



RAISING THE BAR

EVIDENCE-BASED THINKING ABOUT THE BAR EXAM

Winter 2023
Volume 6 Issue 1

[AccessLex.org](https://www.accesslex.org)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From the Director	1
Distinguished Commentary	2
<i>Beyond Best Practices, Chance Meyer and Nicole Noël</i>	
Research Spotlight	5
<i>Law Student Well-Being and Bar Exam Concerns, Jerome M. Organ</i>	
New Research by AccessLex/Association of Academic Support Educators Faculty Scholars	
<i>The Impact of Student Consumerism on Academic and Bar Support Programs, Michele Cooley</i>	
<i>Who Watches the Watchmen? Using the Law Governing Lawyers to Identify the Applicant Duty Gap and Hold Bar Examiner Gatekeepers Accountable, Ashley M. London</i>	
Program Profile	11
<i>Advanced Legal Analysis: A Promising 2L Intervention, Liam Skilling</i>	
Conference Corner	13
Publications, Posts, and Podcasts	14
Resources for Legal Educators	15

FROM THE DIRECTOR

As this issue of *Raising the Bar* finds us entering a new year, many of us find it difficult to embrace the “new” after a much-too-prolonged period of new. With professional and personal lives just starting to reach a point of stasis, the prospect of new is likely unwelcome. This January marks the first year in my role with AccessLex Institute®, and I am pleased to be shedding the descriptor of “new” from my position. However, I do plan on retaining a defining feature of my former newness and that is the practice of continuing to ask. As a newcomer, one is permitted to ask many questions. This tends to come easily to both lawyers and researchers, who are patently curious individuals, and I suspect this is a quality we have all possessed since childhood. Fundamentally, lawyers and law students ask and answer questions all day long. Similarly, researchers set out to craft and resolve research questions. However, as we engage in our professions and our professional lines of inquiry, our expertise is sometimes defined by our ability to know (or assume to know) the answer to many questions. In fact, our experience is often defined by our ability to forgo the need to question. In this way we can become leaden in our positions, losing the lightness of open inquiry. With this weight of experience, our vision of the new risks becoming myopic and being viewed as a challenge—not just to the status quo but also to our own well-earned expertise. We seek to preemptively limit inquiry because our professional identity rests on the facts that we already know.

I propose that, in this year, *new* as it may be, we work to embrace all those three-letter words we might have been ignoring at the core of our curiosity—like ask, and why and how and who. I advise each of us to commit to asking questions throughout the year, especially those questions to which we have assumed answers. After multiple seasons of change and upheaval, we benefit from reassessing and posing the fundamental questions all over again. Indeed, the past few years have delivered a new normal and for many of us a new employer. The next few years promise change as fundamental as a new bar exam. Finally, in this coming year, I invite you to engage in re-asking those fundamental and familiar questions that are often the mark of a newcomer. I am pleased in the midst of this newness to affirm that AccessLex is here to partner with you in posing these questions, exploring the known, and revealing the new truths behind these questions.



Joel Chanvisanuruk, M.P.A., J.D.

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](#)

DISTINGUISHED COMMENTARY

Beyond Best Practices

Chance Meyer is an Academic Excellence Lecturer on Law and Nicole Noël is an Assistant Professor of Law and Acting Director of Academic Excellence at New England Law | Boston.

A shared assumption can get embedded so deeply in the discourse of a community that it eventually becomes invisible. No one stops to question it anymore. In legal education, we have been talking for so long about finding “best practices,” we don’t stop to ask whether they are as valuable as we assume.

Or whether they even exist.

Learning experts outside legal education have determined there is no such thing as a disembodied pedagogy.¹ A teaching method exists only as an idea until it is embodied in a particular educator—effectively or not—so that its value can be discovered. Once contextualized in place, space, and community, it becomes something it cannot be anywhere else, for anyone else. As a result, its value is site-dependent. Yet as legal educators, we continue to assume we can exchange some fixed value of delocalized best practices. Year after year, we go to conferences and trade teaching practices without recognizing their chameleonic nature. We might like the color they take on in someone else’s classroom, but they become something different in ours.

When we spoke at Denver Law’s Online & Hybrid Learning Conference this year, we shared a process for iteratively designing legal education programs to fit the one-of-a-kind conditions of a law school. Our process, which we’ve **previously described**, entails measuring context variables and the impact of our discrete teaching activities to iterate each year based on new evidence and move incrementally along an improvement trajectory. We used as an example the evolution of one feature of our program—self-assessment training. Responding to a measured phenomenon of overconfidence among certain learners in our particular learning community, we developed a scaffolded learning process involving self-scoring and self-evaluation of essays against objective rubric criteria. Our main point in Denver was that law schools should learn to design their own context-sensitive teaching methods in response to measured phenomena in their own learning environments. The unique conditions of their

¹ Kris D. Gutiérrez & Patrick Johnson, *Understanding Identity Sampling and Cultural Repertoires: Advancing a Historicizing and Syncretic System of Teaching and Learning in Justice Pedagogies*, in *CULTURALLY SUSTAINING PEDAGOGIES* 247 (Django Paris & H. Samy Alim eds., 2017).

law schools—norms, social positionings, funds of knowledge and power, identities, narratives, histories, discourses—would result in a bespoke set of teaching practices to optimize learning in their contexts. Yet, many of the questions we’ve received since Denver have been about the teaching methods we designed to address the overconfidence phenomenon in *our* setting, rather than the design methods we used. This gives us pause, because the assumption that our teaching practices should work in other law schools is the very assumption we hoped to disrupt.

In our academic improvement program at New England Law | Boston, we have recently experienced greater success looking inward, to understand the situated learning of our particular learners and the context variables that mediate learning in our learning environments, rather than looking outward for practices that worked somewhere else for someone else. The more we increase our impact on student outcomes over the years, the more we come to believe that what’s better than what’s “best” is what actually works for our students, where they are.

It is seductive to think that someone might come along and hand us a simple solution to a complex problem. *Just do this and your students will succeed!* But history shows that “[b]indly worshiping at the altar of best practices is dangerous,”² particularly in education.

In 2000, the Gates Foundation was convinced that small class size was a best practice in high school education. Partnering with the U.S. Department of Education and school districts across the country, the Foundation spent \$2 billion building 2600 small schools in 45 states.³ Those figures are worth rereading. They show the scale of the damage we can do when we are infatuated with the promise of the next best practice. All in all, the program failed. At some schools student outcomes improved, at some they didn’t, at some they got worse. The best practice of small class size was not always best, not everywhere, not for everyone.

The problem is system variation.⁴ Schools are complex organizational systems, where unique conditions mediate learning. Take a practice from one school to the next, one teacher to the next, and it will be situated differently, churn the system in unanticipated ways, and lead to different results. Thus, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching believes that variation is “the core problem to address” in education.⁵ According to Carnegie, “[t]he critical issue is not what works” in teaching, “but rather what works, for whom, and under what set of conditions.”⁶ Anyone who has taught at more than one school and tried to take their teaching methods with them has experienced the challenges of variation. Anyone who has gotten teaching advice from someone outside their school and thought *but that would never work here* knows how profoundly learning design depends on knowledge of context.

2 Scott D. Anthony, *When Are “Best Practices” Not Best Practices?*, HARV. BUS. REV. (Apr. 20, 2008), <https://hbr.org/2008/04/when-are-best-practices-not-be>.

3 Diane Ravitch, *Bill Gates and His Silver Bullet*, FORBES (Nov. 19, 2008), https://www.forbes.com/2008/11/18/gates-foundation-schools-oped-cx_dr_1119ravitch.html.

4 LAWRENCE BERNSTEIN ET AL., IMPLEMENTATION STUDY OF SMALLER LEARNING COMMUNITIES 115 (2008), <https://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/other/small-communities/final-report.pdf> (“there was a statistically significant variation shown across schools”).

5 *The Six Core Principles of Improvement*, CARNEGIE FOUND. FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, <https://www.carnegiefoundation.org/our-ideas/six-core-principles-improvement/> (last visited Nov. 21, 2022).

6 *Id.*

When educators try a best practice and get disappointing results, they habitually overlook variation and assume their problem is that they need yet another, better best practice. For Gates, after small class size, it was teacher evaluations,⁷ which ironically involved *increasing* class sizes of effective teachers.

So it goes in legal education. We ignore the situativity of learning⁸ and the vagaries of implementation in law school systems. We hop from best practice to best practice, hoping and guessing. Instead, we should be developing program design capacities.

When the bar exam changes in 2026, law schools that wait for best practices to emerge from research in other settings will be caught flatfooted and eventually end up relying on guesswork and intuition to decide which practices might work for them. On the other hand, law schools that have developed capacities for iterative program design will rapidly update their data models, make evidence-based changes, and redesign their teaching methods to fit this new system outcome. Their learning environments will reveal what practices are best for them.

⁷ Valerie Strauss, *Why Bill Gates Is Wrong on Class Size*, WASH. POST (Mar. 11, 2011), https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/answer-sheet/post/why-bill-gates-is-wrong-on-class-size/2011/03/11/ABzQTaR_blog.html

⁸ James G. Greeno, *The Situativity of Knowing, Learning, and Research*, 53 AM. PSYCH. 5 (1998).

RESEARCH SPOTLIGHT

Law Student Well-Being and Bar Exam Concerns

Jerome M. Organ is a Professor of Law and Co-Director of the Holloran Center for Ethical Leadership in the Professions at University of St. Thomas School of Law.

One component of the *2021 Survey of Law Student Well-Being*⁹ involved a set of questions for third-year respondents that addressed concerns they had as they approached studying for and taking the bar exam. Specifically, third-year respondents were asked “to indicate the extent to which [they are] concerned that the following factors may make it challenging for [them] to prepare for and perform to [their] abilities” on the bar exam. Options ranged from not at all concerned to a little concerned to somewhat concerned to very concerned.

More than 1,200 third-year respondents answered this set of questions, with roughly 85% indicating they planned to take the July bar exam and roughly 10% indicating they planned to take the February bar exam.

Table 1 shows the six factors of greatest concern to respondents (based on the percentage indicating that they were either somewhat concerned or very concerned about each factor).

⁹ Along with my co-investigators, David Jaffe and Katherine Bender, I want to thank AccessLex Institute for the grant funding that made the *2021 Survey of Law Student Well-Being* possible.

**TABLE 1 – Factors that Were of Greatest Concern to Third-Year Respondents Planning on Taking the July and February Bar Exams
(Bolded numbers reflect statistical significance)**

	FEBRUARY	JULY	WOMEN	MEN	TRAUMA-AFFECTED
Feeling Overwhelmed by Amount of Material	64%	64%	71%	50%	80%
Lacking Confidence Due to Imposter Syndrome or Lack of Belonging	49%	48%	55%	35%	73%
Anxiety	59%	44%	50%	33%	67%
Inadequate Time Management Skills	36%	32%	33%	29%	46%
Not Having Quiet Place to Study	32%	32%	34%	26%	45%
Depression	44%	31%	33%	26%	57%

In comparing July takers with February takers, these data show that the concerns of February takers largely aligned with the concerns of July takers, except for concerns about mental health factors—with anxiety (59% for February v. 44% for July) and depression (44% for February v. 31% for July) being larger concerns for February takers (to a statistically significant degree).

The columns labeled Women and Men contain the disaggregated results for July-takers. These data show that to a statistically significant degree, far more women than men are concerned that the top three factors—1) the overwhelming amount of material, 2) lack of confidence because of imposter syndrome or a sense of not belonging, and 3) anxiety—will make it challenging for them to prepare for and perform to their abilities on the bar exam.

The *2021 Survey of Law Student Well-Being* also included a set of questions regarding the extent to which respondents had experienced trauma. All respondents who indicated that they had experienced trauma were asked to complete the PCL-5, a 20-question screening tool that provides insights on whether someone would benefit from being assessed for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

The column labeled Trauma-Affected disaggregates the responses of those third-year respondents who scored 33 or higher on the PCL-5 (roughly 25%), indicating that PTSD is possible and a clinical interview to obtain information about a PTSD diagnosis is warranted. For this subset of third-year respondents, even greater percentages were concerned about each of the top six factors, results shown to have statistical significance.

These results suggest that third-year law respondents who scored 33 or higher on the PCL-5 likely were more challenged to prepare for and pass the bar exam than their peers who have not experienced trauma or who did not score 33 or higher on the PCL-5. This is a topic that merits further research.

New Research by AccessLex/Association of Academic Support Educators Faculty Scholars

The AccessLex/Association of Academic Support Educators (AASE) ASP Faculty Scholarship Grant provides financial support and research mentors to five academic support educators as they pursue professional scholarship. We are proud to share scholarship summaries from two of the 2021 ASP Faculty Scholars.

Applications for the 2023 AccessLex/AASE ASP Faculty Scholarship Grant will open in spring 2023, and information about the program can be found [here](#).

The Impact of Student Consumerism on Academic and Bar Support Programs

Michele Cooley is a 2021 AccessLex/AASE Faculty Scholar.

Student consumerism influences all aspects of higher education, and law schools are not immune from this. Students often have the attitude that if they are paying for the education, why should they have to invest any other resources or effort into obtaining that degree. Shouldn't they simply be told exactly how to perform well on the exam? This attitude is especially detrimental in law school when the goal is not to have students memorize rules and theories, but rather to teach them how to apply those rules and theories to new scenarios, and ultimately, how to think like a lawyer. Students must be engaged in the learning process and consumerist attitudes can hinder that.

Student consumerism can be narrowly defined as “viewing the relationship between student and institution as similar to the relationship between customer and seller.”¹⁰ Taking a broader view of what this means is more instructive. Student consumerism is a complex set of interconnected attitudes relating to students' expectations of what they are entitled to from lecturers and institutions, the importance they place on academic ends relative to processes, and where they situate the responsibility for their own education.¹¹

Students don't view themselves as being an integral part of their learning process, but expect that learning is something that is done for them or to them rather than something they do for themselves. This is the troublesome part.

Academic and bar success programs work to make students into self-regulated or expert learners. They host skills development workshops that teach students how to take good notes in law school, the importance of critical reading skills, and how and why it is critical to create your own study aids. These types of “how-to” workshops require an engaged audience to be effective. Students must take charge of their learning which can be difficult to teach when students come in with a consumerist attitude.

Figuring out how to best support law students requires acknowledgement of the consumerist attitude. ASP programs have to market their services in a way that makes students feel as though they will “get something” by attending a workshop. This is the easy part. The greater challenge comes once students are through the door. How can information be presented in a workshop in a way that makes students become engaged in and excited about taking responsibility for their own learning?

My research explores in greater detail the impact of consumerism in the undergraduate setting as well as within other professional degree programs. It details what can be learned from those settings and how to incorporate various strategies into ASP programming. For example, in the undergraduate setting, students expect feedback as part of the “service”, but feedback also sparks intrinsic motivation—this may help students recognize the central importance of

10 Nesrin Gokcen, *The Rise of Student Consumerism*, 27 THE PSYCH. 940 (2014), <https://www.bps.org.uk/psychologist/new-voices-rise-student-consumerism>

11 *Id.*

formative feedback for their educational development.¹² Students receive regular feedback in undergrad in the form of quizzes, midterms, or other graded assignments, something they don't experience in law school. Even if the only feedback came in the form of a grade, they were still getting that feedback. Using ASP programming to provide students with feedback they aren't otherwise getting helps to develop their competence and autonomy, traits which allow students to take control of their learning.

This is but one example of how to counter student consumerist attitudes. The full article explores this and other suggestions and will be forthcoming in 2023.

Who Watches the Watchmen? Using the Law Governing Lawyers to Identify the Applicant Duty Gap and Hold Bar Examiner Gatekeepers Accountable

Ashley M. London is the Director of Bar Studies and Assistant Professor of Law at the Thomas R. Kline School of Law of Duquesne University. The full article will be published in the Michigan State Law Review, MICH. ST. L. REV., in 2023.

“Who watches the watchmen?” This has been the rallying cry of the powerless for centuries, and the least powerful of all entities involved in the lawyer licensing process are the bar applicants themselves. Afforded no protections or recourse to address complaints, this class of young professionals falls into a previously unacknowledged ethical duty gap that gapes open during the critical period between graduation and successful passage of the bar examination. In a profession defined by self-regulation, bar applicants appear to be owed fewer ethical duties than a potential client by every entity involved in the process—from state bar examiners, to the National Conference of Bar Examiners (NCBE), to the commercial bar preparation courses they must purchase to prepare for this high-stakes exam.

This ethical duty gap was laid bare as boards of law examiners across the country displayed an entrenched commitment to a gatekeeping function by maintaining rigid and opaque lawyer licensing procedures as they administered the bar examination multiple times in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. Many boards made decisions putting the health, safety, and emotional well being of bar applicants at risk, and in some instances prevented applicants' exam scores from being portable. Times such as these have historically prompted changes to the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct.

Applicants, who are not yet licensed lawyers, are under a duty explicitly set forth in the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct in Rule 8.1: Bar Admissions and Disciplinary Matters. This rule states unequivocally that an applicant has a mandatory duty to refrain from making a false statement of material fact, or to fail to correct a misunderstanding, or to fail to respond to demands for information from the admissions or disciplinary authority. Indeed, applicants are

¹² Richard Higgins, Peter Hartley & Alan Skelton, *The Conscientious Consumer: Reconsidering the Role of Assessment Feedback in Student Learning*, 27 *STUD. IN HIGHER EDUC.* 53, 61 (2002).

charged with meeting standards strikingly similar to those required for lawyer reinstatement after disciplinary action. Conversely, there is no single rule of ethics for the legal profession that speaks to the duties and responsibilities of the bar examiner class itself. These supervising bodies treat applicants as if they have already committed an ethical breach and have resisted suggestions by the American Bar Association (ABA) and the NCBE that boards of law examiners across all U.S. jurisdictions formally adopt a uniform Code of Recommended Standards for Bar Examiners. Promulgated by the NCBE since 1959, and not without its flaws, these standards do suggest uniform practices, transparency, sufficient oversight, funding, and the establishment of committees of cooperation between the bar examiners, the judiciary, and state law schools.

As applicants and members of the legal academy call for reform, many boards of law examiners across jurisdictions cling to the status quo or adopt the Uniform Bar Examination (UBE). Published by the NCBE, a Madison, Wisconsin-based nonprofit organization, the UBE is written by psychometricians whose duty is to maintain the statistical reliability of its product, and whose transparency is limited due to its nonprofit status. Boards of law examiners give broad deference to the NCBE, even though the company is not subject to actionable ethical oversight by the jurisdictions that employ it—not in regard to its business practices, profitability, or code of conduct, while its overarching fealty appears to apply primarily to the integrity of its product line. Commercial bar preparation companies do not owe any ethical duties to applicants either, as most are privately held companies who bind users with arbitration clauses, choice of law provisions, and threats of reporting applicants to their jurisdiction’s board of character and fitness if products are misused.

An open, transparent, and efficient regulatory system applicable to bar examiners and all entities involved in the lawyer licensing process would go a long way toward generating respect for the rule of law, especially among the bar applicants who are seeking admittance. An overemphasis on advancing the narrow interests of maintaining the secrecy of the bar licensing process, of protecting the statistical reliability of a two-day examination over health and safety of hopeful new lawyers, and a lack of process and procedure redress for complaints and concerns, has served only to diminish the respect for the process and emphasize the duty gap between graduation and licensure for bar applicants.

Reforming lawyer licensing could be done first by using existing frameworks of discipline and enforcement and by bringing both lawyers and the rules of professional conduct back into the process. Bar applicants would be protected to a greater extent, but the public would also be protected, reinforcing the very reason these gatekeepers supposedly exist. After all, the purpose of enforcing the rules of professional conduct is to protect the public and the integrity of the legal profession. It can be difficult to hold powerful entities accountable, but that is a function all lawyers are called to perform. How we treat the newest members of our profession is a poor reflection on the profession as a whole. By allowing the duty gap to persist, the legal profession eats away at its position of power and destroys the foundations of self-governance it was built upon. Who then watches the watchmen? In a self-regulating profession, we all do.

PROGRAM PROFILE

Advanced Legal Analysis: A Promising 2L Intervention

Liam Skilling is the Director of the Evening Part-Time Division and Director of Academic Success at University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, William S. Richardson School of Law.

It is often the fate of Academic Success professionals to make do with not enough: not enough support, not enough resources, and not enough time. So it becomes essential to maximize the opportunities we do have to impact student achievement and success.

Advanced Legal Analysis (ALA) is a 2L intervention course for at-risk students, designed to provide coaching on skills they need for law school, to reinforce knowledge they need for the bar exam, and to promote the attitudes they need to be effective students and attorneys. Obviously, this is too much for one course to encompass. Fortunately, initial data indicates promising results, nonetheless. Across three administrations of the course, scores on pre- and post-tests of substantive law have increased an average of more than 35%. Writing skills have shown marked improvement from pre-test to post-test. And students self-report that the course has significant positive impacts, with 100% stating that the course had a positive impact on academic performance or bar readiness. As one student shared on class evaluations, "This course is unequivocally, the most helpful, relevant, engaging, substantive, interesting, and fun class that I have taken at Richardson. My poor academic performance was worth gaining entry into this class. The skills that I have learned in this class had an immediate impact on my study habits, retention, and confidence."

SKILLS

ALA uses Multistate Performance Tests (MPTs) to rehearse the skills students need for law school and the bar exam. During the semester-long course, students complete drafts and rewrites of four MPTs, in addition to completing MPTs as a pre-test and the final exam. The drafts are completed under time constraints that simulate the bar exam. Students receive feedback on the drafts and then complete a revision. This allows for continuous, explicit instruction in legal writing and analysis for a population of students who, for a variety of reasons, did not acquire or develop these skills during their first year of law school. The course also incorporates exercises using MPT components to provide opportunities for rehearsal and coaching of discrete skills: interpreting the call of the question for specific legal tasks; drafting different forms of legal

documents; quickly and efficiently digesting case law; synthesizing rule statements from statutes and cases; effectively analogizing and distinguishing precedent; and triaging and prioritizing tasks to meet time constraints.

KNOWLEDGE

In ALA, students review and relearn certain key doctrinal topics that the students encountered in their first-year courses and which are heavily tested on the bar exam. The course is designed to scaffold an iterative approach to learning, employing spaced repetition and retrieval practice, with students taking a total of ten formative quizzes in addition to a pre-test and the final exam. Students are introduced to various techniques for retention and memorization as they develop their own approach to mastering the material.

ATTITUDES

Students are invited to enroll in ALA based on low first-year grades and other indicators that they are likely to face challenges in law school and on the bar exam. Therefore, students often come into ALA somewhat bruised by their experience in law school, uncertain of their place and their capacity to succeed. In recognition of this context, substantial time is allocated to building community and connectedness among students. Students have multiple opportunities to introduce themselves and share their identities, backgrounds, motivations, and challenges. Creating a class culture of honesty and vulnerability facilitates collaboration. Students work in groups to complete skills exercises, to formulate and assess achievement goals, and to provide constructive feedback in writer's workshops. One student stated, "[The class] created a safe space to fail, to grow, and to learn. In an academic environment that otherwise places students in silos, to be able to collaborate with my classmates was invaluable. Thank you, professors, for a holistic approach to learning and for allowing us to bring our whole person and our lives, into class."

CONFERENCE CORNER

- [Association of American Law Schools Annual Meeting](#) (January 3–7)
- [American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting](#) (April 13–16)
- [Conference on Clinical Legal Education](#) (April 27–30)
- [American Association of Law Libraries Annual Meeting](#) (July 15–18)

Please email RTB@accesslex.org about upcoming bar-related conferences.

PUBLICATIONS AND POSTS

- Christine Charnosky, *Colorado Supreme Court Lowers UBE Minimum Passing Score to 270*, LAW.COM (Nov. 7, 2022).
- Fletcher Hiigel, *How Much Does Bar Exam Registration Cost?*, ACCESSLEX INST. (Oct. 19, 2022).
- Scott Johns, *Putting the Bar Exam on Constitutional Notice: Cut Scores, Race & Ethnicity, and the Public Good*, 45 SEATTLE UNIV. L. REV. (forthcoming 2022).
- Jeffrey A. Parnass, *Civil Procedure and the New Bar Exam*, 94 UNIV. COLO. L. REV. ONLINE F. (forthcoming 2022).
- Jason M. Scott and Josh Jackson, *What Is Quality? Advancing Value-Added Approaches to Assessing Law School Bar Exam Performance* (AccessLex Inst. Rsch. Paper No. 22-04, 2022).
- Stephanie Francis Ward, *Examining the Bar: Should Law Grads Need to Pass the Bar to Practice? Some Say There Is a Better Way*, ABA J. (Oct. 1, 2022).
- Marilyn Wellington, *The Next Generation of the Bar Exam: Quarterly Update*, BAR EXAM'R, Fall 2022, at 19.

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

Information About the Bar Exam

- [AccessLex Resource Collections: Bar Success](#)
- [ABA Bar Information for Applicants with Disabilities](#)
- [ABA Bar Passage Outcomes](#)
- [ABA Statistics](#)
- [Bar Exam Results by Jurisdiction](#)
- [Bar Admission Guide](#)
- [NCBE Bar Exam Fundamentals for Legal Educators](#)
- [NCBE NextGen: Bar Exam of the Future](#)

Student Resources

- [AccessLex Law School Scholarship Databank](#)
- [AccessLex® Student Loan Calculator](#)
- [MAX by AccessLex®](#)
- [ABA Grants for Law Students](#)
- [ABA Scholarships and Financial Aid](#)

Research Grants

- [AccessLex Bar Success Intervention Grant Program](#)
- [AccessLex Bar Success Research Grant Program](#)
- [American Association of Law Libraries \(AALL\)](#)

ASP and Bar Success Resources

- [The Bar Examiner](#)
- [The Learning Curve](#)
- [CALI Lessons](#)

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

JOIN THE CONVERSATION

If you would like to see your work, research or thoughts presented in *Raising the Bar*, we welcome hearing from you at RTB@accesslex.org.

FOLLOW US



Join AccessLex on Social Media



Subscribe to future issues of *Raising the Bar*.



DISCLAIMER:

Raising the Bar serves as a forum for thoughtful, respectful community dialogue about the bar exam. The opinions and research of contributors do not necessarily represent the views of and are not endorsed by AccessLex Institute.

Raising the Bar

Winter 2023

Volume 6, Issue 1

Joel Chanvisanuruk, Senior Editor

Fletcher Hiigel, Managing Editor

Rob Hunter, Staff Editor



AccessLex Institute®, in partnership with its nearly 200 nonprofit and state-affiliated ABA-approved member law schools, has been committed to improving access to legal education and to maximizing the affordability and value of a law degree since 1983. The AccessLex Center for Legal Education Excellence® advocates for policies that make legal education work better for students and society alike, and conducts research on the most critical issues facing legal education today. The AccessLex Center for Education and Financial Capability® offers on-campus and online financial education programming and resources to help students confidently manage their finances on their way to achieving personal and professional success. AccessLex Institute is headquartered in West Chester, PA.
