Project Page	Author	Author URL	Date	Content
Commons:DPC	Lucas Pinto	https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/User:Lucas_Pinto	2021-08-13 00:00:00	Lucas Pinto is a Brazilian photographer and videomaker. He specializes in the Amazon rainforest and other Brazilian landscapes and wildlife. Lucas's work has been published in National Geographic, Discovery Channel, Nature Conservancy, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society, Rainforest Alliance, Sierra Club, Greenpeace, Amnesty International, Oxfam, Sierra Club, Rainforest Alliance, Nature Conservancy, Conservation International, Wildlife Conservation Society

Comments (ATE)	Tom Harbolt		2021-07-23 15:40:39	I am not supportive of these changes. It comes as no surprise that the Committee is recommending what the Supreme Court is asking for. I am not convinced the system is broken. The Bar Exam is uniform. Preparation is not. This will lower the bar it make preparation dependent upon the person providing the guidance, which will not be uniform. The exam is testing minimum competence. If someone doesn't have the minimum competence, I don't understand why the Bar would take it even lower. The state's law schools do a good job of preparing lawyers. If the pass rate is not sufficient, put the burden on the law schools to do a better job. At a minimum, if the State adopts these ill-advised alternatives, I would expect that people would fail the alternatives at the same rate as the Bar Exam. If not, they are dumbed down alternatives. Lastly, again, if these ill-advised alternatives are adopted, I recommend that a prospective employer be able to know what route a student took to becoming a member of the bar. If it is the same "don't ask, don't tell" mockery that the State adopted for the non-exam takers during the pandemic it will be very difficult to believe the alternatives are nothing but an easier route to Bar membership. If someone can't pass a Bar Exam, prospective employers ought to know. It should not should be hidden from them.
Comments (ATE)	David LEFKOWITZ		2021-07-24 07:31:28	I especially support the mentor alternative. In my experience as an Oregon attorney since 1989, I and almost all the attorneys I have known, practice in only one or two specialized areas. Providing the mentor alternative would free law students to focus their studies on their intended specialty, instead of (like me) taking many classes on areas of the law tested by the bar, but would never practice. Thank you.
Comments (ATE)	James Oberholtzer	http://www.oberholtz.com	2021-07-24 10:31:29	I am concerned that the OSB is considering alternatives to the bar exam. The law schools in Oregon are responsible for preparing the law students to become attorneys. They know the students best and over three years. They are trained and experienced dealing with the students. They know how to do the tough job of working with struggling students and telling some that they simply cannot make it. This system is much better than the suggested alternatives. I was educated in the law in Virginia and have passed the bar exams in Virginia, Illinois and Oregon. Each was a positive educational experience. I am still constantly surprised about the modest level of knowledge of the law of some attorneys in Oregon. Rather than seek alternatives and more flexible standards, I think Oregon should raise standards and expect more from the Oregon law schools and the Oregon law students.
Comments (ATE)	DEAN HEILING		2021-07-24 10:58:34	I received my JD from Willamette University College of Law in 1971. The bar exam was intense, but I managed to pass it. Surprisingly, several classmates who smarter and more mature than I failed the exam. I started my practice in Winston, Oregon, and quickly found out that nether law school nor the bar exam prepared me for actually practicing law. I learned the trade by trial and error, leaning heavily on experienced lawyers in Roseburg who would walk me through the steps for each case I took in. It was a sharp learning curve. Over the years I have continued to be a student of the practice of law, and after 50 successful years, although I am formally "retired," I am still a member of the Bar and I still strive to learn and improve. Law school taught me the basics. It was, of course, absolutely essential to becoming a lawyer. But the Bar exam did nothing to further my legal education or establish my fitness to practice law.
Comments (ATE)	Elizabeth Godfrey		2021-07-24 11:28:18	I write as a consumer. When I hire an attorney now, I am at least sure that they have passed the Bar. The standard that assures me they are qualified to represent me. It's basic consumer protection that I expect from attorneys, medical doctors, CPAs, veterinarians, and multiple other professions. To encourage more people to become lawyers, reduce the debt burden they incur from law school. Don't do away with the Oregon Bar Exam.
Comments (ATE)	Joanna M. Wagner	http://joannawagnerlaw.comcastb	2021-07-26 12:35:06	I highly doubt that "diverse" persons fail to follow through with law school because they will ultimately have to take a bar exam. The problem with a non-diverse bar, if it is a problem, is probably lack of diversity in the law school pipeline to begin with, and lack of support systems along the way for finishing school successfully. Law school builds off of a successful college experience, which is in turn built off of a successful high school experience. What about focusing on capturing legal talent in high school, and improving high school student performance, instead of letting bar applicants skip the bar exam? Law school and the bar exam prep attorneys for the sheer drudgery and extreme performance pressure of the profession. I am in general civil practice. There is no practice area that is a cakewalk. It will do no good for the public to have access to "more" lawyers or "diverse" lawyers who just cannot perform at these levels. It would be like allowing a firefighter to be a firefighter without passing a physical exam -- because such an exam would prevent access to the profession by more people.
Comments (ATE)	Cynthia Thornton		2021-07-26 16:20:57	Thank you for requesting feedback on changing the admissions requirements. I disagree with the proposal to provide different admissions standards for some individuals. The primary goal for having minimum requirements is to protect the public. This should remain the priority. The practice of law has become more complex - not less. The Bar Exam is a rigorous test as it should be. I don't believe 1 or 2 years of practical experience can be as thorough as the Bar Exam nor is having a two tier system equitable.
Comments (ATE)	Kristina Kraaz		2021-07-29 13:10:43	I am commenting in full support of the ATE Report recommendations. The OEP and SPP options will not only open the practice of law to many deserving and qualified applicants, but they will prepare the next generation of attorneys for practice in ways that studying for a two-day exam cannot. Too often, the function of the Bar Exam is to reward those who are "good test-takers" rather than to assess an applicant's actual competence. Being a good test-taker is not a skill that actually relates to the successful practice of law; skills gained during experiential learning courses and externships, etc., ARE relevant. I also echo other public comments that encourage the Court to prohibit attorneys from advertising (or asking for employment purposes) about the manner in which an applicant was admitted to the Bar. If the OEP and SPP options are implemented, they should be considered on an equal basis as admission via the MBE. Finally, I encourage the Court to implement the ATE Report's recommendations around equity. The Court and Oregon Bar should consider ways to track participation and success in these alternative options, as they are implemented, to ensure that they are being implemented equitably.