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CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Father Pius Pietrzyk, co-chair of the Delivery of Legal Services Committee, opening this Committee. It's a duly noticed Committee meeting.

So first if we have a motion for the approval of the agenda?

MOTION

MS. REISKIN: So moved.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Is there a second?

CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Second.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Any against?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And that is passed, then.

The second item is the approval of the minutes from the January 23rd Board meeting. Do I --

MOTION

CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Move approval.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Is there a second?

MR. MADDOX: Second.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All those in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: The motion carries.

The minutes are approved.

So we're going to the main focus of the

business of this. Part of our work as Board members is

the oversight, and in some ways when you're the head of

a for-profit board, your goal is pretty easy. The

purpose of a for-profit entity is to make profit, and

so your primary duty is to make sure that the

corporation maximizes its profits.

Obviously, we are a nonprofit corporation.

Our goal is not to maximize profits. That includes

federal funds, even though it's an important part of

what we do. Our goal is to assist poor people in

getting quality legal services.

I think that means that it's part of our

oversight of the Board. It's not just simply financial
accounting or accounting to make sure that we follow the rules and regulations, as important as those are. To fill that out, we must make sure that the primary goal of this Corporation -- that is, to provide quality legal services to the poor -- is also followed.

I think part of the motivation for the reform of this Committee and the new direction that we approved about a year or a year and a half ago was to make sure that there is more information given to the Board so the Board can fulfill its proper and, I think, statutory obligation to oversee the quality of legal services being provided through the funds that come through this organization.

So I'm glad that we are beginning these series of briefings from Management to begin to communicate to the Board the Corporation's own review and oversight of the grantees to see that that work is being done.

We talked about this in the past. My idea is that this is the beginning of these briefings, and that as a Board, we should also discuss if we're getting the level of information that we want, the degree of information that we need, to do our oversight so that
we can communicate with Management as the other Committees, the Audit Committee or the Finance Committee, have done to make sure that we're getting this information as a Board that we are comfortable with to provide our oversight.

So this is, as I said, the beginning of it. And so we'll turn it over to Management to provide the beginning of this briefing. So thank you very much.

MS. JENNINGS: Great. Thank you, Father Pius. For the record, I'm Lynn Jennings, Vice President for Grants Management, and I'm joined by Janet LaBella, who's the Director of the Office of Program Performance. And we appreciate this opportunity to tell you about the grant work that the Office of Program Performance does as it relates to grantee oversight.

Getting started, what we're going to do today is we're going to talk about what the competition process looks like and what type of information we ask for and how in depth it is so that we have a pulse on what's going on with regard to the programs. And then Janet is going to take over, and she will talk about
what we do during the performance period of the grant.

As many of you know, we don't really have competition in the full sense of the word. So as we fashioned a way to review what the grantees were doing, about a third of our grantees are up for competition every year, and we do this by service area.

This briefing relates to basic field, Native American, and migrant grants, but not to Pro Bono Innovation Fund and TIG and disaster. They have somewhat of a different cycle. So one-third is up for full competition every year. The others are up for renewal. And so that's how it looks.

So there are three elements, three components, to competition. One is programmatic. Two is regulatory compliance. And three is fiscal compliance, which is a new addition since 2012. And we're in our third cycle of having a full fiscal application. I want to talk a little bit about what the programmatic review looks like, what the regulatory compliance review looks like, and fiscal review looks like.

So the program liaisons in the Office of Program Performance, they are divided into regional
teams, and whatever cycle they're in, they review the programs for which they're responsible. The process begins in the spring with the notice of intent to compete. Those notices of intent to compete come in, and then they submit full applications in the late spring or early summer. So it's quite an extensive timeline for the application process.

Over the summer, that's when the program counsel evaluate and score each of the grant applications. And they're very involved. They follow the performance criteria, each of the four performance criteria.

Since 2013, we have had outside reviewers score the applications to ensure that there is -- it's another layer of oversight to ensure that there is no bias on the score of the program liaison.

So the next slide shows you how we norm those scores. So this is just a snapshot of what it looks like. And if there is a grant variation between the score of the external reviewer and the OPP staff, that receives additional scrutiny as to why that might be. If there's a variation of 1.5 points or greater, then
we will discuss that in a meeting. So once the program counsel score their applications, then they write up a report about that and that is given a staff-level review by Janet, by the director of program performance, as well as Reginald Haley, who runs the competition process.

Once that is done, simultaneous with that is the director of the Office of Compliance and Enforcement is also doing a regulatory compliance review. So she has a broad spreadsheet and looks to see if there have been any compliance issues that have arisen since the last time in competition or the renewal.

Additionally, the fiscal compliance analyst scores the fiscal application on a score of 1 to 100, and then Lora Rath meets with each of the fiscal compliance analysts individually to see what they found, if they're recommending special grant conditions and the like. And then all of that information is put together on the computer in EasyGrants, which we're replacing soon, thank goodness. And then it is time for executive review.
So Jim and I will sit in meetings. A great deal of our time is dedicated in the fall to reviewing all of the grants in competition, and we discuss them in depth, and then our recommendation. So really, the OCE director signs off, the OPP director signs off, and then it is our turn to review them and then make recommendations.

MS. REISKIN: Did you say that the external review you do 25 percent? And is that random? 

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. It's random.

So generally, the vast majority, about 80 to 85 percent of our grantees, or 75 to 80 percent of our grantees, who are in competition receive the full three-year grant. However, it's generally a high of 30 to a low of 16 percent have received less than the full three years.

Generally, if they have less than a full three-year grant term, they will have special grant conditions attached to it. Sometimes if it's less than three years, it's to get them in a cycle where if there's a problem that has both a migrant and a basic field, we want them to be on the same cycle so that
they're not off cycle.

So that would be a reason for not imposing special grant conditions. But as you can see, it's generally about 20 to 23 percent of our grantees would have less than the full three-year term.

We've also in the last few years imposed greater special grant conditions. I think in 2012 we had nine programs that were subject to special grant conditions. In 2013 we had about 20 to 24 programs that were subject to special grant conditions. And this year we had 27 programs subject to special grant conditions. Yes?

MS. REISKIN: What do you attribute that to? And I also noticed the slide before, there was a distinct change. What --

MS. JENNINGS: Well, I think a lot of it is the fiscal application. As you can see, in 2014 there were eleven programs that had fiscally-related special grant conditions, and I think that that has a lot to do with it.

I do think that there's greater scrutiny in terms of performance, basically, both on the
programmatic side and on the fiscal and compliance side. So if we see something where -- for example, this year, though, we do give them a chance to improve before we impose special grant conditions. Some of them in the fiscal review may be missing a policy or two. And so we did reach out to some of the programs that needed to put those in place before we would sign off on the grant. And many of them delivered and got the policy or two approved by their board of directors. However, if they were not able to do that, then we imposed the special grant condition. And we do meet monthly to track the special grant conditions, if the grantees are making progress or not. So we follow up on that very closely. So that, in a nutshell, is the competition process, which is -- that's much briefer than it is because it's quite a long process. And I think that there are probably some efficiencies we can work in the system moving forward, but I would be --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: The web program will probably help with the efficiencies, the new --
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And just a rough

MS. JENNINGS: I think so, yes. Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And just a rough
guess -- I know you haven't calculated -- but when
receiving the new application for the renewal of the
grants to the final approval, about how long is that
process usually?

MS. JENNINGS: It's about six months.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And then it would take
effect, what, about six months after?

MS. JENNINGS: Well, the process is they
submit in June, usually, and we make final decisions by
the end of the calendar year. So they have funding for
the new calendar year.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So the funding starts
at the beginning of the calendar year?

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. It starts in January. So
there's a lag because we're on the fiscal year, the
government fiscal year, but our grantees, how we give
out the money, is based on the calendar year.

Yes, Julie?

MS. REISKIN: Can you explain the -- they're
approved for three years, but we're still doing
something every year?

MS. JENNINGS: Right. Just so that we continue to conduct oversight, we want to see if anything has changed with the program. So a renewal application is much shorter than a full-blown application. But we want to see, have there been any major changes in the program? Are there any management changes?

MS. REISKIN: So akin to like an interim report with a private foundation?

MS. JENNINGS: Something like that. A little more formal than that, probably, but something like that.

MS. REISKIN: And I know when we first came on the Board, we were given a report that said there was almost no actual competition; very rarely were there two people competing for the same money. Is that still --

MS. JENNINGS: Right. That continues to be the case. We might have one per year where there's actual competition, and I think part of that is it takes a lot of know-how and expertise and
sophistication to run an LSC-funded program. And so there's not a lot of competition out there for that. We have had some mergers, just a couple in the last few years, but that's about the extent of it.

Martha had her hand up.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I'm sorry, Martha.

DEAN MINOW: It's really great to see the implementation of the system. I'm just wondering about how much you are able to get feedback from grantees about how transparent, how clear, how user-friendly this is. And how do you tweak it? How do you get feedback on the process?

MS. JENNINGS: I'll let Janet handle that one.

(Laughter.)

MS. LABELLA: This is, for the record, Janet LaBella, the director of the Office of Program Performance.

We get feedback in a variety of ways. At the beginning of the cycle every year, we have what we call an applicant information session, which is a webinar for anyone. It includes those that are in renewal, if they're interested, and we particularly reach out to
those that are in competition.

As part of that process, we do a survey at the end, and we also invite questions. So we get feedback at that point. We have a special email address for the competition's help desk, and they can submit questions at any time. Those questions are answered promptly.

So we get feedback, I would say, in a fairly consistent level throughout the year. We also have regular contact with the programs. And we invite them to give us comments and questions and suggestions for improvement throughout the year as well.

MS. JENNINGS: And we also have a debrief here internally at the end of the session to see what we could do to improve the process.

Father Pius?

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I've got two questions. First, in terms of the grant conditions, what are the typical grant conditions or the reasons for the grant conditions to pop up? Is it usually because we see failures in financial oversight, or what's the -- are there typical grant conditions that we apply, or is it just so very specific that we don't --
MS. LABELLA: Well, from OPP's perspective, I would say they fall into a variety of categories. Sometimes we'll have new grantees. As Lynn mentioned, there were a couple mergers. We had a couple of grantees who had not been LSC grantees previously. So there is a series of special grant conditions that are tailored to them but also are generally with respect to someone who's a new grantee. We want to see, if it's a merger of two service areas, how they are integrating all of the different aspects of management and service delivery. So there's a couple of those if we have new grantees.

We also last year, or this year, had three that were follow-ups from not having completed implementation to our satisfaction of tier 1 recommendations in our program quality visit reports.

Then we have one-offs, those that we have a particular concern about a particular aspect of programmatic work and service delivery. And there will be special grant conditions with respect to that.

MS. JENNINGS: And on the compliance and fiscal side, I would say there are probably three
sources. On the fiscal side, it would be from the OIG, any recommendations we've gotten from the OIG where we're doing followup investigation -- not followup investigation; I take that back -- but where we're doing followup based on their referral to us, and we want to keep a close eye on that grantee.

It could be something found after the fiscal application, where there might be many of those eleven, I would say, probably about half, or certain policies weren't in place and we want to make sure that those policies are in place.

Then again on the compliance side, it would be something that we found onsite, and we want to make sure that those corrective actions are being followed up on.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And I just want a little bit of an idea on the scoring. What exactly do we use that scoring information for? Could you go back to that? I'm just trying to get my -- back to the scoring slide. So this is an example, for example, of one grantee.

MS. JENNINGS: Right.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And this is in the application process?

MS. JENNINGS: Yes.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And does this determine some of the special conditions or the grant conditions that we might impose on it? Or precisely what is this used for?

MS. LABELLA: It does not determine special grant conditions or funding term directly. But I'm sure that there is a correlation between overall low scores and whether or not a program is getting a limited funding term or special grant conditions. But it is not a mathematical formula. However, I would expect a correlation.

This particular slide that you see up there is what we call a score compare. And that is a comparison when we have an outside reviewer. But the scoring is done regardless of whether there's an outside reviewer or not.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Do we ever amalgamate this data, the scoring data, to see if there are trends in the way in which they match up? Because
this is all keyed off the performance criteria.

MS. LABELLA: Correct.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So do we look at this to see whether or not there are trends where maybe we're not providing sufficient information on the performance criteria, that sort of thing? Do we ever do that with this data?

MS. LABELLA: We haven't. You mean to see if there's a particular trend of lower scores in a particular performance area?

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. If everybody's getting -- for example, board governance -- a lot score on board governance, it would suggest to us that there's something wrong with our communication on what the requirements are for board governance. And the question is whether we do that to see if there are trends in these scores to improve the way in which we communicate our expectations.

MS. LABELLA: I think that's a good suggestion. I would just mention that since we're on this three-year cycle, you're evaluating different entities each year. So that has an effect on what the
relative scorings might be.

MS. JENNINGS: And I would say we use the score as an indicator of, is this a program we want to fund for three years? Do we need to go out there and see if there are some issues? And so that's what we use it for internally in terms of a decision-making tool.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Because my thought might be, just internally in terms of guidance that we provide grantees, if we're seeing consistently low scores in one of these performance criteria, that might be a suggestion to us --

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. Absolutely.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: -- this is something we need to do a webinar or a survey. This should be one of our goals in terms of our communications with our grantees in the future. And it seems that it's a useful -- at least it's collection of data that could be useful.

MS. LABELLA: I think that's a great suggestion.

MR. MADDOX: Janet, I have a question about
this process. It's a very detailed analysis. The financial administration, for instance, is, it seems to me, an opportunity for your office to look at a grantee at least every three years. Right?

MS. LABELLA: Correct.

MR. MADDOX: So there have been a number of grantees since we've been on the Board who, through OIG investigations or whistleblowers or otherwise, we've learned have had really bad financial administration -- bad internal controls, fraudulent schemes going on, and the like. Have -- I'm sorry?

Yes.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Just a few.

MR. MADDOX: Just a few. Well, really, I mean, out of 135 it really isn't that many. But it seems like that this would be an opportunity for LSC to take a detailed look at every grantee's operation, whereas the OIG might come along every ten years on a grantee, or there might be some specific fraud investigation on a random basis.

In this process, have you found instances where you have said, this grantee's operations are
wholly inadequate and therefore, in essence, debarred them or otherwise sanctioned them? Because it seems like otherwise, the practical consequences of this process seem like they're not being fully utilized.

MS. LABELLA: There have been a few instances where, based on the proposal submitted as well as other information that we have, which typically at that juncture would include a visit, a capability assessment visit, we have not provided funding.

Now, sometimes in that situation we would recompete the service area. We might provide what we call bridge funding to provide services until we can transition to a new provider. So that has been the most serious consequence of having a grantee or an applicant who has not submitted a sufficient proposal, which is indicative of not providing adequate services in the service area.

But as Lynn mentioned, in addition to that as the most serious consequence, there are special grant conditions and there's limited term funding. We have had limited term funding as month-to-month funding, as each month they have to submit reports indicating that
they are working on whatever the deficiencies are so
that they can receive the next month funding.

We have provided a single one-month funding.

On occasion, we've provided six-month funding, again
with a required demonstration of correction of certain
deficiencies before the next six months can be granted.

So there's a variety of tools that are employed.

MR. MADDOX: Just another question and then
I'll let you go, Julie.

For instance, we've got this Dakota Plains
Legal Services case, where the OIG -- this is public.
Right? Yes -- the OIG found that from 2009 to 2013,
almost $100,000 in extra overtime and other pay was
made to an exempt employee.

Did your review process in the grant awarding
mechanism, did that identify any of the problems that
apparently went back to 2009? So I assume that this
process took place some time as recently as, what,
2012.

MS. LABELLA: That level of fiscal analysis is
usually under the Office of Compliance and Enforcement
and not under OPP.
MS. JENNINGS: That's correct. And Lora will say that really, since this Board has been in place and the Fiscal Oversight Task Force, the level of oversight on fiscal matters and other compliance matters has really ramped up. So prior to that time, it probably would not have come about.

In terms of knowing that an employee was misclassified or classified themselves as exempt or non-exempt when they're exempt, I don't think that that would have come out even in a fiscal application.

But I think, as we look at risk overall, we know that some of our smaller programs, because of the lack of segregation of duties because they don't have that many fiscal people onsite if they have fiscal people at all, are a greater risk than some larger programs that can segregate duties. And so that goes into our risk analysis.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Gloria?

CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Well, in response to the Fiscal Oversight Task Force and all, you have put in some new procedures like this template over here on the board. Have you looked comparing what kind of
review results you got before the Task Force report and now that you have this, including external reviewer scores that we did not have before?

Are you tracking what's happening overall in terms of how many of the grantees are having, for instance, special conditions attached and for what purpose among the fiscal, the management, and whatever?

I hope that we're tracking that information as we've revised and improved our means of assessment tools.

MS. JENNINGS: I would say we're tracking 2013 forward. But I don't think that we've gone back and tracked prior to that. There was no fiscal application prior to 2012, and it was my understanding -- and Lora, correct me if I'm wrong -- that Lora's review was not in the grants system prior to that. I don't think the OCE director did that as a formalized basis as we do now.

MS. LABELLA: That's correct.

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: So it's really since 2013 that we can start collecting data that not only informs your operation but also sort of a report card that we and the Board can look at and have some
idea of the reliability of what's before us?

MS. JENNINGS: Right.

MS. LABELLA: Well, what we do track, Gloria, and we have slides that demonstrate that, are the number of special grant conditions and the topic of the special grant condition, whether it was fiscal or programmatic. And we can drill down more deeply on that if there's an interest. And we also track, again, the grant award term and can show the variations in that.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Gloria, this slide that's showing here is the best illustration of that. That shows a very clear difference between 2014 and 2012.

MR. LEVI: So do you think the word will get out in such a way that some -- our hope would be that this would float back down. Would it?

MS. LABELLA: Oh, I think it does. Right. I would be expecting to see that, I would say, after the next cycle is completed. In other words, since you have the three-year cycle, it's when you're into the third year, which means you're having a repeat of the applicants for the time that's demonstrated up there,
that you would see a real decline, hopefully, in those bars.

MR. LEVI: Well, we're confirmed till 2017.

(Laughter.)

MS. LABELLA: So we'll be looking forward to that for sure.

MS. JENNINGS: And we will continue.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I think Julie had a question.

MS. REISKIN: Yes, two. One is, first of all, do you track the really good stuff for best practices, and how is that communicated elsewhere?

Then second, do you ever see cases where grantees are really good on one and really problematic on another, or is it pretty much if they're not complying with fiscal, then their programs aren't good, or are they really separate?

MS. JENNINGS: I think that's an all depends. There is definitely some times. If the program is administratively a mess, chances are that it is not maximizing its efficiency in delivering quality legal services. We do see that a lot.
But I think it's a continuum in terms of how it pans out in the field. But I can think of some two or three programs where they're administratively a mess and they are not maximizing the delivery of legal services. But then I can think of another one that we've been dealing with for a long, long time where their delivery of legal services has improved but yet administratively they have been challenged.

MS. LABELLA: So I think there's a spectrum, Julie. And you'll find some programs that hit it at the top level for all of the performance areas, and including the fiscal review.

Then you'll have others that may be much too focused on the delivery of legal services to the expense of the administration, management, and fiscal. And so hopefully we're able to assess that through the competition process.

MS. JENNINGS: And in terms of the best practices question that you asked, we just hired a new researcher/writer. And with the revamp of the website, we hope to get more best practices out there.

There is great room for improvement there.
It's just a question of resources. I think we need to definitely devote more to that. Jim and I have had some conversations about that recently, and so we're going to try a new tack and we'll attack it that way.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: One thing we're aiming to do is to increase our use of webinars to propagate information about best practices. My own view is that a website is not an effective means to communicate best practices inform to our grantees. It's by its nature passive. It requires that people go to it to retrieve the information. I think we need to be much more proactive in getting information out there.

MS. REISKIN: I agree. But I would hope that it would be stored there after it's given so that people can refer to it.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. Correct.

MS. LABELLA: Right.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes.

MS. JENNINGS: Janet, do you want to go? So during the performance period, we also do quite a bit of oversight, mostly through our site visits. And Janet's going to talk about that.
The site visits and the competition process are really quite integrated, and they have become moreso in the last few years. So for example, the site selection, visitation and selection, actually takes place during the competition process.

The risk criteria and assessment is done through LSC Grants. So at the time of competition, each individual grantee is assessed in terms of risk. So the two primary risks, key risks, are the date of the last OPP visit and whether there's summarized here an indication of significant programmatic concerns that can come from a variety of sources.

What you see now up on the screen --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: What are the primary sources for those programmatic concerns? Is it through the scoring or is it through previous visits?

MS. LABELLA: It can be through the scoring. It can be through previous visits. It can be from other information that has come to our attention, such as, for example, from the OIG, OCE, or other funders. So those are the primary.

Then up on the screen now you see all the
other factors. And so those are assessed each year, and they're put into LSC Grants. And then we essentially score those. They are scored, and then we put them into a spreadsheet and analyze the programs that have the greatest risk. And that informs our visit selection process.

MS. REISKIN: Could you put that back for one second?

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And Janet, I assume you'll be sending this slide show to us?

MS. LABELLA: Yes. Yes. Absolutely.

So I think you're quite familiar now with the OPP visits. The primary one that we do is called the program quality visit, fondly known as the PQV. And that is typically one week duration, performed by a team of staff and typically one or two temporary employees.

Now, when I say typically, there is really no typical because it depends on the size and the geographic size. So it's both the number of personnel and the geographic size of the service area that determines the size of the OPP visit team. When there
are really, really big service areas, either in terms of personnel or geography, we may be there for two weeks in order to do it most efficiently.

The program engagement visit is typically two to three days, and most often by the liaison for the program, although occasionally we'll have someone else go if there's a particular area we're following up with that we think merits more than one person going.

So this slide shows -- oh, I'm sorry.

PROFESSOR VALEN西亚-WEBER: When you visit a large grantee with multiple offices geographically spread out, do you do any visits to the non-central offices?

MS. LABELLA: Yes, we do. We don't necessarily visit every single office. In some of our grantees, they are really quite far-flung, and some of them have only one or two staff people. So we do look at what is the cost/benefit analysis of going to those.

However, one of the things we've learned is, in a program that is really geographically dispersed, that it's useful to go to at least one or two of those so that you can get a sense of how is the service
delivery in that rural area from a very small office.

Sometimes what we'll do is instead of us going to the office, we'll actually ask them to come to a more central office, and so that we'll interview them in person as opposed to telephonically. But we just won't be at their particular office.

MS. REISKIN: Do you ever use Skype or something so that you can see the office but without the expense of someone going?

MS. LABELLA: Yes. We have used that as well. And sometimes what we do is we disperse the team. So if it's a large geographical area, we'll drop the team in the western part of the state, and the main office may be in the eastern part of the state, for what we call the entrance conference. They can be connected in by videoconferencing or Skype or some other means to the entrance conference, so that we have done that as well..

So this slide just shows the number of OPP visits per year. We stayed fairly constant last year in 2014. We dropped a tad for PQVs, and that was mainly based on the staff transitions that we had.
Now, there you'll see the green. And you had asked before about the number of multi-applicant competitions. So the green are the capability assessment visits. They're very much like a program quality visit, but they occur if there are multi applicants for a service area.

On occasion -- well, and also if there is a new entity that's going to be an LSC grantee that has not been previously, and on occasion, if there is someone who has not really made the mark in the competition process and we want to do a visit to inform us about the decision. And those are the green ones up there. So we typically have between one and three a year of capability assessment visits.

Now, starting in 2012 --

MR. LEVI: Wait. Can we go back to that chart thought showed -- no, the one before that. No, there was one that showed that temporary employees go. Where was that?

MS. JENNINGS: Temporary employees? This?

MR. LEVI: Right. Are those the people that are the outsiders?
MS. LABELLA: Now, when you say the outsiders, our temporary employees are not employees of an LSC grantee. They're frequently former executive directors or they are in management at a non-LSC grantee.

MR. LEVI: No. But when you did your scoring thing, you showed --

MS. LABELLA: Yes. That's right.

MR. LEVI: So I'm trying to match that up with this.

MS. LABELLA: Some of them may be the same people. But there's a much larger group that go on visits than do the scoring. We've typically had about three people who have done the scoring. And often, they have been former LSC employees, who are more familiar with the process, but not always recent former LSC employees. But this is a much larger group that goes on the visits.

MS. REISKIN: And this is the group that we're going to be adding clients to. Right?

MS. LABELLA: That's correct.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes.

MS. LABELLA: So back in 2012, we started with
what we called the post-PQV RFP. And this was an
effort to do two things. It was an effort to
streamline the application and to make it more relevant
because we had grantees who we had just visited, and
now we're asking them to throw back at us what we just
sent them in a report.

So we thought, well, this is not the most
effective way to follow up with them on how they're
improving their services. So we also wanted to do a
more systemic followup on the recommendations.

So at that time we designated certain
recommendations as tier 1, which are the most
significant recommendations. And so now that is what
their proposal in competition is. It is a response to
what they have done in terms of those recommendations.

Now, these are the number of tier 1
recommendations for each grant term cycle. Now, the
first grant cycle, April 10 to March 11, we had to go
back to the PQV reports and identify recommendations as
tier 1 because they had not been coded as that at that
time.

Subsequent to that, we have been coding the
recommendations as either tier 1 or not tier 1. And the grantee is informed at the time of the visit, and it's in the report, that they will need to follow up on all of the recommendations that are designated as tier 1.

MS. REISKIN: When you're deciding how many tier 1 and the extent, does the percentage of their budget that's LSC have anything to do with that?

MS. LABELLA: No.

MS. JENNINGS: No, it does not.

MS. REISKIN: So we're going to do just as much whether we're funding 5 percent than if we're funding 80 percent?

MS. JENNINGS: That's right. That's correct.

MS. LABELLA: That's right. However, having said that, we don't have anyone that extreme. But if there is a very specialized funding source that they have, we will not be looking into that as thoroughly when we're onsite.

So let's say they have some of these abused and neglected children grants. We won't be interviewing all of their staff and reviewing all of
the document if it's something that is not reportable
to LSC. So in that sense, we're not looking into that
in as much depth.

Now, one of the nice things that we can do now
that we've coded all of these tier 1 recommendations
and they are part of the application is we can drill
down and see, well, are there any trends and how do
they look?

So these are grantees with tier 1
recommendations per topic in performance area 1. So
they had, for example, needs assessment or
recommendations regarding strategic plan, priorities
goals, and outcomes. And the colors demonstrate, for
the competition cycles, how many there were.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So, for example, the
one that says strategic plan, is it that they didn't
have a strategic plan, or it was deficient, or they
weren't following it, or all of the three?

MS. LABELLA: It could be any of those things.
And in fact, I think you hit on the three primary
ones. It can be that they haven't done one for a long
time and they are clearly in need of a strategic plan,
or that they have shelved it and they really need to take it off the shelf and dust it off, or that they're not following it at all. So it's all of those with regard to the strategic plan.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So for example, if I might working with our grantees, that's pretty consistent. We have a pretty consistent number of people who have strategic plan problem -- ten, nine, ten, pretty constant.

MS. LABELLA: Right.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So it looks like it's something that we should consider addressing in the future with our grantees to make sure in the future we can get that number down.

MS. LABELLA: Right. Right. And I think there's been an increased emphasis on strategic planning in the last three or four years. And so that fits in with that as well. To some extent, one of the interests with strategic planning has been as the funding issues developed, and some grantees were receiving a lot less funding, both LSC and non-LSC. Strategic planning was essential in terms of how they
were going to go forward with reduced funding.

The next series of slides show this with respect to the other performance areas. So you will see the spike with intake. Intake is a very, very difficult thing to do very well because the demand is absolutely overwhelming. It could take all your resources to do intake, and then what would you do?

So it's a very critical aspect of both the relationship with the clients -- it's the first time the applicants interact with the program -- and it sets the stage for the service delivery. So it's very critical, but it is very difficult. And it so resource-intensive.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: This is clear that the biggest problem that they have is intake.

MS. LABELLA: Well, this is now with respect to performance area 2.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Right, right; and we have ongoing programs to help them deal with intake, or to consider? I know we've talked about it a lot, at least with the technology side -- it's been very, very important on this.
MS. LABELLA: Right. I think there's a lot of crossovers. With TIG, one of the things we've done in the last several years is emphasize online intake, which can really provide some major savings of resources and efficiencies. So that's one approach.

We typically have sessions at both NLADA and Equal Justice conference regarding intake, and so that's something that we emphasize there. And we provide technical assistance when necessary.

We've assisted some grantees with developing what we call intake playbooks or intake manuals, and we've gone onsite to help them with that and follow up with that; and also provided technical assistance in terms of the technology that's very helpful with having an efficient intake system.

Julie?

MS. REISKIN: That just seems like an area that's ripe for some best practice stuff, where you could have those playbooks available online and have some webinars.

MS. REISKIN: I remember seeing the Bay Area intake, and that's a phenomenal system.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. It's great.

MS. LABELLA: Yes.

MS. REISKIN: And it's something -- I saw it years ago now and I remember it, that's how impressive it was.

MS. LABELLA: Right.

MS. REISKIN: And it took them a long time to develop it.

MS. LABELLA: Then we move on to performance area 3, and legal work management is consistently the one --

MR. LEVI: What is LEP?

DEAN MINOW: Could we ask what was LEP?

MS. LABELLA: Oh, I'm sorry. Limited English proficiency.

MR. LEVI: And maybe you just said this, but on intake, how many webinars do we do on that?

MS. LABELLA: Specifically on intake? We have not done any recently specifically on intake, although, as I said, we've done sessions on intake specifically.
MR. LEVI: It just seems like there's so much we are hearing.

MS. LABELLA: No, I think that is something that we're focusing on, and also with the web resources as well. We have been gathering materials to really emphasize intake.

MR. LEVI: But in a helpful way. As we go out in the field and do our field, we've heard of some wonderful intake programs.

MS. LABELLA: That's right.

MR. LEVI: You'd love to be able to share them more broadly. Maybe it would help here.

MS. LABELLA: Right. And for example, with some of these that have issues, we recommend that they connect with some other program that does do intake efficiently, and we usually connect them up so that they can contact them.

We have also facilitated sometimes visits where the program that is in dire need of improving their intake can visit someone who has done a good job.

DEAN MINOW: So there's another place where I wonder about feedback. Is there a specific feedback
question that says, were you connected with resources to address a problem?

MS. LABELLA: I'm sorry. I didn't catch the first part?

MS. JENNINGS: Were you connected.

DEAN MINOW: I'm wondering, in the feedback from grantees, do we ask specifically, were you connected with resources to help you address the problems that were identified? Because it would be nice to know, even if we think we're connecting them, do they think we're connecting them?

MS. LABELLA: Right. I think that's good. Now, the ones that we do connect we follow up with. So we do know if they followed through or not. But in terms of other grantees who we have not visited, we don't know, really, the extent to which they have connected with others.

MR. MADDOX: Janet, the limited English proficiency number has doubled every year for four years.

MS. LABELLA: No. It has gone up -- I'm not sure that it's -- I guess it actually is pretty
symmetrical, isn't it?

MR. MADDOX: So next year, is it 16?

MS. LABELLA: I tend to think not. A lot of that depends on which program you're visiting. But also, as you know, there has been a trend up in terms of the variety and extent of languages that are spoken. And so that impacts our grantees. And so this is reflective, I think, of that as well.

MR. MADDOX: Well, right. That's my point. It seems like this process is helpful in identifying troublesome trends that grantees are facing. For instance, I know in Louisville, Kentucky, even without actually being in the community where people with limited English proficiency typically live and work, you can see people who obviously are having trouble with English. And that's not just Mexican or Central American. It's all over the world.

MS. LABELLA: Right. It's a whole variety of languages. Right.

MR. MADDOX: Yes. And I know our school system has just reported last week that they're having to open an entirely new middle school for people who
really don't speak English at all.

Is this something that LSC Management is focused on as a way of talking to Congress about? Since Congress has made clear, or the Executive Branch has made clear, that it's responsible for our immigration system, not the states, and certainly not the cities and counties. It just seems like that's a trend that's troublesome.

MS. LABELLA: It's definitely a trend that's an eye-opener. It's a wakeup call to programs out there that while they may not have many applicants and clients now in their service area that have other languages as their primary language, that they may be looking at that very soon.

We do have actually a nice map on the website that shows the increases in persons who have limited English proficiency throughout the country as well as the percentages. So it shows what the trend is in terms of the uptick of the number of people in the service area as well as the total number as an indicator of what the trend is.

MS. JENNINGS: Right. And I think that point
is well taken, Vic. The issue is, are the programs doing their needs assessment in a timely manner? Because if the community of clients is changing and having such a demographic shift, are they aware of that? Are they keeping up with that? Are they doing the outreach to the community that they need to do?

I don't think we've cross-tabulated the increase in LEP and lack of doing a needs assessment, or maybe it has been. So that is a point well taken.

DEAN MINOW: Can I just chime in here and say the data that I've seen indicate big shifts to secondary and tertiary cities instead of major cities of the immigrants' pattern, so that communities that didn't used to see large immigration are seeing it.

MS. LABELLA: Right.

DEAN MINOW: But I'd echo Vic's comment about looking to other federal agencies that actually are entrusted, particular with language assistance. And DOE is certainly one. HHS is one. Homeland Security is one. If the federal government is spending any time on language elsewhere, we should be getting some help on that front as well.
MS. LABELLA: No, that's an excellent point. So I guess we can move to performance area 3. And here --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Let's see 2 again.

MS. LABELLA: Oh, you want to see 2 again? I'm sorry.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Now we can go to 3.

MS. LABELLA: Oh, Gloria?

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Oh, I'm sorry, Gloria.

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: This shift in limited English proficiency populations is frequently a concern because of undocumented immigrants. But you need to be aware of the lawfully entered, legally present, documented immigrant that's happening now. And this is in the latest report coming out of the divisions in Department of Homeland Security.

There's a shift to more Asian and African immigrants. And as Martha has mentioned, they do not necessarily go to the primary big cities. And so the impact of people who may have thought they have to prepare for Spanish-speaking or other kinds of
populations are going to be faced with a whole set of populations.

It does raise the issue about what had been the traditional pre-1980s, late 1980s, provisions of services in what was the old Immigration and Naturalization Services, which had programs funding English language instruction, all kinds of adjustment programs for newly arrived, legally present, authorized immigrants.

That money has shrunk, and so has the grants, say, to community colleges to do that. And so it means that our legal services providers will encounter people who are here, and when they face a legal issue, will not have had access to language competency kinds of services that existed in the past.

It may mean that our grantees will have to seek out more locally funded, locally operated programs to fill this gap that's happened in the cuts in federally funded budgets.

MS. LABELLA: Right.

MS. JENNINGS: Thank you.

MS. LABELLA: With respect to performance area
3, legal work management, which also includes supervision, it is the highest area with actually quite a bit in PAI, private attorney involvement, and advocacy as well.

MS. REISKIN: Can you explain the difference between advocacy and legal work?


MS. REISKIN: Oh, okay.

MS. LABELLA: So it's really the supervision, and do they have appropriate protocols in place? Do they have standards of practice? Do they have tickler systems and things like that? That will be in the legal work management and supervision.

Advocacy is more, do they have a breadth of advocacy? What is the quality of the advocacy? We review writing samples from every advocate before we go on a visit, and so if there are concerns related to that, both in terms of the breadth and the quality, that will be something that will show up in the advocacy area.

Moving on to performance -- oh, I'm sorry?
MS. REISKIN: So what the advocacy is, is it in certain topic areas? That's really concerning.
Both of those are really -- because that's like the heart and soul of what we do. And so what trends are you seeing? Has it always been this high?

MS. LABELLA: I would think, although we can't track it back before that, I would say that this is probably generally reflective. You don't see a real trend line there. If anything, you see advocacy going down, indicating an improvement. But you don't see any real clear trend lines there.

So I don't think that this is a new area of great concern. Sometimes, again, when you have the dislocations that are occasioned by loss of funding, it's going to put stressors on both your advocacy and your legal work management.

For example, some of the advocacy is coordination of the legal work and the advocacy in the program. And sometimes that has been occasioned by if an advocacy director or litigation director has left the program, that as a cost-saving measure, they have not hired anyone to replace that person.
What happens then is you end up having siloed advocacy, and they're not coordinating it as well. So those are some of the things that come under the advocacy, as well as sometimes there's a trend or a tendency to focus on one particular practice area and not really be as responsive to the needs assessment.

Sometimes that is reflective as well of specialized funding sources. And so we'll be concerned about making sure that there's a breadth of advocacy that matches what the needs assessments are, and that will show up often under advocacy as well.

Now, this is performance area 4, and the indications below are the specific criteria for each of them. And you can see that board governance there has had numerically the highest number of tier 1 recommendations in the last four cycles. And I think that is reflective of the concerns about board governance and, overall, with the engagement of the board and the oversight of the board.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And certainly this committee has talked about having that as a topic in the future. I think we're aware that's an important
DEAN MINOW: And that has been quite explicit also in dealing with fraud.

MS. LABELLA: Now, I find this slide particularly interesting. When a grantee has a program quality visit, they get two years of doing this post-PQV RFP, and that is whether it is in competition or in renewal.

So this is a significant departure from the typical renewal application. They actually do a full-blown -- it's almost identical to the competition process when it is someone who is in post-PQV status. Okay?

So since they are in this status for two years, this shows the number of recommendations that were implemented. Now, this is conflated. This is taking all the cycles and mushing them together so you can see the trend.

But you can see, for example, for implemented, the number goes up significantly in the second year of the reporting, of the implementation. And being implemented goes down a little bit because some of
those then became implemented.

But overall, if you look at implemented, being implemented, implemented in part, that is significantly the vast majority of the recommendations are being dealt with in a positive way.

I think that's it. So any other questions?

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: That's the end of the whole report from you both?

MS. LABELLA: Yes.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So I'll give you my thoughts and comments first, and then we'll see if anybody has any questions.

First, just thank you. I think this is, for the first time that I've been aboard, the most thorough discussion of program quality that we've seen, based on the grantee visits. And I think it's a good start, and we can talk a little bit more, too, about the way that it needs to be improved. I'll jump into that.

Then a couple things that come to mind. First is, we do need this in writing beforehand. It's hard to come up with thoughtful questions on the spot. So from my personal view, this information really needs to
be provided -- whether it's in the confidential section
or wherever you want to put it, I don't care -- but it
needs to be in writing to us so that I can look at the
numbers and give you more intelligent questions about
the response.

MS. LABELLA: Certainly.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And especially those
graphs on the performance criteria that you have at the
end. Those are absolutely crucial because it just
shows us where the trends are and it shows us where we
have to focus.

I would like a little bit more on the scoring
and to look at the relationship between the scoring and
the visits just to see that they track a little bit.
If we could have more of an amalgamation of some of
those scoring numbers to give us an idea of what we're
looking at when we're looking at the grants, that will
help give us, I think -- and again, by pulling that
scoring out, it's like metadata. It's not
grantee-specific, so we can still provide some
confidentiality to the grantees. And I think that
would help as well.
I think just a list, too, in the future of the grantee visits that you've made -- where have you been? Where were you in 2014? '13? '12? Which grantees have you seen, especially the performance visits? Just so we know which grantees you're visiting.

Again, I don't want to make public things that are private in terms of confidentiality. So you don't have to exactly tie all the performance evaluations. But I think it's just a good idea so that the Committee knows where these are going on and what's going on.

MS. JENNINGS: We'll put a comprehensive list together for both the Audit Committee and DLS Committee of all the visits that we've done in the last three years.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I think that would be great. And every year when we do this, we just update it so we can get a sense of where we're going, how we're going, because I think it's just part of our oversight process.

The other one is a broader comment --

MR. LEVI: So you mean this to be done every year?
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. This should be done every year. We're doing this every year, yes.

And I do want --

MR. LEVI: We've got to start thinking about what happens after us. We want to set the --

MS. REISKIN: Exactly.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. And this needs to be -- I think it's good for the Management to be able to come up with the summaries, and it's going to help in the future on what you do programatically. It also is going to help us.

We're going to be doing the strategic plan pretty soon. And this kind of data is helpful to us, I think, in understanding how we're going to formulate that strategic plan and in the future when we do strategic plans.

So that's why I think this is a first step, and it's important. And the more data that we get to help us understand what the trends are in this, I think it'll be better for us.

My second comment, and I know I'm going to sound like a broken record on this: All of this, all
of this, is keyed off performance criteria.

Everything, just about everything, that we have is keyed off performance criteria, which has not been significantly and thoroughly reviewed in about ten years.

We've gone through the PAI stuff. We've gone through fiscal oversight. We've gone through the 40th anniversary. I think the Board and Management seriously need to think about whether a comprehensive review of the performance criteria is appropriate. I think it is.

The only question, I think, is the timing and the staffing to be able to do a comprehensive -- I know we've started some aspects of performance criteria review based on some deficiencies the Board has seen. I think every time we do this, we see deficiencies in the performance criteria.

Since those performance criteria key off everything that we do, that if we're not up to date on that and we're now reviewing that, then we're not getting the right information about the trends and the deficiencies and what else is going on.
So those are my thoughts on the reports going on in the future and the way in which the reports themselves can be made better by doing the performance criteria. I don't think the Board should be writing the performance criteria, but I think the Board does have a role in encouraging Management to do that.

So those are my thoughts on it, and if anybody else has any questions -- Gloria?

PROFESSOR VALENCA-WEBER: Along with the report on performance criteria, on the Audit Committee we have really been also working on the Office of Compliance with OIG.

When we do have a report on who you visited in each of the years, I would like as much as possible a coordinated memo with the Office of Compliance of which of the grantees they have been looking at and that we're studying in the Audit Committee are part of the same group so that we have some idea to connect both ends of the evaluation process.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes.

PROFESSOR VALENCA-WEBER: This is very much pointing to what the Fiscal Oversight Task Force and
others pointed out. We're still unconnected in siloed forms of information that make it hard to get the total picture of particular grantee performances and what's happening.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. We're trying to break down those silos and integrate them more. I think we've made progress on that, but we want to formalize that as well. And so we'll be moving forward with that.

I think one thing that will be very helpful with that is all of the work that Peter Campbell has been spearheading in OIT. Part of the problem with siloing is where the information is housed, and we're going to do something radical and file things under grantees instead of just by function.

So I think that will be a huge improvement in accessing information for anybody who wants to get any information on any of our grantees internally.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I just want to follow up on that very quickly. One question, and this is maybe for the Committee: One thing we have not had here is any grantee-specific information, whether there
are troubles or particulars with program quality specifically with any grantees.

That's just something that I struggle with because I don't want every single problem of the grantees to come up into a public forum because I don't think that's necessarily fair for them, but whether there should be more grantee-specific information about some of the visits, and especially if there are problems that the Board should know.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Father Pius, we do post on our website all reports of grantee visits, at least the program quality visits, the larger visits. They're on the website and publicly available, and we've been doing that since 2011. They go back to 2008. So any report is available for the public. That's readily available.

MS. JENNINGS: One thing that we have also been doing is in the competition process and the post-PQV tier 1, if they are not following through on the recommendations, we've been holding their feet to the fire with pretty comprehensive special grant conditions as well in the last few years. They've been
quite prescriptive in how we've been dealing with them.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Julie, you had something?

MS. REISKIN: Yes. I agree with everything Father Pius said. This is really good information. I'd also like to start getting regular reports on how it's going with integrating the client piece into the PQVs because I really want to make sure that that happens and provide any support.

At some point I'd be interested in knowing the people that do the reviews, particularly the outside people, how are we matching their expertise so that when we're judging the advocacy, the people that are judging it have some experience in those particular fields?

You don't have to answer right now. But at some point I'd like to know, if we're judging someone who's doing Social Security cases, the person who's judging it, do they do this work, and recently?

Because doing this work today is very different than doing this work 15 years ago.

MS. LABELLA: Right. I should just clarify
here that when we evaluate program quality, we do not second-guess the advocacy in a particular case. When we review the writing samples, we're looking at, generally, is it well-presented, the facts and the legal argument? As I said, we're looking at the breadth of the advocacy and that kind of thing.

We want to hear about individual cases. We typically ask, what is the most significant or important work they've been involved in in the last year, to hear, well, what's their high points, to look at that. Typically, that will match the writing sample.

So we want to hear what are the results achieved for the clients in those situations. But we do not delve into each individual case and second-guess, like I said, the advocacy.

MS. REISKIN: Do you look at case loads? Trends? Win/loss?

MS. LABELLA: Yes. We look at case loads and trends. So now you're getting into outcomes, and a lot of our programs actually do collect outcome data, which is commonly referred to as main benefit.
That will show, for example, how many evictions were prevented, how much was obtained by a client in an SSI appeal, both in terms of the retro and the monthly. And you get that as an aggregate. And you can obviously look at it individually as well, depending on how you run the report.

So we request that in our document production before we go on visit, and we review that when we're out there. And we're definitely interested in what they get. What is the outcome overall as well as what are the outcomes in the individual cases that we're discussing.

MR. LEVI: So the other information that you requested, Father Pius, when would we be seeing that? A year from --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Well, we can do it more often. But my thought would be, at a minimum, that this April meeting should be --

MR. LEVI: I agree with that. But this year we haven't gotten the extra pieces that you asked.

MS. LABELLA: We can certainly provide the list of all the visits, to whom that OPP has done for
the last three years. That's very easy.

MR. LEVI: Yes. Right.

MS. JENNINGS: Right. And we're going to couple that with the OCE visits as well. And so I would imagine within a week we can --

MR. LEVI: You could just send that out to us.

MS. JENNINGS: Yes. We will. Absolutely.

MR. LEVI: And then I thought there was one other compilation, though, that you asked about.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: The scoring.

MR. LEVI: The scoring. Couldn't that be included? Is that too bulky?

MS. LABELLA: I think, with that -- in fact, I may want to talk to Father Pius offline to see exactly what he's looking for, to see what we can put together. We have the scoring, and as you saw from the scoring slide, even though that's the score compare, we have that for all of the staff reviews.

MR. LEVI: Well, we don't want to review --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. I want some averages, summaries.

MS. LABELLA: Right. So we can go back with a
few years for that, too, if you're interested in what
was the average score for each performance area or each
of the ways we've broken it down.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I am.

MS. LABELLA: Yes. That shouldn't be that
difficult. But we can certainly get you the visits
more easily than we can generate that report.

MR. LEVI: Then finally, I was going to say
I'm sure that most of us -- I speak for myself. I
don't know when a program visit is posted. And I think
that one of the things you might do is hit some of the
high points from visits. Now, maybe that's a closed
session. I don't know.

MS. LABELLA: Sure.

MR. LEVI: But we'll trust you to say, we were
at these six that this happened.

MS. LABELLA: We could definitely do that.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: For those reports, is
there an executive summary at the beginning of those
reports?

MS. JENNINGS: There is a summary at the
beginning.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Then what I would suggest is that next time, those executive summaries for the past year are collected together and put into a document and made part of our Board book.

MS. JENNINGS: Okay.

MR. LEVI: That's good.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I'm sorry. Harry?

MR. KORRELL: This is very helpful, and after a couple of years of looking at financial reporting and hearing reports in the Audit Committee about what we're doing in the event of an earthquake or a monster eats our computer -- it's all important. But this is actually really helpful, and it just makes you feel like we're paying attention to the right things, and we're working on improving quality, and I really appreciate that.

I am a little worried that when we have a Board meeting, Management sits there and just thanks, oh, my God, what are they going to ask for next?

(Laughter.)

MR. KORRELL: Because as we go around the table, everybody wants a report. Everybody wants a
summary. And I'm a little worried, not with any
specific request here, but I do hope that Management
and staff are willing to say back to us or up through
Jim, please don't have us do six more things because we
never take them back.

I'd like one of those, and I'd like one of
those. And we just keep piling on. Do the requests
sunset? As a Board, I think we need to be careful what
we ask for. And I hope that you are willing to say up
through Jim, hey, we've got enough to do on our plate.

MR. LEVI: On our plate. Well, they do. They
already have that.

MR. KORRELL: They do. I just notice, as we
go around the table, everybody who opens his mouth asks
for a different report and some more summaries and
analysis. So we need to be careful, and I hope you'll
tell us when we're asking for too much.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I speak for all of our
staff in saying God bless you, Harry.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: No. It is a good
point. I think there's a basic level of information
that we do need. But I am sensitive to Harry's point, that the staff isn't there just to carry out whatever the peculiar needs of any particular Board member is. It should be something that is really good data that's useful for us and that's important in a sense only to our role in oversight. And I think the information that we get about program quality is an essential part of our oversight. So I do want to make sure we get at least the minimum information that we need.

I'm sorry. Martha?

DEAN MINOW: Well, I just think back to your prior comment. When you are producing material anyway, it's just sharing it with us in advance of the meeting would be great. So I think, if I can just call this the Harry principle --

MS. JENNINGS: Any other questions?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Oh, I don't think we have any other questions.

MR. LEVI: On that point, if there are reports we've been asking for that we don't seem to want, for
gosh sakes, tell us to stop doing them.

MR. KORRELL: I think they rely on the fact that we're probably not going to remember between now and the next meeting.

(Laughter.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All right. Any other questions or comments on this?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I just want to give my thanks to Lynn and Janet for this very excellent report. This is the first time we've done this, and I think it was a great first start, a very great first start.

I think we'll refine it as we go through to get the information that I think that we need. But this has been wonderful. And I know it's new for you, and I'm sure it was a lot of time and effort. And we very much appreciate all that was put into it. So thank you both very much, and thank your staffs as well. I'm sure you weren't at the computer, just the two of you by yourselves, doing all that stuff.

MS. LABELLA: I should absolutely emphasize
that. We could not do this without OPP's star staff.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Please do thank them for me. This has been very, very helpful.

Is there any public comment that's of relevance to the Delivery of Legal Services Committee?

Any public comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Seeing no public comment, is there any other business that the Committee needs to act upon?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Seeing none, I entertain a motion to adjourn.

MOTION

CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: So moved.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So moved. Is there a second?

MR. MADDOX: Second.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All those in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Any opposed?

(No response.)
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And this meeting of the Delivery of Legal Services Committee is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:53 a.m., the Committee was adjourned.)

* * * * *