

DISCUSSION: SUBENTITY FEEDBACK REGARDING PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

In May, staff issued a survey to the leadership (chairs and vice-chairs) of the following State Bar subentities to solicit feedback on Ms. Boomer's recommendations:

1. California Board of Legal Specialization
2. Client Security Fund Commission
3. Committee of Bar Examiners
4. Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct
5. Committee of State Bar Accredited and Registered Schools
6. Council on Access and Fairness
7. Law School Council
8. Lawyer Assistance Program Oversight Committee

A reminder email was sent in early June, which resulted in a total of seven responses (out of 13 possible). All of the members who responded to the survey agreed that switching to a simpler set of rules seems efficient and would not pose issues, however, training would be necessary. One member expressed concern that allowing three motions on the table could confuse the committee and would be make it challenging to sort what is being voted on.

With respect to the proposed procedures for public comment, 3 out of the 7 responses agreed with the proposed recommendations and suggested adding a link to the public comment policy in every meeting notice. One member raised an issue regarding exceptions for representatives of affected entities, specifically that clarification is required about whether limitations can be set for the number of representatives wishing to provide comment. Setting limitations on the number of representatives will avoid an entity from bringing forward a number of students, faculty, or others to attempt to influence the subentity on its decision-making. One member commented that if an item generates significant interest, there should be parameters and a process for setting a separate meeting to hear public comment rather than moving the placement of the item on the agenda.