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(11:20 a.m.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Seeing a quorum present, I hereby open the duly announced meeting of the Delivery of Legal Services Committee, and we begin with the first item, the approval of the agenda. Do I have a motion?

MOTION

MR. MADDOX: I move the approval of the minutes (sic).

MS. REISKIN: Second.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: So moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: The agenda is approved. We have just one minutes to approve.

MOTION

MR. LEVI: So move.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Any second?

MR. MADDOX: Second.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: That's passed.

The first thing we'll discuss is the evaluations for the Committee's goals. We're still a fairly new Committee and I think we're still finding our sea legs, as it were. We still suffer, I think, a bit of the issues that we've had before, is exactly the purpose and direction.

I think the bylaws have given us some more direction, and the revision of the bylaws. But I think probably the greatest concern is the question on what this Committee should be doing.

My concern, though, is that there's a sense that doing something means passing resolutions. And I'm not sure that's really the ultimate focus of this Committee. I'm not sure that we'll ever be in a position like some of the other Committees, like Ops and Regs, to be passing a lot of resolutions.

I think the purpose of this Committee, one, is
to provide a mechanism for the Board to receive more information from Management on the quality of legal services that's being done.

I've said this before, and I'm becoming more and more concerned about it or more and more realize, that we receive a great deal of information from the Management about the financial oversight of our grantees, but almost nothing with regards to the quality of legal services provided.

I understand it's provided on the website. But we would never say to the Audit Committee, well, the audits are all provided on the website, so that should be enough for you. So I think there does need to be more communication on that, and I'll talk about that in a second.

The second thing is I do think that our discussions here provide information --

MR. LEVI: Wait a minute. They're not here to hear that. So hold your thought, and restate it when they're here to hear it. But state whatever else you want to say.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Well, I'll restate it,
then, because the other part is relating to that, too.

I do think that we do have some impact. I was very, very pleased to see Jim's list of goals for the upcoming year, which he includes some reflection on or some amendments to the performance criteria.

I think that's something that we've flagged on this minute. I don't think it would have come up without the discussions on this Committee and without the concern of these Committee members. So while I understand that there's some concern about that all we do is hear presentations and that we don't ever provide resolutions to the Board, I don't think that we should make the passing of resolutions our goal.

I think the goal is to begin -- at least my thought is to begin setting up the process by which we get more reporting from Management about the quality of legal services that are done by the Board. And I think, too -- I talked about this with Charles as well, and I'm wanting to get input from this.

We have two competitive grants programs, both the TIG grant and now the Pro Bono grant. And there is some financial oversight for it, but there isn't really
any oversight for what's actually being done in terms of the work product of these.

Given the huge increase in money that's now being allotted, especially to the pro bono, is whether or not there should be at least some report from Management to the Board about what's actually being done in these programs in terms of the work product being done, and that kind of thing, so that the Board has at least some input or some knowledge of what the results of these competitive grants projects are, not as financial oversight, but how it affects the delivery of legal services and whether or not these things are in fact making a difference in the provision of legal services.

I think they are; I really do. But I think the more that information is consolidated and given to the Board in a report through this Committee, I think that ought to be at least a part of the regular communication between the Management and the Board on this.

So that's my take on the reviews and my response to the reviews. I think the input that we got
from the evaluation is good. I think it's accurate in
many ways and I think it's right. So I think we're
still trying to figure out what it is that we're doing.
But I think what that means is setting up the
foundation for future work, and I think we ought to
have those.

Jim, welcome. John wanted me repeat -- I was
talking about the evaluations. And there was some --
I'll just repeat very quickly -- I think some concern
on the Board that this Committee's problem is we don't
know what this Committee is doing, or that it isn't
doing anything, just listening to reports.

My view is that the purpose of this Committee
is to provide an outlet for Management to report to the
Board on the quality of legal services. And that
doesn't necessarily mean we provide resolutions. The
Audit Committee does not do a lot of resolutions.

My comment was, it's true that audits of
grantees are listed on the website. But we would never
say to the Audit Committee, that's enough for your
oversight. And I think there is very -- and I'm not
blaming anyone; I just don't think this has been our
practice -- there hasn't been a lot of collection of material and presentation to the Board in a systemic way of the quality of the delivery of legal services. I know how difficult it is, and I don't want to move to -- I'm not saying we ought to have a ratings program in place by next meeting. But there needs to be some avenue. We need to be moving towards a regular provision of that kind of information to the Board.

That includes not just the grantees, but the output of our competitive grants programs as well, both the TIG program and now the Pro Bono legal program. And I think how that affects legal services, delivery of legal services, should be part of the oversight of this Committee.

So I've restated it once, and twice again. That's my thought, and I just wanted to get some people's responses to the evaluations and to that idea.

Gloria?

CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Well, I share concern about our being more involved in reviewing performance criteria. But at the same time, those are under construction in response to a number of things
from the oversight reports that we had. And I'm willing to wait some, especially as Jim and the Staff develop some more concrete kinds of information they feel they can share with us.

The other part from the review that I think remains strong and I have thought from the beginning that it was an issue, and that's training of grantee board members. After the reports yesterday that Lynn Jennings and the other people gave us, it's very clear that we need well-trained board members for our grantees who can perform what board members are supposed to do so that whatever activities are undertaken responsibly, not just in a management style but in fiscal accountability.

That's the only way we're going to maximize the number of dollars actually spent in providing legal services to the poor. So that's my two main takes from our --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I think we'll bring that up when we talk about some of our future topics over the next year. So thank you, Gloria.

Julie?
MS. REISKIN: I totally agree with what both of you said. I guess my question is when and how -- we talk about the performance criteria, but we bring it up, and then we have a panel, and then we don't ever discuss it.

So for example, today is leadership. Well, the leadership thing in the performance criteria is all about the director and nothing about the board. When would be the appropriate time for us to say, well, maybe we should change that and have something in there about the board? Because the board is the ultimate check and balance, and the board is the entity legally responsible for leadership.

So to me, I thought it was odd that it didn't -- and I just never understood -- I think I've asked this question about four or five times now since I've been on the Board. When is the time to discuss and say, maybe this needs to be amended?

I don't think we should be willy-nilly amending things here, there, and all over. I think we need a process and we need input from all stakeholders, especially clients. So I'm not saying we should just
start throwing things out there.

But I feel real strongly that these are things that should be looked at, and that when we notice something that to me is glaringly missing, we should be able to do something about it.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. I know Jim has listed that on his list of goals for the next year, and I think that's important. And we have talked about -- at least Gloria and I have talked about -- some of the future topics for this Committee, and that's certainly one of them.

I'll talk about that more. But Jim, did you want to add?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. Performance criterion 4 does address board governance. It's just that today's panel is focused on a subpart of criterion number 4 that deals with executive director leadership.

But we currently have underway right now a project to revise the portions of performance criterion 4 that deal with board leadership, and we'll have something to bring to the Committee on that.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Anything else about the
Committee evaluation?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Moving on to the next agenda item, and that is the presentations, so what we discussed in the past, and talking about the things we should discuss in the future.

We've talked about, and I've talked about with Janet, that the very next meeting that we should have, that is, our meeting in D.C., should really be the beginnings of the -- so not have a panel, but rather have that an extended discussion with Management about some of the things that we would like them to report to us on the quality of legal services.

Janet thought that by the April meeting, that would be doable. And we're not looking for something as complicated as what's provided for the Audit Committee, but we are talking about the beginnings of a report on -- so, for example, last year you did 28 reviews of different grantees; just a brief report on what those are, the significant problems of those.

Some reports on the two competitive grants programs, not in terms of finances but in terms of the
actual projects, and the difference that those are making in the community. Those are the types of things.

It's an ongoing process. So as the reports are given, we can ask the Board whether there's different information that we think that we should get, things that should be changed as we go forward. But I was hoping that the April meeting would be the first step in that communication between Management and the Committee.

Martha?

DEAN MINOW: That makes sense to me. One thing that I found very valuable in the panel discussions is the selection of themes or topics that the Board should understand that are either trends or patterns.

It might be appropriate, either in the April meeting or in followup meetings, to identify whether there are any such themes or trends that might be relevant to the changes in the performance criteria, or something like that.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And I don't have the
charter right exactly in front of me, but that element is in the charter as well. So I really want those parts of the charter which would call for a Management report to be reflected in that April report.

   Again, this is the first attempt at it, so we hope to revise it and refine it as we go forward. But to my idea, then, there would be really no panel discussion. It would be more of a discussion with Management.

   Now, the July meeting, taking on what we've discussed already, the idea of corporate governance has been big. We've talked about this before, and I think the July meeting in Minneapolis is an appropriate place to talk about corporate governance.

   We've talked about getting maybe some people who are experts in corporate governance and people to talk about corporate governance for a panel on that, especially with regards to Board week.

   John?

MR. LEVI: The only issue there, and I just want to talk -- Gloria and you and I should talk about this -- that meeting is going to be very much dedicated
to Native American topics. So to the extent that the
Delivery of Legal Services Committee has a relationship
to that, it may wish to square that up with that
Minnesota meeting. And not to foreclose the other --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: No, no, no. That's
fine. I just didn't realize that that was the focus.

MR. LEVI: Yes. And so I think that maybe we
do the other in October. But think about that between
the two of you, and I'm open to your suggestion.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Does anybody have
any -- and this is opening it up. That's as far as
they had gotten, this Board meeting, which is going to
be on leadership, the report on the April, and then
possibly corporate governance in July, or at this point
maybe in October as well.

But are there thoughts from some other people
on the Committee about things that maybe we should be
looking towards in the future? Or do we want to
discuss that as we get later in the year? Julie?

MS. REISKIN: There isn't an answer to this,
but I think it's something that we need to talk about,
is the whole issue of outcome measures. I know that
there's good work being done on this, but we haven't
really ever had a discussion about what is it that we
need. What defines quality?

I think the panel we just had to me indicated
my growing feeling about how important extended
representation is and how the quality involved --
especially with some of these complex issues like
foreclosure and veterans stuff.

But I think we need to really talk about -- so
when we talk about outcomes, what do we mean? How are
we using data? What is quality? And then are there
other output or other measures that we should be
looking at like how many calls get returned? Are those
things that we should measure? Is that too much for us
as just one funder? What are other funders doing?

But I think that we need to talk about this
more because we talked about it initially at the
beginning, and then really, since the strategic plan,
we haven't. And I think it's important.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: I think part of it is
that we've been gaining information because of our data
collection process, which is in process. And I think
we've come a long way since then. I don't think we're
quite collecting any of that data yet, are we?

But once we do start collecting that data and
processing it, I would expect some preliminary reports
from Management about some of the work that we've done
with that; then talking about what we do with this
data, how it's used, how it gives us a better sense, if
it does give us a better sense, of the quality.

But Jim, if you want to address that. I
certainly expect more reports on outcome measurements.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: It will be next year
before we'd be in a position to report specifics back
to the Committee on that. But the suggestions that are
coming up here give me a lot of ideas on how we can
give you information of the type you're requesting.

DEAN MINOW: Well, I just wanted to note that
one of the reasons that we're going to foundations for
funding is to try to come up with some better
understanding about data and quality. So this is two
parallel streams.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. I know we haven't
talked about it as a Board, but I don't think that
means that nothing's been done. I think it's just a
lot of the groundwork is being put together, and once
we're in a position to get some more information, that
that will be brought to the Board.

MS. REISKIN: And I think that's all great. I
think we need to figure out some way, whether that's
through public input at these meetings or some way or
somehow, to get the client perspective on what they
think is quality.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: That's very good point.

Anyone else? Does anybody else want to about
any other ideas about the things perhaps we should be
discussing as a Committee?

MR. MADDOX: I was just going to say, Father
Pius, I'm hoping, in the process of reevaluating
performance criteria and expanding reporting and
gathering data whatnot, we don't overdo what grantees
have to do. I sort of wish Gloria were here because I
feel like I'm singing her song.

I've never been a legal aid lawyer, but I've
been a lawyer. And I don't want to be tracking every
phone call I return in a database. So I think there's
a risk of just overwhelming the reporting element for
no good purpose. I think that's something we need to
be aware of as we go forward.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. And I think
Management is very aware of that. It's certainly my
impression from Jim, is that they're very aware of that
and they want to make this as flexible as possible for
the grantees.

I don't think it's the purpose of this
Committee to define what data is collected, but once we
start getting data, to understand how that's being
collected. And it's just a part of our duties to
oversee that, just to see what this data is, to make
sure that they're allowing Management to ensure the
proper quality of legal services.

Because I just don't think there's very -- at
least at the Board's level, I'm not comfortable with
the fact that we have a good sense of what that is
right now in the same way that we have in terms of
finances. It may never be the same, but I think it
could be more.

Anything else?
(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Good. I think that was a helpful discussion. We'll be getting back to you a little bit. Gloria and I will talk about the July meeting to John, and we'll think about then a good topic for that as well. Okay? So thank you all.

Now I am going to turn to our panel. I'm very excited. One of the things that struck me on my panel when I was at the 40th anniversary is the number of people who found the transition from being a legal aid lawyer to being a legal aid executive director, and it is a very different set of skills.

A number of people commented to me about the help of the Meyer Foundation in providing them the resources that needed to be more effective as administrators. So I am very, very please to have Rick Moyers from the Meyer Foundation here to give us some of his input and some of his experience with this because at least from what I have heard, the Meyer Foundation has been very helpful to our grantees in the past.

So I will turn this over. You've seen the
performance criteria. We're talking about leadership and the importance of leadership in various circumstances. So I want to turn this over, then, to Mr. Moyers to discuss the issue. Thank you again.

    MR. MOYERS:  Thank you. I'm so happy to be here. I think you know some of this or you wouldn't have invited me, but I just want to reiterate a couple of points.

    First off, just a quick note on the Meyer Foundation. The Meyer Foundation is one of the largest private foundations that supports nonprofits in the greater Washington region, and we support a lot of legal services organizations.

    But in addition to our local work, we have been part of a national conversation about nonprofit executive leadership and nonprofit executive director burnout and turnover. And that body of work has collectively come to be known as "Daring to Lead." And there have been three studies produced in 2001, 2006, and 2011.

    The upshot of that body of work is that there is a substantial amount of evidence that over the next
five years to decade, between two-thirds and
three-quarters of current executive directors are
likely to lose their jobs -- not lose their jobs,
they're likely to leave their jobs.

(Laughter.)

MR. MOYERS: We can equivocate about whether
executives have a tendency to overstate their own plans
for leaving, and sometimes they do. But nevertheless,
there's some evidence that some of the executives who
had postponed their retirement as a result of the
economic downturn that began in 2007 are now planning
to step down.

That demographic reality, on top of normal
attrition rates due to burnout and just typical job
transition, means that we can expect a large wave of
transitions over the next decade.

At the Meyer Foundation, at other foundations,
we believe that this wave of transitions should be a
significant concern for any grant-making organization
that depends on the effectiveness of its grantee
partners to carry out its mission.

In our experience, organizational
effectiveness is closely linked to effective leadership. And in our experience, many organizations hang in the balance during moments of leadership transitions.

This especially critical because most of the organizations that we fund, most of the organizations that you fund, have almost no operating reserves and just don't have any margin for error. They cannot afford the cost of a leadership misstep, and a leadership misstep would have a significant impact on the quality and delivery of legal services.

So that's most of what you're going to get from me. This morning we're going to hear from representatives of four organizations that have gone through relatively recent leadership transitions about what we can learn from their experiences and what the Legal Services Corporation and other grant-makers should be keeping in mind as our grantee partners go through transition.

As I say that, I didn't know any of these leaders before this session. And I just want to, from an external perspective, commend you on the quality and
thoughtfulness of the leadership of the organizations you fund. This is going to be a great panel. It has been great getting to know all of you, and I'm looking forward to the conversation.

So on my left -- and have the bios been given to you in your book? So I don't have to introduce everyone?

So with that in mind, can you each talk briefly about how you came into the executive director role or what the path was to being an executive director? Because I think that will be significant to some of the later discussion. And start with Nikole.

MS. NELSON: I'm Nikole Nelson. I am the executive director of Alaska Legal Services. I came to be the executive director of Alaska Legal Services after serving in my program for about 14 years. I was a staff attorney, and then the supervising attorney of our largest office for the six years before I became the executive director in 2010.

MS. LARSON: I'm Chris Larson. I have been at Three Rivers Legal Services since March of 2014. I did not come from within the ranks, so that was a little
different. The executive director that had been there previously retired after a 17-year iconic and successful career. She's kind of an icon in our community.

The board was tasked with looking for a new director, and they hired the Management Information Exchange organization to help them look for a candidate and to vet and interview all of us. And there was a series of several interviews, and as a result, I was fortunate enough to be in the stewardship role of the director at Three Rivers. And I moved to Gainesville in March.

DEAN MINOW: Where did you come from?

MS. LARSON: I came from Florida Rural Legal Services. I was the deputy director there since 1999.

MR. COOK: Good morning. My name is Jim Cook. I'm with Idaho Legal Aid Services. First, I wanted to apologize about my attire. It is still with the Friendly Skies, my suit is.

(Laughter.)

MR. COOK: I don't always dress like this at meetings.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Sort of Idaho casual.

MR. COOK: Yes. Western casual.

I came to Idaho Legal Aid Services in 1999 as a staff attorney, and I was in that role till about 2005, when I became the deputy director. And then I became the executive director in April of 2013.

MR. MOYERS: This is the iconic leader.

(Laughter.)

MS. THOMPSON: Oh, yes, sure, iconic. I'm Allison Thompson. I'm the former director of Three Rivers Legal Services because Chris is the director now. I was there until, what, April of last year. But I came into legal services, what, 40 years ago.

I started with a program in Florida as a Reggie Fellow at Bay Area Legal Services, and then I went from there to Rhode Island Legal Services as an attorney up there. And then from Rhode Island, I worked with the Legal Services Corporation, as we used to call them monitors. They sound nice now; you call them assessment teams or something, but monitors.

I did that for about five years. And then after that, I was recruited to go to the Virgin
Islands, where I directed the program for about 15 years. Then my folk got sick and I had to come back to the mainland, and so I came back to direct Three Rivers Legal Services, where I've been for the last 17 years.

MR. YOUNG: Good morning. Anthony Young, executive director at Southern Arizona Legal Aid. And I came to my job by what I would call a circuitous route. I started out as a staff attorney in Western Nebraska and was both staff attorney, managing attorney, and pro bono coordinator there in Western Nebraska.

With the consolidation of legal services programs across the country, Nebraska went from three legal services programs to now one. That led to my move to Arizona, where I started out with one of our sister programs, Community Legal Services, where I managed their Yuma, Arizona office. And then from there, I moved to Tucson, Arizona to my current job.

For me, I think coming to this role, a factor in me getting this job, I think, was having participated in the pilot project that LSC had back in early 2000 for a mentor pilot project, where mentees
such as myself, managing attorneys, were partnered with executive directors from across the country to work on various projects, to learn what it would be like, and the kind of issues or challenges that directors have to deal with.

That made a difference to me in two respects. A, I could put it on my resume, and I think it made a difference for the board in selecting me; I sort of had a stamp of approval from LSC, having participated in that mentor pilot program; and then also for me personally having an opportunity to work on specific projects. And we had a specific project that comes to mind having to do with PAI and the development of a PAI program.

So I had the experience of working with a very experienced executive director that came from what I call the old school of how you address PAI, which was essentially seek a waiver, versus how do you then grow a PAI program to really make it a meaningful component of the service delivery model.

So that made a difference for me after I got the job as executive director at Southern Arizona Legal
Aid to really think about a vision for where our program would go.

MR. MOYERS: I just want to observe, after listening to those answers, that compared to the broader nonprofit sector overall, this represents an unusually large number of people who have a lot of experience in the same system and who have moved from deputy or senior program roles into executive director roles, which is unusual. And I also think it's a very healthy thing for this network of organizations, to have leadership pipelines of sorts in place.

You also heard the amount of experience in the field and that's on the panel. So I wanted to ask you how you think the operating environment for legal services organizations has changed, maybe over the past two decades or so. And I asked about legal services organizations, but it's really -- this is all nonprofits. I don't see any significant differences.

MR. YOUNG: I can start. I guess I would say some of the significant differences -- and there have been many -- have been around the need to raise funds from the private sector, whether it's foundations,
private individuals.

The idea that we as legal aid agencies not only need to focus on and think of ourselves as law firms but as not-for-profit agencies, and to be willing to join the nonprofit community -- one of the things that I've done in Tucson was to join the group of nonprofit executive directors in Tucson because those nonprofit agencies have similar issues to what we have.

They have employment issues. They don't deal with unions; I have a labor union that I have to deal with. But certainly in terms of employment issues, that happens in the nonprofit sector as a whole.

Certainly the notion of private foundation support and individual donor support has been a longstanding goal within the nonprofit sector, but it's been a recent thing, I think, in legal services to think about going out and developing resources outside of the legal community.

So I think those are the biggest thing. The other thing I want to mention was certainly a unique challenge to me that certainly has happened around the country, is the consolidation of legal aid programs
across the country.

When I started at Southern Arizona Legal Aid in 2007, we were still experiencing some vestiges from what I would describe as forced marriage in that we had incorporated some Native American programs into our basic field, basically a basic field organization. So they had to become part of our culture. We had to become part of theirs, and they had to become part of ours.

It took a lot of effort on my part to really begin to sell the notion that we're one organization both to our Native American component and to our basic field or staff component. So I would cite those as some of the biggest changes that happened over the last two decades.

MS. THOMPSON: I think from very old school perspective, going back 40 years, that certainly the use of technology and social media -- I mean, that was just unheard of. I remember when we got the first fax in the office, and being able to use that effectively.

In addition to that, I think that looking for funding in different ways is something I think that
we're just going to have to find new ways of getting funding for the organizations.

Also, making our alliances different. Old school legal services folk, we're real clear about our enemies and our friends, and never the twain shall meet. Now we understand the twain has to meet in order for us to get where we need to go. And some of us are better at it than others. The inclusion of the private bar, the inclusion of political folk who haven't always liked us, I think that's a bit difference.

Also, the mentoring of people on the staff to do work other than just the litigation work -- networking, outreach, administration, that kind of thing, I think all of those factors are away from where we were when we were doing -- just having a revolution with the big class actions and the law reform. Not that that wasn't a good time, but --

(Laughter.)

MR. MOYERS: So I'll take one comment from this side. You all have to -- from my left. Anything about outcomes? Or --

MS. NELSON: Sure. Sorry, go ahead.
MR. MOYERS: You have to collectively make one comment -- no.

(Laughter.)

MS. NELSON: All right. So I'm making the comment. Right now I think there's been a change, and again, it's part of the initiative that LSC is putting together right now in helping us collect outcomes for our funders.

For our program, LSC is a minority funder, and we have been already collecting outcomes for the other programs or funders that give us money. And so again, this is something that's different from the experience of my prior director, who didn't have that need to track that information in the same way that we had. So there's been that transition. Again, I think it's a positive one. And I think that we need to do it in order to be competitive in this environment. But it is a change, I think.

MR. MOYERS: I was kind of joking. We can take another comment if you want.

The followup question to that is: Does this require different skills, new skills and different
MR. COOK: My comments are just based on part on working with my predecessor, Ernie Sanchez, who was in the position for some 40 years. Ernie and I used to talk almost every morning when I was the deputy director, and he was frequently saying to me that you almost have to be a politician, an employment law attorney, a HIPAA attorney -- it's this Jack of all trades position now.

When he got into the position, that was not so much the case. And I think part of the problem with my program is we did not develop the administrative infrastructure to accommodate that, and I have not yet fully done that, either. So it's one person trying to assume all those roles.

I think the response should be the ED does some of each of those things, but also creates more positions to handle those. Because it's really almost impossible for one person to do all of those elements. And I don't know if a lot of legal aid grantees have done that yet.
MR. YOUNG: I was just going to add to that. There are pressures on executive directors to keep administration small at a time when, really, we need to be beefing up administration.

So when new dollars come to us, those dollars tend to drive us towards hiring more staff to serve more people. Or in my context, I have a labor union that wants to increase its membership. And so they argue for hiring additional bargaining unit members to the detriment of administration.

So it's constantly singing this message to not only our boards but our staff about the need for internal controls, the need to have adequate administration to address all of the challenges that are put on us by the many funders that we have, not just LSC.

MR. MOYERS: This is off script, but I want to ask this question of the panel because this is an issue that is really important to the sector, I think.

How many of you feel like your organizations are woefully under-administered? You're not spending nearly enough on administration, and I'm meaning
finance, H.R., fundraising staff, and admin support.

MS. THOMPSON: I think I left my program like that, and it was one of the things -- I wrote a letter to my board when I was leaving saying what I thought they needed to look for. I didn't want anything to do with selecting the person, but what they needed to look for.

It was somebody who had a different understanding of that. I come from, you get paid nothing and you do all the jobs.

(Laughter.)

MS. THOMPSON: And that was the noble cause. And really, you come from that generation, the Baby Boomers generation. Whereas I do the fundraising. I do the hiring. I do the firing. I run the program. I do the external politics. That's all my job. So you work yourself into a frenzy, and you complain all the time, and you feel really good, and you aren't doing anybody any favor.

So fortunately, I recognized that. And I was leaving, so I did tell my board, these are the things you need to do. And my successor, Chris, I'm sure is
going to be doing things a lot different from that.

MR. MOYERS: Have you?

MS. LARSON: And if I don't, I'll hear about it. No.

(Laughter.)

MS. LARSON: It's funny. One of the things I always hear when I go address a group, whether it's the county commission people or the folks administering our CAP money or whatever, it's like, Allison was funny.

(Laughter.)

MS. LARSON: And I'm not. But yes, I do think that we have one gentleman in our office who did the H.R. piece, the technology piece, and the accounting piece, and he's retiring in 20 months. So yes, I think we're going to need to make some serious changes.

We may get some pushback from advocates who say, well, we still need an assistant in this office. We are short-staffed over here. We don't have enough.

But I think in order for our organization to survive, we are going to have to grow administration, and we won't have to apologize for that to anybody.

Like I was saying at breakfast, God forbid,
you can get malpractice insurance, if something goes
wrong with a case, to make the client whole. But there
is no administrative malpractice insurance. If
something goes wrong, it's a scandal. It doesn't
reflect well on us, on you. Heads roll.

So we really don't want to make mistakes.

There's a lot more at stake than there used to be
because there's so many sources of funding and there's
so many ways that you can make a mistake.

MR. MOYERS: Anyone else on the admin piece?

MS. NELSON: Well, I'll just back up. That
same experience with the lack of administration
happened with my executive director, who was very old
school, too. When I came in and learned what he was
doing, all of his job, I thought, I'm not going to do
that. I'm not going to take this job and do all of
that.

So it required, over the course of the last
four years, for me to beef up administration. And my
board went along with it, and they understood that
Andy, bless his heart, had been digging himself into a
hole with the best of intentions. But it really isn't
a way that you can run a strong organization, I think.

MR. MOYERS: What people say -- I'm sorry.

MR. YOUNG: Well, I can add a comment there.

MR. MOYERS: Go ahead. Just very quickly.

MR. YOUNG: I would just say in 2010 through 2011, I would have said that our administration was woefully underfunded or supported. Since that time, we've been able to rebuild administration. When we went through the cuts in 2010/2011, not only did we close offices, or an office, we lost administrative staff.

But for me, it's been preaching to the board about the need for administrative staff such that when we were able to get the resources, we can target those resources to hire administrative staff.

The other thing I would say, it's been looking at our indirect costs and talking to funders about, hey, we have these costs that have to be accounted for, and looking to write that into grants wherever possible. So I just wanted to mention that.

MR. MOYERS: So any advice about transition?

What are the elements that make transition go well, in
your own experiences?

MS. THOMPSON: My advice is when you leave, don't let the staff call you and ask you questions.

(Laughter.)

MS. THOMPSON: Redirect them. Just because you've been there a long time, you've got a new director; that's who you should be talking to.

The other thing is that I don't like the idea that people leave when they burn out because I think that -- because you're burned out or you can just afford to leave. I think that we need to be doing something so that people can leave because it's time, and also leave because economically they can afford to.

People stay too long sometimes because of that, not that we don't appreciate the wisdom that they bring with them. But if you find out why they're staying and it has to do with money or burnout, we need to be making accommodations for people to be able to leave comfortably and when it's time.

I could still run a program, and I'm not burned out. But it's my time. And I think that when you realize that it's your time -- and I told my board,
I'm looking for new ideas, new things. I don't want any mini-me's in here. I want to have people to come in to bring to the program a new energy, a new light. Let some light bulbs go off here. That's what we should be looking for as we leave, especially if we've been married to legal services all your lives like I have.

Also, supporting the new director -- I know when I came to the program I'm at now, it took me about three years for them to like me. So what I did was up until the time I was leaving, I kept telling my staff, I want you to support the new person, whoever that person is. I want you to be able to do that. I trained my management team to be able to do that.

The other thing is I didn't want anything to do with the selection of the new person because that could only lead to messiness. And it's the board's job, anyway. So I didn't need that. That's what the board is for.

I helped the board get situated for calling Patty and starting to do the interviews. And I gave them a year's notice. I stayed a year and a three
months. But I did give them enough time to plan it. And I think all those kinds of things are important.

Chris and I, we have lunch about once a month, not for me to direct the program. But if she wants to bounce something off me or if something needs a historical perspective, then I can give it to her.

MR. YOUNG: What I would add is probably two, maybe three things. One is board education, board training, from the perspective of having an appreciation or understanding for what they need, what the challenges are for that organization. And I think that's a place where LSC can help boards.

There was a time when LSC did provide trainings to boards, particularly around inclusion and involvement of diverse groups, both in the leadership of the program and in the everyday work of the program. So I think LSC certainly could help with board training.

The other thing that I think, from my vantage point, is taking the time to really assess the needs of the organization. Oftentimes when new directors come in, they have a vision for what they want to do. Staff
has a vision for what they'd like to see happen. The board may have a vision. And everybody's pressuring the director to move in a certain direction. I think taking the time to go on a listening tour, visiting the various offices and communities that the organization is excepted to serve, goes a long way in helping the director in terms of framing that vision, making it what would work best for that community.

So I think those are the two things. There was a third thing that I'm forgetting, so I'll pass on that.

MR. COOK: I'd like to make a comment.

MR. MOYERS: Yes.

MR. COOK: I think what Anthony just said was part of my experience. But one thing, my program, there was this, oh, my gosh. Ernie's been there 40 years. Are the lights going to work tomorrow when we have a new ED? Because everybody had been with Ernie forever.

So I think a huge part with the success of our transition was communication. And when I say that,
that sounds just kind of a generic term. But what I
mean is, I inundated our people with information. In
fact, I created something called the Administrative
Update. It goes out every two weeks. We're on our
45th edition.

They know what we're going to do, and I ask
for their comments. And whether it's on staffing,
whether it's on policy-directed changes, whether it's
on we just got new grants or lost grants, whether it's
on we're going to meet with the Supreme Court on this
issue, they know the admin unit is working for them and
is working hard.

But they also know the direction we're going.
And if they want to have input, they can, and they
will be heard. So there's not a bunch of surprises.
There wasn't this new guy in; we start to cut heads
off. It's telling them where we're going to go before
we go there, telling them as we do it, and then telling
them after we did it.

So there's a path that everybody understands.
There's no surprises. And I think that that's made
people buy into a lot of the -- we did layoffs. We did
a lot of very difficult things. But they understood why. And also, after our finances improved, they saw the benefits of it. But I think just telling them what's going to happen really helped them.

MS. LARSON: I think Anthony is dead on. The first thing that we did the first week I got there was I took a road trip and I went to every office. I sat with every staff member.

First I had a meeting outlining my vision for how I wanted life to be at Three Rivers and building on the legacy of what had already gone before. And then I sat with each staff person and heard about what kind of work they were doing. They showed me examples. I wanted to get a really good feel.

In my own head, I decided I was not going to make any drastic changes in the first six months at all because it just takes a lot of time to get up to speed and to learn the community, the staff, the board, who you're dealing with. Yes, if you have to make a decision because there's some kind of crisis, fine. But I think we kept things in place, and now gradually we're making some changes.
But you want to build on the legacy that you already have. You want to honor and respect the people that have been working so hard. You certainly don't want to come in and say, everything was wrong and I'm going to change it. That would just not win you any support, and it would be the wrong move.

MS. NELSON: Well, and I think I'm just going to piggyback on what everyone else here has said. In our service area -- which is incredibly vast; Alaska is the largest service area, I think, aside from maybe Micronesia, that LSC serves. And most of our offices -- we have 11 offices, only four of which are connected on the road system. So going on a driving tour isn't possible.

(Laughter.)

MS. NELSON: That said, it was really important. Even though I had effectively grown up in the program, I knew everyone, it was really important for me during that transition to maintain communication with my predecessor, to understand his thought process, where our organization -- we got to the position we were in through very thoughtful means.
It wasn't happenstance. People had made thoughtful decisions to take certain actions. So I needed to understand both historically why we had ended up there and to look at those decisions, putting on a different hat.

Again, if you had told me when I first took the job that there was somebody about Alaska Legal Services I didn't know, I would have fought back at that point. But when I put on the hat as executive director, I realized that the perspective changes everything.

I also needed to make sure that I could build unity within my program, which seems a little bit strange, given that I had been there for so long and felt like I had good relationships with all of our offices.

But again, people were worried. Is this going to be urban-centric now? Will you only be serving the needs of Anchorage? What about the rural offices, your bush offices? Are you going to understand and help us meet our needs?

So again, communication, from my perspective,
was very important. And I did something similar to I think what Jim is talking about. We have the ALSC Scoop, which is a newsletter that I send out every couple of weeks just updating everyone on what's happening across the organization administratively, making sure that our administrative offices are seen -- telling folks what our comptroller is doing to support the work in the field, which seems like a little bit silly, perhaps.

But if people understand what the head financial officer is doing to help you provide services, I think they're going to be less likely to give you pushback when they understand the purpose of it.

Also, trying to explain -- for instance, I wanted to take a different direction with our pro bono services in trying to increase that. But I needed our staff attorneys to understand how important volunteers are to the health of a nonprofit organization, and how they can aid you and also your clients in getting your message out. And all of that is just communication, communication, communication, and doing a lot of
groundwork.

I think that sometimes, as an executive director, you think that those things are secondary to the 150 other things you're supposed to do in any given day. But I really think that they're the base in making sure that your organization is healthy first and then it will ease your workload upstream or downstream.

MR. MOYERS: If we have a lot more time for this discussion today -- and I mean a lot more time, like another hour --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: No.

MR. MOYERS: I've been told -- there's a conversation to be had here about boards, and partnership between boards and executives, and the changing role of the executive/board partnership, including how the board can relieve some of the burden for executive directors so it's not so much about this one person who's carrying such a disproportionate amount of leadership.

But instead of having that conversation -- I would encourage you all to have it at some point in the future -- I'm going to ask each of you what the Legal
Services Corporation could do to support new leaders.

And then we're going to have time for questions.

MR. YOUNG: I'll start. Certainly being a beneficiary of the pilot mentoring project, I would promote that as something that LSC should look at reestablishing. It certainly made a difference for me and my colleague in Montana, who also participated in that program. And it's just a way of creating a pipeline of potential leaders that boards can look at.

The other thing, I think, is training. I think the MIE, the Management Information Exchange, does a great job with their one-day new executive director training. But I think LSC should look at partnering with MIE and maybe lengthening that and creating a fellowship program, if you will, where new directors can get training or support over a longer period of time as opposed to one day.

MS. THOMPSON: I also think that's important, the mentoring. I was a mentor when Anthony was a mentee, and I think that that is a good idea.

But also, more guidance. And I don't know how it would be possible, but what would be a really good
thing -- if you had really good and objective people to
provide actual guidance for the new director. You're
not just there by yourself.

Directors many times feel like there's nobody
to bounce things off of. There's nobody to turn to.
I'm up here alone. I've got a staff looking at me,
waiting for me to screw it up.

(Laughter.)

MS. THOMPSON: Having real mentors some place
in the service of the region or the state that can work
with them on a periodic basis.

MR. MOYERS: Yes. But would a coach -- are
you talking about coaching, like executive coach?

MS. THOMPSON: Oh, that's the new word. Yes,

MR. MOYERS: Go ahead, Anthony.

MR. YOUNG: I was just going to make a comment
following up on Allison's comments.

NLADA and the African American Project
Directors, to address the isolation associated with
this role, have created the support circles.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.
MR. YOUNG: And so it's created an opportunity for me to talk about issues that I can't talk about with anybody else with other colleagues at my level who have an understanding of the kind of challenges that executive directors face.

So I think what the NLADA has done and the African American Project Directors have done around support circles, that may be something that LSC can tap into and help to make it more robust to support new executive directors. So I just wanted to mention that.

MS. THOMPSON: Having a safe support circle, I think, is real important to a brand-new director who wants to feel more confident than they actually feel and having a safe place to be able to talk about it.

MR. COOK: I think that's a good point. My closest compatriot is probably 350 miles away. So it is sort of an isolated -- especially in my state. There are no other providers, and I would have to go to Helena, Montana or Seattle, Washington if I wanted to actually see somebody else. So it is a rather isolating experience, and that would be very positive.

The MIE new directors training was very good,
but it's very short. And it would be nice if after --
that was, I think, my second month on the job. It
would be nice to have something after that at some
point.

But my big issue would be a model set of
policies from the LSC. I have updated 26 policy
directives since I've become the ED. And even after I
updated them, the OCE came and found that we had things
like our household definition wrong, very embarrassing
mistakes.

I have spent so many hours working on policy
directives. And it would be really great if, when I
took the position, I could look at a standard set, just
model policies based on the regulations, that made me
secure that these are okay. These are good.

These are solid, and things that I can give,
not just that I can read, but a part-time receptionist
with high school diploma can read because everyone we
hire we give this giant pack of policy directives.
It's absolutely overwhelming. And we say, okay, you
master that even though you work for us ten hours a
week.
So I have problems with people -- not only my competence keeping them up, but making them so people can understand them. And I think if you did something that was voluntary so people aren't saying, hey, the LSC is forcing this on me, I would look at it as something that I would go to for probably 90 percent of my policy directives. There might be a few that for some reason I would feel like we need to modify them.

I think it would lead to better compliance throughout the entire system. I think OCE and the OIG would have less to do when they come because they would say, look, okay. You've got 50 policies, and 40 of them are the standard. We know, at least on paper, you're doing things right. We'll look at other issues.

I just think it would be very helpful, also, to the senior EDs when you update the PAI regulation, does it make sense to have 132 EDs go and say, okay, we've got to update the PAI reg, and what do we do? It would be nice if they could see what the LSC thinks is a common-sense, clearcut, plain English way of doing that. And I just think that would be a win/win for both the programs and the LSC.
PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Could I just follow up on that? Are you talking about model policies dealing with matters that are required by LSC regulations? You're not talking about policies involving how you deal with your personnel and sick leave and things like that. Is that right?

MR. COOK: Just with LSC regulations, yes.

MS. LARSON: For example, OCE was in my office when I left yesterday. They were asking us about our PAI commitment and what we were doing. And I was telling them that there were now changes to the reg that allowed law student participation in some cases to count towards our 12-1/2 percent requirement, and we sure have an abundance of law students in our service area. We're grateful for that.

But I asked them, well, when does the time that we're spending with law students count towards our PAI contribution? Can we charge a case to PAI because the law student is working on it together with us? What happens when the semester ends and they leave us and the staff attorney is working alone on the case? Or should it just be the time we spend
supervising them to help us with a non-PAI case? And they said, we will take all these questions back to Washington and we will let you know.

So I agree that sometimes it would be really helpful if there was an internal guidance about these things so that we don't make mistakes because we don't want to make mistakes. We would really like to get it right.

MR. YOUNG: Can I just make a quick comment on that? A recent experience of ours is where we created a contracting policy at the directive of OIG. I then send the draft policy -- this is before I submit it to the board -- and say, take a look at it. Is it okay? And they say, no. We're not going to comment.

So then I take it to my board and my board approves. Then I find out they didn't like it. And so then we had to go back to the board to change it. And so all of that, that whole exercise, could have been avoided if we could have been told, here's a model policy, or policies were out there at the start..

MS. THOMPSON: Can I just say one thing?

MR. MOYERS: If it's tiny. If it's quick.
MS. THOMPSON: This is quick and has nothing to do with anything. But it has something to do with me and my history with legal services.

We have to work on diversity in leadership in legal services. It's absolutely incumbent upon us, with the changing demographics of the world, and for us being a justice organization, in the leadership not to do better.

I think it should be something that should come directly from LSC that encourages, and not just a little pat on the head, but seriously encourages that, and to listen to those people who are bringing it to your attention.

MR. MOYERS: Anything else to answer the LSC question? And then I've --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Yes. Because I would like to open this up to questions. I think we're running very low on time.

MR. MOYERS: Yes. This is when I was instructed to end.

MR. LEVI: Well, we can have a few more minutes here.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: For questions.

MS. NELSON: So the one thing I would say that I think might be a useful use of LSC's time and resources is connecting new directors to the whole body of information about nonprofit management that's already available, like for instance on the Meyer Foundation.

One of the things that was very useful to me when I first became the director is participating in a local group called the Foraker Group. I was certain when I came here that there must be one in every state if Alaska had one, but in speaking with Rick about it, it turns out it's a bit anomalous.

So it's a fantastic program, a nonprofit that supports other nonprofits and provides nonprofit management training to a whole scope of nonprofit leaders. And so through this process -- it was over a ten-month period -- I would meet monthly with other new directors serving nonprofits, and learned a grant deal of information about nonprofit management.

It was inexpensive. It was only about $3,000. And encouraging LSC recipients to search out those
resources in your local community instead of LSC recreating the wheel, looking to outsource that, and of course then just filling in the gaps with the things that are specific to LSC.

MR. LEVI: Do you have regular program counsel from LSC that you can bounce things off of? Do you each have a person that is designated for you? And have you, informal or otherwise, a formal mentor/mentee type among your executive director crew or colleagues? And is that something that's even been suggested?

MS. NELSON: We do have someone from the Office of Program Performance who is assigned to each of our programs. And then as far as official mentors or mentees, no. There's not an official mentor/mentee program. There is a support group of new executive directors that I participate in that has the director from Hawaii, New Mexico, Montana, and then also one of the D.C. programs.

MR. LEVI: And who established that? Did we or did you informally do it?

MS. NELSON: It turns out my program officer
from OPP, Stephanie Edelstein, introduced us. And then NLADA started facilitating those calls to start with, and it's sprung up from there and continued on.

MR. YOUNG: And I would just say the African American Project Directors Association has what's called support circles, where we're paired with other directors from around the country. And since Arizona is a three-state LSC-funded program, I've been paired with someone in another state.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All right. If there are any other questions? Robert?

MR. GREY: Let me just pursue the diversity issue for just a second and ask you, in the best of all worlds, if we could form the perfect outreach or the perfect development strategy, for achieving the best representation of our communities in legal services, what are your thoughts about that?

You made an observation. But part of that is process, and what do you do about it and how do you go about it? And if you had the right ingredients, what would it look like?

MS. THOMPSON: The reason I was emphasizing
leadership, because I never had problems. When I got to my program, I think there was one minority person in the program other than me. And then by the time I left, it was about 50/50.

I never had a problem at all finding diverse staff. And that ethnic staff, abled and disabled, races, countries, languages -- I had the U.N. there. But that was because I affirmatively acted to get them.

I didn't say, oh, no, well, we don't have any of those, or we would have -- legal services has the same few people that we march out every time to represent the diversity of the organization, which is unfortunate.

I think that regardless of what people say, it's not going to happen until, one, we have to be very mindful of being able to afford people. A lot of people who live in poverty, they have to have better salaries in legal services in order to keep them.

Two, if the leadership is developed and there's diversity among the leadership, it is easier to be able to recruit and to keep like staff. I believe that. That's what I believe. That's been my
experience.

I just think, even though it's a bad word, we have to affirmatively act to create diverse staffs in legal services. We've got to go to the National Bar Association. We've got to go to -- is it BLSA? I couldn't remember, it's been so long for me -- BLSA. We have to make sure that there's connections.

When I was a director, kids came in from the college. Not kids, they're grown folk at the college that came in, and they would say, oh, well, we heard about you from this person or that person. The leadership in our local minority bar association came out of our legal services programs because we had more diverse staff there.

So one follows the other. If you're really making an effort and doing some sort of evaluation of, what does our staff look like? What does our population look like? What do people look like? And even beyond it reflecting the population you have, I think the diverse staff brings a richness to your program and an understanding of things that you just don't have ordinarily.
MR. ISAAC: Can I address that?

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: If you want to come up to the microphone and very briefly --

MR. ISAAC: I'm the current vice president --

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Just give your name again.

MR. ISAAC: Don Isaac, Florida Rural Legal Services. I'm the current vice president of AAPDA, and we had a very intentional way of seeking diversity. In our meetings it would be a main discussion about, who are the diverse managers in the country?

It's a pipeline. We would discuss them, and then not steal from each other every time we found a director somewhere, but as an intentional way of looking at it, an intentional way, like Allison says, going to job fairs, going to minority job fairs. It has to be intentional.

That's not just for diversity purposes. It's for quality purposes, too. You need to go and get the best people, and not just anybody just walking off the street. So we had an intentional -- we still have an intentional model for how we seek managers, et cetera,
and we're always looking for diverse managers in our
programs.

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: All right. It looks
like we're just about out of time.

One thing that I'm just going to -- I know
Rebecca's going to kill me, but I always like to put
this back to the performance criteria. I do note that
one of the performance criteria in leadership does
include that the program provides opportunities for the
development of a diverse group of leaders. So it's
certainly something that we mention.

But there are some things that you have talked
about that we haven't, that you've talked about that
really aren't reflected, I think, in our performance
criteria. One of those, although we do have a separate
section on communication, communication is not
mentioned at all in leadership, in the leadership
section. I think that might be something we should
consider in the future.

The other thing is that our leadership section
in the performance criteria is all downwards, that is,
over the agency. But there's no sense of leadership
with regards to the board of directors.

I think we realize more and more that the leadership of the executive director with regards to the board of directors is also a crucial part of the leadership of the organization. And I think that's not really reflected in the leadership.

Then the sense that not only within your organizations but outside, how is the person looked at as a leader within the legal services community, among the other grantees or other legal services community? And how is he looked at within the community, the poor community that's being served as well? Is legal services considered a participant or a leader within the community itself?

I think these are things we've all talked about as indicators of leadership for an executive director and a program that aren't really reflected in the performance criteria.

Just very briefly, if there's anything else, if you've had a chance to look at the performance criteria, where if you think there's anything else that perhaps might be specifically mentioned that's not
mentioned in there as a sign of a good leader? Any thoughts on that?

You probably don't have it in front of you, but if you have thought about it -- or send us an email. I'm happy to send an email on this because I like to concretely tie it back to these performance criteria.

So with that, and seeing that there are no other questions, I just wanted to really thank you. I think this has been a wonderful discussion. It's a discussion we've been looking forward to have for quite a while. And I do especially want to give thanks to the Meyer Foundation and their participation, not only here at the meeting today, but their work on fostering good leaders and good leadership in the nonprofit community, and the model of leadership they provide in that, and the example of leadership both by existing and former executive directors in this model of leadership.

I certainly encourage those of you -- we talked about the mentor/mentee relationship. And a good leader is not only one who seeks a mentor but one
who, as an established leader, provides mentorship to others.

I think the legal services community will look at you folks as mentors in the future, and hopefully, as time permits, that you allow yourself to mentor those who were once in your positions as beginning executive directors. So thank you very much for your time and for your leadership.

(Applause)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: We do have a few other items on the agenda that we have to finish. The next item on the agenda is, if I'm not mistaken, is there any public comment? Are there any members from the public who would like to provide any comment?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Seeing none, is there any other business that the committee needs to address?

(No response.)

CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: And seeing none, do I have any motions?

MOTION

CO-CHAIR VALENCIA-WEBER: Move to adjourn.
CO-CHAIR FATHER PIUS: Moved to adjourn. Any 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 Committee is adjourned. Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:34 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.)

* * * * *

* * * * *