

2018 Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.)



Prepared by the Standing Committee on Professional Regulation
of the American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION COMMITTEE ROSTER

Hon. Dolores Dorsainvil, Chair
Upper Marlboro, MD

Hon. Daniel J. Crothers
Bismark, ND

Shawn M. Harpen
Las Vegas, NV

Amanda Jones
New Haven, CT

Robert E. Lutz, II
Los Angeles, CA

Nancy Jane Marshall
New Orleans, LA

Sari Montgomery
Chicago, IL

Hon. Michael Oths
Boise, ID

Sharon E. Pandak
Woodbridge, VA

Lea Gutierrez
Special Advisor
Chicago, IL

Charles J. Vigil, Liaison
ABA Board of Governors
Albuquerque, NM

Betty Smith Adams, Liaison
ABA Solo, Small Firm and General Practice
Division
Glenelg, MD

Denise M. Quinterri
Association of Professional Responsibility
Lawyers
Pheonix, AZ

Wendy J. Muchman
National Organization of Bar Counsel
Chicago, IL

Center for Professional Responsibility Staff
Teresa Schmid, Director
Ellyn S. Rosen, Regulation & Global Initiatives Counsel
Shawna Miller, Program Assistant

Introduction to the 2018 S.O.L.D. Results

The ABA Standing Committee on Professional Discipline greatly appreciates the participation of U.S. lawyer disciplinary agencies in the annual ABA Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems (S.O.L.D.). The S.O.L.D. questionnaire for 2018 was sent to 56 lawyer disciplinary agencies. Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia did not provide responses by the publication date. At the request of the State Bar of California, please derive data from these [public sources](#). The questionnaire is attached at the end of the survey.

The 2018 Survey results consist of ten charts arranged alphabetically by jurisdiction. Responses correspond to the questions as numbered on the questionnaire appended to the end of this document. Notes ("N") at the end of each chart include explanatory information provided by some jurisdictions. Where exact figures were not available, estimated figures were provided. The abbreviation "N/A" means that the data is not available or applicable. Medians and averages are shown where potentially meaningful. Please note, averages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Questions regarding the survey and questionnaire should be addressed via email to Ellyn S. Rosen, Regulation and Global Initiatives Counsel, ABA Center for Professional Responsibility at Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org.

2018 S.O.L.D. Results

The information contained in the 2018 S.O.L.D. is not intended to constitute a comprehensive overview of each jurisdiction's lawyer disciplinary system. Where possible, footnotes have been included to address variations in the manner of which jurisdictions function and maintain statistics. [Click here](#) for lawyer disciplinary agency contact information. Additional data about lawyers and the legal profession can be viewed at [Legal Profession Statistics](#).

Chart I Lawyer Population and Agency Caseload
Volume, Parts A & B

Chart II Diversion

Chart III Sanctions Imposed, Parts A & B

Chart IV Reinstatement / Readmission Statistics

Chart V Caseload Statistics

Chart VI Case Processing Times

Chart VII Budget and Sources of Funding

Chart VIII Annual Registration Dues & Fees in State
Disciplinary Systems

Chart IX Staffing of Disciplinary Counsel Offices,
Part A & B

Chart X Staffing of Adjudicative Offices, Parts A - C

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I - PART A
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	1. # of Lawyers with Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2.b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program
Alabama	18,409	1,180	Yes	0
Alaska	3,114	245	No	N/A
Arizona	18,750	3,047	Yes	N/A
Arkansas	9,766 ^N	697	No	0
Colorado	26,963	3,586	Yes	N/A
Delaware	4,484	219	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	79,177 ^N	1,114	No	N/A
Florida	88,537	4,131	Yes	N/A
Georgia	39,750	2,197	Yes	9,564
Hawai'i	4,931	365	No	N/A
Idaho	5,236	343	N/A	N/A
Illinois	72,952	5,029	Yes	N/A
Indiana	18,595	1,411	N/A	N/A
Iowa	9,500	867	No	N/A
Kansas	11,090	849	No	N/A
Kentucky	18,783	1,105	Yes	N/A
Louisiana	22,377	2,528	Yes	0
Maine	5,406	188	Yes	N/A
Maryland	40,300	1,802 ^N	No	N/A
Massachusetts	59,092	3,800	Yes	N/A
Michigan	42,240	N/A	Yes	N/A
Minnesota	25,665	1,107	No	N/A

*** = Estimated**



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I - PART A
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	1. # of Lawyers with Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2.b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program
Missouri	30,928	1,748	Yes	N/A
Montana	4,035	286	No	N/A
Nebraska	6,952	450	N/A	N/A
Nevada	9,056	1,485*	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	5,400	163	No	N/A
New Jersey	75,207	3,500*	No	N/A
New Mexico	7,400*	625	No	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	19,315	2,139	No	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	15,986	1,856	No	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	23,131	2,959	Yes	N/A
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	14,873	1,625	No	N/A
North Carolina	28,972	1,252	Yes	8,959
North Dakota	3,033	149	No	N/A
Ohio	44,856	2,693 ^N	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	18,033	1,159	No	N/A

* = Estimated



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I - PART A
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	1. # of Lawyers with Active License	2. # of Complaints Received by Disciplinary Agency	2a. Central Intake or Consumer Assistance Program	2.b # of Complaints Handled Separately by Central Intake/ Consumer Assistance Program
Oregon	15,185	1,580 ^N	Yes	N/A
Pennsylvania	65,504	4,326	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	5,245*	310	No	N/A
South Carolina	12,812	1,384	Yes ^N	N/A ^N
Tennessee	22,956	1,360	Yes	2,277
Texas	103,342	8,015	Yes	1,126 ^N
Utah	9,572	934	Yes	585
Vermont	2,744	131	Yes	N/A ^N
Virginia	31,858	3,156	Yes	N/A
Washington	32,297	2,168	Yes	N/A
Wisconsin	21,000	1,660	Yes	N/A
Wyoming	2,963	150	Yes	N/A
* = Estimated				
TOTAL*	1,257,772	83,073		22,511
AVERAGE*	25,669	1,731		2,814
MEDIAN*	18,595	1,372		856

CHART I – PART A NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Arkansas	Q1: The court clerk includes in the status of "active" several categories including attorneys, mostly older or ill, who no longer actively practice.
Michigan	Q1: This total includes MI and non-resident active members.
Ohio	Q2: Ohio has 32 Certified Grievance Committees, which investigate and prosecute lawyers. This number represents the number of grievances received through the Office of Disciplinary Counsel.
Oregon	Q2: Client Assistance Office (CAO) records indicate that office received 1,484 complaints naming a specific lawyer. Added to that figure are 96 matters initiated by Disciplinary Counsel's Office (DCO) based upon either trust account overdraft notifications received directly from financial institutions or on its own initiative.
South Carolina	Q2a: The SC Bar has a Client Assistance Program administered by an in-house lawyer.
South Carolina	Q2b: We do not have access to this information. It is collected by the SC Bar, which is its own entity.
Texas	Q2b: Matters were resolved by The Client-Attorney Assistance Program.

CHART I – PART A NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Vermont	Q2b: executive branch of state govt. runs a separate consumer assistance program, but lawyer discipline matters are redirected to Prof. responsibility program.
---------	---

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART B
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending From Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Alabama	744	874	318	107	48
Alaska	102	197	57	16	4
Arizona	581	2,439	596	317	91
Arkansas	644	N/A	N/A	N/A	30
Colorado	422	0 ^N	265 ^N	109	58
Delaware	46	N/A	106	112	7
District of Columbia	374	751	737	362	33
Florida	4,131	4,159	6,629	2,962	242
Georgia	254	500	1,951	1,811	117
Hawai'i	240	178	336	75	3
Idaho	226	0	569	307	24
Illinois	1,828	1,233	4,958	4,958	3,719
Indiana	33	1,267	413	328	38
Iowa	429	502	794	481	34
Kansas	N/A	568	193	139	31
Kentucky	153	727	428	189	45
Louisiana	1,604	1,606	2,490	717	131
Maine	105	18	134	102	23
Maryland	N/A	90*	2,000*	1,746*	38*
Massachusetts	505	N/A	N/A	N/A	84
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*** = Estimated**



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART B
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Minnesota	509	535	1,089	243	49
Missouri	270	1,006	1,053	471	47
Montana	162	58	396	109	15
Nebraska	49	196	303	166	14
Nevada	N/A	148*	994*	1,072*	71*
New Hampshire	82	129	80	25	14
New Jersey	939	2,200*	2,163	1,872	291
New Mexico	77	N/A	695	644	22
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	1,257	1,257	1,758	140	37
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	584	622	727	614	125
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	1,051	825	1,809	539	35
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	404	912	1,044	392	11
North Carolina	834	495* ^N	726	589	56
North Dakota	51	58	63	48	4
Ohio	626	1,299	1,957	1,048	65 ^N
Oklahoma	141	N/A	383	332	42

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART I -PART B
LAWYER POPULATION AND AGENCY CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	3. # of Complaints Pending from Prior Years	4. # of Complaints Summarily Dismissed / Screened Out	5. # of Complaints Investigated	6. # of Complaints Closed or Dismissed After Investigation	7. # of Lawyers Charged After Probable Cause Determination
Oregon	282 ^N	629 ^N	1,694 ^N	531 ^N	73 ^N
Pennsylvania	1,253	1,093	4,486	2,788	212
Rhode Island	N/A	71	239	231	5
South Carolina	802	328	2,186	898	5
Tennessee	495	615	745	510	130
Texas	139	5,561	2,315	1,779	74
Utah	573	347	1,160	773	52
Vermont	N/A ^N	64	53	37	12
Virginia	319	2,055	592	256	N/A
Washington	639	1,005	1,311	924	59
Wisconsin	551	1,533	400	50	29
Wyoming	17	66	83	61	7
* = Estimated					
TOTAL*	24,527	38,216	53,478	31,980	6,356
AVERAGE*	570	889	1,163	695	135
MEDIAN*	422	615	727	347	38

CHART I – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Colorado	Q4: The central intake model is designed to facilitate contact between our office and anyone who has a complaint or concern about a lawyer's conduct. To that end, each request for investigation is assigned to one of six attorneys for review and follow up with the complaining witness. The central intake model is designed to ensure that each request for investigation is properly investigated and analyzed regardless of the information received in an initial request for investigation. Based on our interpretations of the definitions, no request for investigation is summarily dismissed under the Colorado model, however, 2,837 matters were dismissed after an initial review by an Intake Attorney.
Colorado	Q5: Number of investigations processed by the trial division. Matters processed to the trial division typically involve issues that may result in some form of public discipline, or that require more investigation than can be conducted in the central intake section of our office. Approximately 3,586 requests for investigation were investigated in some matter by the central intake attorneys in our office in 2018.
North Carolina	Q4: All grievances are investigated to the degree necessary to determine if the grievance has merit.
Ohio	Q7: New complaints. Lawyers and judges included.
Oregon	Q3: Number reflects only those complaints pending as of January 1, 2018, in DCO (282), not CAO.
Oregon	Q4: Number of dismissals/resolutions by CAO within 6 days or less.
Oregon	Q5: Number reflects only those complaints pending as of January 1, 2018, in DCO (282), not CAO, plus total files opened by DCO during 2018 (349), plus 1,316 investigated by CAO (disposition greater than 6 days), less the number referred from CAO to DCO in 2018 (253). NOTE: Since referrals from CAO to DCO are the same matter, they are not counted twice but many of the 282 matters pending on January 1 likely were also referrals from CAO.

CHART I – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Oregon	Q6: Number includes 343 by CAO (dismissals that were resolved after more than 6 days in office); 154 dismissed by DCO; and 34 dismissed by SPRB.
Oregon	Q7: Includes 55 lawyers the subject of formal proceedings and 18 lawyers who accepted letters of admonition rather than being served with a formal proceeding. NOTE: Prior to 2014, it appears this question was answered with the number of complaints that resulted in either formal proceeding or admonition, rather than the number of lawyers.
Vermont	Q3: Due to a mid-year change in program administrator, we do not have an accurate number for this this year.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART II - DIVERSION**

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	8a. Yes, there is a program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
Alabama	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arizona	Yes	N/A	77	18	1	58
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	10*	5	0	5
Colorado	Yes	N/A	74 ^N	36	1	38
Delaware	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida	Yes	N/A	134	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	Yes	N/A	1	1	0	0
Idaho	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Illinois	Yes	N/A	9	3	0	6
Indiana	Yes*	Yes	20	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	Yes	N/A	6	0	1	5
Kansas	Yes	N/A	28	17	0	11
Kentucky	Yes	N/A	121	107	13	11
Louisiana	Yes	N/A	8	8	0	0
Maine	Yes	N/A	3	1	2	3
Maryland	Yes	N/A	9	16 ^N	1	13

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART II - DIVERSION**

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	8a. There is a program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
Massachusetts	Yes	N/A	24	21	3	0
Michigan	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Minnesota	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Missouri	Yes	N/A	10	5	2	3
Montana	No	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Hampshire	Yes	N/A	8	0	0	8
New Jersey	Yes	N/A	51	56	2	47
New Mexico	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	Yes	N/A	2	0	0	2

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART II - DIVERSION**

Jurisdiction	8. Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	8a. There is a program, but Data is Not Maintained	9. # of Complaints Referred to Alternatives to Discipline / Diversion Program	9a. # of Respondents Who Successfully Completed Program	9b. # of Respondents Who Did Not Successfully Complete Program	9c. # of Respondents Still Participating in the Program
North Carolina	Yes ^N	N/A	14	0	0	14
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ohio	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	Yes	N/A	46	22	0	24
Oregon	Yes	N/A	24* ^N	5	1	13
Pennsylvania	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Rhode Island	Yes	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
South Carolina	Yes	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	1
Tennessee	Yes	N/A	32	28	0	11
Texas	Yes	N/A	75	75	N/A	N/A
Utah	Yes	N/A	8	7	1	0
Vermont	Yes	N/A	9	7	N/A	2
Virginia	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Washington	Yes	N/A	22	5	0	17
Wisconsin	Yes	N/A	31	10	N/A	21
Wyoming	Yes	N/A	1	1	0	0

* = Estimated

CHART II –NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Colorado	Q9: 40 (Intake), 31 (Investigative), 3 (Trial) = Total of 74
Indiana	Q8: JLAP & Trust Account School
Maryland	Q9a: Includes preceding Fiscal Years.
North Carolina	Q8: Successful completion of the diversion program may but does NOT necessarily result in dismissal of the grievance.
Oregon	Q9: Number represents total of participants in the diversion program during the 2018 calendar year—both in the program at the start of year (12) and offered diversion in lieu of formal discipline in 2018 (12) NOTE: Because terms of diversion are generally one or two years, no one permitted a diversion program in 2018 would have completed it within that same calendar year, so the numbers for Q9-a and Q9-b represent subsets of the participants in diversion at the start of the year.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III -PART A
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

Jurisdiction	10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition	10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand	10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)
Alabama	33	0	33	28
Alaska	0	0	0	N/A
Arizona ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arkansas	7	N/A	N/A	7
Colorado	6	6	0	170
Delaware	3	1	2	N/A
District of Columbia ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Florida ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	27	16	11	26
Hawai'i	10	10	0	25
Idaho	15	5	10	N/A
Illinois ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Indiana	14	0	0	14
Iowa	90	90	N/A	42
Kansas ^N	0	0	N/A	42
Kentucky	42	30	3	11
Louisiana	6	4	0	0
Maine	25	25 ^N	0	0
Maryland	N/A	N/A	N/A	22 ^N
Massachusetts	37	37	N/A	N/A
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III -PART A
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

Jurisdiction	10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition	10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand	10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)
Minnesota	118	112	0	11 ^N
Missouri	N/A	92 ^N	0	121 ^N
Montana ^N	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	3	N/A	3	N/A
Nevada	60*	N/A	N/A	60*
New Hampshire ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Jersey ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	18	18	N/A	N/A ^N
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	196	22	0	174
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	55	55	0	133
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	252	27	0	225
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	25	25	N/A	138*
North Carolina	91	23	N/A	68
North Dakota	15	12	N/A	9*
Ohio ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

*** = Estimated**

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
 2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
 CHART III -PART A
 SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Jurisdiction	10. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public Disciplinary Sanctions	10a. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Admonition	10b. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Private Reprimand	10c. # of Lawyers Receiving Private / Non-Public: Letter of Warning / Caution (are not considered disciplinary sanction in all jurisdictions)
Oklahoma	56	36	20	N/A
Oregon ^N	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pennsylvania	310	53	12	245
Rhode Island	40	12	1	27
South Carolina	94 ^N	14 ^N	N/A	89 ^N
Tennessee	70	39	31	0
Texas	124	N/A	124	N/A
Utah	14 ^N	14	N/A	N/A ^N
Vermont	3	3	N/A	N/A
Virginia	48	21	20	7
Washington	4	N/A	7	N/A
Wisconsin	7	N/A	7	N/A
Wyoming	3	N/A	3	N/A
* = Estimated				
TOTAL*	1,921	802	287	1,694
AVERAGE*	51	26	11	65
MEDIAN*	25	18	3	28

CHART III – PART A NOTES

The following jurisdictions responded that they do not have private/non-public discipline: Arizona, District of Columbia, Florida, Illinois, Kansas, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, and Oregon.

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Main	Q10a: Admonition referred to as Dismissals With Warnings (DWW).
Maryland	Q10c: In Maryland, a warning is not considered a sanction.
Minnesota	Q10c: Private probation.
Missouri	Q10a & 10c: Admonitions & Letters of Warning/Caution are public.
New Mexico	Q10c: Letters of Caution are not considered a disciplinary sanction in NM. However, 44 attorneys received non-disciplinary cautionary instructions in 2018.
New York: 4th Dept./ 5th, 7th, & 8th Districts	Q10c: A "Letter of Advisement" is non-disciplinary pursuant to Appellate Division, Fourth Department rules.
South Carolina	Q10: 94, but only 14 received a sanction
South Caroling	Q10a: Admonition referred to as sanction.
South Carolina	Q10c: 89 letters of caution, 1 deferred discipline agreement, but neither are considered sanctions.
North Dakota	Q10c: Letters of Warning/Caution are not considered discipline.
Utah	Q10: A total of 16 orders issued against 14 attorneys.
Utah	Q10c: Letters of Warning/Caution are not considered discipline in our jurisdiction.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III -PART B
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

Jurisdiction	11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined	11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured	11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation	11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution	11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs
Alabama	72	9	5	26	6	12	14	10*	105
Alaska	4	0	N/A	3	0	1	0	0	3
Arizona	109	4	11	20	8	29	61	2	109
Arkansas	21	1	1	15	4	23	1	N/A	N/A
Colorado	60	6	4	38	7	10	23	1	60
Delaware	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3
District of Columbia	77	27	10	39	54	18	6	2	N/A
Florida	235	69	28	86	18	49	17	N/A	N/A
Georgia	60	13	0	29	15	3	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hawai'i	7	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	4
Idaho	10	0	0	5	0	17	3	0	2
Illinois	79	15	7	37	7	13	7	3	79
Indiana	40	3	6	23	1	0	4	N/A	37
Iowa	69	3	0	18	1	36	0	0	18*N
Kansas	79	5	3	13	0	21	4	N/A	20
Kentucky	36	7	4	16	4	5	5	7	37
Louisiana	109	12	7	37	16	5	32	0	109

* = Estimated

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III -PART B
SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Jurisdiction	11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined	11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured	11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation	11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution	11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs
Maine	23	5	2	4	8	16	8	1	1
Maryland	65	14	12	20	3	16	N/A	N/A	17
Massachusetts	69	9	4	33	8	19	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan	111	18 ^N	6	45	20	41 ^N	0	30	111
Minnesota	45	8	0	23	2	6	12	0	0
Missouri	50	13	3	15	5	7	7	0	N/A ^N
Montana	16	2	0	5	0	9	2	1	16
Nebraska	17	3	1	6	3	4	2	N/A	17
Nevada	71*	4*	N/A	35*	N/A	32*	43*	71*	N/A
New Hampshire	20	3	4	2	3	11	1	N/A	20
New Jersey	174 ^N	17	18	55	33	84 ^N	N/A	0	174
New Mexico	22	1	0	13	2	6	2	1	8
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	19	2	1	6	5	5	N/A	N/A	N/A

* = Estimated

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III -PART B
SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Jurisdiction	11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined	11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured	11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation	11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution	11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	16	4	2	4	5	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	22	6	3	10	1	2	N/A	0	0
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	23	5	3	4	8	3	N/A	0	0
North Carolina	103	3	12	20	3	73	15	N/A	103
North Dakota	5	0	N/A	3	0	2	0	0	N/A
Ohio	68	N/A	14	22	11	1	N/A	N/A	N/A
Oklahoma	17	5	6	5	3	1	0	0	17
Oregon	99 ^N	4	8	14	3	34 ^N	17	1	10
Pennsylvania	155	12	19	47	5	80	3	0	197
Rhode Island	6	N/A	1	2	0	3	N/A	N/A	N/A

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART III -PART B
SANCTIONS IMPOSED**

Jurisdiction	11. # of Lawyers Publicly Disciplined	11a. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Involuntarily Disbarred	11b. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Disbarred on Consent	11c. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Suspended (Excluding Interim Suspensions)	11d. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Interimly Suspended (for Risk of Harm or Criminal Conviction)	11e. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Admonished / Reprimanded / Censured	11f. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Placed on Probation	11g. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Restitution	11h. Public Sanctions: # of Lawyers Ordered to Pay Costs
South Carolina	15	2	3	8	10 ^N	2	N/A	5	10
Tennessee	150	21	2	18	14	204	13	17	30
Texas	215	14	17	152	0	32	N/A ^N	N/A	N/A
Utah	36	6	4	9	0	8	9	N/A	N/A
Vermont	7	1	1	1	0	4	2	0	0
Virginia	49	3	9	16	N/A	21	N/A	N/A	130
Washington	72	17	10	28	18	17	26	19	43
Wisconsin	34	1	1	15	4	17	N/A	6	15
Wyoming	7	0	1	3	1	1	0	2	7
* = Estimated									
TOTAL*	2,872	378	253	1,054	320	1,007	339	179	1,512
AVERAGE*	59	8	6	22	7	21	10	6	43
MEDIAN*	45	5	4	15	4	10	4	1	17

CHART III – PART B NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Arkansas	Q11g: This is the amount ordered to be paid, not the amount collected to date.
Arkansas	Q11h: This is the amount ordered to be paid, not the actual amount collected to date.
Iowa	Q11h: Trial costs are assessed in all suspensions.
Maryland	Q10c: In Maryland, a warning is not a sanction.
Michigan	Q11a: Admonished
Michigan	Q11e: Reprimands
Minnesota	Q10c: Private probation.
Missouri	Q11h: Costs in disciplinary matters are taxed in the same manner as costs in civil proceedings. In addition, a fee is imposed by the Missouri Supreme Court. Fees are as follows: Reprimand \$750; Reprimand with Requirements \$1,000; Suspension \$1,000; Probation \$1,500, and Disbarment \$2,000. See Missouri Supreme Court Rule 5.19(h) .
New Jersey	Q11: Excludes interim suspensions.
New Jersey	Q11e: Admonishment- 25 Reprimand- 27 Censure-32
Oregon	Q11 & 11d: Number includes administrative suspensions (13) for non-cooperation with DCO investigation
Oregon	Q11e: Includes 16 reprimands and 18 letters of admonition.
South Carolina	Q11d: Not a sanction.
Texas	Q11f: Included in suspensions.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IV – REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

Jurisdiction	12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	13a. # Granted After Disbarment	13b. # Granted After Suspension	13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status	14. # Denied / Dismissed
Alabama	8	0	2	3	3
Alaska	3	0	1	0	0
Arizona	12	0	8	1	4
Arkansas	2	0	2	0	0
Colorado	2	0	2	0	0
Delaware	3	0	0	2	1
District of Columbia	5	3	2	0	1
Florida	9	1	7	1	10
Georgia	13	12	4	N/A	1
Hawai'i	2	0	1	0	0
Idaho	2	0	2	0	0
Illinois	3	2	1	0	2
Indiana	3	2	N/A	N/A	0
Iowa	2	0	2	0	0
Kansas	1	0	1	0	0
Kentucky	14	0	7	0	0
Louisiana	8	3	14	4	1
Maine	4	0	3	0	1
Maryland	15	0	5	0	9
Massachusetts	11	1	4	2	4
Michigan	12	0	9	0	1

* = Estimated

Jurisdiction	12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	13a. # Granted After Disbarment	13b. # Granted After Suspension	13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status	14. # Denied / Dismissed
Minnesota	13	0	6	0	5
Missouri	145 ^N	1	27	N/A	11
Montana	1	0	1	0	0
Nebraska	2	0	1	0	1
Nevada	5	0	3	3	2
New Hampshire	2	0	1	0	0
New Jersey	12	0	12	0	N/A ^N
New Mexico	1	0	1	0	0
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	14	2	4	0	5
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	1	0	0	0	1
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	12	1	4	0	3
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	4	0	3	0	1
North Carolina	8	0	6	2	0
North Dakota	1	0	1	0	0
Ohio	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Oklahoma	8	0	2	5	5
Oregon	236	0	100	0	0

* = Estimated

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IV – REINSTATEMENT/READMISSION**

Jurisdiction	12. # of Petitions, Motions or Requests for Reinstatement / Readmission Filed	13a. # Granted After Disbarment	13b. # Granted After Suspension	13c. # Granted After Transfer to Disability Inactive Status	14. # Denied / Dismissed
Pennsylvania	163	1	4	0	6
Rhode Island	2	1	1	N/A	0
South Carolina	7	1	5	0	2
Tennessee	7	0	7	0	1
Texas	8	2	66	0	3
Utah	8	0	5	1	1
Vermont	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Virginia	1	0	N/A	1	1
Washington	17	0	13	0	0
Wisconsin	40	0	2	0	8
Wyoming	2	0	1	0	1
* = Estimated					
TOTAL*	854	33	353	25	95
AVERAGE*	17	1	8	1	2
MEDIAN*	5	0	3	0	1

CHART IV NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Missouri	Q12: 94 of the 145 reinstatements were Return to Active Reinstatements. Those individuals apply for reinstatement under Missouri Supreme Court Rule 6.06 but have not been suspended or disbarred. In 2018, 83 of the 94 applicants returned to active status. The remaining 11 were pending at the end of 2018.
New Jersey	Q14: The Disciplinary Review Board handles this category.



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART V – CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	15. Average Caseload Per Lawyer		16. Average # Cases Carried Over from Prior Years		17. Average # New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer		18. Average # Cases Closed Per Lawyer	
Alabama	598		250		598		642	
Arizona ^N	487	117	41	43	453	69	444	40
Arkansas	148		161		174		145	
Colorado	598 ^N	39	N/A		598 ^N	39	511 ^N	32
Delaware	50		16		35		35	
District of Columbia	49.13		24.93		24.2		24.13	
Florida	120		46		73		124	
Georgia	25		25		30		12	
Hawai'i	77		60		91		38	
Idaho	232		85		147		146	
Illinois ^N	100*		100*		300*		400*	
Iowa	100*		100*		90*		120*	
Kentucky	152		45		107		140.5	
Louisiana	207		133		73		59	
Maryland	N/A		N/A		30*		N/A	
Michigan	N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Minnesota	36		41		36		36	
Montana	91		107		91		83	
Nebraska	71		12		59		99	
New Hampshire	49		16		33		38	

* = Estimated



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART V – CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	15. Average Caseload Per Lawyer	16. Average # Cases Carried Over from Prior Years	17. Average # New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	18. Average # Cases Closed Per Lawyer
New Jersey	137	63	74	80
New Mexico	215	25	195	209
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	81	70	137	183
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	201	117	329	219
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	130	50	80	85
North Carolina	130	52	78	78
Ohio	58	58	80	50
Oklahoma	66.8	27.6	45.6	24.5
Oregon	46 ^{*N}	50	45 ^{*N}	29
Pennsylvania	177	46	160	111
Rhode Island	78	N/A	78	N/A
South Carolina ^N	274	100	174	178
Tennessee ^N	115	29	124	28
Texas	71	32	39	45
Utah	255	97	158	87
Virginia	59	12	47	33

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART V – CASELOAD VOLUME**

Jurisdiction	15. Average Caseload Per Lawyer	16. Average # Cases Carried Over from Prior Years	17. Average # New Cases Assigned Per Lawyer	18. Average # Cases Closed Per Lawyer
Washington	108	34	39	87
Wisconsin	110	27	83	90
Wyoming	64	50	150	126
* = Estimated				
AVERAGE*	152	67	141	137
MEDIAN*	104	50	80	87

CHART V NOTES

The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New York: 2nd Dept./ 2nd, 11th & 13th Judicial Districts, and North Dakota, and Vermont.

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Arizona	Q15: Intake Caseload 487, Litigation Caseload 117 = 604.
Arizona	Q16: Intake Caseload 41, Litigation Caseload 43 = 84.
Arizona	Q17: Intake Caseload 453, Litigation Caseload 69 = 522.
Arizona	Q18: Intake Caseload 444, Litigation Caseload 40 = 484.
Colorado	Q15 & Q17: Intake Caseload 598, Trial Caseload 39 = 637
Colorado	Q18: Intake Caseload 511, Trial Caseload 32 = 543.
Illinois	Q15 -16: Monthly and Q17-18: Yearly.
Maryland	Q17: Docketed cases.
Oregon	Q15 & Q17: Estimated and only includes matters that survive CAO investigation/screening.
South Carolina	Q15: 274 cases involving complaints against lawyers or Committee on Character & Fitness (reinstatements) for 8 staff lawyers. Judicial complaints are currently 259 and are handled by one staff lawyer.
South Carolina	Q16-Q18: Lawyer and Character & Fitness cases for 8 lawyers.
Tennessee	Q15: Investigation Caseload 115, Litigation Caseload 29 = 144.
Tennessee	Q16: Investigation Caseload 124, Litigation Caseload 28 = 152.
Tennessee	Q17: Investigation Caseload 226, Litigation Caseload 33 = 259.
Tennessee	Q18: Investigation Caseload 63, Litigation Caseload 17 = 80.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VI – CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

Jurisdiction	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction	22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction	23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Alabama	N/A	150 days	180 days	240 days	300 days	80 days
Alaska	84.45 days	434.87 days	N/A	N/A	396.5 days	173.5 days
Arizona	25 days	225 days	391 days	N/A ^N	106 days	299 days
Colorado	49 days	257 days	365 days	35 days	210 days	82 days
Georgia	7 days	90 days	220 days	240 days	420 days	90 days
Hawai'i	143 days	125 days	381 days	513 days	566 days	770 days
Idaho	N/A ^N	180 day	250 days	N/A	120 days	60 days
Illinois	Fewer than 10 days	Fewer than 90 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Iowa	2-3 days	200 days	250 days	N/A	270 days	90 days
Kansas	14 days	180 days	270 days	N/A	365 days	270 days
Kentucky	4 days	68 days	157 days	119 days	650 days	166 days
Louisiana	38 days	252 days	372 days	144 days	501 days	1,104 days
Maryland	7-10 days*	120-210 days*	365 days*	N/A	547 days*	60 days*
Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	240 days	248 days
Minnesota	14 days	240 days	407 days	N/A	152 days	108 days
Montana	30 days	180 days	180 days	N/A	270 days	90 days

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VI – CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

Jurisdiction	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction	22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction	23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
Nebraska	5 days	84 days	289 days	257 days	298 days	173 days
Nevada	7 days	30 days	14 days	N/A	90 days*	60 days*
New Hampshire	30 days	164 days	188 days	N/A	154 days	2 days
New Jersey	Less than 45 days per court rule	215 days ^N	215 days ^N	N/A	661	N/A ^N
New Mexico	Varies; 1-3 days*	Varies; 15-90 days*	Varies; 90-120 days*	Varies; 90-180 days*	Varies; 180-365 days*	Varies; 180-365 days*
New York: 2 nd Department/2 nd , 11 th , and 13 th	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department/9 th District	7 days*	270-365 days	Varies	N/A	N/A	N/A
New York: 2 nd Department/10 th District	7-14 days	120-180 days	180-365 days	Varies	Varies	Varies
New York: 4 th Departments/ 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	14 days	90 days	270 days	N/A	180-270 days	90 days

*** = Estimated**

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VI – CASE PROCESSING TIMES**

Jurisdiction	19. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Summary Dismissal	20. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Closure/Dismissal After Investigation	21. Average Time from Receipt of Complaint to Filing of Formal Charges	22a. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Private Sanction	22b. Average Time from Filing of Charges to Imposition of Public Sanction	23. Average Time to Process Petition/Motion for Reinstatement/Readmission from Filing to Final Disposition
North Carolina	91 days ^N	225 days	393 days	N/A	195 days	63 days
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	N/A	82 days	N/A	N/A
Ohio	40 days	170 days	345 days	N/A	362 days	0 days
Oklahoma	45 days	180 days	270 days	N/A	270-365 days ^N	270-365 days ^N
Oregon	74 days ^N	214 days	338 days	N/A	278 days	14 days- 2 years ^N
Pennsylvania	12 days	86 days	N/A	11 days	14 days	127.5 days*
Rhode Island	2 days	90 days	180 days	90 days	270 days	60 days
South Carolina	15.69 days	266 days	973 days ^N	742 days	1632 days	423.5 days
Tennessee	1 day*	154 days*	154 days*	320 days*	320 days*	60 days*
Texas	Maximum of 30 days	Maximum of 120 days ^N	159 days	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vermont	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Virginia	7 days	135 days	381 days	330 days	476 days	N/A
Washington	7 days*	74 days*	356 days*	N/A	364*	N/A
Wisconsin	45 days	285 days	N/A	N/A ^N	N/A ^N	85
Wyoming	30 days	56 days	150 days	N/A	295 days	90 days

*** = Estimated**

CHART VI NOTES

The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any information for this chart: Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, and Utah.

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Dept., South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Arizona	Q22a: Arizona does not have private/non-public sanctions.
Idaho	Q19: No summary dismissal. Investigate all.
North Carolina	Q19: All grievances are investigated to the degree necessary to determine if the grievance has merit.
New Jersey	Q20 & Q21: Does not distinguish between cases dismissed and cases prosecuted.
New Jersey	Q23: This is handled by the Disciplinary Review Board.
North Dakota	Q22a: 82. Questions 19-21, Q22b, & Q23 not captured for data.
Oklahoma	Q22b & Q23: Varies greatly; requires Court opinion.
Oregon	Q19: This figure represents the average length of dispositions in CAO – other than matters that are referred elsewhere, there are very few cases in which dismissal is done with absolutely no investigation.
Oregon	Q23: Dramatic differences depending on the type of application and whether it is contested. Uncontested informal reinstatement generally completed within 60 days.
South Carolina	Q21: for cases disposed of in FY 18-19. It would be much more complicated to calculate for cases where FC were filed in FY 18-19.

CHART VI NOTES

The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any information for this chart: Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, and Utah.

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Dept., South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Texas	Q20: Unless an investigatory hearing is held, then 180.
Texas	Q22a, Q22b, Q22c: Statistics are not broken down into this level of detail.
Wisconsin	Q22a & 22b: Varies.



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Alabama	18,409	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	N/A	N/A	N/A
Alaska	3,114	\$933,567	\$933,567	\$0	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Arizona	18,750	\$3,976,078	\$3,430,777	\$545,301	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Arkansas	9,766	\$926,000	\$912,000	\$14,000	100% Supreme Court General Budget	0%
Colorado	26,963	\$8,430,222	\$7,415,441	\$1,014,781	0%	100% registration fees; attorney fines
Delaware	4,484	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
District of Columbia	79,177	\$9,624,541	N/A	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Florida	88,537	\$15,818,562	\$15,818,562	N/A	N/A	N/A
Georgia	39,750	\$3,911,511	\$3,706,511	\$235,000	100 Bar Association Dues	0%



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Hawai'i	4,931	\$1,771,938	\$1,771,938	\$1,771,938	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Idaho	5,236	\$831,496	\$759,615	\$71,881	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Illinois	72,952	\$17,419,290	\$15,256,324	\$2,162,966	94.7% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	5.3% Investment and Other Income
Indiana	18,595	\$2,480,958	\$2,480,958	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Iowa	9,500	\$1,600,000	\$1,400,000	\$200,000	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Kansas	11,090	\$2,054,000	\$2,054,000	N/A ^N	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Kentucky	18,783	\$1,569,902	\$1,569,902	\$1,569,902	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Louisiana	22,377	\$5,937,778	\$3,203,570	\$2,734,208	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Maine	5,406	\$1,330,000	\$972,000	N/A	0%	100% Attorney registration; CLE approval fees
Maryland	40,300	\$4,164,303	\$3,923,530	N/A	90% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	10% Bank interest; recovered costs; client protection fund reimbursements
Massachusetts	59,092	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan	42,240	\$5,076,565	\$3,947,760	\$1,128,805	97% Bar Association Dues	3% Other
Minnesota	25,665	\$3,889,345	\$3,889,345	N/A	95% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	5% Other
Missouri	30,928	\$3,256,854	\$2,682,296	\$574,558	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Montana	4,035	\$825,000	\$740,000	\$85,000	70% Bar Association Dues	30% Reserve



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
Nebraska	6,952	\$586,084	\$586,084	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nevada	9,056	\$2,300,000	\$2,300,000	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
New Hampshire	5,400	\$1,159,000	\$1,159,000	\$0	93% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	7% Fines; Cost Reimbursements
New Jersey	75,207	\$13,376,536	\$10,845,957	\$2,530,579	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
New Mexico	7,400*	\$1,000,000*	\$1,000,000*	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
New York: 2 nd Department/ 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	19,315	\$1,074,000	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	0%
New York: 2 nd Department/ 9 th District	15,986	N/A	\$2,276,059	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	0%
New York: 2 nd Department/ 10 th District	23,131	\$2,224,889	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
New York: 4 th Department/ 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	14,873	\$2,274,572	N/A	N/A	100% Legislative Appropriation	0%
North Carolina	28,972	\$4,103,331.58	\$4,009,715.49	\$93,626.09	100% State Bar Dues	0%
North Dakota	3,033	\$587,411	\$587,411	N/A	42.8% Bar Association Dues & 57.2% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Ohio	44,856	N/A	\$3,161,629	\$699,445	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Oklahoma	18,033	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$13,500	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Oregon	15,185	\$3,447,254	\$2,435,781	\$239,908	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Pennsylvania	65,504	\$10,291,983	N/A	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Rhode Island	5,245*	\$1,119,609.28	\$1,119,609.28	N/A	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING**

Jurisdiction	Number of Lawyers with Active License	24. Total Lawyer Discipline System Budget (\$)	25. Total Discipline Counsel or Comparable Prosecutorial Office Budget (\$)	26. Total Discipline Board or Comparable Administrative /Adjudicative Budget (\$)	27. Source of Funding	27e. Other Sources of Funding
South Carolina	12,812	N/A ^N	N/A ^N	N/A ^N	N/A ^N	N/A ^N
Tennessee	22,956	\$4,696,629.39	\$1,199,496.00	N/A	96% Bar Association Dues; 2% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	2% Interest paid to BPR; Ethics Workshop registration fees
Texas	103,342	\$10,427,933 ^N	\$9,732,243 ^N	\$600,975 ^N	N/A	N/A ^N
Utah	9,572	\$1,376,388	\$1,376,388	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Vermont	2,744	N/A	N/A ^N	N/A ^N	100% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	0%
Virginia	31,858	\$7,235,520	\$7,235,520	N/A	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
Washington	32,297	\$5,908,075	\$5,601,229	\$306,846	100% Not Earmarked ^N	0%
Wisconsin	21,000	\$3,443,300	\$3,443,300	\$3,443,300	92% Supreme Court Assessed Fees	8% Other
Wyoming	2,963	\$433,226	\$405,960	\$27,266	100% Bar Association Dues	0%
* =Estimated						



AMERICANBARASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VII – BUDGET & SOURCES OF FUNDING

CHART VII NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Dept., South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public resources](#).

Kansas	Q26: Budget not maintained separately.
Oregon	Q24: Total budget includes DC Office, CAO intake office, and estimated portion of the GCO budget attributed to staffing adjudicative function.
Oregon	Q25: DCO only; does not include CAO (intake office) or any portion of GCO (adjudicative staffing).
South Carolina	Q24-Q27: This information is not available. The Office of Disciplinary Counsel and the Office of Commission Counsel do not have separate budgets. Rather, both offices are a part of the SC Judicial Branch overall budget. The South Carolina General Assembly approves the Judicial Branch budget on a fiscal year beginning July 1. No portion of any Bar Dues or payments to the SC Client Security Fund support the discipline system.
Texas	Q24: Total budget includes: Commission for Lawyer Discipline, CDC, and Board of Disciplinary Appeal.
Texas	Q25: This budget is just CDC.
Texas	Q26: Total budget for Board of Disciplinary Appeals, but money spent on volunteer grievance committees is included in the CDC budget.
Texas	Q27e: CDC's budget is funded from bar dues and attorney's fees collected in disciplinary judgments.
Vermont	Q25 & Q26: Vermont licensing fees fund the entire professional responsibility program.
Washington	Q27: Less than two percent of the discipline system budget is funded from alternative revenue sources, including recovery of discipline costs, issuance of discipline history certificates, and recovery of revenue for auditor review of trust account records.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VIII – ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Alabama	\$350								
Alaska	\$660								70 years old / 25 years of practice = \$335
Arizona		\$345	\$345	\$345	\$505	\$505	\$505		
Arkansas		\$125	\$125	\$125	\$200	\$200	\$200		Age 65+/ retired= \$20
Colorado		\$190	\$190	\$190	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$130 under 65 years	65 years+/ inactive= \$0
Delaware		\$168	\$168	\$168	\$168	\$168	\$229		More than 10 Years = \$341
District of Columbia	\$317							\$194	
Florida	\$265								
Georgia									≤ 4 years a member pays a total of \$327 (\$50 Bar Center Assessment & \$25 Clients' Security Fund Assessment in addition to dues).
Hawai'i		\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$250		

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VIII – ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Idaho		See Other	\$320	\$320	\$425	\$425	\$425		Less than 1 year admitted Jan - June = \$175 / Less than 1 year admitted July - Dec = \$115 72+ years = \$70
Illinois		\$0	\$121	\$121	\$385	\$385	\$385		
Indiana	\$180								
Iowa	\$255								
Kansas	\$175								
Kentucky			\$220	\$220	\$220	\$220	\$310		Members of Judiciary= \$150
Louisiana		\$175	\$175	\$175	\$235	\$235	\$235		
Maine		\$160	\$160	\$160	\$265	\$265	\$265		Over 50 Years = \$140 / Judges = \$40
Maryland	\$130								\$130
Massachusetts				\$271			\$351		
Michigan	\$315								Active 50+ = \$135 (CPF -\$15 + Discipline-\$120)

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VIII – ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Minnesota		\$120	\$120	\$120	\$254	\$254	\$254		
Missouri		\$280	\$280	\$280	\$410	\$410	\$410		Non-Resident = \$325
Montana	\$495								
Nebraska	\$99								
Nevada	\$490								
New Hampshire	\$205								
New Jersey				\$35	\$183	\$183	\$212		
New Mexico		\$350	\$350	\$350	\$410	\$410	\$410		
New York: 2 nd Department/ 2 nd 11 th & 13 th Districts	\$375								Biennially
New York: 2 nd Department/9 th District	\$375								Biennially
New York: 2 nd Department/10 th District	\$375								Biennially

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VIII – ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:									
Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
New York: 4 th Department/ 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	\$375								Biennially
North Carolina	\$325								
North Dakota		\$325	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$350	\$380		
Ohio	\$175								
Oklahoma		\$137.50	\$137.50	\$275	\$275	\$275	\$275		
Oregon		\$453	\$453	\$537	\$537	\$537	\$537	\$125 (or retired)	Active/ Pro Bono = \$125 / More than 50 Years = \$0
Pennsylvania	\$225								
Rhode Island	\$200								
South Carolina ^N		\$190	\$190	\$275	\$275	\$275	\$275	\$205	Judicial Staff GT 3 Yrs = \$205 Judicial Staff LT 3 Yrs = \$190
Tennessee	\$170								
Texas		\$68	\$68	\$68	\$148	\$148	\$235		
Utah		\$255	\$255	\$255	\$430	\$430	\$430		All totals include a \$5 fee for Client Protection Fund.
Vermont	\$210								
Virginia	\$250								

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART VIII – ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &
FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS**

28. Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:

Jurisdiction	No Tiers Specified	0-1 year	1-2 years	2-3 years	3-4 years	4-5 years	5+ years	Inactive	Other
Washington		\$224.50	\$224.50	\$449	\$449	\$449	\$449		
Wisconsin		\$283	\$283	\$283	\$496	\$496	\$496		
Wyoming		\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$242.50	\$355		

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
 CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
 2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
 CHART VIII – ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES &
 FEES IN STATE DISCIPLINARY SYSTEMS

CHART VIII NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Dept., South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public resources](#).

South Carolina

Q28: The basic dues are \$275.00 plus \$30 optional indigency services funding plus \$70 mandatory disciplinary system assessment. Less than 3 years= \$190 plus \$30 optional indigent services funding plus \$40 disciplinary assessment. The Supreme Court must approve any changes in the annual assessments. [See Rule 410, SC Appellate Court Rules.](#)



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART A
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

Jurisdiction	29. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		30. Other Disciplinary Counsel		31. Other Lawyers		32. Investigators		33. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		34. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		35. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Alaska	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arizona	1.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Arkansas	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Colorado	1.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Delaware	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	1.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Florida	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	36.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	12.0	0.0	51.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Georgia	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	2.0 ^N
Hawai'i	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Idaho	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	27.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	10.0	0.5	0.0	2.0
Indiana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	2.0
Iowa	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.5 ^N
Kansas	1.0	0.0	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Kentucky	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	11.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Maine	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Maryland	1.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	1.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
Michigan ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART A
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

Jurisdiction	29. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		30. Other Disciplinary Counsel		31. Other Lawyers		32. Investigators		33. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		34. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		35. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Minnesota	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	9.32	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.44	0.0	9.82	0.0	.43	0.0
Missouri	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	8.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Montana	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Nebraska	1.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0
Nevada	1.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Hampshire	1.0	0.0	2.0 ^N	0.0	2.0 ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
New Jersey	1.0	0.0	13.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Mexico	1.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
New York: 2 nd Department/10 th District	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	1.0	0.0 ^N	0.0
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ohio	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oklahoma	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Oregon	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART A
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

Jurisdiction	29. Chief Disciplinary Counsel		30. Other Disciplinary Counsel		31. Other Lawyers		32. Investigators		33. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		34. Secretarial / Clerical / Administration		35. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	28.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Rhode Island	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	1.0	0.0	1.0 ^N	0.0	7.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Tennessee	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Texas	1.0	0.0	4.0 ^N	0.0	32.0	1.0	12.0	0.0	33.0	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Vermont	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 ^N	0.0 ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Virginia	1.0	0.0	9.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	1.0	0.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.30
Wisconsin	1.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0



AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

Center for Professional
Responsibility

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART A
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

CHART IX NOTES: PART A

N/A = Data not available or applicable

**Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Dept., South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date.
Please derive California data from these [public resources](#).**

Georgia	Q35: About 25%.
Indiana	Q35: Semester unpaid.
Iowa	Q35: Semester unpaid.
Michigan	Q29-Q35: Data not maintained and/or provided.
New Hampshire	Q29: Chief General Counsel= 1 full time. Not Chief Disciplinary Counsel.
New Hampshire	Q30 & Q31: Staff lawyers include 3 General Counsel, who perform administrative tasks and supervision, and also screen and investigate complaints; and 2 Disciplinary Counsel, who prosecute formal charges and appear at the NH Supreme Court.
New York: 2nd Department/10th District	Q35: Varies.
South Carolina	Q30: Deputy.
Texas	Q30: Regional Counsel.
Vermont	Q32: Contracts as needed, full and part time.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART B
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	36. Auditors		37. Probation Monitors		38. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	39. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Alabama	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	0.0
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Arizona	2.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Records Department	36.0	0.0
Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
Colorado	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	N/A	48.0	0.0
Delaware	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	5.0	0.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	35.0	0.0
Florida	5.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	112.0	14.0
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.5	Receivership Clerk	22.0	2.5
Hawai'i	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	1.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	40.0	5.0	N/A	97.0	9.0
Indiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	16.0	2.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	10.0	0.5
Kansas	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	IT	12.0	4.0
Kentucky	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	0.0
Louisiana	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	29.0	1.0
Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	N/A	11.0	0.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART B
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	36. Auditors		37. Probation Monitors		38. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	39. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Maryland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Executive Secretary/ Admin. Assistant	27.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	55.0	0.0
Michigan ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0
Minnesota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	.39	0.0	Accounting .31/ Judges .08	28.4	0.0
Missouri	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	IT	20.0	1.0
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
Nebraska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	Administrative Contractor	6.0	6.0
Nevada	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	0.0
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	9.0	0.7
New Jersey	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	IT	68.0	0.0
New Mexico	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	5.8	0.0
New York: 2 nd Department 2 nd , 11 th & 13 th Districts	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	0.0
New York: 2 nd Department 9 th District	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	17.0	1.0
New York: 2 nd Department 10 th District	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	18.0	1.0
New York: 4 th Department 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	20.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	1.0	Attorney/Client Assistance Program	47.0	1.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART IX – PART B
STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	36. Auditors		37. Probation Monitors		38. Other Staff		Other Staff Details	39. TOTAL PAID STAFF	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	4.0	1.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	26.0	1.0
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	15.0	1.0
Oregon	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 ^N	0.0	N/A	15.0	0.0
Pennsylvania	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	55.0	0.0
Rhode Island	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	6.0	0.0
South Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	14.0	0.0
Tennessee	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	IT	34.0	0.0
Texas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	97.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	11.0	0.0
Vermont	0.0 ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0 ^N	N/A	1.0	1.0 ^N
Virginia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	33.0	0.0
Washington	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	Department Administrator	38.0	0.30
Wisconsin	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	30.0	0.0
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	N/A	2.0	0.0

CHART IX NOTES: PART B

N/A = Data not available or applicable

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Dept., South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date.

Please derive California data from these [public resources](#).

Oregon	Q38: Numbers do not include the 3 lawyers and 2 administrative assistants (OTHER STAFF) in separate intake office that is not within Disciplinary Counsel's office (CAO).
Vermont	Q36: Contracts as needed.
Vermont	Q38: Outside counsel contracts for conflicts.
Vermont	Q39: Shared admin; contracts as needed.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART A
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	40. Non-Lawyer Head of Office		41. Chief Adjudicative Counsel		42. Other Adjudicative Counsel		43. Other Lawyers on Staff		44. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		45. Secretarial / Clerical Administration		46. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Colorado	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Georgia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.25	0.0	0.0
Hawai'i	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Illinois	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Iowa	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.23	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.65	0.0	0.0
Kansas	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Louisiana	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	1.0	0.0	1.0
Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
New Jersey	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Carolina	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.75	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Oregon	0.0	0.0	1.0 ^N	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0 ^N	0.0	0.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART A
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	40. Non-Lawyer Head of Office		41. Chief Adjudicative Counsel		42. Other Adjudicative Counsel		43. Other Lawyers on Staff		44. Legal Assistants / Paralegals		45. Secretarial / Clerical Administration		46. Law Students / Clerks	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
Pennsylvania	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
South Carolina	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Vermont	0.0	0.5 ^N	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Wyoming	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

CHART X – PART A NOTES

Not all jurisdictions maintain this data and therefore the following jurisdictions did not provide data for this chart: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York: 2nd Dept./9th District, New York: 2nd Dept./10th District, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Districts, New York: 4th Dept./5th, 7th & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Oregon	Q41: The General Counsel supervises the part-time Adjudicator but does not herself perform adjudicatory functions. Her position is full-time, but her supervision of the Adjudicator is only an aspect of her job – that task is not itself full-time.
Oregon	Q45: The Disciplinary Board Clerk functions are not a full-time position. That person also has other unrelated duties.
South Carolina	Q43: Receiver.
Vermont	Q40: 0.5-0.75 Program Administrator.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART B
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	47. Other Staff		47. Other Staff Details	48. TOTAL Paid Staff	
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Colorado	0.0	0.0	N/A	3.0	3.0
District of Columbia	0.0	0.0	N/A	12.0	0.0
Georgia	0.0	0.50	.25 Clerk of Board/ .25 Counsel to review board (independent contractor)	0.0	0.50
Hawai'i	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Idaho	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0
Illinois	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	2.5
Iowa	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.08
Kansas	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0
Louisiana	6.0	0.0	2 Media Full- Time / 4 Tech Full-Time	19.0	2.0
Maine	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	0.0
Massachusetts	0.0	0.0	N/A	8.0	0.0
Michigan	0.0	0.0	N/A	7.0	0.0
Missouri	0.0	0.0	N/A	3.0	0.5
Montana	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0
New Jersey	1.0	0.0	IT	17.0	0.0
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.0
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Ohio	0.0	0.0	N/A	3.75	0.0
Oregon	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	2.0

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART B
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	47. Other Staff		47. Other Staff Details	48. TOTAL Paid Staff	
	Full Time	Part Time		Full Time	Part Time
Pennsylvania	10.0	0.0	N/A	27.0	0.0
South Carolina	1.0	0.0	Court Reporter	5.0	0.0
Utah	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0
Vermont	0.0	0.0 ^N	N/A	1.0	1.0
Washington	0.0	0.0	N/A	1.0	0.4
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	N/A	0.0	1.0

CHART X – PART B NOTES

The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York: 2nd Dept./9th District, New York: 2nd Dept./10th District, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Districts, New York: 4th Dept./5th, 7th & 8th Districts, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Vermont

Q47: Contract counsel for volunteer hearing panels.

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART C
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level	49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level	49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level
Alaska	33%	25%	N/A
Arizona	0%	33% ^N	0%
Arkansas	28.6%	N/A	N/A
Colorado	33.0%	0%	N/A
Delaware	33.3%	33.3%	N/A
District of Columbia	33%	N/A	22%
Georgia	0%	0%	33%
Hawai'i	28%	N/A	33%
Idaho	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%
Illinois	33%	0%	0%
Iowa	20%*	N/A	N/A
Kansas	0%	0%	0%
Kentucky	30%	0%	22%
Louisiana	33%	33%	33%
Maine	N/A	N/A	N/A
Massachusetts	33%	0%	33%
Michigan	N/A	N/A	33% ^N
Missouri	33.0%	33.0%	N/A
Montana	23%	N/A	N/A
Nebraska	30.0%	0%	30%

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY
2018 SURVEY ON LAWYER DISCIPLINE SYSTEMS (S.O.L.D.)
CHART X – PART C
STAFFING OF ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES**

Jurisdiction	49a. % Public Member Volunteers at Hearing Committee/Trial Level	49b. % Public Member Volunteers at Presiding Judge/ Disciplinary Level	49c. % of Public Member Volunteers at Appellate/ Board Level
New Hampshire	40% ^N	N/A	33% ^N
New Jersey	33.3%	N/A	N/A
New Mexico	33%	N/A	33%
New York: 4 th Department/ 5 th , 7 th & 8 th Districts	14%	N/A	N/A
North Carolina	33 1/3%	0%	0%
North Dakota	33.33%	0%	27.27%
Ohio	N/A	N/A	14% ^N
Oklahoma	28.5%	33.3%	0%
Oregon	33%	0%	0%
Pennsylvania	0%	N/A	15%
South Carolina	33.3%	0%	0%
Tennessee	N/A	N/A	25%
Texas	33%	N/A	N/A
Utah	22.2%	N/A	N/A
Vermont	33%	33%	0% ^N
Washington	0%	0%	29%
Wyoming	28.5%	N/A	N/A

CHART X – PART C NOTES

N/A = Data not available or applicable

The following jurisdictions do not maintain this data and therefore did not provide any for this chart: Alabama, Florida, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Nevada, New York: 2nd Dept./9th District, New York: 2nd Dept./10th District, New York: 2nd Dept./2nd, 11th & 13th Districts, Rhode Island, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Connecticut, Mississippi, New York: 3rd Department, South Dakota, and West Virginia had not provided data by the publication date. Please derive California data from these [public sources](#).

Arizona	Q49b: Probable Cause Committee determines filing of formal charges: 33% = Public Members.
Michigan	Q49c: 3 non-lawyer members/6 lawyer members.
New Hampshire	Q49a & 49c: All hearing and board members are volunteers.
New Jersey	Q49a: Public Members make up 1/3 of the entire committee. Hearing panels are comprised of 1 public member (nonlawyer) and 2 lawyers.
Ohio	Q49c: There are 28 commissioners, 4 of them are non-lawyers.
Vermont	Q49c: Appeals are directly to the Supreme Court.

The American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility is the only organization that collects, analyzes, and compiles statistics about lawyer regulatory systems on a national basis. This data, which is published as the ABA Survey on Lawyer Disciplinary Systems (S.O.L.D.), serves to educate the public, the profession, the news media, the judiciary, and disciplinary agencies about disciplinary sanctions, caseload, staffing, and budgetary activity in each jurisdiction. Information from the Survey has been used to effect changes in caseload management, staffing, and funding for disciplinary systems. As a result, it is essential that the Center maintain accurate data with respect to each jurisdiction.

We appreciate your cooperation in helping us collect this vital data. Your timely responses are especially appreciated. Prompt responses to the questionnaire allow us to publish the data in a manner that is most useful to courts, disciplinary agencies, and the public. If you have any questions regarding your response, please contact Regulation and Global Initiatives Counsel Ellyn Rosen at Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org as soon as possible.

"Terms and Phrases" are included and referenced at several points in the Survey questionnaire. You may find it convenient to print them prior to starting the Survey.

The Survey is published electronically on the Center for Professional Responsibility's web site at [Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems](#).

The Center will begin posting available data in July.

Any suggestions for future modifications that would increase the usefulness of the Survey are welcome and appreciated.

PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE BY December 2, 2019

TO:

Ellyn Rosen

Ellyn.Rosen@americanbar.org

American Bar Association Center for Professional Responsibility

321 North Clark Street, 20th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60654-7598

P: 312/988-5311

Please provide the following Jurisdiction Contact Information

Jurisdiction:	
Person Reporting:	
Title:	
Telephone:	
E-Mail Address:	

So that we may maintain accurate information for the ABA [Directory of Lawyer Disciplinary Agencies](#), please complete the following information for the Chief Disciplinary Counsel and the Disciplinary Board Chair.

Name of Chief Disciplinary Counsel:	
Title:	
Address:	
General Phone:	
Direct Phone:	
Fax:	
E-Mail Address:	
Website (if available):	
Name of Disciplinary Board Chair:	
Title:	
Name of Chief Adjudicative Counsel or other Head of the Adjudicative Office of the Disciplinary System:	
Title:	
Address:	
Phone:	
Fax:	
E-Mail Address:	

TERMS & PHRASES

The following explanation of terms and phrases used in the Survey on Lawyer Discipline Systems is provided to assist in the collection of data.

Adjudicative Office of the Disciplinary System:

The adjudicative office of the disciplinary system is comprised of the professional lawyer and nonlawyer staff, as defined below, who support the system's adjudicators in the performance of their duties, including administrative functions. For purposes of this Survey, the actual adjudicators are excluded from this definition of the adjudicative office. The adjudicative office may operate from a different location than the investigative/prosecutorial branch of the disciplinary agency, or it may be located within the same office space, but separated physically. Examples of titles of the adjudicative office include the Lawyer/Attorney Disciplinary Board, Disciplinary Review Board, Board of Disciplinary Appeals, Board of Professional Responsibility or Commission.

Adjudicative Counsel:

Lawyers employed by the disciplinary agency to work for the adjudicative branch of the system (excluding counsel to the jurisdiction's highest court). These lawyers do not perform investigative or prosecutorial functions. They are responsible for assisting disciplinary system adjudicators, including Hearing Committees/Panels, Appellate Board members, and Presiding Disciplinary Judges. Their duties include conducting legal research, assisting adjudicators with trial and oral argument preparation, and preparing bench briefs, draft reports and recommendations. The Chief Adjudicative Counsel may also be referred to as the Executive Director, Counsel or General Counsel of the Disciplinary Board.

Adjudicative Staff:

All nonlawyer staff in the adjudicative office of the disciplinary agency (excluding staff of the jurisdiction's highest court). In some jurisdictions the head of the adjudicative office is not a lawyer and may be referred to as the Executive Director or Administrator of the Disciplinary Board.

Alternatives to Discipline Program (also known as Diversion):

A program allowing for complaints involving lesser misconduct to be handled administratively prior or subsequent to the filing of charges. The respondent and disciplinary counsel enter into an contract tailored to the circumstances of the case whereby the respondent is referred to a remedial program that may include fee arbitration, arbitration, mediation, law office management assistance, a lawyer assistance program, psychological counseling, continuing legal education programs, ethics school or any other program authorized by the court. The respondent's participation is voluntary. Upon the respondent's successful completion of the program, the

contract is terminated and the complaint dismissed. A breach of the contract may result in the resumption of the disciplinary proceedings. An Alternatives to Discipline Program is not a disciplinary sanction, like probation.

Complaint:

Any information received by the disciplinary agency regarding lawyer conduct that requires a determination as to whether the disciplinary agency has jurisdiction over the lawyer or matter(s) complained of, or whether sufficient facts are alleged that would, if true, constitute misconduct. These complaints are sometimes called “grievances” or “requests for the investigation of a lawyer.” These complaints may be in the form of a written submission, e-mail submission, a telephone or in-person discussion whose contents are reduced to writing, or other information received by the disciplinary agency, including written, audio or visual media reports, records of criminal convictions, etc.

Disbarment on Consent:

A form of discipline on consent whereby a lawyer against whom formal charges are pending tenders a conditional admission to the allegations of misconduct, agrees that the appropriate sanction for that misconduct is disbarment and requests that the appropriate authority, typically the highest court, impose that sanction. In some jurisdictions, disbarment on consent is referred to as resignation with charges pending. In other jurisdictions, a resignation, with or without charges pending, means that a lawyer who is retired, or no longer engaged in the practice of law in that jurisdiction, asks to assume inactive status. The latter form of resignation does not constitute a disciplinary sanction for purposes of this Survey and should not be reported.

Charges:

After a determination has been made that there is probable cause to believe that misconduct occurred, any document, pleading or notice filed by the disciplinary agency or appropriate authority with the designated adjudicatory tribunal, wherein a lawyer is charged with specified acts of misconduct and violations of the rules of professional conduct and a disciplinary sanction is sought.

Investigation:

Any inquiry into allegations of misconduct contained in the initial complaint to the disciplinary agency, including, but not limited to, asking the lawyer who is the subject of the complaint to respond to the allegations, interviewing witnesses and/or obtaining documentary evidence concerning the allegations.

Misconduct: A violation of the applicable rules of professional conduct.

Private/Non-Public Sanction:

Any disciplinary sanction where the identity of the lawyer sanctioned is kept confidential. Such private sanctions may include censure, admonition or reprimand. In cases where a lawyer receives a private sanction, a description of the conduct for which that lawyer has been disciplined, without disclosing the name of the lawyer, may still be published for the education of the profession and the public. For purposes of this Survey, if such publication occurs the sanction is still considered private/non-public.

Screened Out/Summarily Dismissed Without Investigation:

The disposal of a complaint by the disciplinary agency, whether or not that complaint is accorded file status or is docketed, without seeking any information in addition to that which is contained in the initial complaint, including but not limited to complaints disposed of for lack of jurisdiction or for not alleging sufficient facts that would, if true, constitute misconduct.

Please fill in the appropriate figures for the calendar/fiscal year 2018. If data is provided for a fiscal year, please identify the time period below. Where a question asks for an average, such as in Part II, please provide that number for the calendar/fiscal year that you use. Some questions will ask for data relating to other years.

The Survey questionnaire is intended to be as brief as possible, while still allowing us to gather essential, accurate, and complete information. We understand that this can be complicated by the diversity of lawyer discipline systems and terminology utilized by the various agencies. As a result, where necessary, please provide footnotes on the last page of the questionnaire to any responses where there is a **major** variation in procedures. We will include those explanatory footnotes to the extent possible.

If your jurisdiction does not maintain the type of data or engage in the type of activity requested, please answer with the designation N/A. Please indicate estimates by adding an asterisk to that response.*

Question	Calendar Year 2018	Fiscal Year
Data provided is based on:		From: To:
If your jurisdiction publishes an Annual Report electronically, please provide the link:		

PART I: CASE PROCESSING & SANCTION STATISTICS

A. LAWYER POPULATION

Question	Response 2018
Q1. Total number of lawyers, resident and nonresident, with <u>active</u> licenses to practice law in your jurisdiction in the calendar/fiscal year:	

B. CASE PROCESSING STATISTICS

Question		Response 2018
Q2.	Total number of complaints (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>) received by the disciplinary agency during the calendar/fiscal year 2018 :	
Q2-a.	Does your jurisdiction have a Central Intake Program (<i>sometimes referred to as Consumer Assistance Program</i>):	
Q2-b.	If the total number of complaints received by the agency <u>excludes</u> matters handled by Central Intake or other Consumer Assistance Program, how many matters were handled separately by Central Intake or the Consumer Assistance Program?	
Q3.	Total number of complaints received by the disciplinary agency <u>prior</u> to calendar/fiscal year 2018 that were <u>still pending</u> on the first day of calendar/fiscal year:	
Q4.	Total number of <u>complaints that were screened out/ summarily dismissed without investigation (as defined in Terms & Phrases)</u> during the calendar/fiscal year 2018 . (This number may include complaints that were received prior to the 2018 calendar/fiscal year, but were not so disposed of until then):	
Q5.	Total number of complaints that were <u>investigated</u> during the calendar/fiscal year 2018 . (This number should include complaints from previous years that were still pending as of the first day of the 2018 calendar/fiscal year, as well as complaints received during that year):	
Q6.	Of the total number of complaints reported in response to Question 5 , how many were closed or dismissed by the disciplinary agency during calendar/fiscal year 2018 after a determination that there was not a sufficient basis to warrant charges (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>).	
Q7.	<u>Total number of lawyers</u> against whom charges (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>) were brought in the calendar/fiscal year 2018 :	

C. DIVERSION

Question		Response 2018
Q8.	Does your jurisdiction have an Alternatives to Discipline Program/ Diversion Program (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>)?	
Q8-a.	Yes, we have a program but data is not maintained:	
Q9.	Total number of lawyers referred by the disciplinary agency to an Alternatives to Discipline Program/Diversion Program in calendar/fiscal year 2018 ?	
Of the total number reported in response to Question 9 , what is the number of lawyers who:		
Q9-a.	Successfully completed the program:	
Q9-b.	Did not successfully complete the program:	
Q9-c.	Are still participating in the program:	

D. SANCTIONS IMPOSED

Question		Response 2018
Q10.	What is the total number of lawyers who received <u>private/ non-public</u> disciplinary sanctions during the 2018 calendar/fiscal year:	
Of the total number of lawyers who received private/non-public disciplinary sanctions in response to Question 10 , what is the total number of lawyers who received the following:		
Q10-a.	Admonition:	
Q10-b.	Private Reprimand:	
Q10-c.	Letter of Warning/Caution or other (<i>please specify</i>):	

Question		Response 2018
Q11.	Total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in the 2018 calendar/fiscal year:	
Of the total number of lawyers who received public disciplinary sanctions in response to Question 11 , what is the total number of lawyers who received the following:		
Q11-a.	Involuntary/Adjudicated Disbarment:	
Q11-b.	Disbarment on Consent (<i>including applicable Resignations as defined in the Terms & Phrases</i>):	
Q11-c.	Suspension (<i>excluding interim suspensions</i>):	
Q11-d.	Interim Suspension (<i>for risk of harm, criminal conviction, finding of guilt, or other reason</i>):	
Q11-e.	Admonishment, Reprimand, or Censure:	
Q11-f.	Probation (<i>including probation imposed in combination with other sanctions, e.g., a suspension for a period of time followed by probation</i>):	
Q11-g.	Restitution:	
Q11-h.	Payment of Costs:	

C. REINSTATEMENT AND READMISSION STATISTICS

Question		Response 2018
Q12.	Total number of lawyers who sought reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law during the calendar/fiscal year 2018 :	
Total number of lawyers who were reinstated/readmitted in the calendar/fiscal year 2018 after:		
Q13-a.	Disbarment-Involuntary/Adjudicated or Consensual (<i>as defined in the Terms & Phrases</i>):	
Q13-b.	Suspension:	
Q13-c.	Transfer to disability inactive status:	
Q14.	Total number of lawyers whose requests for reinstatement / readmission were denied and/or dismissed, voluntarily or involuntarily, during the calendar/fiscal year 2018 :	

PART II: CASE LOAD STATISTICS

A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL

Question		Response 2018
Q15.	What was the average caseload per staff lawyer in calendar/fiscal year 2018 ? (<i>Caseload or cases means the number of investigations, charges and reinstatements/readmissions</i>).	
Q16.	What was the average number of cases per staff lawyer carried over into the calendar/fiscal year 2018 from previous years?	
Q17.	What was the average number of new cases assigned per staff lawyer in the calendar/fiscal year 2018 ?	
Q18.	What was the average number per staff lawyer of cases closed/dismissed during calendar/fiscal year 2018 ?	

B. CASE PROCESSING TIMES

Please indicate estimates by asterisks

Question		Response 2018
During each of the calendar/fiscal year 2018 , What was:		
Q19.	The average number of days to process a complaint from its receipt to screening out/summary dismissal without investigation, (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>)?	
Q20.	The average number of days to process a complaint from its receipt to closure/dismissal <u>after investigation</u> , if no charges are filed?	
Q21.	The average number of days to process a complaint from its receipt to the filing of charges (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>)?	
The average number of days to process a complaint from the filing of charges to the imposition of:		
Q22-a.	Private/Non-Public Sanction:	
Q22-b.	Public Sanction:	
Q23.	The average number of days to process a petition, motion or request for reinstatement/readmission to the practice of law, from the time the petition, motion or request is filed to final disposition?	

PART III: ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES & FEES / BUDGET

A. BUDGET AND SOURCES OF FUNDING

Question		Response 2018
Q24.	Total budget for the lawyer discipline system--disciplinary counsel's office and the adjudicative office (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>) -- in calendar/fiscal year 2018 :	\$
Q25.	Of the amount in response to Question 24 , the total budget for disciplinary counsel's office:	\$
Q26.	Of the amount in response to Question 25 , the total budget for the adjudicative office of the disciplinary system (<i>as defined in Terms & Phrases</i>):	\$
Please indicate the percentage of funding from each source.		
Q27-a.	Bar Association Dues:	%
Q27-b.	Supreme Court Assessed Fees:	%
Q27-c.	Supreme Court General Budget:	%
Q27-d.	Legislative Appropriation:	%
Q27-e.	Other (<i>please specify</i>):	%

B. ANNUAL REGISTRATION DUES AND FEES

Please respond to the following for the calendar/fiscal year 2018.

Question		Response 2018
Q28.	Annual fees/dues required per lawyer to practice law:	\$

If there is a scale related to years of practice, please include from lowest to highest:

Years in Practice	Annual Fees/Dues

PART IV: STAFFING OF DISCIPLINARY AGENCY

Please report the total number of full-time equivalents for calendar/fiscal year **2018** in each category, e.g., when two individuals are each employed part-time for 50% of the work week, they equal one full-time equivalent. Decimals may be used, e.g., when three individuals are each employed part-time for 50% of the work week, they equal 1.5 full-time equivalents. Please report **paid** staff only.

A. DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL OFFICES

	Position	Full-Time 2018	Part-Time 2018
Q29.	Chief Disciplinary Counsel:		
Q30.	Other Disciplinary Counsel:		
Q31.	Other Lawyers on Staff:		
Q32.	Investigators:		
Q33.	Legal Assistants/Paralegals:		
Q34.	Secretarial/Clerical/Administrative Personnel:		
Q35.	Law Students/Clerks:		
Q36.	Auditors:		
Q37.	Probation Monitors:		
Q38.	Other Staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)		
Q39.	TOTAL number of paid disciplinary counsel's office staff: (should be the sum of Q29 through Q 38)		

B. ADJUDICATIVE OFFICES

Position		Full-Time 2018	Part-Time 2018
Q40.	Nonlawyer Head of Office:		
Q41.	Chief Adjudicative Counsel (Head of Office):		
Q42.	Other Adjudicative Counsel:		
Q43.	Other Lawyers on Staff:		
Q44.	Legal Assistants/Paralegals:		
Q45.	Secretarial/Clerical/Administrative Personnel:		
Q46.	Law Students/Clerks:		
Q47.	Other Staff not reflected above: (please specify category of personnel)		
Q48.	TOTAL number of paid staff for Disciplinary Board: (should be the sum of Q40 through Q47)		

	Discipline Systems Adjudicators	
Q49.	What is the percentage of nonlawyers serving as adjudicators at the:	
Q49-a.	Hearing Committee/Trial Level:	
Q49-b.	Presiding Disciplinary Judge/Trial Level:	
Q49-c.	Appellate/Board Level:	

Please use the below space for any footnotes to any responses where there is a major variation in procedures.
