Minutes of the Meeting MCLE Commission September 26, 2016

On September 26, 2016, at 1:00 p.m. the Commission on Minimum Continuing Legal Education met in the Attorney Conference Room located at 231 Capitol Avenue in Hartford.

Members in attendance were:

Hon. Elliot N. Solomon, co-chair Attorney Frederic S. Ury, co-chair Hon. Elizabeth A. Bozzuto Hon. William H. Bright, Jr. Hon. Bernadette Conway Attorney Lawrence F. Morizio Attorney Rosemarie Paine

Attorney Louis R. Pepe was not in attendance at this meeting. Also in attendance were Attorneys Cathy Dowd and Elizabeth Rowe, Counsel to the Commission, Attorney Joseph D'Alesio, Executive Director of Superior Court Operations, Attorney Melissa Farley, Executive Director of External Affairs, Attorney Martin Libbin, Director of Legal Services, Attorney Joseph DelCiampo, Deputy Director of Legal Services.

- 1. The Commission introduced all of the members.
- 2. Judge Solomon and Attorney Ury discussed the policies and goals behind the enactment of the legislation.
- 3. The Commission reviewed and adopted FAQs regarding Minimum Continuing Legal Education.
- 4. The Commission reviewed and approved its webpage, which was created by the Judicial Branch.
- 5. Attorney Farley provided the Commission with a Suggested Publicity Plan for notifying the members of the Bar of their new obligation to complete continuing legal education. The Commission requested that a hyperlink to the final FAQs be included in the publicity campaign and that the bar associations be informed that Commission members were willing to speak on this topic to their respective members.
- 6. The Commission reviewed and approved a PowerPoint presentation for use at any education courses on MCLE.
- 7. Members of the Commission are scheduled to speak and present the PowerPoint presentation on October 17, 2016, at the Hartford Insurance Company and on November 7, 2016 in Middletown at the Superior Court. The Commission is also working to offer a presentation in Bridgeport.
- 8. The Commission considered a question from the public regarding how to advertise and/or determine that a proposed CLE course complies with the Rule when the course is not approved by another jurisdiction. It was determined that

- the course is approved if the attorney has a good faith belief that the course complies with Practice Book §2-27A (c)(6).
- 9. The Commission discussed whether it would informally approve courses by request from providers or Connecticut attorneys. It was noted that attorney and course providers were not required to get approval of the course in advance. It was determined that the Bar Counsel could inform parties that courses approved in another jurisdiction were automatically approved in Connecticut, although the counting of credits might differ and that any legal providers accredited in another state were permitted to offer courses in Connecticut. It was determined that the Bar Counsel's office would prepare acceptable disclaimer language that a CLE provider could advertise regarding whether the courses counted for credit in Connecticut and include this language in the FAQs. It was determined that any questions proposed to the Commission that could not be answered by Bar Counsel's office would be brought to the Commission for review.
- 10. The Commission discussed its meeting schedule and determined it would meet by telephone conference call on the first Thursday of the month at 9:15 a.m. The next meeting of the Commission was scheduled for November 3, 2016 at 9:15 a.m.