

School Portfolio Alternative Subcommittee  
March 5, 2021  
Meeting Minutes

**1. Attendance taken**

- a. Individuals present via Zoom: Brian Gallini, Kamron Graham, Helen Hirschbiel, Rebecca Ivanoff, Chase Morinaka Anthony Rosilez, Peter Sabido, Joanna Perini-Abbott, Jason Sprecht, Manuella Tshala, David Wade, Troy Wood
- b. Not present: Representative Stark

**2. Officers named**

- a. Anthony Rosilez named as School Portfolio Alternative Subcommittee Chair
- b. Brian Gallini and Rebecca Ivanoff named as Co-Secretaries

**3. Review of the New Hampshire model and related discussion**

- a. Program overview, key elements include:
  - i. Program is administered through partnership between the one law school in the state, the NH Bar, and the NH Supreme Court
  - ii. All students engage in identical 1L curriculum and then apply to be admitted to the Honors Program after their 1L year.
  - iii. Selection of participants involves evaluation of a wide range of criteria.
  - iv. Students engage a broad curriculum that develops both doctrinal knowledge and practical lawyering skills (drafting contracts, motions, client meetings, depositions, etc.).
  - v. Students create a portfolio of work throughout their time in the program, which includes both written and videotaped content. Their work product is evaluated by an assigned member of the board of bar examiners (BBX). Feedback is both formative and summative in nature, and that deep engagement throughout the program is core to students' learning.
  - vi. That BBX member ultimately decides whether the participant satisfies requirements to admit to the bar. Neutral gatekeeper is a key element for the program (as opposed to faculty/deans at a given law school serving as the final evaluator).
- b. Positive outcomes reported from colleagues in New Hampshire:
  - i. Graduates of the program are very well prepared to practice law, often outperforming those who have a couple of years of practice experience in simulation exercises (taped client meeting, for example).
  - ii. Those that end up taking the bar exam pass it at a higher rate than those that do not. Nothing limits a graduate from sitting for a later bar if they want to enhance employment options and flexibility to move to other states.
  - iii. They are ready to enter the job market sooner than those that need to study and sit for the bar exam.

- c. Ideas/concerns/questions raised
    - i. Is it scalable? Important to keep the evaluation portion neutral and it will take significant volunteers to execute in Oregon.
    - ii. Want to ensure equity issues are considered throughout the process.
    - iii. Graduates are required to complete at least six units of experiential education pursuant to ABA standards. Law schools could package and sequence courses in a way that could work for a similar model. Field placements (aka externships), clinics, and simulation courses already exist. Opportunity presented to think through the incorporation of additional simulation content with doctrinal courses.
    - iv. Communication plan designed to create buy-in from legal employers would be an integral part of any launch.
    - v. Considerations on consortium options and impact on reciprocal admission would need to be examined.
    - vi. This pathway has limited flexibility related to students' curricular choices, as the course sequencing is largely predetermined. Interested in vetting the student perspective on the impact of those limitations.
- 4. Preliminary discussion of the whether program would measure applicant's ability to meet the essential eligibility requirements of a lawyer in Oregon (See RFAs 1.20 and 1.25)**
- a. Discussion of the current competencies required. Ideas exchanged on how those rules could benefit from some revision, regardless of subcommittee's ultimate recommendations.
    - i. Suggestion to review the IAALS report in conjunction with the current rules and consider weaving the 12 building blocks of minimum competence into our skills requirements.
    - ii. Consider including more related to ethics and access-to-justice elements.
  - b. Agreement to table discussion until after a closer examination is undertaken at the subcommittee level and a discussion can be had with the wider committee to ensure an integrative approach related to proposed revisions.
- 5. Member assignments for subcommittee work**
- a. Exploration of the management of the program from the Bar's perspective
    - i. Brian Gallini
  - b. Exploration on the perspectives of employers and the employability of program participants
    - i. Examining all levels of employers and firms (small, mid and large)
      - 1. Chase Morinaka and David Wade will contact employers
      - 2. Rebecca Ivanoff will contact Career Services Dean
  - c. Exploration of student perspectives on this program
    - i. Manuella Tshala and Chase Morinaka
  - d. Exploration of the impact on legal education from the school's perspective. Any challenges related to this program as compared to other pathways?
    - i. Rebecca Ivanoff
  - e. Analysis of how this program comports with existing rules for admission

- i. Peter Sabido
  - f. Members unassigned: Anthony Rosilez (will fill in where needed); Jason Sprech; Representative Stark
- 6. Meeting Schedule**
  - a. First week of April – report in on assigned work
  - b. Third week of April – finalize subcommittee report to wider committee