



Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE)

State of Connecticut Judicial Branch

CO-CHAIRS:

Hon. Elliot N. Solomon
Frederic S. Ury, Esq.

MEMBERS:

Hon. Elizabeth A. Bozzuto, Hon. William H. Bright
Hon. Bernadette Conway, Lawrence F. Morizio, Esq.
Rosemarie Paine, Esq., Louis R. Pepe, Esq.

**COUNSEL TO
COMMISSION:**

Michael P. Bowler, Esq.

Minutes of the Meeting Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education September 7, 2017

On September 7, 2017, the Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education (“Commission”) met by telephone conference call from 8:45 a.m. until 9:37 a.m. A meeting space for members of the public was provided at 100 Washington Street in Hartford.

Members in attendance were:

Hon. Elliot N. Solomon, co-chair
Attorney Frederic Ury, co-chair
Hon. Bernadette Conway
Attorney Lawrence F. Morizio
Attorney Rosemarie Paine
Attorney Louis R. Pepe

Also in attendance were Attorneys Michael P. Bowler, Cathy A. Dowd, and Elizabeth M. Rowe, Counsel to the Commission, Attorney Martin L. Libbin, Director of Legal Services, and Attorney Joseph Del Ciampo, Deputy Director of Legal Services.

- I. The Commission approved the minutes of the June 1, 2017 meeting with Judges Solomon and Conway and Attorney Pepe abstaining.
- II. The Commission discussed updates on seminars and Commission opinions.
- III. The Commission considered a request from the Legislative Commissioner’s Office whether an attorney may claim MCLE credit when the teaching activity is conducted by a non-attorney. The Commission determined that the activity is eligible for MCLE credit provided the activity meets the content requirements of the MCLE rule. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel’s signature without additional review by the full Commission.
- IV. The Commission considered a request from Attorney Jason Maddux whether an attorney may claim MCLE credit for taking a bar preparation course to sit for another

jurisdiction's bar exam. The Commission determined that the activity is eligible for MCLE credit provided the attorney either attends an in person course or develops an appropriate self-study course that includes an online or other video/audio teaching component. The Commission decided to prepare the opinion anonymously and to publish the opinion online to aid the bar in understanding the MCLE rule. Further, the Commission decided that once drafted, the opinion could be approved by the Chairs and issued under Counsel's signature without additional review by the full Commission.

- V. The Commission considered several proposed changes to the MCLE rule drafted by Attorney Ury. After discussion, the Commission tabled the matter for further consideration.
- VI. The Commission confirmed the next meeting for October 5, 2017 at 8:45 a.m.