TABLE OF CONTENTS

The National Conference of Bar Examiners (NCBE) [recently announced](#) recommendations for a new generation of bar exam—one that will remain closed book, but test fewer subjects in an integrated format, rather than with separate MEE, MBE, and MPT sections. We are grateful to the NCBE for their contribution to this issue—the first piece in our series on reimagining lawyer licensing.

There is great enthusiasm about improving bar exams, though questions persist about lawyer licensing in general. Doctors must know human anatomy. What must minimally competent 21st century [lawyers know](#)? How detailed must this knowledge be? Must rules be memorized, or need lawyers simply possess foundational knowledge **and** the ability to research specifics? Might competency be established through expertise in specialty areas? And beyond knowledge, what basic skills must new lawyers possess and how should skills competencies be measured? (See [Shultz & Zedeck](#), [IAALS Foundations for Practice](#) and [Building a Better Bar](#), [California Attorney Practice Analysis](#), etc.)

We will most effectively answer these questions, and improve the entire attorney licensing process, by working together. I have pledged to help the NCBE and state bar examiners in any way I can, and I urge readers to be alert to opportunities to do the same—take part in surveys, pilots, and other studies, nationally and in your jurisdiction; voice your concerns, questions, and ideas. Above all, remain part of the lawyer-licensing reform conversation. Let's roll up our sleeves and collectively do the work necessary to improve the future of our profession.

To those ends, for this issue we invited thoughts on lawyer licensing. We thank each of our many guest authors in this issue, all of whom could surely speak for hours, if not days, on these important questions. Please note, however, contributors were given strict word limits, so as you read on, know that these brief pieces present only the *beginnings* of much longer conversations.

We hope that the future will bring continued robust exchanges regarding empirically based thinking, as we move together toward meaningful, inclusive, and long-lasting change.

On that note, I want to take this opportunity to remind readers that the AccessLex Bar Success Research Grant and Bar Success Intervention Grant programs will be accepting applications from May 1 through May 31, 2021. Please share the links below with your colleagues:

https://www.accesslex.org/grant/bar-success-grant-program

https://www.accesslex.org/grants/bar-success-intervention-grant-program

AccessLex-funded research and interventions from these grant programs I founded in 2018—spotlighted in the Winter 2021 *Raising the Bar*—have already yielded findings that are changing legal education for the better. If you have a hypothesis or intervention that you have been thinking about studying, please apply for one of these grants.

And, lastly, I am so proud and pleased to announce the AccessLex-AASE ASP Faculty Scholarship Grant, a collaborative program of AccessLex Institute and the [Association of Academic Support Educators](#) (AASE). This grant underscores both organizations' commitment to the professional development of ASP faculty, especially those who are newer to the discipline, and to the publication of scholarship related to teaching and learning in legal education. The deadline to submit completed applications is April 16, 2021. For more information or a scholarship grant application, contact DeShun Harris at D.Harris@memphis.edu, Laura Mott at laura.mott@law.cuny.edu, or Cassie Christopher at Catherine.Christopher@ttu.edu.

Stay safe and be well,

Sara Berman, Esq.

Director, Programs for Academic and Bar Success
AccessLex Center for Legal Education Excellence®
Visit the Director's [SSRN author page](#)
Visit the AccessLex [SSRN page](#)

REIMAGINING THE BAR EXAM AND OTHER PATHS TO LICENSURE

This section includes eight pieces representing some 20 contributors expressing a wide range of thoughts on the future of bar exams and lawyer licensing.

Update from the NCBE's Testing Task Force

NCBE's Testing Task Force completed its study and rang in 2021 with a bang by publishing the *Overview of Preliminary Recommendations for the Next Generation of the Bar Examination* on January 4. The recommendations are evidence-based and supported by the qualitative and quantitative data gathered over the course of three years, including input from the many stakeholders who participated in the study. The preliminary recommendations are set out at a high level in this update, while a more complete description of the recommendations and detailed reports of our research are available online. A video presentation describing the recommendations and a set of FAQs are also provided there.

For the next generation of the bar exam, the Task Force recommended an integrated examination that measures knowledge and skills holistically using both item sets and stand-alone questions, as well as a mix of item formats. Greater emphasis will be placed on assessment of lawyering skills. The knowledge and skills assessed will be those that are of foundational importance and common to numerous practice areas, which is consistent with the regulatory framework of a general license to practice law. The following legal subjects and skills will be assessed on the next generation of the bar exam:

Foundational Concepts and Principles

- Civil Procedure
- Contract Law
- Evidence
- Torts
- Business Associations
- Constitutional Law
- Real Property
- Criminal Law and Constitutional Protections Impacting Criminal Proceedings

Foundational Skills

- Legal Research
- Legal Writing
- Issue Spotting and Analysis
- Investigation and Evaluation
- Client Counseling and Advising
- Negotiation and Dispute Resolution
- Client Relationship and Management

The scope of what will be included within the eight Foundational Concepts & Principles (FC&P) and the seven Foundational Skills listed above will be carefully aligned with minimum competence for entry-level practice and set out in the Test Content Specifications (TCS) that will be developed as one of the first steps of implementing the recommendations. The Foundational Skills may be assessed in the context of the FC&P or in other legal contexts. Whenever the Foundational Skills are assessed in a context other than the FC&P, a closed universe of appropriate legal resources (e.g., statutes, cases, rules, regulations) will be provided to candidates. For example, we anticipate that an MPT-type library, where resources specific to the task candidates are asked to complete, may be provided. The intent is to make the exam more realistic and to reduce the amount of legal knowledge candidates must know or learn for the exam.

The exam will be administered in-person and delivered by computer, either at computer testing centers managed by appropriate vendors or on examinees' laptops at jurisdiction-managed testing sites. The exam will be given as a single event at or near the point of licensure, although jurisdictions could still permit students to test in their final semester of law school. A compensatory scoring model will be used to produce a single combined score for making admission decisions.

We anticipate that it will take four to five years to develop and administer the new integrated bar exam. The major steps of implementation are identified in the *Overview of Preliminary Recommendations for the Next Generation of the Bar Examination*. Implementation will be conducted in a systematic, transparent, and collaborative manner, informed by the input from and participation by stakeholders, and guided by best practices and the professional standards for high-stakes testing. A dedicated website will be created to keep stakeholders informed and involved as the process unfolds and ensure a smooth transition to the new exam for jurisdictions, candidates, and law schools.

Comments on a New Bar Exam

Jane Bloom Grisé is the Director of Academic Enhancement and Assistant Professor of Legal Research and Writing at the University of Kentucky J. David Rosenberg College of Law.

As a new bar exam is developed, we should consider the exam's impact on law graduates and legal education. With respect to law graduates, we need to acknowledge that there are gender differences in performance on multiple-choice tests. Multiple-choice tests were developed as a method of quickly assessing recruits in World War I. The tests were introduced into education to eliminate variability in teacher grading. For many reasons, women consistently perform at lower levels than men on multiple-choice tests. Whether studies look at the LSAT, MCAT, GRE, or eight million fourth and eighth graders, the result is the same. The format of an exam impacts women differently than men. This differential has long term implications for the progress of women in law.

With respect to legal education, the content and format of the bar exam has a profound effect on legal education and law school assessment methods. Indeed, multiple-choice testing was not utilized in law schools until the MBE was added to the bar exam. If multiple-choice testing continues to be used in a substantial way on the bar exam, law professors will continue to increase their use of this assessment method. Without the highly developed statistical expertise of law examiners, the increased use of multiple-choice questions may unfairly impact women. In short, multiple-choice tests should be used sparingly, if at all, in lawyer licensing.

My law review article in progress, *Question #1: Do Women Score Lower than Men on Multiple-Choice Tests?*, addresses this topic in more detail.

The Need to Consider Cost in Bar Examination Reform

Brittany L. Raposa is Associate Director and Professor of Bar Support at Roger Williams University School of Law.

The National Conference of Bar Examiners (NCBE) has released its preliminary recommendations on the future of the bar exam. The recommendations, in large part, focus on content and delivery. However, building a better bar exam also includes looking at another important factor: cost.

It goes without saying that preparing for and taking a bar exam is expensive. Graduates have to pay for a bar preparation course, which is likely over $1,000, and then have to pay their bar exam application fees, which can range from $250 to $1,600. Graduates across the country are required to pay these fees all the while being encouraged not to work in order to ensure first time bar exam success.

We know that our graduates are hurting from shouldering a large financial burden. Some students have to work while studying for the bar because they simply cannot afford to take the study time off, decreasing their chances of first-time bar passage. Upon failure, the graduate has to somehow come up with the high cost of fees yet again to retake the exam. Many graduates who choose not to work

borrow additional private loans, adding to an already high pile of student loan debt that is difficult (or even, dare I say it, impossible) to pay off. The stress of finances is, without a doubt, a bar exam risk factor that also disproportionately impacts first generation students and students of color.

The bar exam is being reevaluated to more closely test skills that resemble the realities of the practice of law. However, we cannot mimic reality without realizing that most of our graduates, and our graduates in vulnerable populations, simply cannot afford this exam. Privilege is not knowing that you are hurting others and not listening when they tell you. Many of our law graduates are hurting. It is time that we start listening and include cost in bar examination reform.

Incorporating Anti-Racism Principles into Lawyer Licensure

Kimberly Mutcherson is Co-Dean and Professor at Rutgers Law School. Elizabeth Kronk Warner is Dean and Professor at the University of Utah S.J. Quinney College of Law.

The method of lawyer licensure in most states is inconsistent with and, in several ways, antithetical to anti-racism principles. The bar exam tests privilege and access, not capacity to be a competent attorney. Those who pass are usually privileged by having the time to devote 400-500 hours to study for the exam, the money to focus on studying, and funds to pay for expensive commercial review courses. Consequently, vulnerable students, especially women and people of color, regularly fail the exam at least once on their way to licensure. Only 5% of Black applicants passed the California February 2020 bar—a horrifying result—and one that we are aware of only because California collects and shares race data on bar passage. The bar exam does not mimic the life of a practicing lawyer. Research from Professor Deborah Merritt and her collaborators demonstrates that new lawyers do not need to possess the memorized information required by the bar exam and that most of them will promptly forget the majority of what they memorize in bar prep. Employers report that they can "teach" new lawyers the necessary substance

to practice in their fields but what they really need new lawyers to have are strong legal skills. Given the disparate passage rates, the unequal resources many bar takers of color have at their disposal for preparation, and what we know about the efficacy of the exam, continuing to license lawyers in this way ignores lessons from anti-racism—namely that combating racism requires active work to uncover and remove barriers to success rooted in racist practices. Failure to consider a radical transformation to lawyer licensure perpetuates the racist history of the bar exam.

Anti-racism countenances multiple paths to licensure, which might include an exam that tests the knowledge and skills new lawyers truly need to possess and a model that incorporates specific law school requirements followed by a set number of hours of legal work under the supervision of a licensed attorney.

(Please visit the Law Deans Antiracist Clearinghouse Project for a wide range of important information and related work.)

One Small Step Would Make a Huge Difference

Yolanda D. Ingram is Director of Bar Support and Assistant Teaching Professor at Drexel University Thomas R. Kline School of Law.

Solving the licensure problem is a multi-faceted issue which will require a multi-faceted solution. If law school begins to integrate true formative assessment throughout the curriculum, beginning in first semester by partnering with state bars and/or the NCBE, progress will happen. Integrating formative assessment into the curriculum is in line with ABA Standard 314 and could be adopted as part of an improved licensing process.

First year and bar tested subjects could be taught in shorter segments and tested throughout law school—as opposed to waiting until after graduation. For example, 1L might include four weeks of Torts, then four weeks of Civil Procedure, and so on, with an assessment after each segment. Students would have the opportunity to complete these mini exams each semester and if necessary, take

them multiple times before graduation. If a student fails, they will have multiple opportunities to retake and pass the assessment. Other disciplines, such as the medical profession, already operate in this fashion for licensing. No more waiting until three years after learning the material to be tested on subjects that they may never use again in law practice. If this system were adopted, the waiting period after law school to start employment will be eliminated. Graduates could get started right away helping clients. Most importantly, adding multiple opportunities to become licensed would remove a huge barrier to access for underrepresented groups.

I have given a great deal of thought to related issues including the costs of such proposed changes, and how the suggested curricular reform may be implemented in ways that will allow faculty more academic freedom and not force them into constraints many now feel of "having to teach to the test." Such additional, though critical points, are beyond the brief word limit for this piece, thus I will explore them further in future publications.

Revising ABA Standards to Ensure Minimum Competency including in Awareness of Health and Well-Being

David Jaffe is Associate Dean of Student Affairs at American University Washington College of Law. Janet Stearns is Dean of Students and Lecturer in Law at the University of Miami School of Law.

Researchers and bar examiners are considering the meaning of minimum competency to practice law and contemplating changes to lawyer licensing. The time is thus now to ensure that our students and graduates have information and resources to help with substance use and mental health (SUMH) challenges, given their prevalence in law schools and in our profession, (see Jerome M. Organ et al., Suffering in Silence: The Survey of Law Student Well-Being and the Reluctance of Law Students to Seek Help for Substance Use and Mental Health Concerns and Patrick R. Krill et al., The Prevalence of Substance Use and Other Mental Health Concerns Among American Attorneys).

On March 1, the ABA Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar announced

proposed Standards Amendments that address some of these concerns. The notice and comment period closed on March 31, and the Council is expected to meet in May to decide whether to move forward with these reforms, or to accept further changes. We have argued for including SUMH education explicitly in Section 303 (Curriculum) and strengthening the interpretative language in Section 508, but we remain gratified that the Council is focusing on this important agenda.

To voice support for or obtain further information about this reform effort, contact the authors or members of the ABA Council for Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar.

New Pathways to Close the Justice Gap

John Pierre is Chancellor at the Southern University Law Center (SULC).

Law licensing is stale and hierarchical. My perspective and vision of future lawyer licensing comes from involvement in the Institute for the Future of Law Practice (IFLP, "I-flip"), where I serve as a board member and my SULC students have flourished as interns in some of the world's most sophisticated practice settings.

Law licensing and the legal service ecosystem needs to be more like the healthcare service ecosystem. Approximately one in ten professionals in the healthcare services ecosystem have a medical degree (M.D.), whereas approximately eight in ten legal services professionals have a law degree (J.D.). Healthcare services ecosystem professionals have a well-developed career path along the entire educational spectrum with 9.3% having a M.D. or D.O. degree, 8.9% having a master's or doctorate degree, 33.5% having a bachelor's degree, 29.9% having an associate's degree, and 18.4% having a high school diploma and/or on the job training. Furthermore, the healthcare services ecosystem has over 40 different credentialing bodies that play a role in developing the healthcare services professional ecosystem.

In the legal services professional ecosystem, there are realistically only two career paths where 79.3% of legal professionals are lawyers with a J.D.

degree, and 20.7% of legal professionals are legal support professionals without a J.D. degree (i.e., typically associate or bachelor degrees). These limited pathways are a barrier to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

All of us in legal education and the legal profession need to become more attuned to the changes occurring in practice. Through partnerships with IFLP and others, SULC students have learned allied disciplines (tech, process, data, design) that have made them immediately valuable as paid interns to very sophisticated employers (e.g., Cisco, Cummins, NetApp, Knowable, Apple, Hewlett-Packard, Verizon, and John Deere). In virtually all cases, this combination of knowledge and work experience has led to permanent employment. At the other end of the spectrum, IFLP interns have worked for Civil Resolution Tribunal, a government-run online dispute resolution (ODR) system in British Columbia that has eliminated lawyers for all disputes under $5,000. In their place comes a growing cadre of case managers. Similar programs are in pilot in the U.S. Why are we so fixated on the current lawyer licensing system, where the only pathway to becoming a legal professional is passage of a bar examination after completing three years of law school? Perhaps, we should revisit the current lawyer licensing system to figure out innovative ways to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion, and close or eliminate the access to justice gap.

Diploma Privilege in Utah

Catherine Bramble is a Professor at BYU Law School.

On April 21st, 2020, the Utah Supreme Court granted Emergency Diploma Privilege to qualified applicants who completed 360 hours of supervised practice. In August 2020, the first group of the 177 candidates became licensed members of the Utah Bar without the requirement of passing a formal bar examination. As of December 2020, the majority of candidates had not only completed the required hours, but had also provided over 2,900 hours of pro bono legal service to Utah's citizens.

The bar exam has long been employed as a test of minimum competence based on the assumptions that graduation from an accredited law school is not sufficient proof of fitness to practice law and that the bar exam will correctly identify individuals who may cause harm to the public through lack of skill. However, recent studies have raised concerns as to whether the exam actually tests the skills required of an attorney and whether the barrier the exam imposes results in enough benefit to justify the cost of exclusion that has perpetuated a lack of representation in the legal field and a lack of attorneys to meet increasing access to justice concerns. Utah's successful use of Emergency Diploma Privilege has provided a unique opportunity for licensing bodies across the United States to consider Thomas Edison's challenge: "There is a better way for everything. Find it." Whether some form of Diploma Privilege is the solution or not, it is time to at least ask the question of if there is a better way.

Highlights from 2021 "Law and Leadership: Paths to Bar Licensure" Conference

The Collaboratory on Legal Education and Licensing is a group of scholars who have studied and written about the bar exam, licensing, and legal education for many years. We thank them for this conference update.

Dean Gordon Smith organized and led Brigham Young University Law School's annual Law and Leadership conference to reflect on the "known racial, gender, and other biases present in traditional bar examinations" and to reconsider the bar examination as a gateway to licensure in the wake of the state's historic decision to adopt an emergency diploma privilege in the pandemic summer of 2020. Below are conference highlights.

Morning Keynote Address: A Short History of Attorney Licensing

Dean Joan Howarth provided a history of law licensing, including its ongoing pattern of excluding racial minorities and other "undesirables." She challenged the audience to consider why the legal profession requires less clinical and practical experience for licensing than other professions, why most jurisdictions ignore and therefore perpetuate

the racial and ethnic disparities of the traditional bar exam, and why we tolerate the absence of evidence connecting the traditional bar exam to the competencies needed to practice law.

She described the persistence of the Langdellian model of legal education, which divorces the teaching and learning of law from the practice of law. Though purported to protect the public, the current bar exam is not designed to fulfill that task, she said. How could we allow someone who has never been a lawyer representing a client or someone who has never been inside a courtroom to be licensed to practice law? And why would we continue to test memorization of detailed legal rules when lawyers have libraries in their pockets? And, Dean Howarth noted, the rules tested are the abstract "law of nowhere," disconnected from any real jurisdiction or actual law. She encouraged the audience to think about the answers to these questions in light of the exam's exclusionary history.

Panel: Examining the Bar Examination

Professor Marsha Griggs questioned our reliance on the bar exam, knowing its discriminatory impact. She also challenged us to explore how our vaunted licensing system came to be effectively reduced to a hashtag, "#Barpocalypse," in reaction to the horrors and realities of testing during a pandemic. She lauded the efforts and outcomes of states like Utah that did the hard work of first reaching out to broad communities of stakeholders (including the test-takers themselves) and then thinking outside the box to envision and implement workable alternatives. Professor Griggs called on the broader legal profession to continue the difficult but productive conversations about the way we license new attorneys. For only if we face the failings of 2020 with collaborative input can we move beyond the status quo that has held us captive for the past 50 years.

Professor Victor Quintanilla described his team's groundbreaking AccessLex-funded research demonstrating that the choice of a bar exam cut score is a choice about the state's racial and ethnic makeup. His research shows that using the lower cut score that California has just adopted would

have increased greatly the number of lawyers of color who would be practicing in that state, without any documented risk to public protection.

Professor Andrea "Andi" Curcio critiqued the methodology of the traditional multistate bar exam, particularly its emphasis on speed and memorization. She asked the audience to read and answer an MBE question within 108 seconds, as would be required on the exam, illustrating pointedly both the difficulty of completing the necessary analysis and the disconnect between that kind of question and what is required for attorney competence. The result (less than ⅓ answered correctly) was consistent with recent research by Steven Foster who asked experienced lawyers to take the bar exam. They all failed, and two-thirds of them failed in their areas of expertise—a clear indicator that the exam is not related to minimum competence!

Afternoon Keynote Address: Designing an Evidence-Based Licensing System.

Professor Deborah Jones Merritt described the results of Building a Better Bar Exam, her AccessLex-funded research with Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System (IAALS). This national study utilized diverse focus groups of new lawyers and those responsible for supervising entry-level lawyers to identify the skills and knowledge actually used in the first year of law practice. As recognized repeatedly throughout the conference, including by Professor Merritt, any licensing system must be based on evidence that identifies minimum competence to practice law. Supplementing past surveys, the evidence from this focus-group study makes clear that lawyering skills matter more than doctrinal knowledge; that neither memorization nor speed is valued in practice; and that many new lawyers have considerable client contact and take primary responsibility for client matters, often without adequate preparation for that role. To the extent doctrinal knowledge is important, what matters is knowledge of threshold concepts, not detailed rules. The study culminated in identification of twelve interconnected building blocks that new lawyers need to be competent.

Professor Merritt described how the insights from the project can be used to create an evidence-based licensing system. Among her conclusions: courts should require all candidates to complete a faculty-supervised clinical experience, as well as courses on client interaction, negotiation, and the role of the lawyer as a public citizen, to qualify for a license. With additional requirements, that curriculum could support a diploma-based license. If a written exam is deemed necessary, it should expand the use of performance tests with additional time, make any multiple-choice questions open book, and test research skills, all to better simulate the challenges of law practice. She concluded with a call to immediate action because the current bar exam is not based on appropriate evidence, it does not protect the public, and it has a well-known disproportionate racial impact.

Panel: Alternatives to the Bar Exam

Dean Kevin Kelly described Wisconsin's diploma privilege. He explained that Wisconsin's law school graduates are licensed because they have satisfied the state's substantial curricular and minimum GPA requirements, guaranteeing their degree establishes the competence demonstrated by that law school performance.

Dean Megan Carpenter described New Hampshire's Daniel Webster Scholars Program, considered by many to be the gold standard of law licensing. This program was developed collaboratively by the NH bench, bar, and academy. Students accepted into the program follow a rigorous curriculum where they are exposed to the full range of lawyering skills required in practice, including counseling clients, working with practicing lawyers, taking depositions, appearing before judges, negotiating, mediating, drafting business documents and creating portfolios of written and oral work. Their work is evaluated by professors, judges, and bar examiners. Upon successful completion of all course requirements, they are licensed to practice law the day before graduation, without the need for a separate bar exam. Employers of graduates of this program report that they outperform graduates who take the traditional bar exam.

Professor Eileen Kaufman described yet a third alternative—the Lawyers Justice Corps. A Lawyers Justice Corps would match law graduates who commit to a year of service with legal services organizations that agree to support and carefully supervise the graduates in their first year of practice. The goal is to create a cadre of new lawyers dedicated to providing legal services to underserved and vulnerable populations while providing an alternative pathway to licensure that avoids the racial disparity of the traditional bar exam. After six months of supervised practice, law graduates participating in the program would be licensed, without the need to study for and take a bar exam. Professor Kaufman stressed that participants would be demonstrating possession of critical lawyering competencies while representing clients with pressing legal needs, as opposed to spending months studying and taking a bar exam that fails to measure the range of competencies lawyers actually need.

Dean Ian Holloway described the many lessons the American academy might learn by studying how Canada licenses lawyers. One aspect of the Canadian model he would not recommend is "articling," a form of apprenticeship that he thinks is not sustainable and that distorts the market in pernicious ways. But four other aspects of the Canadian model do warrant consideration. First, the written exam used in some parts of Canada (Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Nova Scotia) tests important skills not tested by the UBE. Second, he described the Law Practice Program (LPP)—an eight-month program of working in a simulated law firm that allows for systematized training, followed by a four-month paid placement. Third is the Integrated Practice Curriculum (IPC), which consists of curricular requirements embracing experiential work leading to practice-ready graduates, similar to the Daniel Webster program. Both the LPP and the IPC are designed to ensure that lawyers acquire the requisite competencies utilized in practice. Finally, he stressed the importance of having non-lawyers involved in leadership roles when developing a licensing system.

Final panel: Utah's Emergency Diploma Privilege and Supervised Practice

Professor Catherine Bramble, who was instrumental in working with the Utah Supreme Court in its adoption of an emergency diploma privilege in 2020, introduced the panel by reminding us of the trauma facing law schools, law students, faculty, and staff in March 2020. She credited the white paper, "The Bar Exam and the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Need for Immediate Action" published by the Collaboratory on Legal Education and Licensing for Practice, as the impetus for conversations with the Utah Supreme Court about crafting an alternative form of licensing during the pandemic. Ultimately, Utah became the first state in the country to establish an emergency diploma privilege, licensing JDs from qualifying law schools who completed 360 hours of supervised practice. Four graduates who participated in the program, **Hayley Cousin, Jarom Harrison, Lauren Heperi, and Zachary Zundel**, described the pro bono work they did in their placements, handling matters related to domestic violence, family law, debt collection from low-income individuals, criminal appeals, and legislative advocacy.

Professor Susan Griffith, who supervised and trained Cousin at her placement, described supervised practice as a win-win: it benefits the graduate by providing hands-on training and experience and the organization by supporting their work expanding access to justice. One graduate said, "It completely changed the trajectory of my entire law career" because she had not contemplated pursuing a career in public interest until her supervised practice. The students agreed that they learned more from supervised practice than they would have from spending months cramming for the traditional bar exam.

Dean Smith closed the conference by reminding us that leadership begins by noticing a shortcoming in the status quo and collaborating with others to take action to make the world better. This conference was a meaningful step in those directions. He charged all of us to join those efforts.

Please email **RTB@accesslex.org** with your input on reimagining the bar exam and lawyer licensing for future *RTB* issues.

CONFERENCE CORNER

Recordings and Slides from Past Events

- 2020 AccessLex Legal Education Research Symposium, Dec. 3, 2020
- Leveraging Student Engagement to Maximize Student Success, AccessLex Institute, Jan. 26, 2021
- Law & Leadership Conference, BYU Law School, Jan. 29, 2021

Upcoming Events

- AERA Virtual Annual Meeting (Apr. 8–12, 2021)
- Innovations in International Legal Education During the Pandemic, Southern Illinois University School of Law (Apr. 9, 2021)
- AALS Conference on Clinical Legal Education (Apr. 28–May 1, 2021)
- Lawyering Skills in the Doctrinal Classroom, University of North Dakota School of Law (May 10–11, 2021)
- Institute for Law Teaching and Learning Summer 2021 Conference (June 10–12, 2021)
- Online & Hybrid Learning Pedagogy, University of Denver Sturm College of Law (Sept. 30–Oct. 2, 2021)

Please email **RTB@accesslex.org** about upcoming bar-related conferences and conferences with bar exam-related sessions that may interest *Raising the Bar* readers.

PUBLICATIONS AND POSTS

Selected Publications

- Rory Bahadur, Blinded by Science? A Reexamination of the Bar Ninja and Silver Bullet Bar Program Cryptids, 49 J.L. & EDUC. 241 (2020).

- Bridget J. Crawford, Menstruation and the Bar Exam: Unconstitutional Tampon Bans, 41 COLUM. J. GENDER & L. (forthcoming in 2021).

- Allison Korn & Laila L. Hlass, Assessing the Experiential (R)evolution, 65 VILL. L. REV. 713 (2020).

- NCBE Testing Task Force, Overview of Preliminary Recommendations for the Next Generation of the Bar Examination (2020).

- Sarah Schendel, Listen! Amplifying the Experiences of Black Law School Graduates in 2020, NEB. L. REV. (forthcoming in 2021).

Selected Posts and Podcasts

- Ben Bratman, The Next Generation of the Bar Exam, NCBE Style, BEST PRACTICES FOR LEGAL EDUC. (Jan. 14, 2021).

- Sherry Karabin, Bar Exam Standouts: A New Study Identifies Law Schools Whose Graduates Overperform on the Crucial Test, NAT'L JURIST, Jan.-Feb. 2021, at 16.

- Cheryl Miller, California Supreme Court Creates Alternative Path to Law Licensure for Recent Grads, LAW.COM (Jan. 28, 2021, 2:26 PM).

- Sam Skolnik, Over 1,000 New Lawyers Get Licenses Without Taking Bar Exam, BLOOMBERG L. (Jan. 4, 2021, 6:50 AM).

- Karen Sloan, 'A Dream Come True Instead of a Nightmare': Will the Bar Exam Revamp Go Far Enough?, LAW.COM (Jan. 12, 2021, 2:29 PM).

- Stephanie Francis Ward, While Many Jurisdictions Had Few or No Online Bar Exam Testing Violations, California Had Many, ABA J. (Jan. 12, 2021, 12:14 PM).

Please email **RTB@accesslex.org** with recent and forthcoming bar-related publications, posts, and podcasts to be included in future issues of *Raising the Bar.*

RESOURCES FOR LEGAL EDUCATORS AND LAW STUDENTS

Updates from the NCBE's Testing Task Force

- Testing Task Force Blog
- Testing Task Force Research
- Testing Task Force Presentations

General Bar-Related Resources

- AccessLex Resource Collections: Bar Success
- LibGuides
- Bar Information Guide
- ABA Bar Information for Applicants with Disabilities

Grants and Scholarships for Law Students

- AccessLex Law School Scholarship Databank
- ABA Scholarships and Financial Aid
- ABA Grants for Law Students

Grant Opportunities for Legal Educators and Researchers

- AccessLex Grant Programs
- American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)
- AccessLex Bar Success Research Grant Program and Bar Success Intervention Grant Program
- AccessLex-AASE ASP Faculty Scholarship Grant

Please email **RTB@accesslex.org** with information about resources for faculty and students in your jurisdiction.