

Name: Daniel Quick

I support the proposal and the additional language regarding identification of counsel falling under this new sentence which will be in language suggested by the SBM. I understand that this proposal is designed to address access to justice issues under the assumption that law school clinical programs generally address underserved portions of our population. However, that is not necessarily the case; one could imagine (and there may well be) clinical programs at some schools which are focused purely on political issues. Is it prudent to allow out of state attorneys a free pass to practice in Michigan with their clinical students to advocate for issues outside of traditional access to justice areas? I am unsure but suggest this be considered by the Court.