

Rubric Form for Entity Regulation Pilot Project

Purpose Statement

The following rubric and supporting materials are designed to provide structure and consistency in how WSBA staff and the Practice of Law Board (POLB) evaluate applications to participate in the Entity Regulation Pilot Project.

- WSBA staff will use the rubric for the initial review of each application to ensure all required materials are complete, threshold protections for consumers are in place, and the application is ready for Board consideration.
- The POLB will then use the same framework to guide its qualitative evaluation and discussion, drawing on the staff review and the applicant's materials to make a holistic assessment and well-reasoned recommendation.

The rubric is not intended to produce an aggregate score or automatic outcome. Instead, it provides a consistent reference for identifying strengths, gaps, and areas requiring clarification. Ratings and notes will inform, but not determine, the final judgment. The intent is to make the process transparent, coherent, and repeatable, while still allowing for professional discretion, continuous learning, and refinement as the Pilot Project evolves.

This approach supports the Supreme Court's direction that the Pilot Project advance access to justice through innovation, while maintaining consumer protection and ongoing monitoring. By documenting how each decision is reached and by revisiting the rubric periodically, WSBA staff and the POLB can ensure that both the evaluation process and the underlying standards improve over time.

Rating System

Each criterion will be rated as Sufficient, Needs More Info, or Insufficient:

- Sufficient – response adequate for participation in the pilot project
- Needs More Info – additional information needed to make an informed assessment
- Insufficient – response is inadequate and/or weighs against participation in the pilot project

Include any comments about the reasons for the rating of a criterion, or any additional information needed, in the Notes section. If a rating on a particular criterion adversely affects the application to the point that it could possibly disqualify the application, check the box for PDQ (possible disqualification).

Entity: _____

Compliance Officer: _____

Criteria

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Compliance Officer Qualification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Individual is a lawyer or other suitable individual within the entity and demonstrates adequate compliance and/or law firm management experience.<input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Individual is a lawyer or other suitable individual within the entity but need better demonstration of experience.<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Individual is not authorized to practice law or is not a suitable individual within the entity or lacks requisite compliance experience.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PDQ</p>	
<p>Background Check</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> No issues discovered.<input type="checkbox"/> Issues reviewed by counsel; no further action needed.<input type="checkbox"/> Issues reviewed by counsel; referral to POLB.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PDQ</p>	
<p>PROPOSED SERVICE MODEL SECTION</p> <p>Service Model Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Service model is described in detail, provides full description of appropriate legal services, and clear understanding of how the services will be provided to consumers.<input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Service model is described, but lacks adequate details in some areas.<input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Service model is unclear or inadequately described.	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PDQ</p>	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Supervision of Legal Professionals and Technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Clear description of supervision methods for legal professionals and technology. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Supervision methods are mentioned but not clearly described. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Supervision methods are unclear or not described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Consumer Accessibility (there are two sections: How Entity Provides Access and How Consumers Access)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive plan for consumer access. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Plan for consumer access is described but lacks some details. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Consumer access is mentioned but not fully detailed or unclear. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Fee Structures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Fee structures are appropriate for service model. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Unclear how fee structures are appropriate to service model or how client funds will be safeguarded. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Fee structures do not appear appropriate for service model. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>REGULATORY REFORM SECTION: HYPOTHESIS AND DEMONSTRATION</p> <p>Rules and Laws: Identification, Modification, and Exemption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Appears all relevant rules and laws have been identified with clear, full explanations for the modification or exemption. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Additional rules or laws might need to be included or additional explanation to fully understand how the selected rules or laws are relevant or why some rules or laws were not included. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Clearly one or more rules or laws are needed for operation of the service model or it is unclear how the rules or laws identified relate to the service model. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Appropriate and Reasonable Modifications and Exemptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> All modifications and exemptions appear appropriate and reasonable. <input type="checkbox"/> Concern with modifications and exemptions as noted. <input type="checkbox"/> None of the proposed modifications and exemptions appear to be appropriate or reasonable. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Enhancing Access to Affordable and Reliable Legal and Law-related Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Full explanation with clear correlation between service model and increased accessibility to legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Explanation lacks a clear correlation between service model and increased accessibility to legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Not clear how service will increase accessibility to legal services. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Framework for Data Collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Full description of a practical model for collecting and submitting data. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Identification of data to collect but lacks details for a practical plan. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Does not describe a practical plan for collection of data. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>RISK ASSESSMENT SECTION</p> <p>Entity Identified Risk 1: _____</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<p><input type="checkbox"/> PDQ</p>	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Entity Identified Risk 2: _____</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Entity Identified Risk 3: _____</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Entity Identified Risk 4: _____</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>WSBA Identified Risk 1: Inappropriate or flawed legal results</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>WSBA Identified Risk 2: Failure of consumers to exercise legal rights due to ignorance or incorrect advice</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>WSBA Identified Risk 3: Purchase of unnecessary or inappropriate legal services</p> <p>Identification of Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Potential risk to consumers is identified with detailed explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Potential risk to consumers is identified with some explanations. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: No risks to consumers are identified. <p>Risk Mitigation and Monitoring Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive and specific measures to mitigate or eliminate risk, ensuring competent and reliable legal services. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are mentioned but not fully described or possibly not adequate to mitigate risk identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no measures to mitigate or eliminate risk are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Public Protection Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive measures for public protection, including tracking harms, contingency plans, and reducing bias. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some measures for public protection are mentioned, but not fully detailed. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no measures for public protection are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Consumer Complaint Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Detailed process for receiving, reviewing, and resolving consumer complaints, including submission methods, timelines, and escalation paths. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some aspects of the consumer complaint process are mentioned, but not fully detailed. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no consumer complaint process is described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Financial Responsibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive plan demonstrating financial responsibility to compensate consumers, including insurance and financial assurances. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some aspects of financial responsibility are mentioned, but not fully detailed. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no plan for financial responsibility is described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Sharing Data to Third Parties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Detailed policies and procedures for ensuring informed consent and confidentiality, privacy, and security of client information when sharing data. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some policies and procedures for data privacy and security when sharing data are mentioned, but not fully detailed. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no policies and procedures for data privacy and security when sharing data are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
<p>Data Privacy and Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Detailed policies and procedures for ensuring confidentiality, privacy, and security of client records and information. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some policies and procedures for data privacy and security are mentioned, but not fully detailed. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no policies and procedures for data privacy and security are described. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Conflicts of Interest</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Detailed policies and procedures for identifying, managing, and avoiding conflicts of interest. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some policies and procedures for conflicts but lacks details. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no policies and procedures for conflicts of interest. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Prioritizing Best Interest of Client</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Comprehensive policies and procedures for ensuring prioritization of client's best interests. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Some policies or procedures are mentioned, but not fully detailed. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Few or no policies or procedures related to prioritizing best interests of client. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	
<p>Waiver of Rights as Condition of Service (if waiver exists)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient: Clearly identifies rights consumers will waive and full explanation of implications those waivers have on the rules of professional conduct. <input type="checkbox"/> Needs More Info: Identification of waivers with some explanation of implications on rules of professional conduct. <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient: Little or no explanation of implications waivers have on rules of professional conduct. 	<input type="checkbox"/> PDQ	

Criteria & Rating	Possible DisQual	Notes
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS		
RECOMMENDATION <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Recommend		

January 21, 2026

The Honorable Debra L. Stephens
Chief Justice
Washington Supreme Court

Via Email Only

Re: Entity Regulation Pilot Project – Update

Dear Chief Justice Stephens:

On December 5, 2024, the Court ordered the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) and the Practice of Law Board (Board) to collaborate to implement and oversee a pilot to test entity regulation. On behalf of the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) and the Practice of Law Board (Board), we write to update the Court regarding the WSBA and the Board's work to that end.

Applications and Application Review

To date, one entity has submitted an application to participate in the pilot project. The review process includes review by WSBA staff, a background investigation, review by a subcommittee of the Practice of Law Board which includes an interview with the compliance officer, and, finally, review by the full Practice of Law Board which will make a recommendation to the Court. To assist the WSBA and the Board with reviewing an application, we have developed an assessment rubric to ensure applications comply with all requirements and standards. We anticipate sending a recommendation on the first application to the Court in late February.

Data and Compliance Reporting

The WSBA is currently in the process of finalizing requirements for an online entity reporting portal. Entities will be able to login and enter data and compliance information on a periodic basis as required by the Court's order authorizing the pilot project.

IOLTA

One of the requirements of the pilot project is to hold client funds in a trust account. For entities which might not have a lawyer or LLLT directly involved in the provision of legal services, we have worked with the Legal Foundation of Washington to develop a process for requesting an IOLTA



Chief Justice Stephens

January 21, 2026

Page 2

account. The IOLTA request form entities can present to their banks is now available online with the Legal Foundation of Washington.

Communication and Outreach

The WSBA and the Board continue outreach efforts to increase awareness of and garner interest in the pilot project. To that end, we are developing a standard PowerPoint presentation describing the reasons for the pilot project, the pilot's goals, and how to participate in the pilot project. The idea is to provide a tool for individuals to be able to easily and competently talk about the pilot project with groups with which they are associated.

We thank the Court for its engagement and time. The WSBA and the Board will continue regular updates to the Court during implementation and launch of the Pilot Project. We welcome any questions the Court may have.

Sincerely,

Terra Nevitt
WSBA Executive Director

Lesli Ashley
Chair, Practice of Law Board

2026 UPL Complaints

Received: 18

Referred: 10

UPL #	Date of Complaint	Complainant Occupation	Respondent Occupation	UPL Complaint	Brief Summary	Referred
25-27	10/2/2025	Attorney	Out-of-state attorney	Legal advice, legal documents, legal services	Respondent sent legal documents to Complainant's client but is not authorized to practice law in Washington	Yes
25-28	10/10/2025	Individual	Individual	legal advice, legal documents	The Complainant alleges that the Respondent, who is the Complainant's husband's girlfriend, has been completing legal paperwork and attending court proceedings related to a Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO), as well as preparing dissolution of marriage documents. The complainant further states that a judge has previously warned the respondent not to assist with legal documentation.	No
25-29	10/13/2025	Individual	Individual	legal documents, legal services	Complainant's client paid Respondent \$2600 to assist with immigration paperwork. Respondent is not an attorney, and the forms that were filed were incorrect. The money was never returned.	Yes
25-30	10/17/2025	Individual	Individual	legal advice, legal documents, legal rights, legal services	Respondent is not a licensed attorney and Complainant alleges that Respondent is filing documents with the court and even attempted to appear in court.	Yes
25-31	10/20/2025	Individual	Paralegal	Legal advice, legal documents, legal rights	Complainant worked with Respondent at a law firm. Complainant alleges that Respondent was given duties and responsibilities that constituted the practice of law with no attorney oversight. Respondent was in charge of a team of attorneys.	Yes
25-32	10/22/2025	Individual	Individual	legal advice, legal documents	Complainant alleges that Respondent claimed to be a licensed attorney from New York and offered legal assistance during two court cases. Complainant paid Respondent \$1,000. Respondent allegedly drafted and filed legal documents. Respondent is not licensed in WA	Yes
25-33	10/31/2025	Individual	Attorney	legal advice, legal documents	Complainant alleges that Respondent was not authorized to practice law but was doing so anyway. Respondent was a Rule 9 Legal Intern and is now a licensed attorney.	No
25-35	11/12/2025	Attorney	Paralegal	legal advice, legal documents, negotiated legal rights, provided legal services	Complainant alleges Respondent is a paralegal and is representing individuals for their UM claims. Respondent has signed the letter of representation and is not working with an attorney	Yes
25-36	11/15/2025	Individual	Out-of-state attorney	legal advice, legal documents, appeared in court, legal rights, legal services	Respondent is Complainant's ex-husband's girlfriend. Complainant alleges Respondent is giving the ex-husband legal advice, as well as assisting with and filing paperwork on his behalf.	No
25-37	11/27/2025	Individual	Individual	legal documents, appeared in court, legal rights	Complainant was living with a friend and was asked to move out but refused. Respondent has Power of Attorney over the friend and is assisting with removing Complainant.	No
25-38	11/30/2025	Individual	Individual	legal advice, legal documents, legal rights, legal services	This complaint is related to 25-38. Complainant is alleging that Respondent sued Bank of America on behalf of Complainant's roommate/Respondent's client and pocketed the money. Complainant is also alleging that Respondent is acting against Complainant's roommates best interests.	No
25-39	12/2/2025	Individual	Individual	legal advice, legal documents, legal rights	Complainant is involved in a lawsuit and acting pro se. Respondent works for the court and issues documents to the Complainant.	No

2026 UPL Complaints

Received: 18

Referred: 10

UPL #	Date of Complaint	Complainant Occupation	Respondent Occupation	UPL Complaint	Brief Summary	Referred
25-40	12/15/2025	Individual	Out-of-state attorney	Legal advice, legal documents, legal services	Complainant's attorney sent a cease and desist to Respondent's wife. Respondent responded to the cease and desist but made it clear he was acting as a husband and not an attorney.	No
25-41	12/15/2025	Attorney	Corporation	legal advice, legal services	The Respondent is a corporation with "legal" in the title. Respondent claims to help people exit timeshare agreements. Complainant's client had to take out a \$16,561.00 loan with a \$5,592.68 finance charge at an APR of 19.99% just to work with Respondent. Respondent took the money but did not take any action.	Yes
25-42	12/15/2025	Individual	Out-of-state attorney	legal advice, legal documents, negotiated legal rights, offered to provide legal services	Complainant alleges that the respondent provided legal advice and direction that materially affected Washington-based legal rights and proceedings, including matters occurring while a Washington Domestic Violence Protection Order (DVPO) was in effect and involving Washington parties. No clear evidence was provided.	No
25-43	12/18/2025	Attorney	Paralegal	legal advice, legal documents	Complainant is an attorney that interviewed Respondent for a job. Respondent claimed to be a "freelance paralegal" and admitted to giving legal advice and preparing forms for pro se litigants.	Yes
26-01	1/2/2026	Attorney	Notario	legal advice, legal documents, legal services	Complainant alleges that Respondent claims to be an attorney and offered to assist a non-english speaker with an immigration case. Respondent allegedly took money and ruined an immigration case that Complainant is now trying to fix. The money paid to Respondent was never returned.	Yes
26-02	1/9/2026	Individual	Attorney - voluntarily resigned	legal advice, legal documents, legal services	Complainant is a homeowner and Respondent is an HOA Board member and on the "Legal & Rules Committee". Complainant alleges that Respondent is giving legal advice and direction regarding ongoing litigation against the Board.	Yes



PRESS, OUTREACH, & UPDATES:

January 21, 2026

PRESS (PDF in BOX)

- ❖ 2026-01-15 Managed Services Organizations vs. Alternative Business Structures
- ❖ 2025-12-29 The AI-native law firm_ regulatory innovation and ...
- ❖ 2025-12-08 So You Want to Start an Arizona Alternative Business Structure
- ❖ 2025-12-04 Litigation Funder Certum Launches MSO Aimed at Mass Tort Firms
- ❖ 2025-12-02 Wisner Baum sues to block new fees-sharing ban in CA
- ❖ 2025-11-26 Legal Futures Insurance services provider launches own law firm - Legal Futures
- ❖ 2025-11-25 Private Equity Investment in U.S. Law Firms
- ❖ 2025-11-21 From Arizona to California_ TLTF Summit..
- ❖ 2025-11-20 Law Firm 2.0: A Trillion-Dollar Market Begins to Move
- ❖ 2025-11-19 Legal Futures Aviva-backed law firm bid..
- ❖ 2025-11-14 McDermott's Outside Investor Talks Augur Big Law Transformation

ENTITY REGULATION PILOT PROJECT

- ❖ Applications Received: 1
- ❖ Authorized Entities: 0

UPCOMING MEETINGS & EVENTS

- ❖ February 18, 2026, Practice of Law Board Meeting, Zoom
- ❖ March 6-7, 2026, Board of Governors Meeting, Zoom/Grand Mound