

Rules of the
Barry, Diane AG:EX

From: Macallum, Bruce AG:EX
Sent: Thu, April 12, 2007 2:41 PM
To: Mackey, Bryant AG:EX; King, Liz AG:EX; Hutchings, Geraldine AG:EX; Porteous, Lee AG:EX
Cc: Barry, Diane AG:EX
Subject: Hiring process

To panel: Can you please include me as an invitee to your initial meeting next week as I would like to provide you with some thoughts on the hiring process prior to you deciding on your process/assessment methodology for the hiring process. Please find below the link the Public Service Agency HR Toolkit which provides more information on what the merit principle means.

- The principle of merit applies to the articling hiring process (same as public service) See BC Public Service Agency HR Toolkit: <http://www.hrtoolkit.gov.bc.ca/staffing/>
- Articling students are "auxiliaries"

Note: This message, including any attachments to it, is confidential and subject to solicitor-client privilege. In keeping with the Standards of Conduct for Public Service employees, it is not to be disclosed outside of provincial government without prior written approval from the Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Attorney General. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately and do not copy or disclose the contents of this message.

Bruce I. Macallum
Legal Counsel
Legal Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
Tel: 250 356-7364
Fax: 250 356-9264

ARTICLING STUDENT SELECTION AND HIRING PROCESS 2008/9

Briefing by Chair of Articling Student Committee

- Revised*
- The principle of merit applies to the articling hiring process (same as public service) See BC Public Service Agency HR Toolkit:
<http://www.hrtoolkit.gov.bc.ca/staffing/>
 - Articling students are "auxiliaries"
Therefore the procedures for regular government positions do not apply
 - The role of the Articling Committee is to provide guidelines and a copy of the report on the previous year's selection process (attached).
 - Screening out: if applicants don't score beyond 45 points, they are automatically excluded from the process. Last year the base line was _____
 - Equity: In order to comply with the principle of Equity, Government is committed.
 - In the regular public service recruitment process, these positions must be identified as such in "Postings".
 - LSB BMC decision that no equity positions will be designated
 - During the 2001/2 selection process the equity consideration was used to break a tie.
 - Ranking:

Selection panel rank for own purpose to determine 20 candidates for interviewing on 6 positions.

Interview panel starts from scratch

Barry, Diane AG:EX

From: Macallum, Bruce AG:EX
Sent: Thu, April 12, 2007 2:43 PM
To: Mackey, Bryant AG:EX; King, Liz AG:EX; Hutchings, Geraldine AG:EX; Porteous, Lee AG:EX
Cc: Barry, Diane AG:EX
Subject: Report 2006 - 2007 Hiring Process.doc

To 08/09 Hiring Panel: Please find below the Hiring report for the hiring process 2007/2007 for your information.

Bruce

Date: March 1, 2006

To: Articling Committee

From: Barbara Carmichael, Chair
Articling Student Selection and Hiring Panel
(2006/2007 Articling Period)

Re: Articling Student Hiring Process, 2006/7

Legal Services Branch received 112 applications for the 2005/2006 articling year. A committee reviewed the applications and short-listed 20 applicants. These applicants were interviewed by the hiring panel on April 25, 27, 28, 29 and May 2, 2005. in Victoria. The interview process consisted of seven oral questions and two written questions. s.3

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.

s.3

The written assignments consisted of:

- 1.
- 2.

s.3

Hammond, Monica M AG:EX

From: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX
Sent: Thursday, March 20, 2008 10:54 AM
To: Leslie, Susan AG:EX
Cc: Ameeralli, Peter AG:EX; Glover, Joanne AG:EX; Kuzma, Oleh AG:EX; Marr, Sarah J AG:EX
Subject: Assessing Law School Marks

One task the panel will have to determine is how grades are evaluated. The mark for grades is out of 20 and we use an excel spreadsheet to calculate a weighted average.

However, the point values assigned to each letter grade is determined by the selection panel.

Last year the weights were as follows:

A+ - 20
A - 19
A- - 18
B+ - 16
B - 14
B- - 12
C+ - 10
C - 8

Marks of C- or below were given a score of zero.

The Panel will also have to decide whether the grades received by any candidates who have a Masters in Law should be included in the weighted average. Last year those marks were not included as (if I recall correctly) we felt the question just asked for "law school marks" and because the different grading scale used in most masters programs would cause a lead to those marks having a higher weight in the overall average.

If these decisions could be made early on in the process, it would be helpful for Sarah Clark, who has graciously agreed to enter all of the names and grades and then put in the formulas to compute the weighted averages.

Note: This message may be subject to solicitor-client privilege and must not be disclosed to anyone other than British Columbia government personnel without the express written consent of the sender.

Barbara Carmichael

Barrister & Solicitor
Health and Social Services Group
Legal Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
(250) 356-8817 (phone)
(250) 387-2623 (fax)

2010-11 Art. de la 2e

Hammond, Monica M AG:EX

From: Hammond, Monica M AG:EX
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 3:43 PM
To: Verhulst, Sherie AG:EX; Mackey, Bryant AG:EX; Tamosiunas, Genevieve AG:EX
Subject: RE: Articling Student Application Review

Attachments: Assessment Form 2008-9 with Marking Guide.doc; 2010-11 Application LSB.doc

Here's a copy of the shortlisting assessment sheet which I think is the one used last year, although it's misnamed. I can't find anything else that looks like guidelines.

This year's application (which I've also attached) is slightly different than the one used in previous years, but the assessment sheet may be of some use to you.



Assessment Form 2010-11 Application
2008-9 with Ma... LSB.doc (5...

From: Verhulst, Sherie AG:EX
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 3:16 PM
To: Mackey, Bryant AG:EX; Tamosiunas, Genevieve AG:EX
Cc: Hammond, Monica M AG:EX
Subject: RE: Articling Student Application Review

Great, thanks. If they are available, we may also want to get a list of the sorts of guidelines used in previous years. We aren't bound by them, but it might help expedite our own guideline creations...

Sherie Verhulst, Legislative Counsel
Sherie.Verhulst@gov.bc.ca
tel: (250) 356-9557
fax: (250) 356-5758

This e-mail is confidential and may be protected by solicitor-client privilege. If you receive this e-mail in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.

From: Mackey, Bryant AG:EX
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 3:13 PM
To: Verhulst, Sherie AG:EX; Tamosiunas, Genevieve AG:EX
Cc: Hammond, Monica M AG:EX
Subject: RE: Articling Student Application Review

Hi Sherie and Genevieve,

I think we should meet Monday morning in rm 211, as close to 8:30 as possible, and begin the process by establishing some guidelines for evaluation among ourselves.

There is no marking key or set of guidelines to this process; however I'm hoping we can obtain some of the past years very best responses in order to begin with sense of how good a good answer can be, etc.

I think the first part of the morning should be spent establishing our group's approach to this years' applications. I think one of the pitfalls to this process can be grading the first several applicants responses either overly harshly or easily

because of the lack of comparators. Also, I think in past years the panel has graded all responses to specific question from all applicants, and then moved on to the next question, and the next, and so on. This helps to ensure we have a good sense of each applicant's responses evaluated against the whole group for comparative purposes.

See you Monday.

Best regards,

Bryant

From: Verhulst, Sherie AG:EX
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 10:54 AM
To: Mackey, Bryant AG:EX; Tamosiunas, Genevieve AG:EX
Cc: Hammond, Monica M AG:EX
Subject: Articling Student Application Review

Hi Bryant,

I have this lovely binder from Monica, but no instructions as to what to do with it.

I understand we are meeting Monday in rm 211. What time will we be meeting? On that note, I'm available from 8 to 3:30 each day next week.

And, are we going through each application together or are we dividing them up, or??? Do we have some sort of standardized criteria that we are ranking them against?

Thank you.

Sherie Verhulst, Legislative Counsel
Sherie.Verhulst@gov.bc.ca
tel: (250) 356-9557
fax: (250) 356-5758

This e-mail is confidential and may be
protected by solicitor-client privilege.
If you receive this e-mail in error,
please delete it immediately and notify
the sender.

SUGGESTED MARKING GUIDE

PART A

Applicant's Name: _____

Law School Attended: _____

Year of Graduation: _____

Year of Articles Applying For: _____

PART B

Post Secondary
Education

Point Scale for criteria 1 to 3

Courses taken
Program Content
Co-op Program
Awards / Prizes
Other degrees

PART C

Law School Marks

Point Scale

Using the marks on the questionnaire, find the average.

A = 20
A- = 18
B+ = 16
B = 14
B- = 12
C+ = 10
C = 8

PART D

Community and Law School
Involvement and personal
achievements

Contribution to community
Volunteer work
Life experience
Abilities and achievements

1 to 15

For example, include:

- volunteer or community experience (volunteering, cultural activities, university activities, non-profit and community service, etc.);
- life experiences (parenting, travel, hardship, disability, etc.); and
- your abilities and achievements (languages, unique skills, academic or non-academic awards, prizes or recognition, athletics, etc.).

Please provide sufficient detail so that we understand how these experiences have contributed to who you are as a person and strengthened your potential as an articulated student.

PART E

Work experience

Type of work
Places worked
Responsibility
Supervisory role
Initiative
Organization skills
Administrative skills
Other: _____

Point Scale
for Criteria

1 to 10

PART F

Career Objectives Question

s.3

Point Scale
1 to 3

s.3

PART G

QUESTION A
Written Assessment

s.3

Point Scale
for Criteria

1 TO 5

s.3

QUESTION B

Writing ability
Succinctness
Logic reasoning
Other: _____

Point Scale
for Criteria

1 to 10

s.3

PART H

Up to four marks will be provided
for overall presentation, grammar,
spelling and ability to follow directions.

Points Scale
for Criteria

0 TO 4

SUMMARY

Total points in parts B through H of a possible 70 points

Questionnaire cut-off value is points

Applicant granted interview:

Yes

No

Assessment form completed by:

Date:

ANNUAL RECRUITMENT FOR ARTICLES

SUGGESTED MARKING GUIDE TO QUESTIONNAIRE/APPLICATION

PART B – 3 MARKS

- 1 mark – some undergraduate work
- 2 marks – an undergraduate degree
- 3 marks – a useful master's or higher-level degree

PART C – 20 MARKS

This section must take into account course credits so that the course weight affects total marks.

PART D – 15 MARKS

Allocate one mark for each 'simple' or 'basic' skill or ability or experience, such as speaking French, or having computer skills, or having travelled to one or two countries or played one or two sports; and then allocate more than one mark each, based on the experience or contribution or hardship, for things like parenting, disabilities, death in the family during law school, volunteer work, community or cultural involvement, extensive travelling or involvement in sports, etc.

PART E – 10 MARKS

- 1 to 5 marks – minimal work experience or low-level jobs and responsibilities
- 6 marks – below average work experience, in terms of duration and/or responsibilities
- 7 marks – average work experience for applicant's age, considering duration of work and/or responsibilities
- 8 marks - above average work experience, including a progression of responsibilities within the work history and/or law-related experience
- 9 marks - really commendable work experience, including a progressing or high level of responsibility and may include teaching others, practice areas of interest to LSB and/or law-related practice
- 10 marks – exceptional, unique or long work experience in an area relevant to the practice of law at LSB

PART F – 3 MARKS

s.3

PART G (A) – 5 MARKS

Things to consider:

-
-
-
-
-

s.3

PART G (B) – 10 MARKS

Things to consider:

-
-
-

s.3

PART H – 4 MARKS

Things to consider (relating to the application as a whole):

-
-
-
-
-
-

s.3

Drafted By Penny Lipsack
Solicitor
January 2007

PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
ARTICLED STUDENT PROGRAM
APPLICATION 2010/11

APPLICATION INFORMATION

This application is to be completed by law students applying for articles with the Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia for the 2010/2011 articling period. Your application package must include all of the following documents:

- **Completed questionnaire (provide only the information requested);**
- **Resume, not to exceed two pages; and**
- **Transcript of law school grades.**

For your application to be considered:

- the application must be completed in accordance with the instructions;
- the questionnaire, resume and law school transcript must be forwarded to the address listed on the second page of this document. These materials must be received no later than **4:30 p.m. Pacific Standard Time, Friday, February 27, 2009**. (Applications received after that time, and applications for which a required document is received after that time, may not be considered.)

Applicants will be selected for an interview based on their application questionnaire, resume and law school transcript. Applicants who are selected will be asked to provide further information, including references and a sealed law school transcript mailed directly from their university.

A copy of this application questionnaire is available between January 15 and February 27, 2009 at: <http://www.ag.gov.bc.ca/articling-program/index.htm>

Interviews will be conducted on May 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, 2009.

Questions should be directed to:

Monica Hammond
Manager, Articled Student Program
250-356-6451
monica.hammond@gov.bc.ca

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Forward your completed questionnaire, resume and law school transcript by email, fax or regular mail to the attention of Kimberley Hopwood at:

Mailing Address: Legal Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
PO Box 9280 STN PROV GOVT
Victoria BC V8W 9J7

Location: 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria BC

Email address: AG.CSDART@gov.bc.ca

Fax: 250-356-0001

2. Use 12-point Arial font throughout the questionnaire.
3. If applying by email:
 - (a) attach the application questionnaire and your resume to your email in either Word or WordPerfect format;
 - (b) attach your law school transcript to your email as a PDF;
 - (c) if you are unable to attach your law school transcript to your email as a PDF, fax it to: 250-356-0001;
 - (d) if you are faxing your law school transcript to us, make note of that in the email accompanying your application.
4. Your resume must include the following information:
 - undergraduate and postgraduate education;
 - the name of the law school from which you will be receiving, or have received, your law degree, and the year and month of your graduation from law school;
 - academic awards;
 - work history for the past 10 years.

MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
APPLICATION FOR 2010/11 ARTICLES

PLEASE TAB THROUGH DOCUMENT TO COMPLETE:

Name:

Mailing Address:

Phone:

Fax:

E-mail Address:

NOTE: If your contact information changes, please advise Kimberley Hopwood by email at: AG.CSDART@gov.bc.ca.

PART A

POINT VALUE: 20

COMMUNITY AND LAW SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT AND PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

In a response not to exceed one page, please provide information that will allow us to understand how your experiences have strengthened your potential as an articulated student with the Ministry of Attorney General.

For example, you may include:

- volunteer or community experience (volunteering, cultural activities, university activities, non-profit and community service, etc.);
- life experiences (parenting, travel, hardship, disability, etc.);
- your abilities and achievements (languages, unique skills, non-academic awards, prizes or recognition, athletics, etc.); and
- other education and skills (awards, publications, technical skills and other academic achievements).

PART B

WRITTEN ASSESSMENT (There are two parts to the Written Assessment)

QUESTION 1

POINT VALUE: 5

s.3

QUESTION 2

POINT VALUE: 10

s.3

PART C

POINT VALUE: 20

LAW SCHOOL MARKS

Attach a transcript of your law school grades to your application.

PART D

POINT VALUE: 10

WORK EXPERIENCE

These points will be awarded based on information contained in your resume.

PART E

POINT VALUE: 5

Up to five marks will be provided for overall presentation.

THIS COMPLETES THE APPLICATION QUESTIONNAIRE.

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2008/09

QUESTION 1

s.3

QUESTION 2

s.3

QUESTION 3

f

s.3

QUESTION 4

s.3

QUESTION 5

s.3

QUESTION 6

s.3

Written Interview Questions 2008 – 09

6.

s.3

7.

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have **50 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the summary if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the summaries, save your work on the disk, and hand the disk and all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2009/10
(Panel copy – includes answers)

Oral Interview Questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7:

QUESTION 1	5 POINTS
------------	----------

s.3

QUESTION 2	15 POINTS
------------	-----------

s.3

QUESTION 3**15 POINTS**

s.3

QUESTION 4**15 POINTS**

s.3

s.3

QUESTION 5

5 POINTS

s.3

QUESTION 6

5 POINTS

Presentation and verbal skills

APPLICATION PRESENTATION

10 POINTS

TOTAL ORAL MARKS (OUT OF 7):

**MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH**

ARTICLING INTERVIEWS 2009 – 10 ARTICLING YEAR

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS # 1-6 (Panel copy – includes answers)

Question 2. (Questions 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 attached separately)

s.3

2. Question

15 Points

s.3

Panel's Answer Key:

s.3

MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH

ARTICLING INTERVIEWS 2009 – 10 ARTICLING YEAR

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS # 1-7 (Panel copy – includes answers)

Oral Interview Questions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7:

1.

5 Points

s.3

2.

15 points

s.3

3.

15 Points

s.3

s.3

4.

15 Points

s.3

5.

5 Points

s.3

Question 6.

5 Points

Presentation and verbal skills

Question 7

Application presentation

10 Points

TOTAL ORAL MARKS (out of 70):

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2009 – 10 ARTICLING YEAR

Question 1

5 points

s.3

Question 2

15 points

s.3

Question 3

15 points

s.3

Question 4

15 points

s.3

Question 5**5 Points****Question 6****5 Points**

Presentation and verbal skills

Question 7**10 Points**

Application presentation

Total Oral Interview Marks (out of 70):

MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH

ARTICLING INTERVIEWS 2009 – 10 ARTICLING YEAR

WRITTEN INTERVIEW QUESTIONS #8 and #9 (Panel copy - Includes Answers)

Instructions:

You have **50 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the summary if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the summaries, save your work on the disk, and hand the disk and all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

8.

s.3

9.

s.3

s.3

- 2 -

Panel answer key: (these points can come out in order – just grouped for convenience) Marks awarded for any of the following points

s.3

Issues –

s.3

2

s.3

WRITTEN INTERVIEWS QUESTION 2009/10

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have **50 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the summary if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the summary, save your work on the CD, and hand the CD and all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please be sure that your name is either typed at the top of your paper, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Question 1

s.3

Question 2

s.3

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation $f(x) = \int_0^x f(t) dt$. It is shown that $f(x)$ is a constant function and that the only solution of the equation is $f(x) = 0$.

[illegible]

2. *How many people are there in your family?*

[illegible]

	S.22	S.23
Section 14 EA A continue		

**ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2010/2011
(INCLUDING MARKING SCHEME)**

1.

2.

3.

s.3

4.

5.

6.

WRITTEN INTERVIEW QUESTION 2010/2011

s.3

Pages 36 through 37 redacted for the following reasons:

Section 3 (Scope of the Act)

MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH

ARTICLING INTERVIEWS 2010/2011 ARTICLING YEAR

WRITTEN INTERVIEW QUESTION
and INSTRUCTIONS

Please write a paragraph setting out a detailed summary of section 19 of the *Financial Administration Act* in your own words. Please also identify any issues you have with its clarity, or lack thereof, or with the drafting. A copy of section 19 is attached.

You have **30 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may email your answer back to Monica Hammond as soon as you complete the question if you are finished before that time.

Please save your document in Microsoft Word format if possible, and name your document as follows:

[Last Name], [First Name]; Written Interview Question 2010-11.

Please return your answer to Monica Hammond by email no later than 30 minutes after you receive the email forwarding it to you.

Thank you and good luck!

s.3

MINISTRY OF ATTORNEY GENERAL
LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH

ARTICLING INTERVIEWS 2010/2011 ARTICLING YEAR

WRITTEN INTERVIEW QUESTION
and INSTRUCTIONS

s.3

You have **30 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the question if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the question, save your work on the disk in the floppy drive ("A" drive).

Please name your document as follows:

[Last Name], [First Name]; Written Interview Question 2010-11.

If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

s.3

**ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2010 – 11 ARTICLING YEAR
INDIGENOUS STUDENT POSITION**

Question 1

10 points

s.3

Question 2

10 points

s.3

Question 3

10 points

s.3

Question 4

15 points

s.3

Question 5

10 Points

s.3

NOTE: There will be 5 marks awarded for overall presentation and verbal skills.

Total Oral Interview Marks (out of 60):

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2009/10
(Panel copy – includes answers)

Oral Interview Questions 1-5:

QUESTION 1	10 POINTS
-------------------	------------------

In your application you have indicated that you are an Indigenous Student. As you know, from reviewing the materials on the website and in the application package, the Ministry of Attorney General is interested in hiring students who have a strong interest in public service and it looks to its students as a key source of growth. The Ministry is also committed to recruiting excellent candidates with indigenous backgrounds, and therefore has specifically designated one position for an indigenous articling student.

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 1 –

s.3

QUESTION 2	10 POINTS
-------------------	------------------

s.3

QUESTION 3

10 POINTS

s.3

QUESTION 4

15 POINTS

s.3

QUESTION 5

10 POINTS

s.3

APPLICATION PRESENTATION & VERBAL SKILLS

5 POINTS

TOTAL ORAL MARKS (OUT OF 60):

Instructions:

s.3

s.3

Your handwritten or typed responses will be expected by return e-mail or fax (250 614-2637) one and hour and fifteen minutes after you receive the questions. Typewritten responses are preferred. Use only 12 point Arial if typing.

1. _____

s.3

s.3

2. _____

s.3

s.3

1.

s.3

Instructions Concerning Questions 2 and 3:

s.3

2.

s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

3.

s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

Instructions:

s.3

Your handwritten or typed responses will be expected by return e-mail or fax (250 614-2637) one and hour and fifteen minutes after you receive the questions. Typewritten responses are preferred. Use only 12 point Arial if typing.

1.

s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

2.

s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

1.

s.3

Instructions Concerning Questions 2 and 3:

s.3

2.

s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

3.

s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia
Legal Services Branch
Oral Interview Questions 2010

Where the question asks you to discuss a situation you have been involved in, please use an example from your academic, work or volunteer experience.

1.

2.

3.

s.3

4.

5.

6.

Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia
Legal Services Branch
Written Interview Question 2010

s.3

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have **30 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the summary if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the summary, save your work to the desktop of your computer, using the following format: [Last Name], [First Name].

Hand all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2011 – 12 ARTICLING YEAR
INDIGENOUS STUDENT POSITION

PANEL COPY (INCLUDES ANSWERS)

Question 1

10 points

In your application, you indicated that you are an Indigenous Student. As you know, from reviewing the materials on the website and in the application package, the Ministry of Attorney General is interested in hiring students who have a strong interest in public service and it looks to its students as a key source of growth. The Ministry is also committed to recruiting excellent candidates with indigenous backgrounds, and therefore has specifically designated one position for an indigenous articling student.

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 1 –

s.3

Question 2

10 points

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 2 –

s.3

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 3 –

Panel note:

s.3

s.3

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 5 –

s.3

s.3

Question 5

10 Points

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 5 –

Panel Note:

s.3

s.3

NOTE: There will be 5 marks awarded for overall presentation and verbal skills.

Total Oral Interview Marks (out of 60):

Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia
Legal Services Branch
Indigenous Articling Position
Written Interview Question 2010

s.3

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have **30 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the summary if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the summary, save your work to the desktop of your computer, using the following format: [Last Name], [First Name].

Hand all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

**Panel's Answer Key for Written Interview Question
2011-12 Indigenous Interview Candidates**

s.3

**Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia
Legal Services Branch
Oral Interview Questions
2012-13 candidates**

To be sent 24 hours in advance:

1. s.3

2. s.3

To be provided 15 minutes in advance:

1. s.3

2. s.3

To be given in the interview:

1. s.3

s.3

2. s.3

**Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia
Legal Services Branch
Instructions for Written Interview Question**

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have **50 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the assignment if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the assignment, save your work to the desktop of your computer, using the following format: [Last Name], [First Name].

Hand all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

Pages 60 through 63 redacted for the following reasons:

Section 3 (Scope of the Act)

1

ORAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS 2012 – 13 ARTICLING YEAR
INDIGENOUS STUDENT POSITION
ANSWER KEY

Question 1**10 points**

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 1 –

s.3

Question 2**10 points**

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 2 –

s.3

Question 4**10 points**

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 4 –**Question #4 - s.3 (10 points)**

s.3

Question 5**10 Points**

s.3

Panel's Answer Key to Question 5 –

s.3

NOTE: There will be 5 marks awarded for overall presentation and verbal skills.**Total Oral Interview Marks (out of 60):**

;

**Ministry of Attorney General for British Columbia
Legal Services Branch
Instructions for Written Interview Question**

INSTRUCTIONS:

You have **30 minutes** to complete this assignment. However, you may leave as soon as you complete the assignment if you are finished before that time.

When you have completed the assignment, save your work to the desktop of your computer, using the following format: [Last Name], [First Name].

Hand all materials to the monitor. If you have chosen to complete the exercise in handwriting, please hand your papers and all material to the monitor.

Please ensure that your name is either typed at the top of your computer file, or written at the top of your handwritten documents.

Thank you and good luck!

**Ministry of Attorney General
Indigenous Articling Position
Written Interview Question 2011**

s.3

s.3

**Cheat Sheet for Written Interview Question
Indigenous Articling Position – 2011 Interviews**

s.3

2012-2013 Articling Student Written InterviewInstructions:

s.3

Your handwritten or typed responses will be expected by return e-mail or fax (250 614-2637) one hour after you receive the questions. Typewritten responses are preferred. Use only 12 point Arial if typing.

In order to protect the integrity of this competition, please destroy all interview questions once you have returned your completed response.

1. s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

2. s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

2012 - 2013 Articling Student Oral InterviewInstructions Concerning Questions 1 and 2:

s.3

In order to protect the integrity of this competition, please destroy all interview questions once you have completed your interview.

1. s.3

s.3

Question:

s.3

2. s.3

Question:

s.3

Question:

s.3

**LEGAL SERVICES BRANCH
ARTICLING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 20, 2008**

ATTENDEES: Barbara Carmichael – Co-Chair
Monica Hammond – A/Manager
Genevieve Tamosiunas
Dawn Leroy
Joel Oliphant
Kimberley Hopwood (Secretary)

Bryant Mackey – Co-Chair
Kirsten Wharton – Articled Student
Livia Meret
Pinder Cheema, Q.C.
Oleh Kuzma, Q.C. (by telephone)

ABSENT: Karrie Wolfe
Kimberly Henders Miller
Tara Callan
Liz King

1. REVIEW AGENDA & REVIEW MINUTES

Agenda approved. Minutes of October 2, 2008 adopted as written.	ALL
---	-----

2. APPLICATION PROCESS - BRYANT MACKEY & BARBARA CARMICHAEL

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background: Bryant, Barbara, and Monica met with PSA reps for input on streamlining hiring process. PSA suggests we screen 100 applications down to 50, eliminate/change some application questions, and contact exceptional applicants immediately. Our review of past applications shows that screening out between 30 – 50% of applications based on grades would not change who was hired, but would save between 100 -200 hours of legal time reviewing applications. ▪ DECISION: Preliminary screening of applications based on marks. Wait to see what pool is before setting the cut off point. ▪ DECISION: Ask for CV/resume (limit two pages), and unofficial law school transcript from applicants. ▪ DECISION: No separate marks awarded for post-secondary education. Change wording on the s.3 ▪ DECISION: Remove s.3 question. ▪ DECISION: Draft new application, circulate to ASC members. 	MONICA BARBARA BRYANT
---	-----------------------------

3. REPORTS FROM CROWN COUNSEL OFFICE AND CJB – OLEH KUZMA, Q.C.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recruitment events, including recent event at UBC with Barbara, Bryant, Dawana and Johnny, have been successful. CJB is considering hiring more students. Will look at LSB application before finalizing theirs. 	OLEH
--	------

4. REPORT FROM ARTICLED STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE – KIRSTEN WHARTON

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns: Vancouver students' hiring potential in Victoria, peer support, need for contact person in Vancouver. Before hire, give details on individual lawyers' practices in Vancouver. Solutions: Sharepoint service for networking, examine possibility of more students in Vancouver. 	MONICA BRYANT BARBARA
---	-----------------------------

5. SMALL CLAIMS PROGRAM REPORT – BARBARA CARMICHAEL BY E-MAIL BEFORE MEETING

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E-mail report not completed in time for meeting. Barbara taking over small claims supervision from Darcie. 4 new Small Claims files in Barbara's first week as supervisor. 	BARBARA AGT-2011-00180 Page 62
--	--------------------------------------

6. REPORT FROM THE CO-CHAIRS – BARBARA CARMICHAEL AND BRYANT MACKEY

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trish Kumpf accepted role as Indigenous Student Liaison. ▪ Pacific Leaders Program: Drafting a letter for ADAG to send to Premier's Office re loan forgiveness. ▪ Tyler Nyvall, JSB policy analyst, starting as articled student with JSB and will be spending 2-3 months with LSB. ▪ ADAG has requested that we develop policy for approval of non-legal work by students. ▪ July 6 – 10/09: Federation of Law Societies National Criminal Law Program annual conference in Victoria. Invitation from Greg Fitch (presenter) to us and Oleh for students to volunteer in exchange for admission to conference. ▪ DECISION: Allow students not at PLTC to attend, as a week-long CLE. ▪ Floating Auxiliary positions at LSB, possibly CJB – approval in principal to investigate this. 	<p>BARBARA/ BRYANT</p> <p>ALL</p> <p>MONICA</p>
---	---

7. ARTICLING STUDENT CLE COORDINATOR – KARRIE WOLFE

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Karrie was held up in court, but sent word that she will have something in the new year on continuing education . 	KARRIE
---	--------

8. ARTICLED STUDENT PROGRAM MANAGER'S REPORT – MONICA HAMMOND – BY E-MAIL BEFORE MEETING

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recruitment Events: UBC First Nations Legal Program – MAG Information Session Nov. 19th. Receiving information for UBC Law Faculty events, two in Jan and Feb /09. Info session Feb /09. ▪ s.22 will be called to the bar December 16, 2008. ▪ LSAP/PLTC and Bar and Admission fees for incoming students, including 2010-11 early starts, as well as s.22 call and admission fees have now been paid. ▪ All student evaluations coming in are positive. ▪ Per R. Fyfe's initiative, SharePoint site/Articled Student Program blog are in development at https://collaboration.ag.gov.bc.ca/LSB/CSD/articled%20program/default.aspx. 	MONICA
--	--------

9. (2:20 P.M.) IN-CAMERA

NEXT MEETING DATE: DECEMBER 18, 2008 – BOARDROOM 214 – TIME: 10:00 – 12:00

Minutes prepared by: Kimberley Hopwood

cc: Articling Student Committee
Principals
Students
ADAG

ATTENDEES:	Barbara Carmichael – Co-Chair Monica Hammond – A/Manager Genevieve Tamosiunas Dawn Leroy Tammy Fritz (Secretary) Livia Meret Tara Callan (by telephone)	Bryant Mackey – Co-Chair Karrie Wolfe Oleh Kuzma, Q.C. (by telephone) Kathleen Reilly (Principal) (by telephone) Pamela Manhas – Articled Student Joel Oliphant
ABSENT:	Pinder Cheema, Q.C.	Liz King

Agenda approved. Minutes of February 19, 2009 adopted as written.	ALL
---	-----

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome to Tammy Fritz, the new secretary for the Articled Student Program. Tammy has already been a huge help processing the articling applications for next year, and to the students with their small claims work and travel arrangements. • Applications for the articling positions closed on February 27th. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 191 applications received for the 13 articling positions, from 139 students. Last year we got 134 applications from 97 students. • 95 students applied for the CJB positions, 88 for the LSB positions, and 8 for the Indigenous position. • Increased attendance at UBC recruitment events resulted in the number of applications from that university going up to 41 this year from 15 last year. UVic numbers decreased slightly, from 48 last year to 42 this year. • s.22 hire has been randomly selected for audit by the Merit Commissioner. Box of documents for 2009-10 hiring process delivered to Janet Labh, the point of contact for the ministry, on March 13th. 	<p>MONICA</p>
---	---------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kimberly Henders-Miller has resigned from committee. Pinder Cheema is taking her place. Thanks to Kimberly for all her hard work on the committee and for her contributions to the articling program. • Thanks to Dawn for working on the policies. We should have something for our next meeting if there will be significant changes in the policies. • Some of the feedback from the conflict checks has been overly broad and we have revised our process accordingly. Conflict checks must be done within 2 weeks of a student's start at LSB. • s.22 will both be called in May, 2009 and they are looking for employment at LSB Victoria. 	<p>BRYANT & BARBARA</p>
---	--

4. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barbara will work with Trish Kumpf to put together a panel to review the Indigenous applications. Applicants will have separate interviews for each position they are short listed for. CJB summer student selection completed. 41 applications received, three dropped out in the initial round. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> s.3 They have 1.25 hours after receiving the questions to submit their answers. A panel of three reviewed them; 14 telephone interviews granted. The same panel screens and interviews. During telephone interviews applicants are asked s.3 questions and one question regarding s.3 They have 15 minutes to review the questions and prepare the responses; interviews are up to 45 minutes long. We give a grade for marks, but end up with higher grades because we don't start going down by 2 in the Bs as LSB does. We did reference checks on top applicants. We offered five summer student positions to the people in the order in which they ranked. Process for the Articling Students is much the same. 95 applications this year, which is more than double what we had last year. So far 79 have signed up for written interviews. The top 15-20 will be interviewed, either in person or by video. The same panel does the written interviews as the telephone interviews but it is a different panel than for the summer students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will assess all applicants, and make a decision next year whether or not to screen out on the basis of marks. We came up with 8 different questions, 2 for each of the written portions and 2 for each of the final questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oleh will email Monica the questions for inclusion in our binder containing historical applications. At Livia's request, Oleh will provide us with an estimate of hours spent so that we can compare to LSB hours spent. <p>Discussion re: Grade Cut-off, and why we used the grading scale we did. Will be reviewed towards the end of the year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreed that 13 will be the grade cut-off for this year's selection panel. Will decide by email how many people to interview, and will take steps to sure that LSB and CJB interview processes are coordinated. 	<p>BARBARA & BRYANT</p> <p>OLEH</p> <p>BARBARA</p>
---	--

5. REPORTS FROM CROWN COUNSEL OFFICE AND CJB -- OLEH KUZMA, Q.C.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Articling Students, including the LSB ones, are invited to the Crown Counsel conference, which is the last week of April ending on May 1st. 	<p>OLEH</p>
--	-------------

APRIL 16, 2009

Bryant Mackey – Co-Chair
Karrie Wolfe
Oleh Kuzma, Q.C. (by telephone)
Johnny Van Camp (articled student; by telephone)
Joel Oliphant

Liz King

1. REVIEW AGENDA & REVIEW MINUTES

Agenda approved. Minutes of March 19, 2009 adopted as written.	ALL
--	-----

2. REPORT FROM ARTICLING PROGRAM MANAGER – MONICA HAMMOND

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews of 23 shortlisted candidates over 4.5 day period in early May, plus one day for the Indigenous position the following week. • Tara Callan will be hosting five or six University of Calgary students at the Vancouver office on April 29th. • Kathleen Reilly's email read – was unable to attend today, but this would have been her last meeting as her student is finishing. Expressed thanks and appreciation to co-chairs and committee. 	<p>MONICA</p>
--	---------------

3. REPORT FROM THE CO-CHAIRS – BRYANT MACKEY & BARBARA CARMICHAEL

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three students finishing mid-May. s.22 going to private practice in Kelowna; s.22 most likely to be working with Civil Litigation group; and s.3 still looking for work, preferably in Vancouver but will go where the job is. • s.22 started his articles this week – with Revenue and Taxation group now, going to May PLTC session – Tim Leadem is his principal. • s.22 starts articles next Wednesday (April 22nd). Only LSB student here during May PLTC session. • Trish Kumpf no longer able to participate as Indigenous liaison for committee. 	BARBARA BRYANT
---	---

4. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline of shortlisting process. • Issue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few candidates not shortlisted contacted us to find out why. All of these were screened out based on grades, and all are policy analysts working in the Sussex Building. Work experience not taken into account. • One suggested taking a "backdoor route" to get into LSB, by articling elsewhere and then applying for LSB. 	<p>BRYANT</p>
--	---------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General discussion about three issues – two brought forward by Pinder, one by Barbara: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is the process for selecting whose application gets reviewed? 2) What value should be placed on work experience versus grades? 3) How do we respond to requests from students outside LSB and CJB who want to rotate through LSB? Bring discussion forward to committee meeting in October or November, before next application process begins. [Full discussion transcribed, to be brought to that meeting.] Interviews for CJB and LSB articles to be held week of May 4, 2009. Reference checks the following week. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-5 applicants will be interviewed by both CJB and LSB. If any of those applicants successful in both interviews, will be presented with dual job offers. Interviews for LSB Indigenous position to be held May 14, 2009. Five of eight applicants to be interviewed; clear distinction between top five and bottom three. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barbara Carmichael, Johnny Van Camp and Karrie Wolfe will be interview panel. 	ALL
	BARBARA

5. REPORTS FROM CROWN COUNSEL OFFICE AND CJB – OLEH KUZMA, Q.C., PINDER CHEEMA, Q.C.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CJB will conduct 20 interviews for 6 positions during week of May 4, 2009. No students currently doing Crown rotation. 	OLEH
	PINDER

6. REPORT FROM ARTICLED STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE – JOHNNY VAN CAMP

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three students finishing articles in May – s.22 looking for jobs.. s.22 s.22 has started his articles. All students going to Crown Counsel Conference last week of April. s.22 at private bar rotation at Quadra Legal Centre – great experience – firm very accommodating. All students except s.22 at May PLTC session. Indigenous shortlisting process difficult, but good. Great opportunity. Thanks to the committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interesting to see applicants' critical perceptions of judgments and the engagement of aboriginal students with the state. Will continue to assist aboriginal students, including helping them prepare for their interviews (what to read up on). 	JOHNNY
---	--------

7. SMALL CLAIMS PROGRAM REPORT – BARBARA CARMICHAEL

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lots going on with small claims files - Trish Van Winkle, Tammy Fritz and Barbara handling most of the work, as students otherwise engaged. 	BARBARA
---	---------

8. REPORT FROM KARRIE WOLFE – IN-HOUSE CLEs FOR STUDENTS

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• CLE by George Copley, Q.C. on April 14, 2009 was excellent and well-attended.• Difficulty getting students to attend by telephone – so far no one's dialled in to any of the sessions. Considering moving time for fall sessions to 12:30-1:30 to see if that helps.• Next CLE will be on electronic documents, presented by Jonathan Penner. No more after that until August, due to PLTC.• Fall sessions now lined up until November.	KARRIE
--	--------

9. IN-CAMERA: 10:50

NEXT MEETING DATE: MAY 21, 2009 – BOARDROOM 214 – TIME: 10:00 – 12:00

Minutes prepared by: Monica Hammond

cc: Articling Student Committee
Principals
Students
ADAG

Grade cut-off discussion April 16, 2009

- Barbara: I think we should use 13 for the grade cut-off this year – not a huge cut from last year. If that means we look at 67 applications this year and everyone that gets an interview is in the top 50, maybe next year we want to put the grade cut-off a little bit higher.
- Pamela: I would suggest a grade cut-off for next year of 14.
- Bryant: The grade cut-off is fairly fluid. It may be 13 under our scale this year and next year it might be 15 or 12 depending on who applies.
- Barbara: If we only had 50 applicants, everyone would get an interview.
- Dawn: We might not cut anybody out.
- Bryant: I think it is meant to be more efficient – a little bit of a reward for those students who have performed better. Not just because we are looking for grades, but think of it almost in the off-set context - if there are 100 people applying and we take the top 67, that means you are in the bottom third and our experience demonstrates that rarely, if ever, has someone in the bottom third, in the grades calculation, ever been hired. It's not an issue where we will never hire someone with those grades, it's just a matter of managing this year's numbers and circumstances where we have a heck of a lot of applications. And we're hoping out of the 67 we get, we'll be able to come up with 23 interviews.
- Oleh: Why was this particular grading scale used – 20, 19, 18 and then you start dropping by two's rather than 1's.
- Barbara: I think it just was the way it was designed. I don't think it really matters because of the weighted average, so, if you drop by one, drop by two or drop by three, everyone is going to rank the same way. The numbers will be a little bit different but the top 67 people will still be the top 67.
- Oleh: I have concerns about [selection? *tape unclear*] on the basis of grades. Let me just give you an example: A lady who applied to us for an articling position, according to your calculations would be cut-off. She failed one course, got one 1 C+ and the rest are in the B range. Her ranking based on your scale is 12.4. We used a different scale for our summer students basically dropping down by 1 mark at a time, so you get 20 – A+, 19 – A, dropping to 12 for C- as opposed to 8 on your scale. Based on the way we graded, she got 14.6, on your grade system she would get 12.6 and wouldn't get an interview. On our systems, she did exceptionally well and in fact was one of the top five that were given a summer student position. I'm using her as an example because it demonstrates the caution you've

got to use. She comes from USask, so I don't know if that makes a difference or not.

Barbara: Interesting point, Oleh. We've done an analysis of the last two or three years to see if we were missing people like that. We are trying to balance the efficiency and didn't have anyone like that over the time that we looked at. No one from USask applied for an LSB job, so we wouldn't be overlooking her because she didn't apply.

Oleh: But we also have another example: a woman we hired last year as a summer student. I don't think she applied for an LSB position, but based on the way you grade your applications, she was about 60th on the list and, just by chance, because of mistakes made, she was given an interview and ended up, not only with a summer student position, but with an articling position with us this year and she easily would have been in the top five candidates.

Livia: I'm looking at it from the numbers side because years ago, we sometimes got over 100 applications, but they were for 5 spots and I think at that time we were interviewing 10 persons for each position. We often interviewed 40-50 people. So I am thinking for many more positions, 13 positions, if we interviewed 5 per, that would be 65 interviews. I'm looking at it historically. We got 88 applications this year and we have had as many as 120.

Barbara: It was a two-stage process. Your application was marked and they did some culling based on your application and your transcript and your case summary. Then they sent teams of two to UBC and UVic and I think they did the rest of the interviews by phone. They were short interviews: "Why do you want to work for the MAG", "Tell us something about yourself" and there were set questions. Those were marked and then based on that cut-off, 15 people were brought in for the formal interview like we do now for five positions.

Then it was decided to take out that first interview step for budgetary reasons. They added about five extra interviews to make up for that. So they used to have everything we have plus another interview set. The feedback we got from the PSA was that we need to do something to limit the amount of resources we are using to review the applications.

Richard Fyfe wants us to investigate whether or not we can get the same quality of students using fewer resources and that is why we decided to try this grade cut-off. It may be that someone has fallen through the cracks but given how we weigh our entire interview package and how it's worked in the past, those people in the bottom third based on grades are not making it to the interview stage in any event. But I think we will need to

re-assess again after this year and perhaps make more changes or different changes next year.

Bryant: I wanted to add this bit of information about where you will see really low grades, like USask for instance. It seems that schools that suffer a tremendous loss of students to second year transfers are the schools that grade brutally low. I realize that that is simply anecdotal, but there are a number of law schools in Canada that on a regular basis lose ten out of twenty of their first-year students to McGill, U of Toronto or another school.

Historically these schools have found it hard to retain students. The sense is that these schools that grade very hard to try to create an equilibrium within the school. But they make it very hard for that student to transfer to another Canadian law school, because that law school looks at the first-year grades and says, "well, you came here based on your grades and you're our poorest student. . ." without appreciating the differences there. So I don't know if that information can be useful or of any interest to anyone but it certainly seems that a specific number of schools grade particularly hard, especially in the first year.

Dawn: Are they willing to disclose whether they curve on C, or B, or whatever?

Bryant: Well that's another issue because Canadian law schools curve C+ to a B+.

Dawn: Exactly, and if we knew what they did, that would help us.

Barbara: Manitoba sends a letter out attached to the official transcript saying "we grade on this curve, our grades are lower than most other Canadian universities." So we keep that in mind when we are assessing students.

Dawn: I'm just wondering if this is something we are going to do – if we shouldn't only be cutting when we know what the grade curve is. We can find out, at least for the Canadian universities, what their scale is and then we can adjust our thinking to that. I don't think we can find out from Vienna for example. Maybe we shouldn't be screening out people where we have no knowledge of their university's curve, and we should be using the other factors more.

Barbara: How could we come up with a scale that factors in a student's school's curve?

Dawn: We would have to do independent scales and get different numbering.

Barbara: That's going to increase the resources.

Dawn: It's going to increase the math at the front end. It's not going to increase the other resources. We find out what a university scores on and we adjust our scale for the students that applied from there. I have no problem cutting off at 13, but I think there are ways to ensure that we weren't letting people fall through the cracks because they went to USask. I am quite sure that great people fall through the cracks every year.

Barbara: Another thing we have to consider is that some people are applying after having done second year, so they only have their first year marks and one semester of second year. Other people are applying with full sets of marks.

So are we going to look at whether or not some schools, like USask, mark harder in first year and second year? And how do we assess people that only have a few grades versus a full transcript? There are a lot of things that we can look at for considering for next year.

Dawn: And right now we are just trying to do a test, right?

Bryant: Strangely, it may be easier to find out how Australia's marking is or what the equivalencies are, than it might be for Canadian universities, unless those schools are willing to disclose that they're marking their students pretty hard. Many of those international schools are quite accustomed to providing North American institutions with grade equivalents, because the students are in an international community. It may be that Canadian schools aren't so comfortable with saying "yeah, we grade pretty darn hard."

Dawn: Well when you say UVic's on B+, it's almost like everyone is getting a ribbon.

Livia: There are so many variables, that I think in the end, we just have to do something that makes sense.

Barbara: We should bring forward this issue for next year, when we will consider some of the comments of Oleh and Dawn about whether we are going to continue to screen by grades and how we're going to do that.

If we are factoring in some of the law schools' individual curves, that also will affect how we market the short-listing. If we say that we have a low B cut-off, that may not be true depending on your school. I just want to flag that and BF that for maybe next December, when we are looking at how we are going to be evaluating our process next year.

6. REPORT FROM ARTICLED STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE – MARGO FOSTER

➤ Students are watching closely for positions.	
--	--

7. SMALL CLAIMS PROGRAM

➤ Nothing to Report.	
----------------------	--

8. STUDENT IN-HOUSE CLES – KARRIE WOLFE

➤ April 14, 2011 CLE Lunch and Learn is with Kim MacKenzie from the Ministry of Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation. The presentation will be "Behind the Treaty Process in BC".	
--	--

9. IN-CAMERA: 11:30

NEXT MEETING DATE: APRIL 7, 2011 – BOARDROOM 214 – TIME: 10:00 – 12:00

Minutes prepared by: Cathie Moss

cc: Articling Student Committee
Principals
Students
ADAG

Not Responsive

From: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 11:25 AM
To: King, Liz AG:EX
Subject: RE: The screening process for the 2010 articling interviews

Not at all!

I'm willing to go through this whole process if it turns out that's what's necessary to get great students, but if we can get the same quality, or even better, with less effort, that would be a huge bonus!

Barbara Carmichael
Barrister & Solicitor
Legal Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
4th floor – 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, BC V8W 9J7
(250) 356-8817

From: King, Liz AG:EX
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 11:21 AM
To: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX
Subject: RE: The screening process for the 2010 articling interviews

I agree with you that the students we have selected have been first rate and I hope my comments will not be taken to imply that I am in anyway dissatisfied with them.

Elizabeth King
Senior Legislative Counsel
Legislative Counsel Office
Liz.King@gov.bc.ca
Tel: (250) 356-5753
Fax: (250) 356-5758

This message, including any attachments to it, is confidential and subject to solicitor client privilege. In keeping with the Standards of Conduct of Public Service Employees, it is not to be disclosed outside of the provincial government without prior written approval from the Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Attorney General. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately and do not copy or disclose the contents of this message to any other person.

From: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 11:19 AM
To: King, Liz AG:EX
Subject: RE: The screening process for the 2010 articling interviews

Same to you! I really enjoyed working with you and Peter and thought your perspective and contributions were invaluable.

And I really appreciate the email you sent. We'll review the hiring process again next fall and having concrete suggestions like yours will be very helpful. We feel that we have done fairly well in selecting top quality students in the past, but are always looking to see if there are ways to improve and reduce the time required for the shortlisting.

Barbara Carmichael
Barrister & Solicitor
Legal Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
4th floor – 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, BC V8W 9J7
(250) 356-8817

From: King, Liz AG:EX
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 11:15 AM
To: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX
Subject: RE: The screening process for the 2010 articling interviews

Thanks Barb.

I did not want to "go over the top" in the memo and say what a good time we had – but I can say to you and Peter, that I really enjoyed the time we worked on the Panel. Also, it was very helpful to have your and Peter's expertise.

Elizabeth King
Senior Legislative Counsel
Legislative Counsel Office
Liz.King@gov.bc.ca
Tel: (250) 356-5753
Fax: (250) 356-5758

This message, including any attachments to it, is confidential and subject to solicitor client privilege. In keeping with the Standards of Conduct of Public Service Employees, it is not to be disclosed outside of the provincial government without prior written approval from the Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Attorney General. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately and do not copy or disclose the contents of this message to any other person.

From: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 11:13 AM
To: King, Liz AG:EX
Cc: Downing, Ken AG:EX; Leroy, Dawn AG:EX; Ameeralli, Peter AG:EX; Verhulst, Sherie AG:EX; Leslie, Susan K AG:EX; Hammond, Monica M AG:EX; Mackey, Bryant AG:EX
Subject: RE: The screening process for the 2010 articling interviews

Liz,

Thanks very much for both the time you spent on the shortlisting panel and the time you have taken to provide these comments. Feedback from panel members is valuable and appreciated.

I have copied Monica Hammond with this email and am asking her to save these comments and bring them forward to the Articling Committee for consideration when the hiring process comes up for its next annual review.

Thanks again,

Barbara

Barbara Carmichael
Barrister & Solicitor
Legal Services Branch
Ministry of Attorney General
4th floor – 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, BC V8W 9J7
(250) 356-8817

From: King, Liz AG:EX
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2010 11:00 AM
To: Carmichael, Barbara AG:EX; Mackey, Bryant AG:EX
Cc: Downing, Ken AG:EX; Leroy, Dawn AG:EX; Ameerall, Peter AG:EX; Verhulst, Sherie AG:EX; Leslie, Susan K AG:EX
Subject: The screening process for the 2010 articling interviews

Hello ,

I wanted to pass on my thoughts about the screening process that Barb, Peter and I completed last month. I have attached the application form for easy reference.

<< Message: RE: E-copy of articulated student application form >>

I sat on the panel with Barb Carmichael and Peter Ameerall (the "Panel") to determine which applicants would be granted articling interviews in the spring of 2010.

My comments and recommendations have nothing to do with the approach taken by Barb or Peter. I felt the panel members approached the allocation of points for applicants in a similar way and in a manner that was as equitable and objective as possible. My comments are not a criticism of how the members of the Panel implemented the process. Rather I am suggesting that the process itself should be reviewed and in my view modified somewhat.

When we say that we want to hire the best articling students for LSB, I assume we want to hire persons who have demonstrated that they were academically able law students, and are persons who think critically and analytically, who write and speak clearly and who have demonstrated the ability to work effectively with others.

I am not sure the current process achieves that goal. It is hard to defend the process the Panel followed because of the subjectivity of certain parts and the lack of clarity in some of the requests to which the applicants were required to respond. As well, the amount of time spent by the members of the Panel could be reduced.

I don't believe the current process will achieve that goal because of Part A and to a lesser degree the relationship between Part A and Part D. The inherent problem is the inability to mark these provisions in a way that is not subjective. At the end of the process, I found it hard to justify some of my decisions. As well, certain applicants were clearly confused as to what they should put in Part A and whether they could rely on the reviewers to examine their resume (Part D).

For easy reference I have attached the application form we used this year. It is quite similar to the application used in prior years. You will note that it includes 5 parts. These parts are as follows:

1. PART A –community and law school involvement and personal achievements- 20 points
2. PART B –written assignment – 15 points
3. PART C –law school marks - 20 points
4. PART D – work experience -10 points
5. PART E-overall presentation - 5 points

PART A – Community and Law School Involvement and Achievements

Although I think there is a benefit in requiring that a two page CV be attached, the danger of including Part A is that we will hire an articling student on the basis of how effective the applicant is at “spinning” his or her achievements. The range of achievements for which we have awarded marks includes, but is not limited to, the applicant overcoming prior difficult events in his or her life - poverty, health issues, etc., fluency in languages in addition to English, travel, volunteer work, significant involvement in sports, awards, including law school awards, and being a parent while attending law school.

I have the following concerns respecting this portion of the application:

1. This question may well affect who we interview for articles. It is worth 20 points and the range of points awarded for this part of the application varied widely. If the range of points awarded for law school marks varies by 4 or 5 points, those selected to be interviewed must do relatively well in Part A in order to get an interview. Although law school marks determine whether LSB will even look at an application (i.e. the applicant must have an average above the cut off), once you have met this threshold, it is not law school marks that have the greatest weight in determining if you get an interview.
2. I don't agree with the assumption that applicants who have had the greatest opportunity to travel, learn languages, engage in sports etc will be better articling students. Will an applicant who knows three languages be a better articulated student than a person who only, for example, speaks and writes English well?
3. By including Part A we are in fact rewarding the applicants who have had greater opportunities. We are also rewarding applicants who are willing to talk about very personal issues in their past. Finally, applicants can list many volunteer activities without the Panel checking the veracity of those statements or assessing the hours and effort spent by the applicant.
4. Applicants frequently did not respond to this question in a way that allowed them to get as many points as they might. An applicant may have included 1/2 of a page setting out his or her employment history. This information was not counted in both Part A and Part D. You can only get points once for this information. However, applicants were given some points when the benefit of the work experience was connected to the type of work done at the Ministry of Attorney General. Although I can see the logic of this approach, it does mean that applicants who were unaware of this would lose marks. As well, some applicants did not refer to their awards and prizes in part A and they may have assumed that as their resume was attached, we would examine that document to assess this. If the paragraph did not reference prizes how does one include additional marks for awards set out in the resume?

One can always say that such choices aided us in determining if applicants can follow instructions and that is true to an extent. However, this response assumes that applicants are aware of government processes. By asking applicants to append their resume they could easily assume that the whole of the resume would be considered in assessing an applicant. That is what the whole of the world outside of government would normally do.

Part A is very difficult to mark because it is so subjective. Should a mark be given for each organization or club in which an applicant has participated or should different marks be given if the organization is related to the type of work at LSB? Should more points be given for being on the executive of a volunteer group? How does one compare overcoming cancer while at law school with having a baby while at law school? Is participation in 5 clubs equal to establishing and running a successful company? The list of problematic questions goes on and on.

In my view this part of the process should be as objective as possible. The interview stage of this process will necessarily be more subjective.

Therefore I recommend that Part A be deleted or replaced with a written legal question to which an applicant must respond within a short time period.

Part B – Written Assessment

Although I think the inclusion of the questions in Part B are critical to the process, Part B could be structured in a way that allows the answers to these questions to be assessed in a more efficient way and in a manner that permits a more accurate comparison between applicants.

s.3

Again, marking is more subjective than it needs to be; you are not able to compare applicant A to applicant B, C, etc. because no one else chose the same case as applicant A.

s.3

First, I don't have the expertise to assess the judge an answer based on opinion seems unfair and lacking the appropriate analytical precision. I think the question should be more specifically worded so that it is clear we want the applicant As I assume we only want to assess an applicant's ability to set out the should clarify this.

s.3

I do have views, but to

s.3

s.3

the question

With respect to Part B. I would suggest that the committee designing the application

s.3

s.3

This would be a guideline to the panel members and not a rule respecting awarding points for an answer.

My aim in the above suggestion is to promote greater objectivity in marking. We would be comparing many answers for knowledge. As a result, I think our grading would be more defensible.

s.3

would allow the answers to be assessed from a source with greater

This type of question is very useful in my view and it should be retained and perhaps be marked out of 20 rather than 15.

PART C – Marks

No comments.

PART D – Work Experience

Again the issue is how to rank work experience. As with part A, it is not clear how many points to award for each type of job. One can likely agree that working as a lawyer in another jurisdiction should be graded as a 10. However, is performing more demanding jobs over time in a retail company worth less or more points than being a policy analyst in another jurisdiction. I don't know.

In spite of my concerns about how to award points for Part D, I think the resume should continue to be requested but 10 points should be awarded for all matters in the resume. Applicants should be told the maximum number of points that

would be awarded for time spent in volunteer activities, hobbies and development of skills such as playing a musical instrument, work history and awards. It might be 4 for work history, 3 for awards and 4 for volunteer activities, hobbies, sports etc.

PART E –

I feel that this part should remain and I have no additional comments concerning this part.

AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT BY THE PANEL

The selection of articling students is one of the more important tasks undertaken by any lawyer in LSB. Adequate time should be spent in order to do this fairly and well. It is my view that the time spent could be reduced without harming either the adequacy of the process or the selection of excellent applicants.

Each of the 3 lawyers on the Panel spent approximately 5 days reviewing, considering and discussing applications and marks to be given for each application. The time spent was reduced (to 5 days) by the imposition of a required minimum law school average mark for, a person to be included in the group of applicants whose applications were reviewed by the Panel.

I think setting this minimum average mark is an excellent idea and should be applied in each year where the number of applications exceeds the number that we reviewed this year. Before the imposition of a minimum average there were over 200 applications that the Panel would have had to review. That number is too large to permit a complete and thoughtful review; the amount of time that each of the panel member has available is limited.

As well, the suggested changes in approach would likely decrease the time spent in this process.

Conclusions

1. s.3
2. s.3
3. Keep PART C – no change. If the number of applicants makes it necessary, reduce the number of applications reviewed by the panel based on the law school grades of the applicants.
4. Keep PART D but clarify the marks that will be awarded for each category of matters set out in the CV.
5. Keep PART E – no change.

I hope you find these comments useful. I discussed my concerns with Susan Leslie and Sherie Verhulst, both of whom sat on the application review panel in prior years. They told me that they had similar concerns and agree generally with the suggested changes that I have proposed.

Elizabeth King
Senior Legislative Counsel
Legislative Counsel Office
Liz.King@gov.bc.ca
Tel: (250) 356-5753
Fax: (250) 356-5758

This message, including any attachments to it, is confidential and subject to solicitor client privilege. In keeping with the Standards of Conduct of Public Service Employees, it is not to be disclosed outside of the provincial government without

prior written approval from the Legal Services Branch, Ministry of Attorney General. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me immediately and do not copy or disclose the contents of this message to any other person.