

Is this email not displaying correctly? [View In Browser](#)



Bar Exam Tumult in California

Issue 72 | July 18, 2017

California Supreme Court Strips Bar Examiners of Authority to Set Cut Score

For decades, California's bar exam has had a reputation as among the hardest in the country to pass based largely on a required passing score that's higher than that of 48 other states. Now, the California Supreme Court (leapfrogging an effort by the State Bar of California to study the issue) has stripped the Committee of Bar Examiners of its authority to determine the minimum score needed to pass the bar. Why is the state supreme court making what Staci Zaretsky at [Above the Law](#) calls "an unprecedented move?"

Your Next Long Read? Oregon State Bar Releases Futures Report

"The relentless growth of technology and the effects of globalization are upending the legal services market, feeding innovation, exposing inefficiencies, and presenting opportunities for growth." So begins the executive summary of [The Future of Legal Services in Oregon](#), released recently by the Oregon State Bar Futures Task Force. In general, the Pacific Northwest has a reputation for being tech-forward and receptive to change ... does this report bear that out, and if so, what bold findings does it contain?

LSC Gets Fundraising Help from an Unlikely Source: Reddit

Last week, the moderators and certain users of the "subreddit" (Reddit's term for a discussion forum on a particular topic) [/r/LegalAdvice](#) launched a two-week fundraising campaign to benefit the Legal Services Corporation. Why? One moderator writes that quite often, "Get a lawyer" is the best answer to a question in this subreddit, and that for many people, that's "easier said than done." The moderator's description of the need, the incentive for those who donate more than \$100, and the follow-up comments all offer a fascinating window onto how some consumers think about access to justice, and onto what can motivate people to give.

Federal Judge Dismisses 'Quota' Lawsuit Against the State Bar of Texas

Earlier this month, a federal judge in Austin tossed out a discrimination lawsuit filed last year by a white, male lawyer against the State Bar of Texas, writing that the lawyer's complaints about a quota system for board members had been rendered moot by a recent amendment. The relevant statute had previously called for four minority board members, defined by gender and/or race or ethnicity, whereas the amendment simply calls for the appointment of at-large members who represent the interests of lawyers "from the varied backgrounds that compose the State Bar." On what grounds did the lawyer try to advance his case, and why did the judge dismiss it nonetheless? [Texas Lawyer](#) has all the details.

[Like Us on Facebook](#)



Follow DBS on Twitter

[Learn more about the ABA Division for Bar Services](#)

[Read the latest issue of Bar Leader Magazine](#)

{{AA_HTML Manual - Chicago Footer}}