

CONNECTICUT BAR EXAMINING COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING
PUBLIC PORTION
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
MAY 1, 2009

The Chair, Anne C. Dranginis of Litchfield, called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m. (EST). Present were Richard Banbury, Susan Boyan, Kevin C. Connors, Mary Driscoll, Eric Gross, Honorable Athur Hiller, Honorable C. Ian McLachlan, Gail McTaggart, Honorable Aaron Ment, David Moraghan, Irving H. Perlmutter, Denise Martino Phelan, Honorable Barbara Quinn, Matthew Wax-Krell and Michael Whelton. Present by invitation were Howard E. Emond, Jr., Deputy Director, Attorney Services; Kathleen B. Wood, Administrative Director; Jessica F. Kallipolites, Assistant Administrative Director; Joseph J. Del Ciampo, Counsel, Legal Services; and Judith Gunderson, a representative of the National Conference of Bar Examiners. Also present by invitation were graders Dina Plapler, Jeffrey R. Godley, Lorrie Adeyemi and Michael Kokoszka.

The Secretary presented the minutes of the public and private portions of the meeting of January 16, 2009 which had been distributed to the committee members by the administrative staff with the agenda of the current meeting. Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Mr. Gross, the minutes of the meeting of January 16, 2009 were approved unanimously without correction or amendment.

Denise Martino Phelan delivered the quarterly report of the treasurer for the period ending December 31, 2008. Upon motion duly made by Mrs. Phelan, seconded by Mr. Gross, the report of the treasurer was approved unanimously.

The Chair announced the results of the bar examination administered in February, 2009. A total of 355 applicants had taken the examination. Upon motion duly made by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Perlmutter, it was voted unanimously to deem that those 226 applicants who had attained a grade of 264 on the examination had passed the examination. Upon motion duly made by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Perlmutter, it was voted unanimously to deem those 129 applicants who had not attained a passing grade of 264 had failed the examination. Upon motion duly made by the chair, seconded by Mr. Banbury, it was voted unanimously to recommend to the judges of the Superior Court those applicants, 128 in number, who had passed the February, 2009 Connecticut bar examination and whose applications disclose complete compliance with the Rules and Regulations of the Connecticut Bar Examining Committee for admission to the bar of the State of Connecticut. Upon motion duly made by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Wax-Krell, it was voted unanimously that those applicants, 92 in number, who had passed the February, 2009 bar examination, but whose applications disclosed technical defects be recommended to the judges of the Superior Court for admission to the Bar of the State of Connecticut upon remedying their defects unless further examination warrants review under the provisions of Article VI of the Regulations of the Connecticut Bar Examining Committee. Upon motion duly made by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Connors, it was voted unanimously that the applications of those six (6) applicants who had passed the

bar examination but whose applications disclose character and fitness issues be reviewed further pursuant to Article VI of the Regulations of the Connecticut Bar Examining Committee.

The Chair commented on the unusually low passing rate for the February 2009 bar examination, and the unusually high passing rate for the July, 2008 bar examination.

The Director, Kathleen B. Wood, discussed a proposed change on page eighteen of the current bar admission application concerning release of the bar examination results to each of the applicant's law schools. Upon motion duly made by the Chair, seconded by Mr. Banbury, it was voted unanimously to amend the sentence on page eighteen of the bar admissions application so as to read "...summary data which shall include , but not be limited to social security number, date of birth and pass/fail data regarding my performance..."

The Director also introduced a proposed amendment to the Regulations to include a provision addressing issues as to cheating and other dishonest conduct. Upon motion duly made by Mr. Perlmutter, seconded by Mr. Moraghan, it was voted unanimously to table further discussion as to these issues to the meeting scheduled for June 26, 2009.

There was further discussion concerning the use of laptop personal computers for the February, 2010 examination and the necessity to engage in the bidding process for their use. The Director reported on Connecticut Bar Examining Committee approved law schools and that due diligence was required in determining the suitability of schools to be considered for approval and accreditation. Further information will be required from such law schools requesting accreditation. Finally, the Director reported that an inquiry was sent to the Standing Committees seeking information on trends involving motion applicants and that the results will be provided to the Committee.

The Committee then heard from the four graders in attendance concerning issues as to the quality of examination questions and the model answers furnished by the persons preparing the questions. Mr. Kokoszka described the graders' difficulty in grading the answers to the essay questions. Some of the questions are too "thin" on presenting legal issues in the questions submitted, i.e. that there are not enough legal issues presented. His other criticisms concerned the failure of the drafters to present detailed analysis. He also stated that some of the legal issues presented in the questions are not up to date or are not set forth in the analysis provided by the drafters. The other graders added their comments and criticisms of the essay portion of the examination. The four graders retired after their presentation with the thanks of the committee members for taking the time to express their opinions as to the bar examination.

Judith Gunderson of the National Conference of Bar Examiners presented a lengthy talk on the subjects of the Multistate Essay Examination and Multistate Performance Testing, materials for which had been distributed to the members with the agenda of the meeting.

Upon motion duly made by the Chair, seconded by Ms. Phelan, it was voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:12 p.m. (EDT).

Respectfully submitted,

IRVING H. PERLMUTTER
Secretary