

# U-LPQ Update – A Case in Point

by Mitch Satalof

Now that the U-LPQ has been with us for a year or so, how has it impacted our effectiveness as recruiters and law firms engaged in lateral partner recruitment?

To be frank, too many search firms are reticent to use it for fear they'll run into a roadblock at the law firm level. This is hardly the case in the initial stages of lateral partner candidate representation.

Let's dig into it.

Case in point: A few months back, a West Coast recruiter who knows my work at NALSC contacted me about a partner candidate he knew who was now considering change. His dilemma was that this candidate worked and resided on the East Coast and the recruiter's focus was left coast in terms of placements.

The recruiter wasn't sure the partner had a book sufficient to make a transition, but the partner had solid credentials and longevity at their present firm. So, he contacted me as a first step towards an introduction.

After a few conversations with the partner, it was still unclear if they had enough tangible business to undertake a lateral move. So, I took the plunge.

*"Let's do an exercise that will bring clarity to your value,"* I suggested. I introduced him to the U-LPQ and the addendum, as well. *"If you'll put the time and effort into providing me with this information, we'll both have a more concrete understanding of the business you bring and where that might fit into our goal of your landing in another firm's NYC office. It may not be the last step in the process,"* I explained, *"but given this level of detail we can then game plan what's possible to a more definitive end."*

The partner agreed and a few days later, I had a completed U-LPQ and, to my astonishment, a track record of \$1mm+ in business annually over the past 3 years. This changed everything in terms of our outlook.

With my new awareness, and a clear vision of my partner's practice focus and skill set, we whittled down the possible landing firms to a solid half dozen.

Not wanting to offer the entire U-LPQ without sufficient cause or a request from the firms we approached, I carved out a few segments that indicated the partner's consistent business attainment and a nutshell version of their profile and goals for the initial presentation.

Every single firm bit and requested a full introduction. Now, we had significant interest from multiple firms.

*"To date, approximately 50 firms, most of which are in the T200, have informed NALSC that they are open to accepting the U-LPQ as part of the partner movement process."*

The process continued post introduction, with initial interviews that quickly escalated to LPQ requests. With my partner's busy schedule, and their permission, we offered the U-LPQ as an instant fix to many of the firms' deep dive questions. The client addendum was also provided.

In this instance, each firm was grateful for the information and proceeded with further meetings, yet they all eventually stated they needed the LPQ info on their own form. With the previously filled-out U-LPQ, transposing the information moved quickly (as needed on a per firm basis), and the vetting process moved quickly, as well.

My partner candidate now is considering a very worthy offer from one of the firms we approached. He's planning to accept.

I'm highly doubtful that any of this would have transpired without the use of the U-LPQ. And I'm very proud that I had the opportunity to contribute to its development.

And, oh yeah, the other recruiting firm on the West Coast is loving what NALSC brings in terms of working relationships. Where else can you go to find an already trained, highly experienced recruiter in an area that's not your first line of daily communication? Just hand off a possible placement and sit back and wait for the check(s) to roll in.

### A note on law firm acceptance of the U-LPQ

To date, approximately 50 firms, most of which are in the T200, have informed NALSC that they are open to accepting the U-LPQ as part of the partner movement process. Not all want their names broadcast as, in many cases, there's a COO who invested a small fortune in data entry and will push back if information doesn't come in exactly as he/she wants it.

Don't let that deter you; that's a secondary issue. No firm that I know of will turn down the opportunity to draw closer to a partner acquisition when good information is offered.

So, we may have to transpose info. So what? At that point, we know the time invested in transposing is a small step in concluding the lateral hire. Your partner candidate, if serious about the firm's request, should have no problem spending a few hours transferring the information they need onto the firm's form.

In all cases, in the beginning of a candidate relationship, you're asking a lot of questions to understand who and what your partner is and brings along with them. Get it in U-LPQ form at the early stages, and you'll have a very clear understanding of whether expending your energy on the candidate is even worth the time.

And maybe there's a very nice check at the end of the day.



#### ABOUT THE AUTHOR:

Mitch Satalof is the Immediate Past President of NALSC. He is also CEO of Juris Placements, Inc. Mitch devoted much of the past few years to the development of the U-LPQ, which for some, is an essential tool in harnessing the true value and understanding of a partner candidate.

P: (610) 825 7751

E: [mitch@jurisplacements.com](mailto:mitch@jurisplacements.com)

W: [www.jurisplacements.com](http://www.jurisplacements.com)