

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
Anonymous	D		No change.
Anonymous	AM	<p>PTLS applicants should remain required to have completed or be enrolled in Evidence & Civil Procedure, as they are foundational cornerstones to one's understanding of the fundamentals of the practice of law in California. These course are integral to the very basics of what is admissible versus inadmissible, and filing deadlines and procedures.</p> <p>However, with respect to Cal. Rules of Court 9.42 (d)(3), the proposed modification is to remove the requirement of "personal presence of the supervising attorney" to allow law students to appear before the court with their supervising attorney present in a virtual fashion. Virtual appearances are modernly more commonplace, and therefore supervising attorneys should be permitted to directly and immediately supervise a provisionally-trained law student on such virtual platforms.</p> <p>Finally, students who have reached expiration of eligibility (by the date of results after first time taking the Bar) should be permitted to be eligible for the PTLS program until Bar exam passage, so as to encourage the pursuit of licensure.</p>	<p>No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter.</p> <p>Under the current rule, students need not have completed courses in Evidence and Civil Procedure, but need only be enrolled in them when they apply to the PTLS program. Based on the experience of those students who participate in PTLS who have not yet completed these courses, and the experience in other states where these courses are not required for participation in programs similar to PTLS, the working group disagrees that this course work is needed for students to be able to participate in hands-on training in the PTLS program.</p> <p>The proposal that Rules of Court 9.42(d)(3) be modified to allow a PTLS student to appear in court with their supervising attorney present through video appearance, and that students be allowed to remain in the PTLS program after receiving results from their first bar exam, until they have passed, are beyond the scope of the currently proposed modifications.</p>
Anonymous	A		No change.
Kelly Lynn Campbell-McKay	A	I am a Law Student and have been in the Practical Training for Law Students program since my second year. The opportunities to learn and apply my understanding of the law in the program have been invaluable. It is a surprise to me that students of the law on alternative paths such as the LOSP have not had the same learning opportunities as Law students, and I feel like the lack of practical training is a detriment to the legal community as a whole. The most astute legal minds I have worked with all have clerked with attorneys and judges during	No change.

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		their time at law school, and the PTSL program should be promoted and expanded as much as is practicable for the benefit of the profession.	
Anna L. Capria	A	This seems like a great opportunity to increase access to law background to make it more equitable for all.	No change.
Tanya Asim Cooper / Pepperdine University Caruso School of Law	AM	Evidence and Civil Procedure should remain requirements for the PTLS program. In our law clinic, certified law students represent victims of domestic violence and human trafficking in California courts and engage in all aspects of litigation. They need these courses to represent clients.	No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter’s perspective. Under the current rule, students need not have completed courses in Evidence and Civil Procedure, but need only be enrolled in them when they apply to the PTLS program. Based on the experience of those students who participate in PTLS who have not yet completed these courses, and the experience in other states where these courses are not required for participation in programs similar to PTLS, the working group disagrees that this course work is needed for students to be able to participate in hands-on training in the PTLS program. This was an issue expressly discussed with the Committee prior to the circulation of the rule for public comment. The working group continues to support the proposal to eliminate these requirements on a programmatic level. Those entities accepting PTLS students continue to have the authority to mandate the education and experience required to participate as a PTLS student with them.
Crystal Dean	A	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•I believe Rule 9.42(c) requires revision to include apprentices in the Practical Training of Law Students Program administered by the State Bar of California.•Presently, the rule excludes apprentices. It requires a declaration by a Dean of a law school to confirm that the student is enrolled in law school and in evidence and civil procedure classes. It further requires that the applicant to the program represent that they are enrolled in a law school.•I believe the rule is bias and excludes apprentices from an invaluable opportunity to both our education and the future representation of clients.•The rule was enacted as rule 983.2 on December 29, 1993, under the title Practical Training of Law Students. According to the California Regulatory Law Reporter, Vol 13, Nos. 2 and 3 (Spring/Summer 1993), “the purpose	No change.

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		<p>of these rules . . . is to provide for the operation of a program of practical training for law students as a valuable complement to academic classes.” [[And Vol 13, No. 1 (Winter 1993)]]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•State Bar’s Title 4, Division One rules set forth the education standards for the practice of law. Under which Rule 4.29 outlines how an apprenticeship in the law office study program can “comply with the legal education requirements of these rules”. This indicates that it considers us students of the law like any other.•Further, if the apprenticeship path is a legitimate path to practice law, why is it treated differently or not afforded the same opportunities? As first years in the program, we must pass the First Year Law Students’ Exam to move forward, just as those students in unaccredited law schools. If we as students have proved that we are similarly schooled and proven by the same test, we should all be able to participate.•A final point, is that California is one of four states that allow apprenticeship. The other 3 states, Washington, Vermont, and Virginia, all have comparable certified law student or practical training programs, and all 3 of those states allow their apprentices to participate in those programs. This is not an unprecedented change, and I and my fellow apprentices urge the revision of rule 9.42 to include us.•Thank you for your time and consideration. <p>I am attaching my initial request which was submitted to the Judicial Council asking for this revision in August of 2021, which includes the same agreement by licensed attorneys and other law office study program students.</p>	
Pam Delgado	D	<p>[1] I believe that civil procedure and evidence courses are essential for the program. Eliminating those requirements would facilitate errors that could be vital to a client’s case.</p> <p>[2] Additionally, the rules should be more clearly defined as to what the certified law student is able to do, as I was a participant and was not allowed by the court to appear on behalf of clients, even with the supervision of my attorney. Other admitted attorneys would not work with me, as attorneys are not educated on what a certified law student can and cannot do.</p>	<p>[1] No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter’s perspective. Under the current rule, students need not have completed courses in Evidence and Civil Procedure, but need only be enrolled in them when they apply to the PTLs program. Based on the experience of those students who participate in PTLs who have not yet completed these courses, and the experience in other states where these courses are not required for participation in programs similar to PTLs, the working group disagrees that this course work is needed for students to be able to participate in hands-on training in the PTLs program. This was an issue expressly discussed with the Committee prior to the circulation of the rule for public comment. The working group continues to support the proposal to eliminate these requirements on a</p>

Practical Training of Law Students Program Rules Proposal: Public Comment Chart

Attachment E

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
			<p>programmatic level. Those entities accepting PTLS students continue to have the authority to mandate the education and experience required to participate as a PTLS student with them.</p> <p>[2] No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter’s perspective. The working group believes Rule 9.42(d) provides appropriate specificity as to what activities a certified law student may undertake. The State Bar will be making changes to its website concurrent with the adoption of rule changes and will consider this comment in doing so. The State Bar will also consider highlighting this program in an upcoming update to all State Bar licensees, so they are aware of its requirements.</p>
Darrell Griffin Jr	D	Students need practical training. Most of this comes from clinics and collaborative courts. One on one with an actual attorney would be better	No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter’s perspective. The proposed modifications do not affect the requirements for attorney supervision of students in the PTLS program.
Mia Grindon	A	This change makes sense and will enable future legal practitioners to gain hands-on experience earlier in their careers, which will enable them to be more capable attorneys upon passing the bar. The distinction between JD and LLM students is arbitrary and they deserve similar opportunities. Furthermore, Evidence and Civil Procedure has not proven necessary for me in effectively speaking on the record.	No change.
Raymond Scott Hayden	A	Excellent idea to improve opportunities for Law Students in LOS and LLM Programs!	No change.
Mary K. Jones	AM	I oppose inclusion of Students in a Master of Laws program as most masters of law programs are 2 years full-time. Not enough educational hours to protect public. Half the education requirement now in effect and required by the State Bar requires 3 years of study at an ABA school, 4 years at State Bar Accredited school, 4 years under Judge or Attorney. DePaul University College of Law Masters program, "can be completed part-time in 2-1/2 years."	No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter’s perspective. The proposal to allow those in LLM programs to participate in the PTLS program is not changing the credit requirements for those programs or the

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		I approve the PTLS inclusion of those students in the Law Office Study Program.	requirements for credits needed in an LLM program to sit for the bar exam or be certified to the Supreme Court for admission to the State Bar.
Judge Mark Juhas / Chair, California Access to Justice Commission	A	<p>The California Access to Justice Commission writes in support of the proposed changes to the Practical Training of Law Students (PTLS) program [NOTE: this letter’s references to its support for the LOS Program Rule Revisions is contained in the comment chart on the LOS Program]</p> <p>The California Access to Justice Commission advances access to civil justice for all Californians, expands civil justice resources for low and moderate-income people, and develops innovations that reduce barriers to civil justice for Californians from diverse backgrounds. To do so, the Access Commission facilitates collaboration among the courts, the Bar, and the public—including all three branches of government and stakeholders throughout the state.</p> <p>We Support the Proposed Amendments to the PTLS Program.</p> <p>The Access Commission appreciates the State Bar’s efforts to review and evaluate admission rules, practices, and procedures to identify possible improvements and eliminate unnecessary barriers to participation. For the PTLS program, the proposed amendments will, among other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Authorize students in the Law Office Study (LOS) program and in Masters of Laws (LLM) programs to participate; and• Eliminate the requirement that students have completed or be currently enrolled in courses in evidence and civil procedure to be eligible. <p>The Access Commission supports these changes, specifically including the proposed amendments to the definition of “law student” in Rule 9.42 of the Rules of Court, and proposed amendments to Rules 3.2 through 3.11 of the Rules of the State Bar, pertaining to the PTLS program.</p> <p>California’s PTLS program (also known as the Certified Law Student program) allows law students certified by the State Bar and working under the supervision of an attorney to provide specified legal services to clients. The PTLS program gives law students the opportunity to gain hands-on experience while ensuring the protection of the public through attorney supervision.</p> <p>On October 20, 2021, the California Supreme Court directed the State Bar to study and consider whether changes to rule 9.42 would authorize students enrolled in a law office or judicial chambers’ studies program (i.e., the LOS program) to participate in the PTLS program would be prudent. The Court also directed the State Bar to</p>	No change.

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		<p>consider whether any rule amendments may be necessary to provide additional protections to the public and the judicial system. See Order in re Petition to Amend Cal. Rules of Court Rule 9.42 (Oct. 20, 2021, No. S269663) (en banc).</p> <p>The Access Commission agrees with the State Bar’s conclusion that allowing LOS program participants as well as LLM students to participate in the PTLS program makes sense and is prudent. We agree with the State Bar’s recognition of the value of hands-on experience as part of legal education, and that allowing participation may help LOS program participants and LLM students become better lawyers. The Access Commission also agrees that the proposed changes still maintain public protection, primarily through restrictions on activities and attorney supervision as well as through a requirement that LOS participants have completed one year of legal study and have passed the first-year law students’ examination and be actively continuing the study of law in a law office or judges’ chambers. Allowing LOS participants and LLM students to participate in the PTLS program also may increase the delivery of legal services to people of limited means.</p> <p>In addition, the Access Commission agrees with the removal of the requirement that participants must have successfully completed or be currently enrolled in evidence and civil procedure courses. This is an unnecessary barrier to participation at odds with requirements in other states. In many cases, hands-on experience, under the supervision of a lawyer, is an effective way to study evidentiary and civil procedure issues. Further, as noted by the State Bar, law offices, law schools, and others are free to create their own requirements for student participation, which may include prerequisite courses on evidence, civil procedure, ethics or professional responsibility, trial advocacy, or certain substantive areas relevant to the work where appropriate, and need not be a barrier to participation in the program where not necessary. The Access Commission also appreciates the proposed rule changes clarifying PTLS program requirements.</p>	
Sarah Leon	A	I am a CA barred attorney who became an attorney through the LOS. I was not able to participate in PTLS while in the LOS program. I support this change. All California attorneys should have the opportunity to prepare for their role.	No change.
Frederick Mitchell	A		No change.
Zach Newman / Legal Aid Association of California	A	<p>We are writing on behalf of the Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC) regarding the proposed revisions to State Bar rules regarding the PTLS program to increase eligibility and decrease barriers to participation.</p> <p>LAAC is the statewide membership association of over 100 public interest law nonprofits that provide free civil legal services to low-income people and communities throughout California. LAAC member organizations provide legal assistance on a broad array of substantive issues, ranging from general poverty law to civil rights to immigration, and also serve a wide range of low-income and vulnerable populations. LAAC serves as California’s</p>	No change.

Practical Training of Law Students Program Rules Proposal: Public Comment Chart

Attachment E

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		<p>unified voice for legal services and is a zealous advocate advancing the needs of the clients of legal services on a statewide level regarding funding and access to justice.</p> <p>We understand that the California’s Practical Training of Law Students (PTLS) program is a way for law students that are certified by the Bar and working under the supervision of an attorney to provide specified legal services to clients. PTLS helps students gain hands-on skills through real-world contact with clients. But, some of the rules of the program currently make it such that those participating in the Law Office Study (LOS) program cannot participate, along with LLM students. The current proposal seeks to fix these issues.</p> <p>Specifically, the current rules require students to have taken or be enrolled in evidence and civil procedure in order to be in the PTLS program. The currently proposed changes would amend the rules to eliminate the requirement for students to have taken or be enrolled in these courses, whereby LOS and LLM students can be able to engage in the PTLS program. LOS and LLM students should have the same opportunity to participate in PTLS, and this proposal resolves that inequitable barrier. Moreover, these students would not pose a greater risk to the public than law students because all students, no matter what program they are in, are subjected to the same rules and requirements, including close supervision by a lawyer. Last, the proposals also make other rules clearer, which aids prospective and current students in knowing about the requirements are and, consequently, how to be successful in the program.</p> <p>Altogether, the PTLS program is, like the LOS program, an important way for students to get experience and education in a non-traditional or alternative way. Making it so that LOS and LLM students can participate is a positive development because it ensures those involved in these other pathways can actually participate in this valuable experiential program. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide comment. Please contact us with any questions.</p>	
Pamela Ross / All for the Family Legal Clinic	A	Our clinic has been able to help so many more families through the use of certified student attorneys in our nonprofit practice. We also have one paralegal that is doing the Law Office Study Program and not being able to participate in the in court training is detrimental to her progression as a lawyer in training as compared to her peers that are in law school and allowed to have this hands on training.	No change.
Adele Schneidereit	D		No change.
Logan Schlossberg	A	It should be highly considered that apprentices should be included in the PTLS program. The rule is bias and prevents students in the apprenticeship program from gaining incredibly important skills that other students get the opportunity to benefit from. As a student in the LOSP, I have passed the FYLSE, have passed the MPRE, have successfully studied and completed both Civil Procedure and Evidence, and am on track to complete the program in 4 years to take the California Bar Exam. It does not seem fair that students like myself would not get	No change.

Practical Training of Law Students Program Rules Proposal: Public Comment Chart

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		the opportunity to be included in the PTLS program especially where vital information and hands-on learning takes place. Since the apprenticeship is considered a legitimate way to study the law and work towards sitting for the CBX, why would students in the program be exempt from the PTLS program? I truly hope you reconsider Rule 9.42(c) and make the necessary revisions to include us students in the LOSP. I very much thank you for your time.	
Claire Solot / Legal Services Funders Network	AM	<p>The Legal Services Funders Network (LSFN) is a San Francisco Bay Area network of funders who fund civil legal service organizations as a poverty alleviation strategy. Founded by a group of five funders in the fall of 2014, there are currently well over 100 California funders participating, as well as dozens of funders based outside of California. Our funder network is multi-sectoral and is comprised of: Private Foundations; Community Foundations; Law Firm Foundations & Law Firms; Corporate Foundations; Government Funders (state and local); Crowd Source Funders; Individuals and funders who give via Donor Advised Funds (DAFs); Law Schools and Philanthropic Services Advisors.</p> <p>The LSFN Public Interest Bar Fellowship was created in 2020 in response to the COVID 19 pandemic and the delay of the July Bar Exam. Since that time we have graduated over 80 Fellows, who during their fellowships have added over 37,000 hours of additional capacity to Legal Services Organizations (LSO). Over two-thirds of our Fellows have continued in the public interest sector, and many were hired as full-time staff attorneys by their LSO Hosts or other LSOs involved in our program. On June 1, 2023 we will welcome our fourth cohort of LSFN Fellows, which will include our 100th LSFN Fellow.</p> <p>The LSFN Fellowship is made possible via our partnership with the law schools located in and near the counties where we place our LSFN Fellows. The law schools are our key marketers when it comes to letting their May graduates know about our program. In addition, completing their law schools’ course of study and receipt of a law degree is important to our Legal Services Organizations (LSO) Hosts. Registering for the California’s Practical Training of Law Students (PTLS) is a component of the LSFN Fellowship.</p> <p>Since inception, the LSFN annually receives applications from LLM students. To date, all of these applicants have been international students, who not only have legal experience in their home countries, they have tremendous language capacity. One of our first LLM applicants spoke five languages! Modifying the PTLS rules to allow LLM students to participate would be a positive change that would add capacity (both in terms of staff and language) to legal services organizations. Additionally, the LSFN supports eliminating the requirement to have taken or be enrolled in evidence and civil procedure. Not only do many LLM programs not offer these courses, there are many areas of public interest law that one can engage in that do not require these subject matter backgrounds. It is for these reasons that the LSFN supports making LLM students eligible for the PTLS program and that the evidence and civil procedure requirements be amended.</p>	No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter’s perspective on the Law Office Study Program in general, and supports allowing LOS participants in the PTLS program, working under the supervision and direction of a licensed California attorney who meets the eligibility criteria for supervision.

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		<p>However, the LSFN does not support changing the PTLS program eligibility to include students studying law in a law office or judge’s chamber for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Unlike the LLM students, the LOSP students are not part of an established California law school, which have required curriculums and oversight.</p> <p>2. The LOSP students by definition are already exposed to practical training via their law office or judge supervisors.</p> <p>3. With the influx of alternative law school experiences (including online, part-time and programs that enroll students who are incarcerated), the value and relevance of the LOSP program is questionable. For example, in our 2022 LSFN cohort we had a Fellow who attended a California accredited law school part-time over four years. Our Fellow is the parent of two young children, worked full-time while in law school and commuted 20 miles each way to attend classes. This Fellow could have opted for the LSPO program, but felt that it was important to attend an accredited law school. Additionally, more and more law schools are offering classes online and on weekends. In recent years, LSOP students appears to have shifted from the original intended group (those who cannot afford based on time, money and logistics to attend a traditional three year, full-time, in person law school) to people like Kim Kardashian, who could attend law school is she chose to do so, but opted instead to participate in the LOSP.</p> <p>4. The costs associated with overseeing the LOSP program are not justified and should be repurposed. According to the Daily Journal, in 2007 just 32 students registered for California's LSOP program. As of 2004, according to the Los Angeles Times, only 64 attorneys had acquired their legal training and passed the bar exam since 1980, out of the 436 people who registered for the program. In 2006 only one out of the five LOSP students passed the bar exam. A more recent 2015 article in the California Encyclopedia of Law (california.lawi.us) noted that in the past five years only 39 LOSP passed the California bar exam, averaging less than eight (8) individuals annually. The process to become a LOSP and LOSP supervisor is intense and time consuming, not only for the participants, but for the State Bar. Given the many options that now exist to attend law school, it is time that the State Bar revisit offering the LOSP program. Note: the LSFN is extremely supportive of the value of experiential learning. However, we believe it is best suited for students who have participated in a formal, law school program and after they have completed core first year academic studies.</p>	
Tamir Sukkary	A	I support all these changes. Thank you.	No change.
Megan Thompson	A	Glad this is on motion. As a LOSP, I was defeated to be informed the opportunity to participate as a Certified Law Student was not available to me. Even after I passed the FYLSX and completed my studies in Evidence and CivPro to qualify (and submitted the requisite reporting/paperwork). Working in a law office, the opportunities to participate in hearings (instead of merely observing) would have been incredibly helpful. There are safeguards in place, such as obtaining the client’s written consent and the supervising attorney being present. This type of real	No change.

Practical Training of Law Students Program Rules Proposal: Public Comment Chart

Attachment E

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
		world experience is key and goes to the soul of the LOSP. It will create better attorneys, more prepared to advocate on behalf of clients, which is ultimately the goal after all. I'm taking the Bar this February, but I hope this impacts future lawyers in my position who just truly want to do the best they can as an attorney when we get to the other side of the bar.	
Kent Tierney	D	Eliminating the traditional bar exam is not a good idea.	No change. The comment is beyond the scope of the proposed modifications to the rules for the PTLS program.
Michael Trust	AM	No issues with law office/chambers and LLM students being eligible. However, I do think that passing Evidence and Civ Pro should still be required. These are fundamental to most hands-on training experiences that students are going to receive.	No change. Under the current rule, students need not have completed courses in Evidence and Civil Procedure, but need only be enrolled in them when they apply to the PTLS program. Based on the experience of those students who participate in PTLS who have not yet completed these courses, and the experience in other states where these courses are not required for participation in programs similar to PTLS, the working group disagrees that this course work is needed for students to be able to participate in hands-on training in the PTLS program. This was an issue expressly discussed with the Committee prior to the circulation of the rule for public comment. The working group continues to support the proposal to eliminate these requirements on a programmatic level. Those entities accepting PTLS students continue to have the authority to mandate the education and experience required to participate as a PTLS student with them.
Cristi Michelin Vasquez	D	I think it is important for the law students to understand procedures and to understand evidence. While they are supervised by their supervising attorney, They are eligible to make appearances and in doing so are speaking to the court without the benefit of first having their supervising attorney proof their verbal comments. As such, they should have some understanding of permissible evidence. Additionally, they should have an understanding of what is permissible from the other side. This program should be the beginning of training in preparation, not a substitute for education and knowledge.	No change. The working group appreciates the thoughtful response, but respectfully disagrees with the commenter's perspective The current requirements do not require completion of evidence and civil procedure coursework to participate in the PTLS program. Rather, current enrollment in those courses is all that is required.

Name / Affiliation	Position on Proposed Rule	Comment (Verbatim)	Working Group Response to Comment
			The working group continues to support the proposal to eliminate these requirements on a programmatic level. Those entities accepting PTLS students continue to have the authority to mandate the education and experience required to participate as a PTLS student with them.
Corina A. Yetter	A	I agree with making the Practical training of law students more accessible so that more law students may discover whether or not they prefer courtroom litigation before they make career choices.	No change.
Raymond Yeung	A	The experience granted by the PTLS program is incredibly useful to future legal practitioners. The practice of law involves many skills that simply cannot be taught in a classroom or read from a book. It allows students to forge connections in the workplace that may lead to an advantage in future hiring, and it allows students to see whether legal practice is something they want to do in the long term. The opportunity to participate in such a beneficial program should be extended to as many students as possible.	No change.

Legend
A = Agree with proposed rule
AM = Agree if modified
D = Disagree with proposed rule