

WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

LICENSURE PATHWAYS IMPLEMENTATION STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Virtual Meeting

April 1, 2026

Call to Order and Welcome

The meeting of the Licensure Pathways Implementation Steering Committee of the Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) was called to order by Chair Zaida Rivera on Wednesday, April 1, 2026, at 12:00 p.m. Committee members in attendance were:

Zaida Rivera

Jordan Couch

Greg Crowder

Alfredo González Benítez

Judge Cathy Helman

Dean Tamara Lawson

Julia McGann

Terra Nevitt

Judge Leone Reinbold

Yuriko Styles

Dean Athony Varona

Also in attendance were WSBA Assistant General Counsel Catherine Schur; WSBA Associate Director Bobby Henry; Professor Gillian Dutton; Professor Jeff Minneti; and observer anonymous, Aaron A. Tracy, mhobson.

Approve Mar. 10, 2026 Meeting Minutes

Dean Varona moved to approve the March 10, 2026 minutes; Greg seconded. Minutes approved.

Member and Public Comment

No member or public comment.

Discussion of Draft Rule Amendments

Bobby Henry presented to the Steering Committee on the remaining draft suggested court rule amendments not covered at the March 10, 2026 meeting. Steering Committee members discussed three possible options for evidence and professional responsibility course requirements for APR 9 licensed legal interns—(1) requiring all applicants for a Rule 9 license to have completed the courses, (2) requiring completion of the courses only for Rule 9 licensees appearing in any court proceeding, or (3) requiring completion of the courses only for Rule 9 licensees appearing in court proceedings without a supervisor present. The committee reached

a consensus to proceed with the second option.

Bobby presented the remaining proposed amendments to APR 6 and 9. Bobby also noted changes based on input from the Steering Committee at the March 10 meeting. Based on that input, modifications were made to the proposed essay requirements for individuals electing not to take the MPRE and for publishing information about individuals who successfully complete the portfolio evaluation.

Steering Committee members raised questions or concerns regarding the draft amendments. Steering Committee members discussed how APR 9's timing requirements would work in practice and approaches for publishing of the names of people recently licensed to practice in Washington while still maintain confidentiality of license method. The Steering Committee also discussed whether to include a discussion of diploma privilege in the report to the Court as an option for future exploration. The committee determined it would be beneficial to gather more information about diploma privilege before proposing anything to the Court. The committee reached consensus to maintain the suggested rule amendments and report as is, but discuss diploma privilege at a future Steering Committee meeting.

Jordan moved to approve sending the suggested court rule amendments and accompanying report to the Washington Supreme Court for their consideration. Alfredo seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 1:19 p.m. on April 1, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Schur
Assistant General Counsel

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

To: Licensure Pathways Implementation Steering Committee

From: Program Evaluation Subcommittee

Re: Recommendations for Evaluating Admission by Portfolio Evaluation

Date: June 30, 2026

Background

The Pathways Implementation Steering Committee charged the Program Evaluation Subcommittee to

- Identify Portfolio Evaluation goals
- Determine how to measure the goals
- Identify whether the WSBA should begin collecting any data now

The Program Evaluation Subcommittee began meeting in October 2025 and has generally met twice monthly from October through April 2026. Subcommittee members include:

Logan Cornett, Institute for the Advancement of the American Legal System

Jordan Couch, Steering Committee Liaison

Jeff Minneti, Seattle U Law

Andrew Peterson, Administrative Office of the Courts

Zaida Rivera, Steering Committee Chair

Carrie Sanford, UW Law

Sandra Simpson, Gonzaga Law

After discussing approaches to setting goals and measuring goals, the Subcommittee engaged in the following process: (1) constructing a Logic Model; (2) building an Evaluation matrix, and (3) developing a Program Evaluation Modeling by Data Point Table. The Modeling by Data Point Table served as the basis for the recommendations in this report.

Constructing the Logic Model helped the Subcommittee frame the Portfolio Evaluation goals as short-term, intermediate term, and long-term outcomes and identify a set of longer term, more macro impacts that we envision arising from the implementation of the portfolio evaluation. The process of building the logic model had us consider the (1) assumptions that form the foundation of the Portfolio Evaluation, (2) contextual factors that will impact the Portfolio Evaluation, (3) inputs into the Portfolio Evaluation from an array of sources, including the WSBA, applicants for admission, the APR 6 Law Clerk Board and law schools, and (4) the expected outputs and impacts from the Portfolio Evaluation. A copy of the Logic Model is provided in Appendix A to this Report.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

Arising from its work on the Logic Model, the Subcommittee has identified the following major measures of success of the Portfolio Evaluation as an experiential assessment:

- Whether the Portfolio Evaluation adequately assesses minimum competency to practice law resulting in new lawyers who are practice ready and able to engage in ethically sound law practice.
- Whether the Portfolio Evaluation increases access to the legal profession for those historically excluded.
- Whether the Portfolio Evaluation results in greater access to justice for individuals living in legal deserts.
- Whether the Portfolio Evaluation is a financially feasible and sustainable method for a candidate to obtain a law license.
- Whether stakeholders, including the public, bench, and bar consistently view the Portfolio Evaluation as commensurate with the bar exam as a tool for assessing minimum competence to practice law.

Having defined a set of outcomes and impacts, the Subcommittee next constructed an Evaluation Matrix to help identify (1) evaluation questions for each outcome and impact, (2) data necessary to respond to the evaluation questions, (3) where to obtain the data, and (4) the instrument or tool used to obtain the data. A copy of the Evaluation Matrix is available in Appendix B to this Report.

The Subcommittee next converted the Evaluation Matrix into a Program Evaluation Modeling by Data Point Table which enabled the committee to more specifically define each data point that needs to be collected, who will provide the data, how the data will be collected, and the frequency of data collection. The Program Evaluation Modeling by Data Point Table is available in Appendix C to this Report.

While building the Modeling by Data Point Table, the Subcommittee became familiar with existing sources of data at the WSBA that could be used to evaluate the success of the portfolio evaluation. The sources include

- The WSBA Online Admissions Account, which applicants for admission must create prior to submitting their application. Applicants must respond to requests for demographic information with one of the options being “I prefer not to respond.” As with all admissions application information, the collected demographic information is confidential and to be used only in the aggregate for data analysis.
- The WSBA Application for Licensure, which will require Portfolio Evaluation candidates to identify a qualifying supervising lawyer.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- The WSBA database, which will provide demographic and other information about the supervising lawyers.

As the Subcommittee engaged in its work, it reached out for expertise to a number of sources, including

- Cassandra Dyke and Sarra Yamin from the Oregon State Board of Bar Examiners and the Oregon State Bar's Supervised Practice Portfolio Examination's Annual Report
- Courtney Brooks and John Garvey from the University of New Hampshire regarding the Daniel Webster Scholars Program
- Catherine Bramble at BYU regarding Utah's Alternative Lawyer Licensure Program
- Joanne Kane, Director of Psychometrics at the National Conference of Bar Examiners

Recommendations

Based on its work, the Subcommittee notes that assessing the success of the Portfolio Evaluation will be a comprehensive, time intensive, and ongoing project, which will require the WSBA to (1) routinely draw data from information sources that will be developed as part of the implementation of the portfolio evaluation, such as licensure applications, (2) routinely draw data from existing WSBA sources into new reports, and (3) develop a set of surveys for use in the short term, intermediate term, and long term.

As noted above, a major measure of success of the Portfolio Evaluation will be the extent to which Portfolio Evaluation increases access to the legal profession for those historically excluded. To measure success on this and related goals, the WSBA must collect demographic information from Portfolio Evaluation applicants. As also noted above, applicants voluntarily provide demographic information when they apply for a law license, with the option of selecting "I prefer not to respond." Currently, the "prefer not to respond" rate for law license applications is approximately 30%. To meaningfully assess progress on goals tied to applicants' demographic information, in instruments that collect demographic information, such as the WSBA Application for Licensure, the Subcommittee urges the WSBA to emphasize that the information collected will be held in strict confidence and in no way will be traceable back to the applicant. To encourage applicants to respond to demographic questions, the Subcommittee also asks that the WSBA inform applicants that the information the applicants provide will be used to improve the Portfolio Evaluation for future applicants.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

Below, please find a list of the necessary data collection instruments and a summary of the data each will collect. Following this summary, please find a timeline for implementing the recommendations.

(1) Data drawn from instruments that will be built as part of the Portfolio Evaluation Administration

Portfolio Evaluation Application for Licensure

Annually report:

- Number of applicants who apply to participate in the portfolio evaluation,
- Applicant's legal education program status, for example, current APR 6 law clerk, current law student, law school graduate, etc., and
- Supervising lawyer's role—such as APR 6 tutor, law school professor, employer, etc.

Rule 9 Supervising Lawyer Declaration: Portfolio Evaluation Section

Annually report:

- Number of participating supervising lawyers,
- Number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants supervised,
- Supervising lawyer's practice areas, and
- Supervising lawyer's prior experience with supervising new lawyers.

Board of Bar Examiner Grading Information

Annually report:

- Number of portfolio graders participating and
- Number of portfolio submissions graded by each grader during each grading session.

(2) Data drawn from existing WSBA sources that will need to be incorporated into new reports

To understand the impact of the Portfolio Evaluation on underserved communities, including communities in legal deserts and lower-income populations, annually report:

- Number of WSBA members practicing in legal deserts before Portfolio Evaluation implementation,
- Number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants who live in legal deserts,

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- Number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants who complete supervised practice hours in legal deserts,
- Number of WSBA members practicing in legal deserts after Portfolio Evaluation implementation, and
- Number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants who complete their supervised practice hours in a legal aid or other nonprofit setting.

The goal is to understand the impact the Portfolio Evaluation may have on the capacity for legal services within underserved communities, both for applicants and for clients. These underserved communities may encompass rural “legal deserts” in addition to lower-income populations which may be located across the state.

The Subcommittee recommends defining a legal desert as a county with a population less than 50,000. This definition is consistent with the WSBA’s Small Town and Rural (STAR) Council’s definition of “rural.”¹ The STAR Council chose this definition after considering Washington’s “unique geographic and sociogeographic landscape” and materials from the U.S. Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service, which classifies areas as metro and non-metro.

In addition, because a metro area may also have underserved communities, the Subcommittee further recommends that the WSBA explore ways of assessing the extent to which the Portfolio Evaluation Program impacts the delivery of legal services to underserved communities in counties with populations in excess of 50,000. For example, over time, the WSBA could track the number of Portfolio Evaluation candidates and supervisors who work with legal aid organizations and other public interest sector employers and the number of clients they serve during their supervised practice.

To understand who is embarking on the portfolio evaluation, annually report how many Portfolio Evaluation applicants

- Have previously failed the bar exam,

¹STAR Council Charter, adopted in 2021 and amended in 2021, 2024, and 2025. The Charter is available at chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.wsba.org/docs/default-source/legal-community/committees/star-committee/star-council-meeting-materials-mar-25-2026.pdf?sfvrsn=6cf7e7f1_5.

The Subcommittee is aware that the American Bar Association has defined a legal desert as a county that has less than 1 lawyer per 1000 residents. See ABA Profile of the Legal Profession 2020 at page 2 (available at <chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/news/2020/07/potlp2020.pdf>). Because the STAR Council definition is a product of the WSBA’s deliberative process, the Subcommittee recommends defining legal desert consistent with the STAR Council definition of rural rather than the ABA’s definition of legal desert.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- Are licensed in another jurisdiction,
- Have passed a bar exam in another jurisdiction,
- Have previously pursued the Portfolio Evaluation but did not complete it, and
- Have neither sat for a bar exam nor pursued the portfolio evaluation.

To understand who successfully navigates both the Portfolio Evaluation and bar exam pathways for admission, annually report the following information collected from all applicants for admission during the new admittee process

- Demographic information²,
- Whether employed upon completion of portfolio evaluation,
- Type of employer, including type of law practice, size of employer, geographic location of employer.

To understand Bar Exam and Portfolio Evaluation success rates, annually report

- Number of Bar Exam and Portfolio Evaluation applicants who successfully complete the pathways,
- For those unsuccessful on the Bar Exam, the number of times the applicants failed the exam,
- For those unsuccessful on the Portfolio Evaluation, the number of times the applicants attempted the Portfolio Evaluation,
- Pro bono hours reported by lawyers licensed through each licensure pathway, and
- Number of grievances and disciplinary actions made against applicants and lawyers licensed through each licensure pathway.

To understand who is participating in the Portfolio Evaluation as a supervising lawyer or portfolio grader, from the WSBA Members' Profile, annually report the supervising lawyers' and portfolio graders'

- Practice area,
- Law firm or employer size,
- Geographic location of employer, and
- Demographic information.

To understand the WSBA's financial costs of administering the pathways, annually report the WSBA's financial costs broken out by pathway

² When reporting on demographic information, the Subcommittee asks that the WSBA provide the response rates to contextualize the results.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

(3) Data drawn from new evaluation instruments that the WSBA will need to develop

A. Annual Data Collection

WSBA Tool for Tracking Reports of Bias on Portfolio Evaluation

Tool should provide a summary of training provided to supervising lawyers and portfolio graders and the extent to which the training included anti-bias topics.

This is a tool that should be developed as soon as practicable because it may impact the implementation of the portfolio evaluation, including supervising lawyer training.

WSBA Tool for assessing the accuracy and consistency of supervising lawyers' assessment of applicants' work

This is a tool that should be developed as soon as practicable because it may impact the implementation of the portfolio evaluation, including supervising lawyer training.

WSBA Tool for assessing the accuracy and consistency of portfolio graders' assessment of applicants' work

This is a tool that should be developed as soon as practicable because it may impact the implementation of the portfolio evaluation, including grader training.

WSBA Tool for assessing trends or patterns in work product types that are more likely to be graded passing or failing and trends or patterns in activity types that are more likely to be assessed passing or failing

B. Periodic Reporting and Gathering Qualitative Data

To effectively assess many outcomes and impacts, the Subcommittee recommends the WSBA develop a set of surveys for applicants and supervising lawyers. The surveys need not be administered annually, but the subcommittee anticipates that the survey data will be most important in the early years of the program. Thus, the surveys should perhaps be administered annually for the first 3 years of the program and then periodically afterwards.

Portfolio Evaluation Applicant Exit Survey

- Identify reasons why applicants chose the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify the number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants who chose not to take the bar exam because of cost, test-taking struggles, or disabilities.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- If applicants exit the Portfolio Evaluation prior to completion, identify the point at which applicants left the Portfolio Evaluation and the reasons why they left prior to completion, including self-selection or mandated departure.
- If applicants complete the portfolio evaluation, gather data regarding employment status, including number of jobs applied for after licensing, number of interviews, number of job offers, number of applicants hired by their supervising lawyer or employer, and the amount of time elapsed between licensure and employment.
- Identify applicants' type of employment, including JD required and JD preferred positions and other positions.
- Identify applicants' self-reported experiences in navigating the portfolio evaluation—what went well, opportunities for improvement.
- Identify the extent to which the applicants' program of legal education supported their efforts to navigate the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify the extent to which the applicants' program of legal education prepared them for completing the Portfolio Evaluation requirements.
- Identify the applicants' subjective experiences of bias in the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify the APR 6 law clerks' perceptions of the WSBA's support for the implementation and administration of the intra-program components of the portfolio evaluation.
- This information will likely be most useful in the early years of the program.

Portfolio Evaluation Applicant Post-Licensure Check-In Survey

- Identify the number of lawyers admitted by Portfolio Evaluation who are employed in legal settings 5 years after licensure and 10 years after licensure.

Bar Exam Applicant Exit Survey

- Identify reasons why applicants chose to take the bar exam.
- Identify applicants' self-reported experiences with preparing for and taking the bar exam—what went well and opportunities for improvement.
- If applicants are unsuccessful on the Bar Exam, identify applicants' reasons for why they were unsuccessful.
- If applicants are successful on the bar exam, gather data regarding employment status, including number of jobs applied for after licensing, number of interviews, number of job offers, and the amount of time elapsed between licensure and employment.
- Identify applicants' type of employment, including JD required and JD preferred positions and other positions,

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- Identify applicants' self-reported experiences in navigating the bar exam process—what went well, opportunities for improvement.
- Identify the extent to which the applicants' program of legal education supported their efforts to navigate the bar exam.
- Identify the extent to which the applicants' program of legal education prepared them for taking the bar exam.
- Identify the applicants' subjective experiences of bias in the bar exam.
- This information will likely be most useful in the early years of the program.

Bar Exam Applicant Post-Licensure Check-In Survey

- Identify the number of lawyers admitted by bar exam who are employed in legal settings 5 years after licensure and perhaps 10 years after licensure.

APR 6 Tutor Survey

- Identify perceptions of APR 6 Tutors regarding the WSBA's support for the implementation and administration of the intra-program components of the Portfolio Evaluation for law clerks.
- This information will likely be most useful in the early years of the program.

Supervising Lawyer Initial Participation Survey

- Understand reasons why supervising lawyers chose to participate in the portfolio evaluation, how supervising lawyers learned about the portfolio evaluation, and whether the supervising lawyers were recruited to participate in the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify supervising lawyers' socioeconomic status: whether head of household, single parent, current employment status.
- This information will likely be most useful in the early years of the program.

Supervising Lawyer Exit Survey

- Identify frequency of remote supervision, in-person supervision, or both.
- Identify supervising lawyers' subjective experiences of their training in portfolio evaluation.
- Identify supervising lawyer self-reports of experiences in portfolio evaluation—what went well, opportunities for improvement.
- Identify supervising lawyers' subjective experiences of bias in the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify the number of clients served by Portfolio Evaluation applicants.

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- If supervising lawyers stop participating prior to the applicant's completion of the program, identify the reasons why the supervising lawyers stopped participating.
- This information will likely be most useful in the early years of the program.

Portfolio Grader Survey

- Identify prior experience supervising new lawyers.
- Identify reasons for serving as a grader.
- Identify graders' socioeconomic status, including head of household, single parent, employment status.
- This information will likely be most useful in the early years of the program.

Law School Survey

- Identify the number of students and graduates whom law schools assist in navigating the Portfolio Evaluation and qualitative summary of assistance provided.
- Describe assistance law schools provide to help the applicants find supervising lawyers.
- Describe training provided to supervising lawyers, if any, and the extent to which the training included anti-bias topics.
- Describe the extent to which law schools are collaborating on the implementation of the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify law school faculty and administrator perceptions of the WSBA's support for the implementation and administration of the in-school components of the portfolio evaluation.
- Identify law schools' financial costs of student participation in the portfolio evaluation.
- Note this information could be gathered from in-person feedback sessions with law school representatives and would be most helpful in the early years of the Program.

WSBA APR 6 Law Clerk Support Survey

- WSBA reports on the number of APR 6 law clerks and program graduates who the WSBA assists in navigating the experiential Portfolio Evaluation and qualitative summary of assistance provided.
- WSBA reports on qualitative data regarding any programmatic changes the WSBA/APR 6 Law Clerk Board makes to support law clerks entering the portfolio evaluation.

WSBA Member and Judges Survey

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- Identify external stakeholders' perception of newly licensed lawyers' competence to practice law.
- This information would be helpful to gather in the first year after the first cohort of Portfolio Evaluation applicants are licensed and again later in time, perhaps 5 years after the first applicants are licensed and again after 10 years.

Timeline

To implement the recommendations above, the Subcommittee suggests that the WSBA utilize the Timeline below.

By January 1, 2027

- Establish a culture of program evaluation:
 - Identify those responsible for evaluating the success of the portfolio evaluation.
 - Provide appropriate financial and technical resources for evaluating the success of the portfolio evaluation.
- Ensure that each application or form listed below includes questions that will collect the data identified above:
 - Application for Licensure by Portfolio Evaluation
 - Supervising Lawyer Declaration
 - Board of Bar Examiner Volunteer Application
- Build an information gathering tool that will harvest information from existing WSBA sources, including those listed below:
 - Bar exam passage information
 - WSBA new member application
 - WSBA license renewal
 - WSBA Tool for Tracking Reports of Bias on Portfolio Evaluation
 - WSBA Tool for assessing the accuracy and consistency of supervising lawyers' assessment of licensure applicants' work
 - WSBA Tool for assessing the accuracy and consistency of portfolio graders' assessment of applicants' work
- Develop survey instruments, including the following:
 - Experiential Portfolio Evaluation Applicant Exit Survey
 - Experiential Portfolio Evaluation Applicant Post-Licensure Check-In Survey
 - Bar Exam Applicant Exit Survey
 - APR 6 Tutor Survey
 - Supervising Lawyer Initial Participation Survey

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- Supervising Lawyer Exit Survey Portfolio Grader Survey
- Law School Survey
- WSBA APR 6 Law Clerk Support Survey
- WSBA Member and Judges Survey

During Program Year 1, which ends on December 31, 2027

Gather data necessary on the topics listed below and prepare an annual report of the data.

- Number of applicants who apply to participate in the portfolio evaluation,
- Candidate's legal education program status, for example, current APR 6 law clerk, current law student, law school graduate, etc., and
- Supervising lawyer's role—such as APR 6 tutor, law school professor, employer, etc.
- Number of participating supervising lawyers
- Number of applicants supervised
- Supervising lawyers' practice areas
- Supervising lawyers' prior experience with supervising new attorneys
- Number of portfolio graders participating
- Number of portfolio submissions graded by each grader during each grading session
- Number of WSBA members practicing in legal deserts before Portfolio Evaluation implementation
- The number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants who live in legal deserts
- The number of WSBA members practicing in legal deserts after Portfolio Evaluation implementation
- Number of Portfolio Evaluation applicants who
 - Have previously failed the bar exam
 - Are licensed in another jurisdiction
 - Have passed a bar exam in another jurisdiction
 - Have previously pursued the Portfolio Evaluation but did not complete it,
 - Have neither sat for a bar exam nor pursued the portfolio evaluation.
- For applicants who successfully complete the portfolio evaluation, report the applicants'
 - Demographic information
 - Type of employer, including type of law practice, size of employer, geographic location of employer.
- How many Bar Exam and Experiential Portfolio Evaluation applicants successfully complete the portfolio evaluation
- For those unsuccessful on the Bar Exam, how many times the applicants failed the exam

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- For those unsuccessful on the Portfolio Evaluation, the number of times the applicants attempted the Portfolio Evaluation
- Pro bono hours reported by lawyers licensed through each licensure pathway
- Number of grievances and disciplinary actions made against applicants and lawyers licensed through each licensure pathway
- Supervising lawyers' and portfolio graders'
 - Practice area
 - Law firm or employer size
 - Geographic location of employer
 - Demographic information
- Reports of Bias on Portfolio Evaluation
- Accuracy and consistency of supervising lawyers' assessment of applicants' work
- Accuracy and consistency of portfolio graders' assessment of applicants' work

Administer initial/baseline surveys to subsets of each of the following groups

- Supervising lawyer Initial Participation Survey
- APR 6 Tutors
- Law School Survey
- WSBA Member and Judges

During Program Year 2, which ends on December 31, 2028

- Complete the annual reports noted above
- Administer Exit Surveys and report on results
 - Portfolio Evaluation Applicants
 - Bar Exam Applicants
 - Portfolio Evaluation Supervising lawyers
- Administer Other Surveys and report on results
 - Portfolio Graders
 - Law Schools
 - APR 6 Law Clerk Support

During Program Years 3-5

- Complete the annual reports, noted above

During Program Year 6, which ends on December 31, 2032

- Complete the annual reports, noted above

Report from Program Evaluation Subcommittee

- Identify the number of lawyers licensed through the Portfolio Evaluation and who remain employed in legal settings 5 years after licensure
- Identify external stakeholders' perception of newly licensed lawyers' competence to practice law

During Program Years 7-10

- Complete the annual reports noted above

During Program Year 11, which ends on December 31, 2037

- Complete the annual reports noted above
- Identify the number of lawyers licensed through the Portfolio Evaluation and employed in legal settings 10 years after licensure
- Identify external stakeholders' perception of newly licensed lawyers' competence to practice law.

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 1 Input	Who are the candidates entering the licensing pathways?	Annually, the number of candidates who entered the experiential pathway from each of the points below • During their program of legal education (APR 6 clerkship or law school) • After completing their program of legal education • After being excluded from sitting for the bar exam due to the bar exam's cost, the candidate's exam-taking struggles, and/or the candidate's disability • After failing the bar exam • After becoming licensed in another jurisdiction • After passing a bar exam in another jurisdiction	WSBA database Except for third bullet point, law schools will have or APR 6 Board will have the information necessary for the bullets here; may not know reason why graduates have been excluded from sitting for the bar exam Demographic information: WSBA has access to data to issue an aggregate report on race; (WSBA could do analysis of data) WSBA does not currently ask about national origin, but applicants must provide a place of birth and must allow a background check	WSBA Reporting on information obtained from candidates' applications

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		Annually, whether the candidates have previously attempted to compete the pathway for which they are applying. Annually, the demographic information of candidates pursuing licensure in each of the following pathways: (1) experiential pathway; (2) bar exam, (3) admitted on motion, and (4) are licensed in a different country before being licensed in Washington (such as LL.M. students? Demographic information includes the following: • Race • National origin • English as a second language • Gender • LGBTQIA+ status • Age • Socio-economic status	WSBA tracks English as a Second Language (added to demographic list) WSBA asks re gender and has options re LGBTQ+ status WSBA application seeks date of birth WSBA does not currently have data on socio economic status • WSBA asks about parent education level (which could go to socio economic status) • WSBA application seeks current employment information WSBA collects first-gen status	

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		○ Including head of household ○ Single parent ○ Employment status • First-gen status • Disability status • Veteran status • Geographic location of candidate	WSBA collects disability status. WSBA may be able to extract veteran status from application WSBA gets home address for license renewal; WSBA can report by county • Note that geographic location goes to urban v. rural (legal deserts v. not).	
Question 2 Output	Annually, how many candidates participate in the lifecycle of the experiential pathway?	The number of candidates who: • started the program • stopped the program prior to completing it and the point during the program at which they stopped. • finished the program	Needs to be generated: WSBA Experiential Pathway Candidate Application For those participating in the program during their program of legal education, data from the APR 6 Law Clerk Board and Law Schools	Data from applicant applications and program exit data.

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		were asked to discontinue the program		
Question 3 Output	Are the employment experiences of attorneys licensed through the experiential pathway similar to those licensed through other means?	The number of lawyers licensed through the each pathway and who are employed: - upon completing the pathway - within 6 months of completing the pathway - within 1 year of completing the pathway - Descriptive information regarding the candidates' hiring experiences, including - the number of interviews they received - the number of offers they received and - whether their supervisor hired them The geographic location of new bar members' place of employment	Collecting this data will require revision to current practices. - Currently, WSBA houses employment information, but having difficulty getting updated information from members - Currently application for admission asks about employment history; employment address may be supplied when seeking renewal - WSBA is currently revising renewal approach such that new members must	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		The number of new bar members employed in • JD required • JD preferred • Other positions The kind of law practice new members enter, including: • Public interest • Government • Law Firm • Other type of firm, such as accounting firms The number of new bar members employed at each firm size below • 1-5 lawyers • 6-10 lawyers • 11-20 lawyers • 20-50 lawyers • More than 50 lawyers?	update employment with license renewal; also includes not actively practicing and other options	

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		The number of candidates who are sustained in practice • Five years' post-licensure • Ten years' post-licensure		
Question 4 Input	Why have candidates chosen to participate in the experiential pathway program?	Data points that assess whether the experiential pathway is in fact expanding access to law licensure for individuals from groups underrepresented in the practice of law, such data may come from the demographic information identified above as well as candidates' self-reported reasons for entering program	Needs to be created WSBA Experiential pathway candidate application Could also survey participants once on the pathway	Candidate Application and Candidate Survey Responses
Question 5 Input	Why have licensure candidates chosen to take the bar exam instead of seeking licensure through the experiential pathway?	Candidates' reasons for taking the bar exam rather than participating in the experiential pathway	Needs to be created: Licensure candidate survey administered by WSBA	Survey responses

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 6 Input	How successful are those who seek licensure exclusively through the bar exam?	Annually, the number of law clerks, law school graduates, and candidates licensed in a different country before being licensed in Washington who do not enter the experiential pathway, sit for the Washington State Bar Exam, and pass the exam on their first attempt? Annually, the number of bar examinees from each group above who do not participate in any other pathway and fail the bar exam • once • twice • three times • more than three times	WSBA maintains records for law clerks, law school grads, candidates licensed in a different country	Survey responses
Question 7 Input	Who are the licensure candidates who successfully navigate each licensure pathway?	Demographic information defined above for candidates who successfully complete each licensure pathway	See question 1 above for collection and ownership of data • Note that some demographic	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
			information changes over time, creating need to update records	
Question 8 Input	If candidates seek licensure through the bar exam but fail the exam, what do the candidates perceive to be the most significant 3 reasons for not passing the exam?	Qualitative data that reveals candidates' self-reported challenges associated with taking the bar exam, enabling assessment of whether the experiential pathway can be a tool for alleviating bar-exam specific licensure challenges	Will need to create a data collection tool; NCBE may have general information	Survey responses?
Question 9 Input	If candidates do not complete the experiential pathway, why have they chosen to discontinue?	Reasons why candidates chose to discontinue	Will need to create a data collection tool, such as: WSBA Experiential Pathway program exit survey, completed by candidates and supervisors	Survey responses
Question 10 Input	If candidates were asked to discontinue the experiential pathway, why were they asked to discontinue?	Reasons why candidates asked to discontinue	WSBA likely will have info b/c discontinuance arises from bar discipline or complaint	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 11 Input	Who is participating in the experiential pathway as a supervisor?	The number of supervisors who participated in the lifecycle of the experiential pathway program, specifically: - Supervisors who begin the pathway - Supervisors who complete pathway, - Supervisors who supervise more than 1 candidate Supervisors' practice areas, practice size, and practice location - Areas of law the supervisors' practice - Number of attorneys who work at the supervisors' firm 1-5 lawyers? 6-10 lawyers? 11-20 lawyers?	Will need to create a tool for collecting information See notes on question 1 regarding candidates' demographic information Will need to create a survey tool for gathering "reasons why" responses.	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		○ 20-50 lawyers? ○ More than 50 lawyers? • The geographic location of supervisors' practices Whether supervision was primarily remote, in-person, or both Supervisors' demographic information: • Race • National origin • Gender • Age • Socio-economic status ○ Including head of household ○ Single parent ○ Employment status • First-gen status • LGBTQIA+ status • Disability status		

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		Veteran status The nature of supervisor's role: APR 6 mentor, law-school externship supervisor, other law-school employment supervisor, such as a summer internship supervisor Whether supervisor has previously supervised a candidate Extent of supervisor's experience with supervising new attorneys prior participation in the program Supervisors' reasons for participating in the pathway. If supervisors do not complete the pathway, why they have chosen to discontinue.		

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 12	Who is participating in the experiential pathway as a grader/auditor on behalf of the WSBA?	Same information as that above for supervisors	Same as above for question 11—will need to create a tool for collecting and analyzing data	WSBA reporting
Question 13 Input	What efforts has the WSBA engaged in to recruit, train, and support supervisors?	Quantitative and qualitative data describing the WSBA's efforts to recruit, train, and support supervisors Supervisors' subjective experiences in the program How supervisor learned of pathway/was recruited to participate in pathway	WSBA owns and can report Will need to build Supervisor application/survey	Survey responses
Question 14 Input	To the extent possible, does the experiential pathway minimize the impact of supervisors' cultural biases on their assessment of candidates' work?	WSBA efforts to train supervisors re bias— Bias could include a cultural bias and professional bias (this is how I like it) Demographic info of those who started experiential pathway compared to demographic info who finish—could potentially infer bias played a role in differences	Will need to create a tool to gather data - Interview/focus group? - Note that questions should contemplate bias in favor as well as against	Survey responses? Interviews? Focus groups? WSBA report findings

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		Quantitative and qualitative data describing the efforts of WSBA, APR 6 Law Clerk Board and Law Schools to minimize supervisor bias in working with and assessing candidates		
Question 15 Output	To the extent possible, does the experiential pathway ensure that supervisors' assessments of candidates' work is accurate and consistent, such that candidates' work of similar quality receives a similar assessment?	Inter-rater reliability statistics designed to assess accuracy and consistency in supervisors' assessment	Will need to collect a tool to gather data - Will need to build an evaluation process that is sensitive to inter-rater reliability - Potentially create a calibration workshop - Potentially draw upon OR and NCBE experience	WSBA reporting
Question 16 Process	How, if at all, are law schools and the APR 6 Law Clerk Board supporting the implementation of the experiential	Number of graduates law schools assist, and a qualitative summary of the type of assistance provided	WSBA will need to create a survey tool to gather data	Survey responses

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
	pathway for candidates who complete the pathway after completing their program of legal education?	Extent to which law schools assist students in getting employment and positioning materials for employment etc. Number of APR 6 program graduates the APR 6 Law Clerk board assists and a qualitative summary of the type of assistance provided	WSBA has a law clerk interview process	
Question 17 Input	To what extent are Washington state law schools collaborating on the implementation of the in-school components of the experiential pathway?	Qualitative data regarding the degree of collaboration between the law schools	Will need to create a qualitative conversation between WSBA and law schools Could also survey applicants re their perceptions of law school support with pathway	Survey responses
Question 18	To what extent do the law schools perceive that the WSBA is supporting the	Law school faculty and administrator perceptions of WSBA support for the	Will need to create a qualitative conversation	Survey responses

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
	in-school components of the experiential pathway	implementation and administration of the in-school components of the experiential pathway	between WSBA and law schools	
Question 19 Input	To what extent has the APR 6 Law Clerk Board revised its approach to the Law Clerk program to support law clerks who seek to enter the experiential pathway while completing the APR 6 Law Clerk Program?	Qualitative data regarding any programmatic changes the APR 6 Law Clerk Board makes to support law clerks entering the experiential pathway	WSBA will need to create a qualitative tool to gather data	Survey responses
Question 20	To what extent does the APR 6 Law Clerk Board perceive that the WSBA is supporting the intra-program components of the experiential pathway for law clerks	APR 6 Law Clerk perceptions of WSBA support for the implementation and administration of the intra-program components of the experiential pathway for law clerks	WSBA will need to create a qualitative tool to gather data	Survey responses
Question 21 Input	What are the candidates' financial costs of obtaining a law license for each of the available pathways?	Candidates' average net costs associated with Experiential pathway	Will need to create a tool for gathering the information that includes	Survey responses

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		- Bar exam - Licensed by motion - Licensed in Washington after having been licensed in a different country	law school tuition and debt service WSBA knows only the fees charged	
Question 22 Input	What are the WSBA's financial costs for administering the available licensure programs?	WSBA's administrative costs for - Experiential pathway - Bar exam - Licensed by motion - Licensed in Washington after having been licensed in a different country - APR 6 law clerk program, including those who sit for the bar exam and those who participate in the experiential pathway	WSBA has access to data	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 23 Input	What are the law schools' financial costs of participating in licensure programs?	Law schools' financial costs of participating in the following licensing programs • Experiential pathway • Bar exam • Licensed by motion • Licensed in Washington after having been licensed in a different country	Will need to create a tool to survey law school costs • Consider cost of clinic/externship programs prior to experiential pathway implementation and post implementation • Will need precise definition of "law school costs"	Survey Responses
Question 24 Output	To what extent is the experiential pathway a valid and reliable assessment of candidates' minimum competence to practice law?	Validity and reliability statistics for the experiential pathway	Will need to create a tool to gather data • Will need special expertise to create the tool • Good to reach out to Oregon and find out what it has done	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 25 Process	To what extent is the Washington State Bar Exam a valid and reliable assessment of candidates' minimum competence to practice law?	Validity and reliability statistics for the NextGen UBE	NCBE data? - To the extent possible, need to be able to study same metrics in the same way—will be some distinctions b/c rubric-based grading is not the same as standardized test grading - Concern is that NCBE does not have data that validly/reliability re minimum competence to practice of law - Reliability of bar exam is likely ok b/c exam is consistent, but validity as a measure of actual	WSBA and/or NCBE data

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
			competence to practice is not clear b/c standardized test does not measure well a candidate's competence for practice	
Question 26 Outcome	How does the validity and reliability of the experiential pathway compare with the validity and reliability of the Washington State Bar Exam (or the NextGen UBE)?	Validity and reliability statistics for the experiential pathway and for the Washington State Bar Exam (or NextGen UBE)	Will need to create a tool to assess validity and reliability for pathways.	WSBA reporting
Question 27 Input	To what extent is the experiential pathway an equitable and fair measure of candidates' minimum competence to practice law?	Metrics on the experiential pathway's degree of equity and fairness across candidate demographics Demographic info on those who enter pathway but do not complete it	ABA has good data on equity and fairness generally WSBA has begun tracking demographic data	Candidates' experiential pathway portfolio performance data

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		Demographic info on those who complete a program of legal education, but do not make any attempt to get licensed	- See also information identified in question 1 regarding demographic - Assessment expert can also offer thoughts on how best to gather data	
Question 28 Input	To what extent is the Washington State Bar Exam an equitable and fair measure of candidates' minimum competence to practice law?	Bar exam equity/fairness metrics Demographic info on those who sit for the bar exam and those who do not pass	Will need to create tool for measuring, using same sources above re demographic data; pass/fail data	WSBA reporting
Question 29 Outcome	How does the equity/fairness of the experiential pathway compare to that of the bar exam?	Equity/fairness metrics for the experiential pathway and the bar exam	Evaluation tool will need to be developed using sources identified above in questions 26 and 27	WSBA reporting
Question 30 Input	Are specific required activities or work products more likely to be assessed as passing or failing?	Description of required activities and work products graded as passing and failing	WSBA is creating tool to gather information	WSBA reporting

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
		Data reflecting any trend or pattern associated with the activities and work products that are graded as passing or failing Data that identifies the activities and work products that present the most struggle for candidates		
Question 31 Input	Are there any differences in performance on required activities and work products based on candidates' program of legal education and whether they entered the pathway during their program of legal education or after?	WSBA studies of licensure candidates' performance	WSBA will create tool	WSBA findings
Process Question 32 Input	What are the qualitative observations of experiential pathway candidates and supervisors regarding what worked well in the program and what did not?	WSBA collected data on candidates' and supervisors' experiences	Will need to create a WSBA administered experiential pathway exit survey	Survey responses

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 33 Output	To what extent has the experiential pathway impacted access to legal representation for clients living in legal deserts?	Data reflecting the extent of legal representation in legal deserts prior to and following implementation of the experiential pathway Number of clients candidates serve during experiential pathway	WSBA has access to data	WSBA findings
Question 34 Outcome	Are the candidates for the experiential pathway displaying the same caliber of professional conduct as candidates in other licensure pathways?	Annually, the number of bar complaints and disciplinary actions made against licensure candidates and lawyers licensed through • Experiential pathway • Bar exam • Admission on motion • Those licensed in another country prior to being licensed in Washington Annually, the pro bono hours reported for lawyers licensed through each pathway	WSBA has access to data (WSBA complaint reports linked to lawyers' licensure pathway)	WSBA findings

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Question 35	Do lawyer licensure stakeholders perceive the experiential pathway to be as effective at assessing minimum competence to practice law as other licensure pathways?	Survey of external stakeholders' perceptions	Will need to create a tool: WSBA administered survey - Potentially include question on WSBA Quarterly Member Survey - Bar members - Judges	Survey findings
Question 36 Output	Has there been any change over time in the lawyer licensure stakeholders' perceptions of the pathways' effectiveness in assessing minimum competence to practice law?	Stakeholders' perceptions of the effectiveness of each pathway in assessing candidates' minimum competence to practice law. Hiring information noted above will shed light on stakeholders' perceptions	Will need to create a survey tool	Survey findings

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

EXAMPLE

The matrix below provides an example of what a completed evaluation matrix could look like. This example is in the context of evaluation of new licensure pathways.

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Process	To what extent has the pathway been implemented as intended? - What adaptations have been made and why? - How consistently has the pathway been implemented at different law schools?	Comparison of logic model to real-world implementation	Documentation of pathway implementation Key stakeholder perspectives - Law schools - Bar examiners - Pathway participants - Court - Supervisors	Documentary/archival data Stakeholder interviews and/or focus groups
Process	Were sufficient resources available to support successful implementation? - How effectively were those resources used? - What training or capacity-building efforts were most helpful?	Resources dedicated to implementation Resources needed for successful implementation Training opportunities offered	Documentation of resource usage Key stakeholder perspectives - Law schools - Bar examiners - Pathway participants - Court - Supervisors	Documentary/archival data Stakeholder interviews and/or focus groups

Experiential Pathway Program Evaluation Matrix January 26, 2026 Draft

Domain	Evaluation Questions	Indicators/Metrics	Data Sources	Data Types
Which component of the evaluation does the question apply to?	What are the high-level questions we aim to answer through an evaluation?	What data points are needed to answer the question?	Who will the data be collected from or who owns the data?	What is the nature of the data that will be collected (surveys, admin data, interviews, etc.)?
Outcomes (short-term)	To what extent are pathway-licensed lawyers competent to practice law? - How does this compare with recent empirical definitions of minimum competence? - How does this compare with bar-licensed lawyer competence?	Quality of legal outcomes for clients Quality of legal work completed Workplace performance on essential legal (e.g., client interviewing) and non-legal skills (e.g., workload management)	Supervisors Clients Pathway participants Bar-licensed lawyers	Client surveys Supervisor surveys/interviews Pathway participant surveys/interviews Bar-licensed lawyer surveys/interviews
Outcomes (medium-term)	To what extent does the pathway produce equitable outcomes? - Do passage rates vary consistently by race, gender, etc.? - How does this compare with bar exam statistics? - How does the cost to complete the pathway compare to the cost to be licensed via bar exam?	Disaggregated passage rates Costs to participants for completing the pathway Costs to bar-licensed lawyers for taking the bar exam (including bar prep)	ABA bar passage statistics State court/board of bar examiner data on passage rates Monetary and non-monetary costs associated with licensure	Administrative data Documentary/archival data Pathway participant surveys/interviews Bar-licensed lawyer surveys/interviews

Data point		Who provides data	How to collect data	Frequency of Data Collection	Sample Size
Number of candidates pursuing experiential pathway who	Are in law school, APR 6 clerkship, or post-graduation	WSBA/law schools	Draw from pathway candidate application	Routine	Everyone
	Elected not to take bar exam due to cost, test-taking struggles, disabilities	Candidate (law schools may also know who signs up to take bar exam or not)	Need to create a tool to collect this data. Candidate survey? Law school survey?		
	Previously failed the bar exam	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Are already licensed in another jurisdiction (U.S. or foreign)	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Previously passed a bar exam in another U.S. jurisdiction	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Previously pursued but did not complete experiential pathway	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
Reasons for choosing licensing method	Pathway candidates' self-reported reasons for choosing pathway	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect this data. Candidate survey?	Short term	Everyone in a particular year
	Bar exam test takers self-reported reasons for choosing the bar exam	Bar exam taker	Need to create a tool to collect data. Licensure candidate survey?		
Licensure candidate	Race	WSBA	Asked at the time candidate	Routine	Everyone
	National origin	candidate (WSBA potentially?)			

demographics (experiential pathway candidates, bar exam takers, admission by motion)	English as a second language	WSBA	creates account to apply for licensing pathway.		
	Gender	WSBA			
	Age	WSBA			
	Socioeconomic status: Head of household, single parent, current employment status	Candidate			
	First-generation status	WSBA			
	LGBTQIA+ status	WSBA			
	Disability status	WSBA			
	Veteran status	Candidate/Potentially WSBA			
	Geographic location	WSBA, home address by county			
Pathway candidate success rates. Number of pathway candidates who:	Apply to pursue experiential pathway	WSBA		Routine	Everyone
	Do not complete pathway, including: - the point at which they leave pathway; - the reason for not completing; - whether they chose not to continue or were prohibited from continuing pathway; - If they chose not to continue, their reason for discontinuing; and - If they were prohibited from continuing, the reason for the prohibition.	WSBA for data on when candidates leave pathway and prohibitions on continuing; Candidate for reasons why they choose not to continue	Draw from existing sources, except, need to create a tool to collect candidates' reasons for choosing not to continue on pathway.		
	Complete pathway and become licensed	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
Bar exam success rates	Number of law students, APR 6 law clerks, and foreign-trained legal practitioners who only take the bar exam and do not pass the exam - once - twice	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone

	• three times • more than three times				
	For those who do not pass the bar exam, their perceived reasons for not passing	Bar exam test taker; NCBE or other studies of the bar exam may provide background information, as well	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Licensing cost to candidates	Candidates' net costs for: • experiential pathway • bar exam • admission by motion • foreign-licensed legal professionals	Candidate; WSBA for admission fees	Draw from existing sources.	Short term; will test some of our assumptions about the pathway	Sample of whole group
Employment status post-pathway:	Number of candidates licensed through pathway who are employed upon completing the program	Candidate	Draw from existing sources.	Periodic/Midpoint assessment; will need time to assess whether goals met (potentially after first 3 years and then every 3 years after that)	Everyone
	Number of jobs they applied for after licensing	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		Sample of whole group
	Number of interview invitations they received	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Number of job offers they received	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Number of candidates hired by their supervisor or site employer	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Time between licensing and obtaining employment	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Durability of employment. How many bar members licensed through the pathway are employed in legal settings 5 years post-licensure? 10 years?	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Employment type	Geographic location of new bar members' place of employment	Candidate/employer	Draw from existing sources.	Routine; looking for shift over time	Everyone

	Number of new bar members employed in • JD required positions • JD preferred positions • Other positions	Candidate/employer	Draw from existing sources.	Periodic/Midpoint assessment; will need time to assess whether goals met (potentially after first 3 years and then every 3 years after that)	Everyone
	Type of law practice: • Public interest • Government • Law firm • Other	Candidate/employer (WSBA asks for this information on annual license renewal, but answering is optional)	Draw from existing sources.		
	Employer size: • 1-5 lawyers • 6-10 lawyers • 11-20 lawyers • 20-50 lawyers • More than 50 lawyers	Candidate/employer (WSBA asks for this information on annual license renewal, but answering is optional)	Draw from existing sources.		
Supervisor information	Number of supervisors who participate in the pathway	WSBA	Draw from pathway supervisor application.	Routine; will shed light on candidate's practice setting	Everyone
	Number of supervisors who stop participation before their candidate completes the pathway and reason for stopping	WSBA Supervisor for reason for stopping	Draw from pathway supervisor application. Need to create a tool to collect supervisors' reasons for not continuing in program.		
	Number of candidates at one time per supervisor and specifically, the number of supervisors with more than 1 candidate at a time	WSBA	Draw from pathway supervisor application.		
	Number of supervisors who take on multiple candidates sequentially	WSBA	Draw from pathway		

			supervisor application.		
	Supervisor practice area	Supervisor	Draw from existing license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Number of attorneys who work at the supervisor's firm: • 1-5 lawyers • 6-10 lawyers • 11-20 lawyers • 20-50 lawyers • More than 50 lawyers	Supervisor	Draw from existing license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Geographic location of supervisor practice	Supervisor	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Supervision context: • APR 6 clerkship • Law school externship • Law school clinic • Law school simulation course • Other employment during law school • Post-graduation employer	Likely WSBA can derive information from candidate application	Draw from candidate application.		
	Prior supervising experience with new attorneys before participating in pathway	Supervisor	Not known if the supervision took place outside formal WSBA program.		

			Draw from pathway supervisor application.	Short term	Portion
	Whether supervision took place remotely, in-person, or both	Supervisor/candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Reason for participating in pathway	Supervisor	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	How supervisor learned of pathway/was recruited to participate in pathway	Supervisor	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Supervisor demographics	Race	WSBA	Need to create a tool to collect data.	Routine	Everyone
	National origin	Supervisor (WSBA potentially?)	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	English as a second language	WSBA	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Gender	WSBA	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Age	WSBA	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal		

			source is optional.		
	Socioeconomic status: Head of household, single parent, current employment status	Supervisor	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	First-generation status	WSBA	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	LGBTQIA+ status	WSBA	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Disability status	WSBA	Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Veteran status	Supervisor/Potentially WSBA	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Grader information	Number of graders who participate in each grading session	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone
	Number of graders who stop participating and reason for stopping		Draw from license renewal application, but license renewal source is optional.		
	Number of portfolio submissions graded by each grader per session		Draw from existing sources.		

	Grader practice area		Draw from existing sources.		
	Number of attorneys who work at the grader's firm: • 1-5 lawyers • 6-10 lawyers • 11-20 lawyers • 20-50 lawyers • More than 50 lawyers		Draw from existing sources.		
	Geographic location of grader practice		Draw from existing sources.		
	Prior supervising experience with new attorneys before participating in pathway		Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Reason for participating in pathway		Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Grader demographics	Race	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	National origin	Grader (WSBA potentially?)	Draw from existing sources.		
	English as a second language	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Gender	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Age	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Socioeconomic status: Head of household, single parent, current employment status	Grader	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	First-generation status	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	LGBTQIA+ status	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Disability status	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Veteran status	Grader/Potentially WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		

Feedback on pathway implementation	Candidate self-reports of experiences in pathway	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.	Short term	Everyone—depending on how information gathered (Likert scale and/or comments)
	Supervisor self-reports of experiences in pathway	Supervisor	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Assessment bias	Description of training that was provided to supervisors during pathway and whether training included anti-bias topics	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone
	Descriptions of any anti-bias training efforts from WSBA and law schools	WSBA, law schools	WSBA: draw from existing sources. Law Schools: need to develop tool to collect information.		
	Supervisors' subjective experiences of their training in pathway	Supervisor	Need to create a tool to collect data.	Short term—have we structured pathway to minimize bias? Routine for bias reporting	Everyone
	Supervisors' subjective experiences of bias in the pathway	Supervisor	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Candidates' subjective experiences of bias in the pathway	Candidate	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Any reports to WSBA of bias in pathway	WSBA	Need to create a tool to track information internally at WSBA.		
	Inter-rater reliability statistics designed to assess accuracy and consistency in supervisors' assessment		Need to create a tool to collect data; checking with Oregon; curious whether calibration for bar exam	Routine	Everyone

			method be used here?		
	Trends or patterns in work product types that are more likely to be graded passing or failing	WSBA Candidates Graders	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone
	Trends or patterns in activity types that are more likely to be assessed passing or failing	WSBA Candidates Graders	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone
Pathway as accurate measure of competence	Validity and reliability statistics for experiential pathway	?	Need to create a tool to collect data. Need expertise to do so	Short term; how frequently does NCBE assess? Explore other approaches as well	Everyone
	Validity and reliability statistics for NextGen UBE	? Potentially look to ABA, NCBE for background information	Need to create a tool to collect data. Need expertise to do so.	Determine frequency of NCBE's approach Data from Nevada Study (Jason Scott)	
	Annually, the number of bar complaints and disciplinary actions made against licensure candidates and lawyers licensed through • Experiential pathway • Bar exam • Admission on motion • Those licensed in another country prior to being licensed in Washington	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone
Supports offered by law schools and	Number of graduates law schools assist and qualitative summary of assistance provided	Law schools/candidates	Need to create a tool to collect data.	Short-term Law Schools likely able to routinely	Potentially an annual conversation/feedback session between WSBA, Law Schools,

WSBA for participants	Description of assistance provided by law schools to help students find employment to participate in pathway	Law schools/candidates	Need to create a tool to collect data.	provide data on those who complete pathway during law school	and Law Clerk Board for first 2-3 years of pathway
	Number of APR 6 law clerks WSBA assists and a qualitative summary of assistance provided	WSBA/Law Clerk Board/APR 6 candidates	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Qualitative data regarding any programmatic changes the WSBA/APR 6 Law Clerk Board makes to support law clerks entering the experiential pathway	WSBA/Law Clerk Board/APR 6 candidates	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	APR 6 law clerk and tutor perceptions of WSBA support for the implementation and administration of the intra-program components of the experiential pathway for law clerks	APR 6 candidates and supervisors	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
WSBA and law school collaboration	Qualitative data regarding the degree of collaboration among law schools	Law schools	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
	Law school faculty and administrator perceptions of WSBA support for the implementation and administration of the in-school components of the experiential pathway	Law schools WSBA	Need to create a tool to collect data.		
Pathway administration costs	WSBA's financial costs for: • Experiential pathway • Bar exam • Licensed by motion • Licensed in Washington after having been	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone

	licensed in a different country • APR 6 law clerk program, including those who sit for the bar exam and those who participate in the experiential pathway				
	Law schools' financial costs of student participation in: • Experiential pathway • Bar exam • Licensed by motion • Licensed in Washington after having been licensed in a different country	Law schools	Need to create a tool to collect data; be certain to define "financial costs" by asking for specific information.	Short term study of costs	Potentially an annual conversation/feedback session between WSBA, Law Schools, and Law Clerk Board for first 2-3 years of pathway
Perceptions of pathway	External stakeholder reports of perception of pathway candidates' competence	Bar members, judges	Need to create a tool to collect data.	After establishing a baseline, periodic review of perceptions. Will need to be thoughtful about how to manage data around who completed which pathway. Example: name a candidate, but do not reveal which pathway took	
Impact of pathway on legal community	Number of bar members practicing in legal deserts before implementation of pathway	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone
	Number of candidates located in legal deserts	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		
	Number of bar members practicing in legal deserts after implementation of pathway	WSBA	Draw from existing sources.		

	Number of clients served by candidates during pathway	Candidates/supervisors	Need to create a tool to collect data.	Midpoint/periodic; perhaps every 3 years	Everyone?
	Pro bono hours reported by lawyers licensed through pathway	WSBA Licensees	Draw from existing sources.	Routine	Everyone