From: Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Board  
Date: May 5, 2023  
RE: PRELIMINARY SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS TO APR 11

Executive Summary

The Mandatory Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) Board formed a workgroup comprised of Todd Alberstone, Efrem Krisher, and Asia Wright. The workgroup met four times to review and discuss potential amendments to rule 11 of the Admission and Practice Rules (APR). Following the workgroup’s extensive research, thoughtful discussions, and presentation of the suggested amendment before the MCLE Board, the MCLE Board is now soliciting feedback regarding an amendment to APR 11 as discussed below.

The MCLE Board is considering amending APR 11 to:

- require legal professionals to earn one credit per reporting period in the course subjects of both mental health ethics and technology security ethics;
- separate the course subject of equity from the general ethics and professional responsibility course subject while maintaining the requirement for legal professionals to earn one equity ethics credit per reporting period;
- reduce the number of required general ethics and professional responsibility credits from six to five; and,
- allow for additional credits earned beyond the required amount for any given reporting period in the course subjects of equity ethics, mental health ethics, and technology security ethics to count as general ethics and professional responsibility credits.

The suggested amendments do not increase the total number of credits required for a reporting period. Nor do they dilute the general ethics and professional responsibility or law and legal procedure requirements. Although the amendments reduce the general ethics requirement to five credits, they increase the total credit requirements in the area of legal ethics to eight credits, and create four distinct categories of legal ethics: (1) general ethics and professional responsibility; (2) equity ethics; (3) technology security ethics; and (4) mental health ethics. The division of legal ethics into separate categories will eliminate the current confusion between “general” ethics and “equity” ethics credits, as equity is currently a subcategory of ethics and the credits earned count toward the ethics and professional responsibility subject overall.

The suggested amendments will not place a financial burden on licensed legal professionals. In 2019, the WSBA Board of Governors passed a motion directing WSBA CLE to offer free CLEs in the topics of mental health ethics, technology security ethics, and equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law. The WSBA Board of Governors directed that
the CLEs be offered in-person and on-demand for free, addressing the concern that this requirement would pose barriers to access or a financial burden for licensed legal professionals.

These amendments would ensure lawyers, LLLTs, and LPOs focus on mental health ethics and technology security ethics topics (in addition to equity ethics topics) at least once every three years. These are serious topics that can greatly impact a licensed legal professional’s competency to practice law and, if ignored, could result in serious consequences. The proposed requirements, therefore, are directed toward the protection of clients and the public, improving legal professional competency and integrity, and, ultimately, improving the legal community as a whole.

Suggested Amendments

The MCLE Board is considering the following suggested amendments to APR 11:

APR 11
(c) Education Requirements

(1) Minimum Requirement. Each lawyer must complete 45 credits and each LLLT and LPO must complete 30 credits of approved continuing legal education by December 31 of the last year of the reporting period with the following requirements:

(i) at least 15 credits must be from attending approved courses in the subject of law and legal procedure, as defined in subsection (f)(1); and

(ii) at least six eight credits must be in ethics and professional responsibility, as defined in subsection (f)(2), with at least one credit in equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law, the topic of legal ethics which must include the following course subjects:

(A) at least five credits in general ethics and professional responsibility, as defined in subsection (f)(2);

(B) at least one credit in equity ethics, as defined in subsection (f)(8);

(C) at least one credit in technology security ethics, as defined in subsection (f)(9); and

(D) at least one credit in mental health ethics, as defined in subsection (f)(10),
(7) Carryover Credits.

If a lawyer, LLLT or LPO completes more than the required number of credits for any one reporting period, up to 15 of the excess credits, 2 of which may be ethics and professional responsibility credits, may be carried forward to the next reporting period, with the following limitations:

(A) Only two of the 15 allowed carryover credits can be in the course subject of general ethics and professional responsibility;

(B) Credits earned in the course subjects of equity ethics, mental health ethics, and technology security ethics cannot be fulfilled in whole or in part with carryover credit from a prior reporting period; and

(C) After the education requirements of subsections (c)(1)(ii)(B), (C), and (D) are met for the course subjects of equity ethics, mental health ethics, and technology security ethics, any additional credits earned for any one reporting period in these course subjects will count as general ethics and professional responsibility credits.

(f) Approved Course Subjects. Only the following subjects for courses will be approved:

(2) General ethics Ethics and professional responsibility, defined as topics relating to the general subject of professional responsibility and conduct standards for lawyers, LLLTs, LPOs, and judges, including equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law, and the risks to ethical practice associated with diagnosable mental health conditions, addictive behavior, and stress;

(8) Equity ethics, defined as subjects relating to equity, inclusion, and the mitigation of both implicit and explicit bias in the legal profession and the practice of law;

(9) Technology security ethics, defined as subjects that educate and inform lawyers, LLLTs, or LPOs about their ethical obligations and professional responsibilities under the rules of professional conduct regarding cybersecurity and the privacy and protection of electronic data and communication. This includes protection of confidential, privileged, and proprietary information; client counseling and consent; storage protection policies and protocols; risk and privacy implications; protection of escrow
(10) Mental health ethics, defined as subjects that educate and inform lawyers, LLLTs, or LPOs about their ethical obligations and professional responsibilities under the rules of professional conduct regarding mental health issues. This includes education concerning the ethical risks to the practice of law associated with, but not treatment for, substance abuse, addictive behaviors, stress management, work-life balance, anxiety disorders, depression, bipolar disorder, suicide prevention, schizophrenia, and other mental health issues.

(j) Sponsor Duties. All sponsors must comply with the following the duties unless waived by the Bar for good cause shown:

(1) The sponsor must not advertise course credit until the course is approved by the Bar but may advertise that the course credits are pending approval by the Bar after an application has been submitted. The sponsor shall communicate to the lawyer the number of credits and denominate whether the credits are “law and legal procedure” as defined under subsection (f)(1), “general ethics and professional responsibility” as defined under subsection (f)(2), “equity ethics” as defined under subsection (f)(8), “technology security ethics” as defined under subsection (f)(9), “mental health ethics” as defined under subsection (f)(10), or “other,” meaning any of the other subjects identified in subsections (f)(3)-(7).

Background

Equity Ethics Credit

The preliminary amendments remove the course subject of equity from the general ethics and professional responsibility course subject and define equity ethics as its own course subject while maintaining the current requirement for legal professionals to earn one equity ethics credit per reporting period. Additionally, the suggested amendments clarify that the equity ethics requirement needs to be met each reporting period and cannot be satisfied with carryover credit.

Technology Security Ethics Credit

The suggested amendments include a new requirement for all licensed legal professionals to complete one credit each reporting period in technology security ethics which is about the ethical obligations and professional responsibilities regarding the protection of electronic data and communication.

Legal professionals have an ethical and common law duty to take competent and reasonable measures to safeguard client information. They also have contractual and regulatory duties to protect confidential information. Rules 1.1, 1.3, and 1.4 of the Rules of Professional Conduct (RPC) address lawyers’ core
ethical duties of competence, diligence and communication with their clients. Possessing technological knowledge to safeguard client information as a fundamental requirement is explained in comment eight to RPC 1.1 which states that in order for legal professionals to, “[m]aintain the requisite knowledge and skill, a lawyer should keep abreast of changes in the law and its practices, including the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology, engage in continuing study and education and comply with all continuing legal education requirements to which the lawyer is subject.” (emphasis added) With the advent of the global pandemic and more and more legal professionals practicing “virtually,” it is imperative that lawyers, and all legal professionals, stay cognizant of their ethical responsibilities.1

A Technology Security Ethics Credit Must be Mandatory Because Lack of Knowledge in This Area Can Result in Significant Consequences to Legal Professionals and Their Clients.

With each passing year, cybercrimes become more rampant and cyber insecurity results in increasingly costly and catastrophic events. Electronic security breaches today are now so prevalent, that the question is not if, but when, it will happen. The Federal Bureau of Investigation Internet Crime Compliant Center ("IC3") received 847,376 complaints relating to extortion, identity theft, and personal data breaches representing potential losses exceeding $6.9 billion in 2021.2 The IC3 receives an average of over 2,300 cybercrime complaints each day, with over 6.5 million complaints since the IC3’s inception in 2000.3 Washington state is ranked as the 9th highest state where internet crime victims reside.4 Washington state victims reported losing $157,454,331 in 2021 as a result of internet crimes.5 In 2021, the IC3 received 19,954 compromised business email complaints resulting in adjusted losses at nearly $2.4 billion.6 The cybercrimes involved sophisticated scams targeting businesses, including law firms, and individuals, such as law firm clients, performing monetary transfers. Criminals will hack emails and spoof business representatives’ credentials to initiate fraudulent wire transfers.

Law firms are being specifically targeted. Such targeted attacks have become so frequent that the State Bar of Texas maintains an updated list on their blog notifying attorneys of recent scams.7

Additionally, back in October of 2018 the American Bar Association warned,

Data breaches and cyber threats involving or targeting lawyers and law firms are a major professional responsibility and liability threat facing the legal profession. As custodians of highly sensitive information, law firms are inviting targets for hackers. In one highly publicized incident, hackers infiltrated the computer networks at some of the country’s most well-

3 Id. at 18 n.16.
4 Id. at 26.
5 Id. at 27.
6 Id. at 3.
known law firms, likely looking for confidential information to exploit through insider trading schemes.\(^8\)

The IC3 report details a complaint filed by a victim law office in June 2021 regarding a wire transfer of more than $198,000 to a fraudulent U.S. domestic account.\(^9\) However, other law firms have reported bigger breaches with higher stakes at risk. In May of 2020, law firm hackers behind a ransomware attack on a New York celebrity law firm threatened to publish compromising information on former U.S. President Donald Trump if they did not receive their $42 million demand.\(^10\) As proof, the hackers gained access to sensitive client information and published legal contracts related to the law firm’s client, Madonna.\(^11\) The hackers also released 2.4 GB of legal data related to client Lady Gaga.\(^12\)

One in four law firms that participated in the ABA’s 2021 Legal Technology Survey reported their firms experienced a data breach at some time.\(^13\) A breach includes incidents like a lost/stolen computer or smartphone, hacker, break-in, or website exploit.\(^14\) The actual number of victim firms could be higher as the firm may have experienced a security breach and never detected it.\(^15\) The survey revealed that only 53% of law firms have a policy to manage the retention of information/data held by the firm, and only 36% of respondents have an incident response plan.\(^16\)

Law firms are not the only legal targets. In May of 2020, a ransomware attack hit Texas courts and took down the courts’ websites and case management systems for the state’s appellate and high courts.\(^17\) While there is no evidence that hackers accessed sensitive or personnel information, the hack left Texas’ top civil and criminal courts without a working case management system or internet in their offices which forced staff to put out rulings over Twitter.\(^18\)

Cybercriminals attacked our own Washington State Bar Association (“WSBA”) website, malicious code was introduced to the website targeting credit card numbers entered into the website.\(^19\) The myWSBA.org portal was taken offline in mid-November 2020, causing a major disruption for members who wanted to log into their Fastcase and Casemaker accounts, purchase a Continuing Legal Education (“CLE”) product, pay their license fee, and report Mandatory Continuing Legal Education credits.\(^20\) As a precaution, the


\(^9\) Internet Crime Complaint Center, supra note 2 at 11.
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\(^19\) E-mail from Terra Nevitt, Interim Executive Director, Wash. St. B. Ass’n, to WSBA Members (Nov. 13, 2020, 13:32 PST) (email available for records request).
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WSBA asked members who purchased a CLE product or paid their license fee at myWSBA.org during the previous year to monitor their credit card for potential fraudulent activity.\(^\text{21}\)

The fact is, anyone with a computer connected to the Internet is susceptible to a cyberattack from computer hackers who use phishing scams, spam email, instant messages and bogus websites to deliver dangerous malware to the computer.\(^\text{22}\) Once the malware program is installed on the computer, it may quietly transmit the user’s private and financial information without their knowledge.\(^\text{23}\) During the period of March 2021 to February 2022, 153 million new malware programs, including ransomware programs, were discovered.\(^\text{24}\) This is a 5% increase from the previous year.\(^\text{25}\)

Unfortunately, the learning curve is steep for users who find their computers infected.\(^\text{26}\) In 2020, almost 50% of business personal computers and 53% of personal computers that became infected experienced a second malware infection within the same year.\(^\text{27}\) Continuing education in this field is necessary given the pace of technology development. Cyberattacks that will occur in a few years’ time are not conceivable today.

**A Technology Security Ethics Credit Must be Mandatory Because Lack of Knowledge in This Area Can Result in Significant Ethical Dilemmas.**

The following are only a few examples of technology scenarios that lead to ethical pitfalls for legal professionals. CLEs on these topics can give members critical guidance that prevent negative outcomes for legal professionals and their clients.

**After A Cyber Breach**

Do firms have an ethical duty to notify their clients if a breach occurs? If so, there is a significant ethical issue not being addressed by lawyers given only 24% of the law firms nationwide reported a breach in the ABA 2021 Legal Technology Survey notified their clients of the data breach.\(^\text{28}\)

**Public Wi-fi**

It has become commonplace for lawyers to connect to public wi-fi when working in coffee shops or hotels.\(^\text{29}\) However, by doing so, the lawyer can expose confidential and privileged client information because the “packets” or pieces of information they send or receive from their devices can be intercepted and decoded.\(^\text{30}\) Additionally, lawyers may be tricked into logging on to a fake wi-fi network set up by...
cyber criminals to look like the legitimate public wi-fi network. And unknowingly, offer up their clients’ information to criminals on a platter.

**Chatbots**

Law firms are increasingly using Artificial Intelligence such as “chatbots” to deliver legal services and communicate with clients about their legal needs. As such, do legal professionals have an ethical duty to train and supervise bots? Can a legal professional or law firm be disciplined for the conduct of a chatbot? Chatbots have access to a person’s personally identifiable information and other sensitive financial and medical data. Thus, are law firms in the United States that service international corporate clients subject to the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation enacted in the European Union?

**Texting**

Legal professionals use text messages to contact prospective clients. If RPC 7.3 prohibits lawyers from directly soliciting prospective clients using real-time electronic contact, do text messages constitute real-time electronic contact? If not, must the texts follow Rule 7.2, which requires communications to include the name and office address of at least one lawyer responsible for its content?

Legal professionals also use texting to communicate with existing clients. The use of text messages raises concerns whether and how confidentiality can be maintained in these communications and what steps a legal professional should take to ensure client information is protected. At a minimum, is the legal professional aware that others may have access to the client’s mobile device? Additionally, text messages are not kept by the cellular provider indefinitely for future reference. Therefore, do legal professionals need to transfer and backup text messages from their mobile phones to their computers?

**Use of Unencrypted Email**

The use of unencrypted email to communicate with clients is generally accepted. However, the American Bar Association warns,
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professionals must, on a case-by-case basis, constantly analyze how they communicate electronically about client matters, applying the Comment [18] factors to determine what effort is reasonable.39

**A Technology Security Ethics Credit Must be Mandatory Because Members Are Not Fulfilling Their Responsibilities of Competence and Diligence.**

Despite the duty to keep abreast of the risks associated with relevant technology and that legal professionals increasingly use technology in their practice, most legal professionals lack training and experience in technology security to recognize and prevent a cyber-attack. Long gone are the days of the clearly dodgy email from a Nigerian prince in need, now the emails look like legitimate communications from your bank, Amazon, shipping carrier, or even your friend. With phishing, vishing, smishing, pharming, and spoofing tactics continually evolving and becoming more sophisticated and harder to detect, legal professionals not keeping up with the trends are at serious risk of jeopardizing client information and funds. The following statistics are troubling:

- More than 70% of phishing emails, socially engineered fraudulent messages designed to trick a person into revealing sensitive information or deploy malicious software, are opened by their targets.40
- More than 59.4 million Americans fell victim to voice phishing, also known as “vishing” in 2021.41
- Less than 35% of the United States population can correctly define smishing, phishing scams operating through text or short message service messages.42
- Millions in the US, Europe, and the Asia-Pacific region fell victim to a sophisticated pharming scam where the attackers directed bank customers to a fake website which downloaded malware to collect banking credentials before being redirected to their bank’s real website.43
- During the first half of 2021, 62.6% of all identity deception-based attacks, or “spoofing” attacks, leveraged display name deception that impersonated a trusted individual or brand.44

Keeping clients’ information safe is no longer just about keeping hard paper copies secure. The rise of technology in the practice of law creates several risks and raises several ethical questions. The monetary and ethical risks of failing to keep up with the benefits and risks associated with technology are significant and therefore mandating continuing legal education in this area is necessary.

---

39 Id. (referring to Model Rules of Prof’n Conduct R. 1.6 cmt. 18 (2016).
44 Zaharia, supra.
Other Jurisdictions with Mandatory Technology Related Credits

By adding a required credit in technology security, Washington will join other states that recognize the necessity and value of this type of education to the legal profession. In 2023, Florida, New York, North Carolina and The U.S. Virgin Islands require or will require credits related to technology including topics related to cybersecurity.

Mental Health Ethics Credit

A Mental Health Ethics Credit Requirement Must be Mandatory Because of the Prevalence of Mental Health Issues Among Legal Professionals

The suggested amendments include a new requirement for all licensed legal professionals to complete one credit each reporting period in mental health ethics which would cover the ethical obligations and professional responsibilities under the rules of professional conduct regarding mental health issues.

Several recent studies concluded: Attorneys are prone to mental health issues, including substance abuse and addiction, depression, anxiety, and stress, more so than the general population. A nationwide study published in the Journal of Addiction Medicine in 2016 (the “ABA Study”)45, supported by the American Bar Association, studying licensed attorneys currently employed in the legal profession, who voluntarily completed surveys sent by their respective bar associations. The study found:

a. 20.6% of respondents screened positive for hazardous, harmful, and potentially alcohol-dependent drinking, as compared with 6.4% of the general US population;

b. 28% experienced symptoms of depression;

c. 19% experienced symptoms of anxiety;

d. 23% experienced symptoms of stress.

The study concluded, “attorneys experience problematic drinking that is hazardous, harmful, or otherwise consistent with alcohol use disorders at a higher rate than other professional populations.” Attorneys under 30 years old were found to be at the higher level of 32%. Further, the study found that the data underscore the need for resources devoted to address the issues of mental health and substance abuse within the legal profession, through prevention, as well as lawyers’ assistance programs and, where necessary, treatment intervention. That 2016 study cited data from a 1990 study, specific to Washington State lawyers, which found that 18% of lawyers in Washington, at that time, were “problem drinkers,” compared with an estimated 10% among American adults in the general population. The 1990 study found that 19% of Washington lawyers suffered from statistically significant elevated levels of depression, contrasted with estimated levels of depression in Western industrialized countries in the range of 3% - 9%.

https://journals.lww.com/journaladdictionmedicine/Fulltext/2016/02000/The_Prevalence_of_Substance_Use_and_Other_Mental_8.a.aspx
Similarly, a recent survey conducted by ALM Intelligence and Law.com ("ALM Study")\(^{46}\) found:

- e. 74% of respondents feel the legal profession has had a “negative impact” on their mental health;
- f. 44% use alcohol to deal with stress;
- g. 10% self-identify as having a problem with alcohol;
- h. 4% use illegal drugs or abuse prescription drugs to deal with stress;
- i. 64% feel they suffer from anxiety;
- j. 31% self-identify as depressed;
- k. 74% feel their work environment contributes negatively to their own or colleagues’ well-being;
- l. 18% have contemplated suicide at some point in their careers.

Beyond self-assessment by respondents, the ALM Study also found that 62% of respondents know a colleague who is depressed, and 50% know a colleague with an alcohol problem.

Moreover, actual and perceived stigma is a contributing factor to mental health and addiction issues in lawyers. The ALM Study found that 65% of respondents felt they could not take extended leave to tend to mental health issues, and 77% were fearful of what their employer would think if they sought treatment through an extended leave.

### Continuing Legal Education Can Assist in Ameliorating Attorney Mental Health Issues, and Therefore the Competence of Practitioners.

The need to address these issues, and to do so as early as possible, relates directly to competence and fitness to practice law. The proposal to require one hour of MCLE credit every three years is a crucial link in addressing this problem. While other elements are necessary to address the problem, including lawyers’ assistance programs, available treatment, etc., the MCLE requirement is an entry point to provide a broad base of legal professionals with the knowledge they need for self-assessment, recognizing issues in colleagues, destigmatizing the need for help, knowledge and understanding of available tools and programs, including new developments.

A typical course may include current legal requirements and standards concerning competence and mental health issues, whether in oneself or colleagues; available resources, including lawyers’ assistance programs; data concerning the prevalence of mental health issues in the profession; deeper understanding of the nature of mental health issues; tools for self-assessment; common warning signs in colleagues, and deeper understanding of causes and treatments.

The courses accredited to fulfill this requirement should not be designed nor viewed as a substitute for treatment. Nonetheless, requiring every legal professional to devote one hour every three years to education concerning these crucial issues will elevate the profession, improve the overall quality of legal services, and, ultimately, encourage greater public confidence in the integrity of the profession.

---

Moreover, this requirement may encourage members to seek the help they need, and others to be supportive of their colleagues, while maintaining standards of excellence in the practice of law.

**Other Jurisdictions with Mandatory Mental Health CLE Requirements**

In 2017 the ABA adopted the Model Rule for Minimum Continuing Legal Education and Comments (“ABA Model Rule”)\(^\text{47}\), the first such promulgation since 1988. In addition to the inclusion of a diversity and inclusion requirement, one of the main highlights was the addition of a model mental health MCLE requirement. As the ABA stated:

*The Mental Health and Substance Use Disorder Credit recognizes that requiring all lawyers to receive education about these disorders can benefit both individual lawyers and the profession. This requirement is in part a response to the 2016 landmark study conducted by the Hazelden Betty Ford Foundation and the American Bar Association Commission on Lawyer Assistance Programs, entitled, “The Prevalence of Substance Use and Other Mental Health Concerns Among American Attorneys.”*\(^\text{48}\)

At the time, only five states had any form of mental health MCLE requirement. At present, at least eight states (as well as the U.S. Virgin Islands) adopted some form of this requirement.

The clear trend is toward states and other jurisdictions adopting some form of a mandatory mental health CLE, whether as a separate requirement, or couched in terms of a “professional competence” requirement. This trend suggests the importance and value of a mandatory mental health CLE. The CLE requirement elevates the importance of mental health and self-care for legal professionals. Introducing this requirement can destigmatize mental health and promote awareness and self-care. By adding a required credit in Mental Health Ethics, Washington will join other states who recognize the necessity and value of this type of education to the legal profession.

**Conclusion**

Based on the above discussion detailing the importance of the subjects required in the potential suggested amendments, the MCLE Board is considering the above suggested amendments to APR 11. It is the belief of the Board that these requirements increase the protection of clients and the public and improve legal professional competency and integrity.

**Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential timeline for suggested amendment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{48}\) ABA Model Rule Implementation Resources, American Bar Association (February 2017), [https://www.americanbar.org/events-cle/mcle/modelrule/](https://www.americanbar.org/events-cle/mcle/modelrule/).
Reach out to stakeholders for initial feedback. Vote on opening for member and stakeholders comment period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Action Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 9, 2023</td>
<td>Vote on opening for member and stakeholders comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 16, 2023</td>
<td>MCLE Board Meeting during meeting. Hear member, public, and other stakeholder comments. Discuss feedback. Taking into consideration the feedback MCLE Board to vote on whether to make any proposed edits, and whether to proceed with suggested amendment. If proceeding, MCLE Board to nominate Board members to present to BOARD OF GOVERNORS and work on presentation materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7, 2023</td>
<td>Agenda items due. BOARD OF GOVERNORS agenda items due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 24, 2023</td>
<td>BOARD OF GOVERNORS Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 11-12, 2023</td>
<td>BOARD OF GOVERNORS Meeting. Present to WSBA BOARD OF GOVERNORS and ask for support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 18, 2023</td>
<td>MCLE Board Meeting. Discuss feedback from BOARD OF GOVERNORS and vote on whether to move forward with suggested amendment. If proceeding, MCLE Board will nominate Board members to work on GR 9 coversheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 2023</td>
<td>First draft due of GR 9 coversheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 1, 2023</td>
<td>Final draft due of GR 9 coversheet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2023</td>
<td>BOARD OF GOVERNORS Meeting Materials deadline. If needed, send materials to or present at the BOARD OF GOVERNORS meeting September 22-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2023</td>
<td><strong>Suggested Amendment Deadline</strong>. Send GR9 coversheet to Court by October 15th.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>