fully capture accurate data about the LGBTQ+ population. Nationally, there seems to be a decrease in the representation of LGBTQ+ attorneys at higher levels of seniority in law offices. LGBTQ+ lawyers nationally made up 2.19% of partners. 7.68% of summer associates, but only 4.66% of associates and 0.85% of associates and 2.19% of partners.

LGBTQ+ Representation

- Heterosexual/Cisgender
- LGBTQ+

U.S. Population

95.50%
96.30%

Utah Population

97.01%
99.15%

U.S. Lawyers

95.86%

Utah Lawyers

99.99%

U.S. Law Schools

95.50%

Source: 2019 Williams Institute LGBT Demographic Data, 2019 NALP Diversity Report, UCLI 2020 Certification Program Survey

“[S]ome people I worked with in the legal profession were strongly biased against those who behaved in ways they considered immoral [including the] LGBTQ+ community . . . but they felt like these biases were a good thing.”

One reason employers may not be aware of LGBTQ+ attorneys in their offices is that LGBTQ+ attorneys may be concerned that their career mobility will be limited by discrimination, homophobia, and hostility in the workplace. An essential way to help LGBTQ+ attorneys to feel comfortable sharing their identities, if they so choose, is to focus on building supportive and inclusive cultures within law firms and other legal offices.

“[W]hen I first started practicing law . . . I was a closeted lesbian as I was afraid to come out for fear I would be fired, or not hired. [T]hat is one reason I formed [my] own firm.”

“I think there are people who would not hire me now as an ‘out’ lesbian.”

50 The Women Lawyers of Utah survey found a much higher percentage of LGBTQ+ attorneys than the UCLI survey, supporting the conclusion that employers in the UCLI survey were not able to provide a full picture of this population. Barriers to Advancement, 2020 WLU Survey, at 32 (“Among survey respondents, 4% of man-identified and 8% of women-identified respondents are lesbian, gay or bisexual. Only two respondents identified as transgender or non-binary.”).

51 According to the Human Rights Campaign, approximately 50% of LGBTQ+ persons are closeted at work out of fear that they might be stereotyped, lose connections or relationships with coworkers, or make others feel uncomfortable. A Workplace Divided: Understanding the Climate for LGBTQ+ Workers Nationwide, Hum. Rts. Campaign 6 (2010).

52 Paul Willis, Witnesses on the Periphery: Young Lesbian, Gay Bisexual and Queer Employees Witnessing Homophobic Exchanges in Australian Workplaces, 65(12) Hum. Rts. 1589, 1604–06 (2012) (“In male-dominated work environments, homophobic expressions were described as overtly hostile in tone towards LGBTQ sexualities . . . The research highlights the requirement for equal opportunities and diversity policies to extend beyond recognition of targeted discrimination and to recognize the nuanced ways in which homophobic beliefs and heteronormative attitudes can be woven throughout some work cultures.”).

53 Nick Drydakis, Sexual Orientation Discrimination in the United Kingdom’s Labor Market: A Field Experiment, 52 Hum. Rts. 1767, 1776 (2013) (“Heteronormative discourse . . . negatively affects the lived experiences of gay and lesbian job applicants . . . Studies suggest that good relations between employers and employees increase the openness of sexual orientation minorities, improve job attitudes and benefit firms as a whole because teamwork is an important aspect of firm productivity and success.”).
LGBTQ+ INCLUSION IS LINKED TO POSITIVE BUSINESS OUTCOMES

Workplaces that are inclusive for the LGBTQ+ community are linked to "greater job commitment, improved workplace relationships, increased job satisfaction, . . . [and] improved health outcomes among LGBT[Q+] employees." Policies that support LGBTQ+ people give businesses greater ability to recruit the highest-quality candidates and can encourage employees to stay with an employer rather than looking elsewhere.

55 Shaun Pichler, Janell Blazovich, Kirsten A. Cook, Janet M. Huston & William R. Strawser, Do LGBT-Supportive Corporate Policies Enhance Firm Performance?, Accr. Fac. Publ'ns 29 (2020) ("LGBT-supportive policies are important, in part, because they maximize a firm’s ability to attract highly skilled labor in tight labor markets.").
56 M.V. Lee Badgett et al., The Business Impact of LGBT-Supportive Workplace Policies, at 1.
Employers in the UCLI survey reported that less than 1% of lawyers have a disability, which is similar to national trends. The percentage of employed Utahns with a disability (5%) was almost six times higher than the number of Utah Lawyers with a disability (0.8%), suggesting that the legal field is particularly hard to break into for those with a disability or that attorneys prefer not to disclose their disabilities to their employer. Although these numbers are similar to those collected at the national level, it is likely the data reported in the survey do not fully capture the number of attorneys with a disability in Utah. Collecting data at the firm- or office-level is helpful in accounting for every attorney at each employer, but it may overlook those who choose not to share their disability status at work. Some employers may have disabilities that are obvious to their employer, such as partial paralysis, missing extremities, deafness, or blindness. Other attorneys may have less visible disabilities, such as neurological learning disorders (e.g., ADHD), hearing loss, arthritis, or chronic depression.

The legal field can be particularly challenging to break into and navigate for attorneys with a disability. For those with physical disabilities, navigating law offices or court rooms may require thinking ahead or building extra time into transit and arrival plans. This additional barrier placed on attorneys with a disability may unfairly disadvantage attorneys who have disabilities compared to those without disabilities, those experiencing temporary physical or cognitive disability, or those with undiagnosed disabilities.

This shared benefit applies to potential clients as much as it does current and future employees.

A past coworker... was fired because he ‘just couldn’t handle’ the caseload and was taking too much time off. [T]his attorney inherited a... very difficult [caseload which] involved a lot of travel... When he began experiencing significant symptoms of mental illness, he asked management for help (more manpower, more resources, a more realistic caseload, etc.). He was told to take time to ‘take care of himself’ but was not given any other help. Soon he was fired for taking too much time off.”

Employers may unfairly disadvantage attorneys with neurological and other disabilities. Supporting attorneys with disabilities means creating cultures where seeking accommodations is encouraged, not ignored or criticized. Creating a culture and environment that supports attorneys with disabilities also supports attorneys without a disability. Many of the accommodations that benefit those with lifelong disabilities are beneficial to those without disabilities, those experiencing temporary physical or cognitive disability, or those with undiagnosed disabilities.

Attorneys with disabilities make up less than 1% of all attorneys reported in the survey data.
Respondent employers in Utah have fewer DEI and schedule flexibility policies than regional legal employers.

In the UCLI survey, 56% of employers reported at least one formal policy aimed at promoting diversity, equity, or inclusion. Of the employers reporting at least one formal policy, 86% had at least four of these kinds of DEI policies. Nearly 44% of employers of varying sizes reported not having any of the DEI policies listed in the UCLI survey. Policies were categorized in two ways: (1) those promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion; and, (2) those providing flexibility to employees in planning work schedules. Policies promoting DEI included those intended to ensure:

- Equitable access to clients
- Quality work assignments
- Leadership and committee appointments
- Diverse marketing efforts
- Equitable pay
- Equitable opportunity for promotion

In addition to the DEI policies mentioned and depicted above, 68% of legal employers reported having a written policy or strategy regarding the recruitment and hiring of attorneys or paralegals who would be considered diverse by their gender, ethnic or racial background, or LGBTQ+ or disability status. Examples of additional policies and strategies include:

- Actively seeking out diverse candidates
- Considering candidates “based on their qualifications and experience, regardless of gender, race, orientation, age, religion, and/or disability”
- Striving to have at least 30% of applicants be from diverse backgrounds
- Having a diverse recruitment panel
- Focusing on recruiting at law schools that have a more diverse student body population,

- Incentivizing associates to participate in affinity groups within the legal community
- Having experienced attorneys sponsor/mentor junior associates and law students
- Assigning tangible roles to leaders at the firm in DEI Plans with accountability for meeting certain diversity responsibilities
- Retaining a recruiter if certain targets aren’t met for attracting diverse candidates

Approximately 40% of legal employers reported having a policy that required inclusion of at least one diverse attorney in all decisions related to hiring and promotion but only 27% reported having a policy to include a diverse attorney in decisions related to compensation. About 62% of legal employers reported holding mandatory diversity and inclusion training, usually annually.

Roughly 73% of legal employers reported having a formal mentorship program to assist with the training and advancement of newly hired attorneys. Examples of formal mentoring programs include:

- Patterning a program off the Utah Bar New Lawyer Training Program
- Assigning a senior attorney to a junior attorney as a contact for communication and resources
- Planning bimonthly lunch & learns
- Incentivizing mentorship by compensating participation in mentorship activities by the hour
- Requiring monthly check-ins from the mentoring attorney
- Having a formal associate training program
- Empowering the senior attorney to assist in the kinds of work assigned to the junior associate

One particularly important category of DEI policies are those that give employees flexibility in work scheduling. Hiring and retaining diverse talent means fostering a work environment that accepts a diverse approach to the profession. Examples of policies that promote schedule flexibility include:

- Paid maternity leave
- Paid paternity leave
- Paid parental leave
- Flex-time scheduling
- Part-time scheduling

Of the employers in the UCLI survey, 92% reported having at least one formal policy aimed at promoting flexibility in work scheduling. Of those, 76% had policies for paid maternity leave and 60% had policies for paid paternity leave (this includes those who had a policy for general parental leave) for associate attorneys and above. Of the surveyed employers, 20% had no policy concerning paid parental leave of any kind.

“I have female friends who have left firms due to inequitable treatment at larger firms, or lack of policies for [accommodating] having kids.”

The first set of policies listed above provide a look into what Utah legal employers are doing to improve diversity, equity, and inclusion in their workplaces.
The second set represents policies intended to provide attorneys with greater autonomy through schedule flexibility. While it is clear that many Utah legal employers care deeply about addressing these issues, there is still a need for many employers to adopt these types of policies. Even so, adding DEI and schedule flexibility policies will not magically solve a lack of diversity. The UCLI data makes clear the need for a more comprehensive, effective, sustained approach.

Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Policies in Utah vs. Regionally
Figures represent the percentage of Utah legal employers with certain DEI policies.

Key Findings
- Equitable Access to Clients
- Quality Work Assignments
- Leadership Assignments
- Marketing Efforts
- Equal or Equitable Pay
- Equal or Equitable Chance of Promotion
- None of These

Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Policies by Firm Size
Figures represent the percentage of firms that have adopted policies promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Note: Flex-time scheduling generally involves a policy that does not require employees to request formal time off or change of schedule to alter starting or ending times to the work day.

Work Schedule Policies in Utah vs. Regionally
Figures represent the percentage of Utah legal employers with certain work schedule policies.

Work Schedule Policies by Firm Size
Figures represent the percentage of firms that have adopted policies for promoting schedule flexibility for associate attorneys and above.

Note: Regional comparisons for these graphics are based on firms that have offices both in Utah and out of state. Five legal employers reported this kind of data. Legal employers who reported firm-wide policies, ranged in size from a handful of attorneys to over 100 attorneys. Of legal employers predominantly operating in Utah, four employers of 100+ attorneys submitted data, six employers of 51–100 attorneys, eight employers of 21–50 attorneys, and nine employers of 2–20 attorneys.
In light of the Key Findings described above, this section examines how employers can move the needle on diversity, equity, and inclusion and provides a broad overview of some of those best practices. In addressing the diversity issues captured in the Key Findings, legal employers should be prepared to:

- Commit to long-term change driven by data collection and analysis
- Reassess the effectiveness of one-off diversity training
- Adopt policies that support diversity in recruitment, hiring, retention, and advancement

The vast majority of research on DEI in the legal profession focuses on big law firms. Thus, some of the ideas presented here may not be as feasible for or responsive to concerns of government offices, legal non-profits, in-house offices, or small- and medium-sized firms. Legal employers are best positioned to be aware of the challenges of their individual organizations. The recommendations below offer a range of potential solutions for legal employers.

---

60 For an example of an organization experimenting with research-based and data-driven ways to achieve aggressive, measurable diversity goals, see Move the Needle Fund, https://www.mtnfund2025.com/.

61 The best practices included in this report are not intended to be all inclusive but instead represent a selection of best practices, focusing on those that seemed most relevant in light of the survey responses analyzed in this report.
Increasing diversity, equity, and inclusion within organizations is a challenge. Legal employers can recognize the challenge and rise to face it over the long term rather than making one or two short-term efforts and losing momentum. Sustainable and effective change requires systemic interventions and solutions applied consistently over time.62

**BEST PRACTICE #1**

Commit to long-term change and data collection.

“**LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT IS KEY.** The first step to making long-term change is commitment from leadership. The success of attorneys from underrepresented groups is an organization-wide issue. Often, these attorneys are tapped to serve on diversity committees and in other such roles.63 Although underrepresented voices are important in these settings, delegating this obligation to these attorneys alone can overburden and further marginalize them, decreasing the success of DEI efforts.64 Focusing on underrepresented attorneys’ success as an organization-wide goal can lessen these burdens and emphasize an employer’s commitment to DEI.

**SUPPORT STATEWIDE DATA COLLECTION.** The UCLI survey is the start of an ongoing effort to track diversity in Utah’s legal profession.

Without collecting demographic data on the profession, it is impossible to track whether the approaches that employers are taking are working. This demographic information is valuable both in tracking how employers are doing and in providing a comparison that individual employers can use to see how they are doing in relation to their peers.

The 2020 Utah State Bar Member Survey also provides valuable information about the legal profession in Utah.65 However, because the survey is conducted only every ten years (roughly), it shows long-term change but there is not always up-to-date data available. The Utah State Bar survey collects data directly from attorneys rather than through employers. The Women Lawyers of Utah’s survey also provides demographic and qualitative data from in-depth interviews.66 Each of these data collection efforts adds value and helps us answer a range of questions about Utah’s legal profession. Supporting statewide data collection and participating in UCLI’s Certification Program are important to track how the profession is changing, where progress has stagnated, and how the Utah legal profession compares to the profession nationally.

**COLLECT INTERNAL DATA AND FOCUS ON POLICIES THAT CAN BE TRACKED.** The implementation of any DEI goal is a step in the right direction, but DEI initiatives are much more valuable when aimed at goals that can be tracked.67 Tracking outcomes allows employers to focus their efforts on the most effective interventions. Some potential policies were identified in the UCLI survey and are featured in Key Finding #6. Sample policies can also be found on UCLI’s website. In addition to those policies, Best Practices #2 and #3 feature some potential changes that legal employers can implement to reach DEI goals.

**BUILD A WORKPLACE CULTURE THAT IS SAFE AND INCLUSIVE TO ENCOURAGE OPENNESS IN REPORTING.** Psychological safety thrives in “a climate in which people are comfortable expressing and being themselves.”68 In this type of climate, lawyers should feel free to share concerns and mistakes without fearing embarrassment and to speak up without being shamed.69

Creating a psychologically safe workplace culture in an industry like law is inherently difficult. American legal culture is often adversarial and competitive in nature. Many lawyers report constant feelings of being “on edge or at risk of professional harm.”70 Many lawyers are taught that success means never asking for help.71 This becomes dangerous when stress reaches a high, while confidence reaches a low.

**LOOKING IN AND LEADING OUT: KEY FINDINGS ON DIVERSITY FROM THE UCLI 2020 CERTIFICATION PROGRAM SURVEY**

---

62 Diversity Science, Creating Sustainable Approaches to Diversity, https://www.diversityscience.org/
sustainable-diversity-training/ (last visited Apr. 25, 2022).

63 ABA, *Visible Invisibility,* at 36 (“[M]any firms overburdened women of color through diversity committee assignments, recruiting assignments and other such efforts that marginalize the diversity efforts and place women of color in conflicting roles that compete for limited time.”).

64 Id.

65 2020 Utah State Bar Member Survey.

66 Women Lawyers of Utah, Barriers to Advancement: Findings from the 2020 Study of Gender & Racial Bias in Utah’s Legal Profession (2020)


69 Id.

70 Id.

71 Anne M. Bradford, Well-being Toolkit for Lawyers and Legal Employers, ABA RI (2018), https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/lawyer_assistance/fs_colap_web-being_toolkit_for_lawyers_legal_employers.pdf (“If you’re like a lot of lawyers, you may be hesitant to acknowledge you need support, let alone to ask for it. When compared to the general population, lawyers are far more autonomous and achievement-oriented.”).
Legal employers can promote psychological safety by taking a more humane approach to feedback and mentorship of young lawyers. Laura Delizonna’s article, *High-Performing Teams Need Psychological Safety. Here’s How to Create It*, recommends the following steps to create a psychologically safe workplace:

- Use collaborative, rather than adversarial, approaches to solve problems.73
- Promote empathy to enhance vulnerability and bonding, and create trust.74
- Anticipate reactions and plan ahead.75 When a conflict is inevitable, strategically anticipate potential reactions and create responses that avoid possible perceptions of attacking a colleague’s identity or ego.76
- Exchange blame for curiosity.77 Blame breeds defensiveness. Instead, adopt a learning mindset and refrain from making assumptions.
- After a difficult exchange, ask a colleague for feedback on delivery and describe the strategy employed to deal with the problem. This provides a clear way forward for navigating conflict with specific people in the future.78

73 Id. at 3.
74 Id. at 3.
75 Id.
76 Id. at 4.
77 Id.
BEST PRACTICE #2

Reassess DEI training.

The UCLI survey and informal reflections yielded insight into the cultures at Utah’s legal workplaces. Many of the diverse lawyers and law students who shared reflections on their experiences described instances of bias and microaggressions. Diversity training is a common method employers use to prevent bias and microaggressions in the workplace.

This section defines and discusses bias and microaggressions. It then briefly explains why diversity training on its own—and implicit bias training, in particular—is often less effective than intended. Finally, it proposes a few practices that may increase the effectiveness of diversity training in concert with other organization-wide DEI initiatives.

BIAS. “Bias can harm the mental and physical health of employees who experience it, interfere with their performance and engagement, and undermine their professional development and promotion.”79 Implicit bias “refers to the attitudes or stereotypes that affect our understanding, actions, and decisions in an unconscious manner.”80 While explicit bias can be understood as conscious bias where “the person is very clear about his or her feelings and attitudes, and related behaviors are conducted with intent,”81 explicit bias can also manifest as negative actions, or simply “subtle exclusion.”82

Biases are harmful in part because they assume things that may not be true. Research-based examples of bias and stereotyping in the workplace are countless: when women talk on the phone, it is often labeled as “gossip” while men engaging in the same behavior are seen as being productive.83 The “angry Black woman stereotype” assumes Black women are angry when engaging in the same behavior perceived as strength in white women.84 Men may be seen as passionate while women are seen as emotional for the same behaviors.85

The quote to the left also helps describe the difference between implicit and explicit bias.

MICROAGGRESSIONS. Microaggressions are comments or actions that subtly and often unknowingly manifest a person’s prejudice toward any underrepresented group of people.86 Microaggressions create barriers to diversity, equity, and inclusion goals. Generally, microaggressions do so by affecting several pieces of a lawyer’s identity, ranging from fulfillment in their work to their physical87 and mental health.88 Since the pioneering article on microaggressions was published in 200789 research has shown that microaggressions have negative effects for those who experience them.90

I went to law school in Alabama and briefly practiced there under supervision. My experience was that the sexism and racism and ableism seemed more overt in Alabama . . . . However, it was far more diverse, and there were a lot of folks who recognized the problems and were trying to make progress to solve them. In Utah, I see the same biases, but they are more implicit, disguised, and unspoken. Folks seem comfortable, and don’t seem to want to admit that these issues exist.”

82 Id.
83 Madeline E. Hellman, Description and Prescription: How Gender Stereotypes Prevent Women’s Ascent up the Organizational Ladder, 57(4) J. Soc. Iss. 657, 662 (2001) (“A behavior such as frequent phone conversation is a good deal more likely to be seen as slacking off for a woman but productive for a man.”).
84 Roxane A. Donovan, Tough or Tender: (Dis)Similarities in White College Students’ Perceptions of Black and White Women, 35(3) Psych. Women Q. 458, 466 (2011).

LOOKING IN AND LEADING OUT: KEY FINDINGS ON DIVERSITY FROM THE UCLI 2020 CERTIFICATION PROGRAM SURVEY
Such effects include “identity confusion,” “lower self-esteem,” “suicidal ideation,” and “depression.”

Experts have outlined three distinct types of microaggressions:

- **Microassault:** When a person uses derogatory language and “derogatory terms” to describe members of underrepresented groups.
- **Microinsult:** When a person “question[s] how a person [from an underrepresented group] obtained a particular job or place.”
- **Microinvalidation:** When a person “den[ies] them of being oversensitive.”

Microaggressions differ from implicit biases discussed in the previous section in that implicit biases are the internal unconscious prejudice someone holds against a diverse person, while a microaggression is the outward manifestation of this bias. Microaggressions can be comments, actions, or even nonverbal and environmental.

A recent Workplace Experiences Survey found that women and people of color are often mistaken for administrative or janitorial staff—“[b]ecause of the automatic association of lawyers with majority men, lawyers from other groups are much more likely to be mistaken for or viewed as less than a lawyer.” This is an example of a microaggression. This microaggression sends women and BIPOC the message that they do not belong as an attorney and reflects the implicit assumption that diverse people are not expected to reach certain levels of professional status. Attorneys and law students surveyed for this report, along with respondents to the Women Lawyers of Utah survey, consistently reported such experiences.

**HOW TO PLAN EFFECTIVE DIVERSITY TRAININGS.**

In recent years, many organizations have turned to diversity training as a solution to problems with diversity, equity, and inclusion, including problems resulting from biases and microaggressions. Some employers may conduct their own training while others rely on outside support. No matter the approach, employers should ensure that the training is an effective use of employer time and money, by considering, among other things, the following:

1. **Use a Holistic Approach to Improving Diversity.** Companies spend roughly $8 billion annually on diversity training. Another estimate suggests that “20% of U.S. organizations offer training specifically aimed at combating implicit bias, a number expected to grow to 50% in the future.”

2. **By some estimates, companies spend US$8 billion on diversity training (Lipman, 2018), often focusing on unconscious or implicit bias.”)**

3. **One case study concluded that implicit bias training fails to create a “sense of urgency” around addressing such biases, fails to create a vision for “what the organization will look like after changes are made,” and fails to leave participants with “actionable takeaways.”**

To remedy these, the study suggested that employers could create individual accountability, for instance by requiring employees to explain how they have acted on the training in regular employee evaluations.

Emerging research also suggests employers should implement a holistic approach by supplementing diversity training with a range of other efforts, such as those identified in this report or available through UCLI. Effective DEI education must be ongoing.

“While negotiating over the phone[,] opposing counsel directed me to ‘be a good little girl and settle the case.’ In addition to that comment opposing counsel implied that I was not good at simple math and said, ‘Here, let me just do that math for you.’”

“I did a trial advocacy training out of state and while my male counterpart on the fake trial was given extensive feedback both positive and constructive, the only feedback I was given was that I should wear ‘pantyhose’ and wear more ‘feminine shoes.’”

“I can’t even count the number of times clients, opposing parties, and ATTORNEYS I HAVE HAD CASES AGAINST have mistaken me for a receptionist/support staff, despite the fact that my office door has a plaque on it that clearly states my name and “Staff Attorney” on it.”

“One of my male coworkers and I often brainstorm together. VERY often, I will tell him about an idea I have, and in a subsequent meeting with our supervisors and management, he will express the idea as if it were his own. He does not ‘credit’ me with the idea, even as people around us are telling him how clever he is for thinking it up. He often, I will tell him about an idea I have, and in a subsequent meeting with our supervisors and management, he did a trial advocacy training out of state and while my male counterpart on the fake trial was given extensive feedback both positive and constructive, the only feedback I was given was that I should wear ‘pantyhose’ and wear more ‘feminine shoes.’”
Some creative ways to incorporate DEI include courses, a book club, an email drip, guest speakers, celebrations, or creating 20-minute microlearning courses on different topics surrounding diversity and inclusion, and dole them out month over month. Training alone is not enough to change employee behavior but can be effective when used in combination with other practices, including those identified in Best Practice #3.

Incentivize Training. At some firms, diversity training is optional, at others, it is mandatory. Research suggests that voluntary training only reduces implicit bias in the short-term. This may be because those who need the training the most would not attend if it were optional. Making training mandatory may be overall more effective in promoting behavior change and learning, but it may have negative consequences on those who did not want to attend. To bridge the gap between those who do not want to attend training but may benefit most from attending, employers may consider offering incentives to encourage attendance. Incentives can be as simple as gift cards, “catered lunch”, or as substantial as time off, or monetary bonuses.

Focus on Your Audience. Firms should determine the target audience for training. Given that some people are more likely to be subject to bias than others, research recommends employing a scaffolded approach. In addition to a broader, more comprehensive firmwide DEI strategy, a scaffolded approach requires tailoring the content of diversity training to meet the specific needs of the audience. Some employees may respond more favorably to an education-based diversity training session, while others may benefit from a feedback session or an internal mentorship program.

---

104 Evelyn R. Carter et al., Developing & Delivering Effective Anti-Bias Training, at 63 (“When training is voluntary, behavioral learning is significantly lower compared with when training is mandatory.”).
105 Id. (finding that voluntary training “undermines other outcomes that may be important for long-term change, such as behavioral learning” (internal citations omitted)).
107 Escande, The Principles Behind Successful Anti-Bias and Diversity Training.
108 Id.
109 Evelyn R. Carter et al., Developing & Delivering Effective Anti-Bias Training, at 62.
110 Id. at 65.
Looking in and Leading Out: Support Diversity in Recruitment, Hiring, Retention, and Advancement.

The UCLI survey shows that diversity in representation decreases as seniority increases within legal organizations. BIPOC and women are present to a greater extent in entry-level positions but their representation decreases at each level of advancement within the profession. To address this decrease in representation, legal employers should work to increase diversity at each step of the advancement process, including recruiting, hiring, retention, and advancement. The practices below can help.

Broaden recruitment strategies. Changing recruitment strategies can lead to more diverse hiring. Posting open positions in the same places and hoping for a more diverse applicant pool is not effective. Instead, post positions in a wide variety of places, including websites and job boards specifically focused on people who are diverse in ways that are underrepresented among your current staff.112 In addition, posting open positions to a regional audience may attract a more diverse pool of legal talent.112

Be intentional about job posting language. The language used in job postings can lead to fewer diverse applicants. Avoiding gender-coded words is important because more traditionally masculine words such as "competitive," or "dominate" can "dissuade women from applying . . . because they cue that women do not belong."113 In addition, ensuring that all the listed requirements are must-have qualifications, rather than a wishlist of preferred qualifications can attract more women applicants.114

112 See supra Key Finding #1, noting greater racial diversity in the region than in the Utah survey respondent pool.
114 Tara Sophia Mohr, Why Women Don’t Apply for Jobs Unless They’re 100% Qualified, Harv. Bus. Rev. 114

Reconsider the resume and cover letter. To encourage diverse talent to apply, employers can reassess the materials applicants are required to submit.115 Studies have shown that applications with "white" names are more likely to make it through the application process than identical applications with "non-white" names.116

One way to avoid potential bias is to "blind" the initial selection process by having someone who isn’t involved in the hiring decisions remove names and other identifying information from applications prior to reviewing them.117 Although removing names can help address bias,118 there is potential that other information on resumes "can be used to infer someone’s racial or ethnic background."119 For instance, an applicant’s address can be used as a proxy for race and graduation years can lead to an inference about candidate age.120

To ensure a truly blind initial selection process, employers can also consider whether the benefits of resumes outweigh their potential for bias. Instead of requiring a resume, it may be more valuable to assess applicants’ writing or research skills directly or to require applicants to answer specific questions that are relevant to the position.121

Interview more diverse candidates. Including diverse candidates in the interview pool can lead to more diverse hiring. At first glance, this may appear to conflict somewhat with the goal of selecting candidates to interview through a blind process. However, the two can work in concert. If, after reviewing applications blindly and selecting candidates, the applicants selected for interviews lack diversity, this can indicate that the process was not truly blind or that more effort is required to attract a broader applicant pool. "If only one woman is included in the finalist pool, the statistical possibility of her landing the job is zero."122 However, the likelihood of hiring a diverse candidate increases significantly when there are at least two diverse candidates in a hiring pool.123

117 Cavicchia, Is There Bias in Your Hiring Process?.
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Focus on objective criteria. In the absence of clear, objective criteria, those making hiring or advancement decisions tend to use different criteria depending on the gender or race of the applicant. For example, one study found that the criteria used in hiring decisions were redefined to justify hiring men over women. The absence of clear criteria can occur at the recruitment, application review, and interviewing stages of hiring, as well as when making advancement decisions. Interviewing for “fit,” or looking for those who seem to fit in with existing employees, can stand in the way of hiring qualified, diverse talent. Standardizing interview questions and setting clear priorities for candidate qualifications can allow employers to better compare various candidates for the same position.

Create and uniformly apply flexible work policies. Research suggests that men are more likely than women to work flexible hours or take a lighter workload without asking permission first. Men may be taking advantage of flexible schedules with minimal repercussions while women are experiencing negative repercussions by asking for flexibility. One way to address this is to create policies that apply across the board. The UCLI survey found that approximately 40 percent of employers surveyed did not have part-time or flexible work policies in place. When a flexible work policy automatically applies to everyone, there is less risk that discrepancies in who uses the policy will exist. Employers may consider encouraging legal professionals to work remotely when needed, take advantage of part-time options or adopt work schedules customized to their personal needs. These policies benefit working parents and may also improve retention.

Reassess mentorship opportunities. Attorneys rely on mentors to answer questions, receive challenging projects, receive introductions to other attorneys, and understand many other aspects of professional development. Some legal employers have formal mentor programs while others are informal. However, employers should work to recognize and address gaps in mentorship opportunities that disadvantage underrepresented groups.

Some mentorships develop organically, which gives individuals the flexibility to decide what type of mentorship is most effective for them. Many attorneys agree that informal mentoring is more effective than formal mentoring. However, informal mentorship programs can have significant negative repercussions when they leave out historically underrepresented groups. Evidence indicates that most people have the potential for “affinity bias,” which leads to mentors choosing mentees that look like themselves. Because there are fewer BIPOC and women, and potentially fewer LGBTQ+ attorneys and attorneys with a disability, in the most senior legal positions, affinity bias results in fewer BIPOC, women (and potentially other marginalized groups) having meaningful mentorship opportunities. For example, an ABA study found that “[67%] of women [attorneys] of color . . . wanted more and better mentoring by senior attorneys and partners, as did 52% of men of color, 55% of white women, and 32% of white men.”

Informal mentoring alone can lead to a self-perpetuating system where underrepresented groups are receiving fewer opportunities and, therefore, seen as less qualified when advancement decisions are made. The best approach to fostering meaningful mentorship opportunities includes both informal and formal mentoring.

Instituting an organized mentorship plan, supported by regular feedback from mentors and mentees, can also bridge the gap in mentorship quality and availability. Employers should therefore regularly seek feedback from individual employees to determine their level of satisfaction with mentorship opportunities.

UCLI offers a formalized, evidence-based mentorship program that is intended to narrow this mentorship gap for law students entering the profession. UCLI’s program is focused on mentoring law students during their legal education and into the transition to careers as lawyers. This program is valuable because it bridges the gap and focuses on students who may not have mentorship opportunities that develop organically. UCLI is also happy to work with legal employers seeking to develop their own internal mentoring programs that have the potential to reap similar benefits for practicing attorneys.
satisfaction and greater BIPOC turnover. Token women lawyers experience more frequent sexual harassment and discrimination than non-token women, have lower performance ratings than men, and have less informational and emotional support than women in more balanced firms. Underrepresentation and tokenism can be a barrier to advancement. For example, women are less likely to be appointed to board positions if there is already one woman on the board. "Tokenism" is a related finding that many corporate boards are much more likely to "include exactly two women . . . than would be expected by chance" and that "decision makers are . . . less likely to add a woman to a board once it includes two women." A recent study of diverse lawyers found that "almost a third of women lawyers experience more frequent sexual harassment . . . than would one or two spots for diverse individuals in positions of power, it creates a barrier not based on merit. Critical mass theory is the idea that marginalized groups are less likely to participate fully when they are a small minority in the room. When women make up a minority of individuals in a group setting, they participate less than their male colleagues. This means that groups may be missing out on the insights of diverse group members simply because the makeup of the group is not representative. Women may not be fully empowered to contribute equally until they are more fully represented in positions of power. Research on corporate board gender diversity suggests "that at least three female directors are needed before boards experience tangible benefits from gender diversity." Token pressures that heighten their visibility, reinforce negative stereotypes and disengagement for women and BIPOC. This may contribute to the drop-off of assignments and feedback has been shown to affect advancement opportunities for women and BIPOC. This can result in a "thin file" problem. Research has shown that women and BIPOC in professional careers are often given inferior work assignments and receive less performance support (both formally and informally) compared to their white, male peers. Such inequity in the quality of work assignments and feedback can lead to women and BIPOC having "thin files." The quality of work assignments and feedback has been shown to affect advancement opportunities and may play a role in retention by reducing job satisfaction and increasing disengagement for women and BIPOC. This may contribute to the drop-off of diversity in senior positions found in the UCLI survey.

One study showed Black associates were given lower-quality assignments than white associates. One study showed Black associates were given lower-quality assignments than white associates. Another found that women were assigned "predictable and

In addition, "[w]hen women do not represent a critical mass, they experience token pressures that heighten their visibility, reinforce negative stereotypes and induce performance pressures." Thus, it is important to reevaluate governance committees and other groups to ensure that there is adequate representation.

Addressing tokenism requires actively assessing the makeup of boards and other leadership groups to determine if token status is keeping those bodies from achieving the benefits that come with having a critical mass of diverse representation. One way to do this is to consider "at least 30 percent women, lawyers of color, LGBTQ+ lawyers, and lawyers with disabilities for Leadership and governance roles, equity partner promotions, formal client pitch opportunities, and senior lateral positions."
routine work” while men were given “developmental work.” Such disparities in assignment quality may be even worse for women of color. A recent ABA study found that because “women of color were less likely to get good work” (including stretch assignments), “by the time they were third and fourth year associates, they had less experience than the white men who had joined the firm at the same time they did.” This lack of quality assignments lowered the advancement prospects of women of color “and affected their entire career trajectories.” The study also found that “44% of women of color . . . reported being denied desirable assignments” compared to only 2% of white men.

This discrepancy in work assignment quality and the resulting “thin files” of BIPOC and women highlights that simply making advancement decisions “colorblind” will not, in isolation, ensure employers meet DEI goals. Addressing these inequities directly can lead to more equitable decisions based on the commitment and talent of individual attorneys, rather than on systemic, if unconscious, bias.

**Ask for help.** UCLI offers many other potential approaches to explore. For instance, examining onboarding processes to ensure that new employees have the tools to succeed can decrease unequal access to support early on. Incentivizing participation in affinity groups can also create a supportive environment for all attorneys to thrive. UCLI also offers sample policies employers can use to build a strategy that addresses their unique challenges.

**BEST PRACTICE #3**

**CONCLUSION**

The findings of the UCLI survey will not be surprising to most readers. The general trends outlined in this report are largely consistent with other research findings about the state of diversity in the U.S. legal profession. We believe the best practices highlighted in this report will be helpful as legal employers work to create systemic change. These recommendations encourage the value of leadership and data-driven, holistic approaches to diversity, equity, and inclusion. This effort to collect data is an important first step to this work, and Utah can be a leader in similar efforts going forward. We can genuinely reflect and engage with these issues to push diversity, equity, and inclusion forward in our profession.

This is just the beginning.