

LPP Steering Committee

AGENDA

January 16, 2024

4:00 p.m.–5:00 p.m.

Via Zoom

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83083038539?pwd=UHBkbERZMHU2NmxxvOXIZMDBIbFFuUT09>

Item 1	Action —Approval of draft meeting minutes November 21, 2023.	TAB 1	Judge Amber Mettler
Item 2	Action —Approval of draft meeting minutes December 19, 2023.	TAB 2	Judge Mettler
Item 3	Update on Court Memo		Judge Mettler, Kirsten Shumway
Item 4	Update from Bar <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Kirsten will be attending the Second Annual Legal Paraprofessional Summit remotely on February 9, 2024.		Matt Page, Kirsten Shumway
Item 5	Discussion – Should This Document Be Made Public on the LPP Website? <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. LPP Ethics Exam Study Areas	Email Attachment	Kirsten Shumway
Item 6	Discussion —Update from the LPPs on current casework and projects		Tonya Wright, Leslie Staples, Melissa Parache, Brooke Byall, Lindsey Brandt
Item 7	Discussion —Update on outreach efforts		Monte Sleight
Item 8	Discussion — Foreign legal degrees <ol style="list-style-type: none">A. Example of degree evaluation from World Education Services (WES).B. Proposed New Rule 15-705C. Previous discussions on Proposed New Rule 15-705.	Email Attachment TAB 3 TAB 4	
Item 9	Discussion —Update on rural outreach		
Item 10	Discussion —Old business/new business Supreme Court Committee Rule Changes		Kirsten Shumway

TAB 1

**Licensed Paralegal Practitioner
Steering Committee**

Proposed Amended Summary Minutes for November 21, 2023

[This meeting was conducted electronically via Zoom](#)

Committee members	Present	Excused	Bar Staff
Judge Amber Mettler (Chair)	X		Kirsten Shumway
Scotti Hill	X		
Matthew Page	X		
Leslie Staples	X		
Tonya Wright	X		
John Seegrist (Secretary)	X		
Brooke Byall	X		
Lindsey Brandt	X		
Jackie Morrison		X	
Monte Sleight		X	
Melissa Parache		X	
Anastasia Boyko		X	

Introduction

The meeting started on time with a welcome from the Chair Judge Amber Mettler after a quorum was formed and new members and guests were introduced.

Item 1: Approval of the Minutes

Judge Mettler requested approval of the amended October 2023 minutes. The motion to approve was made by Tonya Wright and seconded by Leslie Staples. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

Item 2: Report on Meeting with Judge Mettler and Bar staff Emily Lee and Kirsten Shumway

Judge Mettler and Kirsten Shumway reported on a Zoom meeting they had with Emily Lee on October 31, 2023. They discussed the current status of the LPP Steering Committee which is in transition. They discussed how to continue growing the program, which is small given the amount of work needed to support the LPP program. They discussed the Committee's purpose and determined that needed to be updated. They have decided to create a memo on the Committee's history and challenges that can be used in a planned meeting with the Utah Supreme Court in January. The goal of this meeting is to report to the court where the LPP Program is and to request guidance from the court on how to move forward with the LPP Program.

Afterward their report, the Committee discussed its current situation. Judge Mettler noted that the Committee has treading water, but that might be fine given this is still new. The Committee is currently approved for fifteen (15) members but is currently only staffed at thirteen (13). They discussed the future of this Committee and whether other committees were necessary to handle the workload of the LPP Program. The Committee will hold off adding new members until we hear back from the Court on how they would like us to proceed. The Committee will have a more detailed decision on the future of this program once the Court gives guidance.

The Committee's current role is to continue developing the LPP program including rule making and come up with creative ways to innovate the program. The bar will then work to support those changes. There is a general feeling that the committee has had to "carry all the water" and has become overwhelmed with the

responsibility. Scotti Hill agrees that the Committee has been carrying the weight but feels some things can be done, and we need clarity on who will do them. She noted that we have identified some very tangible needs, and it is exciting to see those and look for ways to empower members. The Committee noted that COVID-19 also affected the Committee's ability to move forward and discussed how to regain the lost momentum. The Committee needs guidance from the Court on what changes are necessary to move forward.

Expungements are a natural expansion for the LPPs role. There is general support for this recommendation from the committee, but the Committee still needs to discuss the required CLE. The Committee discussed its own role in drafting the rules for this expansion. The Bar will then execute the plan and develop the training course required to add this service.

Item 3: Discussion—Report on Internal Roundtable Meeting on LPP Scope with Bar staff, Monte Sleight, and Leslie Staples.

Kirsten Shumway reported on a roundtable meeting that she and Emily Lee (Admissions Deputy Counsel at the Bar) held with Committee members Monte Sleight and Leslie Staples, and Elizabeth Wright (Executive Director of the Bar). They discussed limits on the LPP license. They agreed that certain areas of law that are quite complex and are outside the scope of the LPP license. This includes complex discovery and interrogatories, motion for summary judgement, adoption, and uninhabitable dwelling.

They discussed the scope of the LPP license. The group discussed the meaning of Rule 14-802(c)(1)(C) and (F). The group Under paragraph (C), what does it mean for a document to be consistent with the relevant portions of the Judicial Council-approved forms? The group agreed that it was the substance of the document that mattered over the formatting. The formatting of many approved forms causes problems when LPPs try to efile them. The group also agreed that the documents referred to in paragraph (F) referred to ancillary and factual documents such as a military affidavit.

The Committee then further discussed the scope of the LPP license. Tonya Write asked what an LPP should do if a judge or commissioner asks them a question that is beyond the scope of their license. Kirsten reported that this was discussed in the roundtable meeting as well. LPPs need to help education judges and commissioners on the limits of their license. Before going into court, the need to prepare their client so they know the LPP's role in court. The LPP should have a script of how to handle questions from the bench that are beyond the scope of the LPP's license including letting the judge or commissioner know that the question is outside of the scope. The LPP should offer a solution such as "The answer is found in this pleading on this page," "We can take a recess, and I can talk to my client out in the hall." If the judge or commissioner continues and orders the LPP to answer, the LPP must follow a court order.

Lindsey Brandt commented that family law is unique, and each court handles it differently. There are courts where she is given more opportunities to help her client. She mentioned it would be nice to have some kind of training for LPPs on how to deal with tactical things attorneys do in court. Judge Mettler noted that the Committee has not discussed the idea of LPPs receiving training in this area. Scotti Hill likes the idea of training as well. She also states that the solution should be rule based rather than seeking advisory opinions. This would help assuage doubt on the part of the LPPs.

The presence of the LPP in the court is needed to ensure the process moves forward. An example was given of an individual in a multi-hour hearing where the client went through the motions only to leave and finally settle in frustration. If the LPPs are not in court with the clients, the clients sometimes do not know what to do.

An LPP commented that sometimes attorneys know what LPPs cannot do and use that to their tactical advantage. Judge Mettler pointed out that this happens even with attorneys, not just LPPs. Judge Mettler and Scotti support expanding the real-time experience available for the LPPs. Training should include time in court to learn the processes and the skills needed to support the clients. Rule 14-802 scope does not provide enough

direction to support the LPPs. The rule needs to better clarify the scope of the license. The LPP needs to prepare the client in advance for what they may be allowed to do. It would be helpful if the client has a script of what is essential in their case.

Judge Mettler agreed with Scotti that the scope of the LPP license needs to be in the rules, and the Committee should move away from using Advisory Committee notes. The more the Committee can put into the rule itself, the better.

A question was raised about the difference between an LPP working alone or working in a firm with an attorney. How does this impact the restriction on using the court's forms? If an attorney is involved with the LPP, does it change what can be used? What should be done with the discovery and the current limitations on LPPs? What do you do if a case moves to a point that you need to drop and move your client to an attorney? Clients will need help understanding when a case needs to go to an attorney. This transition may be more difficult for the stand-alone LPP and may cost the client more because the attorney needs time to get caught up.

While these questions cannot be answered right now, it is good that the questions are arising. It helps the Committee find ways to improve the program.

Item 4: Discussion – Update from the Bar

Matthew Page would like to see more CLEs on the LPP Program, and more Commissioners and Judges present at conventions where training is provided. Judge Mettler stated one problem is not getting the schedule out in time for the courts to clear their schedules to attend the conventions. Matthew reported that the Bar president chooses the dates. Usually the Spring Convention is the second week of March.

Matthew Page stated the Fall Forum and Spring and Summer Conventions need more sessions to explain the LPP program, what LPPs can do in court, and the scope of the license. He recommends that we hit this hard in the Spring Conference. There needs to be clarity across the board.

Item 5: Update from the LPP Innovation Subcommittee

Jackie Morrison, Scotti Hill, Monte Sleight, Melissa Parache, and Brooke Byall have spent more time refining the proposed New Rule 15-712 on Expungements, and Proposed amendments to Rule 14-802(c) and definitions in Rule 15-701. Kirsten Shumway stated that the Subcommittee felt the proposed rules were refined enough that the entire Committee should discuss them.

The Committee discussed the special CLE that would be required for LPPs who would like to provide expungement services. The LPP would complete the CLE in lieu of passing an additional exam. The Committee discussed the word “practice” in proposed Rule 15-712. Expungements are a service rather than a practice area. Judge Mettler proposed to delete the words “practice area” and replace it with “service.”

The CLE training should be very basic, and we would only require the CLE every three years unless they have taken the test for the unlawful detainer within three years. Judge Mettler stated the training would be mandatory for LPP. Scotti Hill asked that we table the rest of this discussion until Monti Sleight is present.

Judge Mettler proposed adjourning the meeting since the hour was nearly up. The December meeting will be held on December 19th, at 4:00 p.m.

Adjourned.

Next meeting is December 19, 2023.

402 Reduction (Utah Code § 76-3-402)

Did not discuss.

ITEM 6: Discussion—Possible Safe Harbor Rule: Informal advice from the Bar or LPP Steering Committee.

Did not discuss.

ITEM 7: Discussion—Update from the LPPs on current casework and projects

Did not discuss.

ITEM 8: Discussion—Update on outreach efforts

Did not discuss.

ITEM 9: Discussion—Update on rural outreach

Did not discuss.

ITEM 10: Discussion—Old business/new business Supreme Court Committee Rule Changes

Did not discuss.

TAB 2

Licensed Paralegal Practitioner

Steering Committee

Proposed Summary Minutes - December 19, 2023,

[This meeting was conducted electronically via Zoom](#)

Committee Members	Present	Excused	Guest/Staff
Judge Amber Mettler (Chair)	X		Kirsten Shumway
Anastasia Boyko	X		
Brooke Byall	X		
Emily Lee	X		
Jacqueline (Jackie) Morrison	X		
John Seegrist (Secretary)	X		
Leslie Staples	X		
Lindsey Brandt	X		
Matthew Page	X		
Melissa Parache			
Monte Sleight		X	
Scotti Hill	X		
Tonya Wright		X	

Introduction

The meeting started at 4:02 pm with a welcome from the Chair, Judge Amber Mettler; and a quorum was formed.

Approval of the Minutes

Approval of draft meeting minutes for November 21, 2023, was delayed until the January meeting to allow for review of updates.

Update on Memo to the Court

The final draft of the memo to the court from Emily's team is ready for Judge Mettler to put the draft together in the next two weeks.

Discussion - Update from the Bar

Matt Page questioned the LPP on the emails received through a licensed lawyer. Should these emails be directed to the LPPs instead of directing them to the licensed lawyer site? We should consider referring them to someone who does unbundled services. The LPP Facebook page, managed by Tanya Wright, shows LPPs taking new clients. This list could be used for directing the referrals. Matt will look at the list and direct the emails to them. The LPP email listserv from the bar can also be used to send direct emails.

Kirsten has created a new Zoom link for the committee meeting for 2024 and will send it out with the January agenda.

Michelle Oldroid from the Bar is holding a spot at the spring convention for LPPs. This spot can be used for education on the role of the LPP or for CLE., with the small number of LPPs that could attend the convention, the spot could be better used for a speaker on the role of the LPPs. The focus should be on Commissioners and Judges and how they should interact with and treat the LPPs. Kirsten Shumway will

coordinate the speaker and may consider a panel of speakers from this committee. The Bar will waive the convention fee for the panelist. Those interested can send their names to Kirsten. The convention will be from March 14th to 16th in Saint George.

Discussion on the Scope of Practice for LPPs.

The Bar's Ethics Counsel has asked a question on LPPs drafting stipulated settlement agreements.

If the LPP is working for a mediator and gives the case to the LPP, can the LPP file the documents for one of the parties? Lindsey Brandt confirmed that they could if they would sign a conflict-of-interest document. Only one of the parties would be the client, and the LPP will file the document for the client. This is part of Rule C1i; the mediator attorney may file with one party using the attorney Rule C1I. The committee agrees that this situation is acceptable.

Discussion on updates from the LPP Innovation Subcommittee.

- Proposed New Rule 15- 712. Expungements.
- Proposed amendments to Rule 14-802 to match new Rule 15-712.
- Proposed amendments to Rule 15-701 to match new Rule 15-712.

Jackie Morrison discussed the evictions and criminal expungement Rule 15 712 that would allow LPPs to practice without an additional exam. She proposed an exemption for those with the landlord-tenant license. 15-701 specialized training for LPPs to provide this service. Question on clarification: Is there one training course for each area or one for all? The wording should be changed to "any" from "each" so there will be only one training for all subject areas. Judge Mettler is in support of the wording change. The carve-out on this has been removed.

Considering this training, should questions on the topic be added to the exam? The changes to the exam would be costly and more straightforward to keep as a CLE course.

Removing the language every three years will be a one-time training of one or two CLE hours. Melissa Parache supports the idea that the CLE can evolve with the needs of the LPPs. Scotti Hill questions if this should be a goal. Consideration should be given to reviewing the training with Jake Smith, who did the criminal expungement training. Access to justice has also created a CLE on expungements.

Some expungements after July 1, 2022, are automatic after three years or if it is in the agreement. Anything before this requires a petition. The exam does not currently have expungement questions on it. A condition of the expungement is that the other party must be made whole. The order of restitution may already include this in it.

For now, it is recommended that we write the rule with only the CLE required.

The Bar records all CLE courses, and the CLE training provides a certificate. Judge Mettler is not in support of requiring the certificate to be displayed.

The remaining changes to 15-701 provide a definition to support 15-712. Do we need to add the definition of CLE in 15-701? Judge Mettler recommended that the definition stand on its own. Remove the CLE definition and use "continuing legal education course designed by the bar" for LPPs. Remove MCLE and CLE. 14-802c will keep the list of LPP work and will be referenced in other rules.

The committee was asked if they had any last questions or concerns.

Action: The committee has reviewed the changes and approved them. Lindsey Brandt motioned for approval, and Melissa Parache seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

This recommendation will be sent to the court in January, and the Bar general counsel will prepare a memo to go with the rule change.

Discussion on adding language to Rule 15- 802(c) allowing LPPs to recite facts in court.

The issue the LPPs have in court is needing to know if or when they can. The Judge may ignore the rule and ask to hear from the LPP. Family law is a significant issue, with inconsistencies between courts asking the LPPs to talk. LPPs prepare scripts for the clients beforehand, but the clients need to stick to the scripts.

Opposing attorneys may manipulate the clients, who may need help understanding the questions they are asked. This situation has the potential to blow up quickly with little time to address. This hurts the case and the court's time.

The LPP is helping the clients, but they are forcing them to speak, which can hurt the client's case. The court can be frustrated and will just ask the “paralegals to talk.

Scheduling track management conference is a 4903 motion. What should the clients do? Clients may not go to these. The LPP will sometimes ask opposing counsel to present the agreements for the LPP because they cannot present the agreement. Currently, the LPPs can only do this if the court orders it.

The situation must be brought in line with access to justice to avoid hurting the pro se clients. Lindsey Brandt and Mellisa Parache report that the 3rd district allows LPPs to talk in court but not to argue. Document preparation and settlement agreements must be read into the record. This reading is allowed in the 3rd but not in the 4th district.

Brooke Byall reports that LPPs can already give facts and settlements to the court and participate in scheduling conferences. This report needs to be verified.

It recommended that this be stressed repeatedly at all conventions. Matt Page will help to make sure we take advantage of all opportunities.

Melissa Parache reported that the rule has mostly stayed the same but clarifies what is currently allowed. 14-802 does define facts and emotional support. Emily Lee says the change is substantial, even if it reflects what is happening. Lindsey Brandt clarified that the LPP does more than emotional support. LPPs have been sent out to schedule conferences outside the client's best interest. Emily Lee says LPPS can answer questions of the court and opposing counsel.

A proposal was made to send this question to the sub-committee and for them to come back with a recommendation. Emily Lee supports this topic by going to the sub-committee. Judge Mettler says we need more clarity in the scope of practice and to follow the rule language process. It is better to take your time with wording changes.

Action: This topic will go to the sub-committee for review.

Adjournment

The Following discussion items were not addressed in this meeting.

Discussion – Making Utah’s LPP Core Competency document available to the public on the LPP website.

Discussion—Safe Harbor Rule.

Discussion—Update from the LPPs on current casework and projects

Discussion—Update on rural outreach

Discussion—Update on outreach efforts

Discussion—Old business/new business Supreme Court Committee Rule Changes

Licensed Paralegal Practitioner Steering Committee Meeting Times for 2024 (Third Tuesday at 4 pm):

- January 16, 2024
- February 20, 2024
- March 19, 2024
- April 16, 2024
- May 21, 2024
- June 18, 2024
- July 16, 2024
- August 20, 2024
- September 17, 2024
- October 15, 2024
- November 19, 2024
- December 17, 2024

TAB 3

1 **Rule 15-705. Qualifications for licensure as a Licensed Paralegal Practitioner,**

2 **Applicant with foreign law degree.**

3 (a) **Applicability.** This rule applies to an Applicant who has graduated from a foreign
4 law school.

5 (b) **Requirements of Licensed Paralegal Practitioner Applicants.** The burden of proof
6 is on the Applicant to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the applicant:

7 (1) has paid the prescribed application fees;

8 (2) is at least 21 years old;

9 (3) has:

10 (A) graduated with the equivalent to a First Professional Degree in law or an
11 LLM from an accredited foreign law school that is capable of verification by an
12 Approved Degree Evaluation Organization;

13 (B) been admitted to practice law in that country;

14 (C) maintained good standing and can provide a certificate to that effect and a
15 disciplinary history or its equivalent;

16 (4) is of good moral character and satisfies the requirements of Rule 15-708; and

17 (5) has a proven record of ethical, civil, and professional behavior.

18 (b) **Specialized Course of Instruction requirement.** An Applicant under this rule must
19 take a Specialized Course of Instruction, as defined in Rule 15-701, in:

20 (1) professional ethics for Licensed Paralegal Practitioners; and

21 (2) each subject for which the Applicant seeks to be licensed.

22 (c) **Substantive Law-Related Experience requirement.** Except as provided in paragraph

23 (d):

24 (1) An Applicant must have 1500 total hours of Substantive Law-Related Experience,
25 as defined in Rule 15-701, within the last 3 years.

26 (2) An Applicant for licensure in temporary separation, divorce, parentage,
27 cohabitant abuse, civil stalking, custody and support, and name or gender change,
28 and petitions to recognize a relationship as a marriage must have 500 hours of the
29 total Substantive Law-Related Experience in those areas.

Commented [KS1]: 1. Graduating from country with English common law v. other law.

2. Language added from 14-704 for someone with a foreign law degree who wants to be an attorney in Utah.

Commented [KS2]: We may need to define this or reword.

Commented [KS3]: Would need to define this in Rule 15-701.

Commented [KS4R3]: English translation.

Commented [KS5]: This is the same as those who currently qualify under Rule 15-703 and have a paralegal degree (Assoc. or Bach.), a Master's in legal studies, or a National Accreditation.

30 (3) An Applicant for licensure in forcible entry and detainer must have 100 hours of
31 the total Substantive Law-Related Experience in that area.

32 (4) An Applicant for licensure in debt collection must have 100 hours of the total
33 Substantive Law-Related Experience in that area.

34 (5) All Substantive Law-Related Experience must have been supervised by a lawyer
35 licensed in any state or a Utah Licensed Paralegal Practitioner.

36 (d) **Substantive Law-Related Experience in a school or program.** An Applicant may
37 submit a transcript from an Approved Law School, an Accredited School, or an
38 Accredited Program and receive a maximum of 750 credit hours toward the Substantive
39 Law-Related Experience requirements under the following conditions:

40 (1) Courses must have been completed within the five years prior to applying for
41 licensure as a Licensed Paralegal Practitioner.

42 (2) The transcript must specifically note the Substantive Legal Course, as that term is
43 defined in Rule 15-701, for which the Applicant requests credit under this
44 paragraph.

45 (3) The transcript or other documentation must note whether the credits are
46 semester-based or quarter-based.

47 (4) For credit to apply to a specific practice area, the Applicant must specifically
48 request that a course apply and also demonstrate that the course covers the specific
49 area of practice.

50 (5) Upon request, the Applicant must provide the course description, syllabus, or
51 other course materials.

52 (6) To receive Substantive Law-Related Experience credit, a course must meet the
53 definition of Substantive Legal Course under Rule 15-701, as determined by the LPP
54 Admissions Committee.

55 (e) **Credit for Substantive Legal Courses.** Substantive Law-Related Experience credit
56 for a Substantive Legal Course will be given as follows:

Commented [KS6]: Maybe cut paragraphs (d) and (e).
This would be too difficult to verify.

- 57 (1) If the course is offered at an institution that works on the common semester
58 model, the Applicant will receive 30 Substantive Law Related Experience hours for
59 each credit hour of the course.
- 60 (2) If the course is offered at an institution that works on the common quarter model,
61 Applicants will receive 20 Substantive Law Related Experience hours for each credit
62 hour of the course.
- 63 (3) If the course is offered using any other formula, the Applicant must submit
64 documentation of the actual hours of classroom instruction along with the hours of
65 out of classroom work expected by the program or school. The committee will
66 determine how many Substantive Law Related Experience hours to grant the
67 Applicant based on a rough equivalence to the semester or quarter models.
- 68 **(f) Examination requirement.** An Applicant must successfully pass:
- 69 (1) the Licensed Paralegal Practitioner Ethics Examination; and
70 (2) the Licensed Paralegal Practitioner Examination~~(s)~~ for each ~~the~~ practice area~~(s)~~ in
71 which the Applicant seeks licensure.
- 72 **(g) Licensure and fee requirements.** Upon successfully completing the application and
73 examination requirements, an Applicant must comply with the provisions of Rule 15-
74 716 concerning licensing and enrollment fees before the Applicant will be licensed.
- 75 **(h) Disqualification.** An individual who has been disbarred or suspended in any
76 jurisdiction may not apply for licensure as a Paralegal Practitioner.

77
78

TAB 4

ITEM 8: Discussion— Foreign legal degrees

C. Previous Discussions on Proposed New Rule 15-705.

1. Issue 1: English Common Law v. Other jurisdictions. Should the rule differentiate?

- a. Should those who do not graduate from a country based on English Common Law be required to complete more Substantive Law-Related Experience hours?
- b. [CIA: The World Factbook, Field Listing – Legal System](#)
 - i. Factbook describes 14 types of legal systems in the world
 - ii. “English” Common Law: approximately 80 countries.
 - iii. Civil Law: various forms in approximately 150 countries.
- c. Committee discussed this previously. There was debate as to whether this really matters.

2. Issue 2: What type of foreign degree?

- a. Added language to the draft rule - borrowed language from one of the attorney admission rules - [UCJA Rule 14-704](#)
 - i. *First Professional Degree of law...*;
 - ii. *Admitted to practice of law in that country;*
 - iii. *Actively and lawfully engaged in Full-time Practice of Law in that country for no fewer than 2 years;*
 1. This is in the attorney rule UCJA Rule 14-704, but it probably does not need to be included in our definition since the LPP applicant must complete at least 1500 hours of Substantive Law-Related Experience.
- b. Should they provide some type of Certificate of Good Standing and Disciplinary history like U.S. law graduates are required to do?
 - i. Maintained Good Standing and can provide something equivalent to a Certificate of Good Standing/disciplinary history. Based on requirements for Attorney Admissions [Rule 14-704](#) for US attorneys.

3. Issue 3: Who will provide the degree evaluation?

- a. Should we have a list of approved organizations, and if so, how do we go about adding names to the list?
- b. “Approved Degree Evaluation Organization”: language added to the draft rule.
 - i. Will need to add a definition to UCJA Rule 15-701.
- c. Examples of organizations that provide degree evaluation
 - i. [WES](#): Example of a WES evaluation attached to email.
 - ii. [Association of International Credential Evaluators, Inc.](#) or AICE (from State Dept. website), and they both verify and evaluate degrees. *Called to verify.
 - iii. [National Association of Credential Evaluation Services](#) or NACES has many members, so there is no way to confirm that they both verify and evaluate without reaching out to each individually. Could include language that they need to be sure that the degree is verified and evaluated.
 - iv. Many law schools use LSAC to evaluate and verify degrees (the [CAS A&E](#)). LSAC has a partnership with [AACRAO](#) (American Ass'n of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) to both evaluate and verify degrees. This is what Quinney uses.

4. Issue 4: Number of Substantive Law-Related Experience hours: should it still be 1500 hours, or should it be more?

5. Issue 5: Removing Paragraphs (d) Substantive Law-Related Experience in a school or program, and (e) Credit for Substantive Legal Courses

- a. These are in UCJA Rule 15-703 and Proposed Rule 15-704, but it would be difficult to apply this rule to foreign law degrees.

Notes for Proposed New Rule 15-705:

1. The Dept. of State specifically states on the [website](#) that they are not endorsing the 2 listed companies, so maybe we can change the language to something like "listed on the website of the State Dept."
2. We may need to include language that the law degree needs to be both verified and evaluated. Verified to make sure it is legit, and evaluated to see how comparable it is to an American law degree.
3. I reached out to AICE (from State Dept. website), and they both verify and evaluate degrees. NACES has many members, so there is no way to confirm that they both verify and evaluate without reaching out to each individually. We could do that, or we could just include language that they need to be sure that the degree is verified and evaluated.
4. Many law schools use LSAC to evaluate and verify degrees (the [CAS A&E](#)). LSAC has a partnership with [AACRAO](#) (American Ass'n of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) to both evaluate and verify degrees. This is what Quinney uses.