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CHAIRMAN LEVI: Good morning, everybody. It's my privilege to call to order the duly noticed meeting of the Legal Services Corporation, our first meeting of 015, and ask that we rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

You want to lead it?

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. Could I have a motion to approve the agenda?

MOTION

DEAN MINOW: So moved.

MS. REISKIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. And then we have two sets of minutes from the --

MOTION

MS. REISKIN: So moved.

DEAN MINOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN LEVI: We're now on number 5, which is consider and act on nominations for the Chairman of the Board of Directors.

MR. GREY: Mr. Chairman, if I might have the floor?

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes.

MOTION

MR. GREY: A point of personal privilege. As we start the new year and reflect on what has been a past year of challenges and opportunities, I would like to advise the Board and those that are listening that we have been the beneficiary of visionary leadership, of sustained momentum, and thoughtful and respectful dialogue about the mission of this organization.

For that reason, I would like to place in nomination John Levi for Chairman of LSC because of his exemplary leadership, his thoughtful conversation, and his absolute tenacity in wanting us to do the best that we can do.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

Second?

MS. REISKIN: I'd like to second,
enthusiastically second.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other nominations?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Abstention?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: For the nomination for Vice Chair of the Board?

MOTION

MS. REISKIN: Yes. I'd like to nominate Dean Martha Minow. Oh, sorry, was I not supposed to do that?

CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's all right.

MR. MADDOX: That's fine, Julie. Go right ahead.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: We'll let you both do it.

MS. REISKIN: This leadership team has been amazing, and it's worked. And if it ain't broke, don't fix it. And so, again, I think that you guys together
have been an amazing team. We're just so lucky to have this. And the leadership has reflected in all of the
success that we've had as an organization.

MR. MADDOX: Yes. I agree with everything Julie said. I'd also like to associate myself with remarks of Robert Grey and echo those with respect to Dean Minow. It's been an absolute pleasure to serve as a member of the Board under her leadership with you, John, over the last five years, and it's been an outstanding team.

Together with you, Dean Minow has brought energy and passion and deduction to the task. It's been a delight to work with her, and I look forward to doing so for the next year. I would second Julie's nomination.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other nominations?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Abstentions?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: It carries. Let me just say for a minute, as the Chairman's report -- and if the Vice Chair wants to say something as a part of it, she certainly can -- what a privilege it is to be the Chair at this time and to work with this Board.

Each one of you has taken such responsibility for the position you hold. You've worked, I think, so hard. And you know where we've come from, and you know what the circumstance has been, and that each one of you has in your own way, I hope, a sense of your own contribution to not only the betterment of LSC but to the doors and windows we're opening across the country in the profession and beyond.

Each of you should take a moment, I think, really and be proud of your own efforts, you can think. Because when we've asked you to help, you have. And you've helped beyond measure, and you've helped one another.

I think you all know your own individual contributions to the operations of various Committees. You can actually see the fruits of your efforts. We
have a few more years to go in our tenure, and we're
determined to make them count.

    Martha, I don't know if you want to say
anything more to that.

    DEAN MINOW: I do. And I'm honored to serve
alongside each and every one of you. I can't quite
keep up with John, but I'm doing my best.

    I will say that whoever designed the structure
of our Board had some kind of genius because it has
turned out, I think, that each person on this Board has
made indispensable contributions. There is just no
question in my mind about that.

    It's also clear -- some of us were remarking
on this on our way back from dinner last night -- that
we've become a group. We've become a team. And
there's a force multiplication as a result.

    I think back to where we were when we joined
the Board, an important organization that had some
challenges at that time is now much stronger, even
though there are, in many ways, more serious challenges
in the world. And I'm just honored to have the chance
to continue to serve.
CHAIRMAN LEVI: I just want to then go right into the Chairman's report and say that, of course, we're missing one of our Board members. We're going to have a resolution saluting her. But I would be remiss if I didn't, as a really first principle here, recognize the contribution of Sharon Browne.

I heard her echo through some of your Committee work the other day, and so I feel her presence. She was a terrific Board member. And you never like to lose a Board member because of health issues, and that was just unfortunate for her and for us.

But we look forward to getting a new Board member and to bringing that person along. But I have to say whoever that is has very big shoes that we'll all be -- I guess we can't scare them. But Sharon was an absolutely terrific member, and we will get to a resolution of thanks.

But I want to start with that and also then say to thank the programs yesterday, the programs that came from the Virgin Islands, from Puerto Rico, from Florida. The presenters to the Delivery of Legal
Services panel, those folks covered great distances, and also put a lot of thought into what they wanted to tell us.

Sometimes, and I do listen to your comments as to how best to run these meetings, but you can see that each time we ask our grantees or others to present to us, how much effort they put into thinking about, well, they have a few minutes to tell us about themselves, about their program.

That's a really good discipline, but it's also really impressive, the care with which they put together their presentations. And yesterday's, I thought, we just terrific.

They're not in the room -- Becky is. Becky, welcome back. I don't know how we managed without you. Somehow, we did. Bernie is out in the hall. These meetings move so seamlessly now, you can only imagine what they were like when we started. But we've gotten used to this. It's a high bar.

Marcos, Carl, Carol's not here, Jim, the IG staff, you all come to these meetings and you put up with us, too. We're grateful for your work. The TIG
staff. Janet's still here. Wendy Rhein is here, Wendy
and Janet I see. Did I miss anybody? Lynn. Lora, and
Ron. In any event, all of you. David.

DEAN MINOW: All the OIG staff.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Jeff is sitting back there.

David. I saw David at the TIG conference. Laurie. We
are really very grateful to all of you. And I know
that the hours you put in are certainly long and often
with great pressure, and we appreciate what you're
doing.

We couldn't be having these meetings, really,
at the level that we're holding them at without your
deduction and commitment. So you have the appreciation
of this Board. I just want you to know that.

You've heard me make reference -- I learned
some things at the TIG conference. And Bonnie Hough,
who's from California, and I've forgotten his name --
it's John, I think -- from British Columbia gave a very
impressive report on their collaboration. And that is
something which, when we were in San Francisco in
October, I've invited to provide to all of us.

So next year I'm thinking -- when I asked you
all for suggestions, Charles made them. And we looked into them, and it looked like they all worked. And so I would suggest that we should go to South Carolina, where we haven't been for years and years and years, a year from now; and then to Albuquerque, New Mexico, Gloria's home state, where we haven't been for a long time; and then to Vermont.

Vermont, I think the LSC Board has never been. That is also an opportunity -- and again, at the TIG conference we heard folks from Ontario give very compelling presentations about what they're doing to reach rural populations.

I think there's an opportunity again to bring some Canadian folks. I talked with them. They would be thrilled to come across the border. You also heard from the Vermont Chief Justice, his own commitment in New York.

I should say it's our 40th year, but this was the 15th year of TIG. And the 15th year conference was 300 people. The energy in that conference was -- and maybe Gloria and Charles will say something in the members' reports -- but you could just feel it. And
I'm sure next year will be even larger.

So a couple of other things. Our Board had the, I guess -- I'm not sure what adjective to use so I may be won't use any -- we came into office with an interim President and had an outdated strategic plan and ran a strategic planning process, if you will recall, without a President. And we ended up with a very good plan.

But that plan has a 016 end date on it. And that means, and I'm going to put folks to it this year, but in 016 we're going to need -- I don't want to be in the position, when our terms in 2017 or 2018, of turning over and having that group look back at us and say, well, your strategic plan is a couple of years out of date. What were you doing?

So it seems to me we now have the benefit of much greater understanding. We have a President that's terrific. I know I burdened everybody with the 40th. But I think that we ought to, on our radar, understand that we do have a strategic planning process that we, I believe, are responsible as a part of our service to fulfill and to put together one that is helpful to
those that follow us and guide us through the end of our tenure.

So again, I have to say, before I turn this over to Jim and say a few things about him, as a Chicago baseball fan, this morning Mr. Cub -- this is going to get me --

DEAN MINOW: Ernie Banks passed away.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: -- Ernie Banks. So the friendly confines. Mr. Cub was Mr. Baseball in Chicago for all of us. So sorry for that, but he was my --

MR. SCHANZ: Mine, too.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. I'll recognize the IG there. Anyway, Mr. Cub was the hero of our youth.

DEAN MINOW: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Absolutely. So now Jim is the hero of our 60s, and he is really the hero of our 60s. And let me tell that Jim won't tell this about him because he sent this little note to the Management -- he didn't send it to the Board -- to say he'd had a little bit of a mishap.

But he had more than a little bit of a mishap.

And if you can see, the medical profession really did
a fantastic job under his eye. But Jim is here with us, having had a fall, and he has really had a remarkable recovery because that guy is a go-getter, too. And he keeps himself in shape, and that has paid tremendous benefits.

But we're so fortunate, Jim. When I think back on what turns we could have taken in the road here, well, we got our own version of Mr. Cub in you. And so thank you for being here with us.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: And that's my report.

Members' reports? Julie, then Father Pius, then Charles.

MS. REISKIN: Two things. I had mentioned at a Committee meeting that Jim and I spoke at the NLADA, did what is now an annual "LSC and the Client Voice." I brought the evaluation. I'll pass it around so people can read the comments.

I also wanted to report on -- you guys had authorized me to go on a program quality visit to understand, really in detail, how they work so that I can help work with the staff to help figure out, how do
we get clients involved?

I did that in October, and that idea was presented at this workshop. And people were very enthusiastic and excited about it. I wanted to just take a minute to tell you how it went. I went to the Long Island programs, and learned that public transportation in Long Island is just terrific, which really surprised me.

So anyway, it was a really good experience to see how that all went.

I asked everyone involved for feedback afterwards and got really good feedback. The program really liked it. And they were nervous; there was a little bit of nervousness of a Board member. And of course we explained this wasn't going to be something that Board members do; I was just doing this to help figure out.

But the program really liked the idea of having client involvement. And I confirmed today that they didn't just say that to me, that they've actually said that to some other people. Because I was a little worried.
And the LSC staff were fantastic. We did a
debrief, and they came up with some really good things
going forward of what kind of training people might
need, what kind of skill sets we want to look for, and
then how to go about it.

But I think more discussion is needed, and I'd
like to make sure this moves forward so that we have
something actually in place by the next NLADA
conference because the clients really like that we're
listening and acting. And that's, I think, a really
big deal.

My experience has convinced me more than ever
that this is necessary. I do think that there might be
some pushback from outside evaluators. No one was mean
or anything, and I asked for honest feedback, so I
don't want it sound like -- I mean, I asked for honest
feedback and everyone was polite.

But they didn't like it. They didn't like
having a non-lawyer there. And someone compared it to,
that would be like having an evaluation of hospitals
and having someone other than a doctor do it.

Well, in this day and age, that's how it is.
There's no professional board any more that doesn't have lay people. There are lay people that evaluate hospitals. On every medical board, there's doctors and there's lay people. On any professional board, that's how it is now, and that's how all reviews are done.

So I just can tell you that that's where there's going to be pushback. And so I think it's important that for the staff's perspective, as this comes down, that it's maybe identified, this is a Board decision, so that the staff don't take it because that, I think, is where there's going to be pushback. I don't think there's going to be pushback from the programs.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Can I just comment on Julie's point? She's talking about temporary employees that we include as a part of our evaluation teams. The notion that there isn't a place for a client and the client perspective in looking at a legal aid program is very troubling to me. And I wonder if we have the right people on our evaluation teams if that's the attitude they have.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: I certainly wonder that, too.
I'm sure we all did.

Father Pius?

FATHER PIUS: Two things. First, I just wanted to react to what was said with the joint meeting that we just had, and that is the growth in the Pro Bono Innovation Fund and the quick establishment of it.

What I want to emphasize, too, is one thing we didn't mention is, where did this all come about? Congressman Wolf came to us and asked us to increase pro bono. And we did. We responded, and Congress responded in kind.

I remember very distinctly at one of our meetings about two years ago, and I was talking to someone -- I think it was at one of the receptions -- and said, the importance of getting the Republicans in the Congress to -- we've been doing a good job at explaining what we're doing and helping them to understand what we do and increasing support by the Republicans in Congress for the work we do. The response of the person who worked for legal services was, "Why would we do that? They just hate the poor."

I don't think that's a universal view, but I
think it's more common than we realize. And I hope that our experience, both at the 40th anniversary with this report for the Republican staffers and the incredible work and the great response that was given to us by the Congress in the Pro Bono Task Force report, what happens when we explain what we do and explain the reality of what we do and overcome some of the -- and honestly, there are some prejudices on the Republican side, and when we educate them about what we do -- and when we see them as really collaborators in the work, when we drop our own prejudices that Republicans just hate poor people and realize that their objections aren't bad, they're different; and when we go out of our way to help understand what those objections are and alleviate some of those, that we can do incredible things.

I hope that the rest of the legal services community can see what can happen when we look at the Congress as collaborators in this work and not as enemies who want to destroy the poor. And so I hope that this is a sign of great continuing work that will go on. So that's the first part.
The second thing that I want to say is one of the things that sort of disappoints me, just personally -- and I live far away so I don't really get to be involved nearly as much as I would like with some of our grantees. And so when I come to these meetings, it's great to meet some people.

I want to introduce one, and that is -- Vanessa, do you want to come forward for me, just want to sit at one of the microphones for me? One of the great benefits that we have coming to some of these meetings are when we get to meet the clients themselves, and clients who have been so affected by the work of legal services that they even volunteer to become board members.

So Vanessa is with us from Three Rivers, way up north. So you're down from a little bit of a drive here. And she was a client with regard to housing issues. And Vanessa, I have to say I was impressed with her passion for the issue that drove her to legal services and the issue that continues to drive her.

If you want to just very briefly, just in a minute or so, just talk about your own involvement with
LSC and what brought you to LSC and the passion you have for that issue with the housing issues that you found. There's a button on your microphone to turn it on.

MS. HENRY: Good morning to the Board. I am from Gainesville, Florida. I came to know about Three Rivers and their wonderful services for a complex with 171 families living in bad, poor conditions -- ceilings caving in, rats, roaches you name it, it was there, sitting on wet land.

But there was a big fire that forced us to have to find placement for all those families, to no avail with the owners. So I contacted Three Rivers, and Ms. Gloria Walker and her team came out and helped us form our tenant organization -- and they nominated me as president -- to move forward with relocating these families.

Right now I'm dealing with another complex that has severe mold issues. Families are being displaced. They've moved out of their homes into hotels, to come back and in two months the mold has returned. They've torn out structures to no avail. So
we've contacted city mayors and HUD to come out and personally inspect these units, what they're paying for.

So Three Rivers has really given me to know that these families have voices. And if they don't want to use their voices, I'll be the voice for them. And I am determined to make changes to the housing issues that we have. Families, no matter if we pay $1 or $500 for rent, we should live in the same conditions that other families have the choice to live in.

So I thank you for being here and inviting me. It's been a wonderful trip and I've learned a lot, especially with the pro bono, that is greatly needed for low-income families that can't afford attorneys. We get pushed under the rug, whether it's legal issues, courts, or whatever. But because we can't afford to pay $300 an hour, where do we go?

We've got people that shouldn't be in jail but because they were not properly -- but I thank you again for being here and taking the time. So thank you.

FATHER PIUS: Vanessa, thank you. And you've been on the board at Three Rivers for four months now?
MS. HENRY:  For four months.

FATHER PIUS:  So it's still very new.

MS. HENRY:  Still very new.  I'm learning.

All this is new for me.  But I got a fire and I'm excited.  So if I can help in anything -- but my issue seems to be housing issues.  And my long-term goal is, because the families have contacted me -- this was 15 years ago at Kennedy Homes.

But families that know me in my community, that know the work that I've done, they call me from different complexes:  "Hey, we know you can do it.  Could you please go to the city commission?"

(Laughter.)

MS. HENRY:  So my long-term goal is to form a nonprofit organization that will basically go out and help, and form me a team that we can help these families.

FATHER PIUS:  And I think Vanessa is a prime example of what informed and passionate clients can do to help legal services meet its goal for helping the poor.  So Vanessa, thank you for your service, thank you for your passion, and thank you for your leadership
up in the Three Rivers area.

MS. HENRY: Thank you. Yes, sir.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Charles?

MR. KECKLER: Thank you, John. I just wanted to briefly report some items from the TIG conference, which John encouraged me to go to. It's the first TIG conference that I've gone to. It was very interesting.

One of the things that that conference highlighted for me is something that I think we implicitly acknowledge, and sometimes explicitly, that technology now is a core component of what we need to do here as an organization.

It's gradually emerged as experimental, as an extra, as an additional item. But now it's very much like a lot of organizations in both the private and nonprofit world and intentional technology strategy, technology planning, is obviously a key part of what we're going to do going forward.

Another observation, general observation, that I had is, as mentioned, there were 300 people there. There were multiple sessions going on. There's some
social interaction and very positive relationships in that crowd which basically is fostering a culture of innovation that we're doing here, sponsored.

I must say that that's very unusual and very positive for a government entity, on the other hand to be fostering the separate culture innovation among nongovernmental employees, some of them grantees, many of them grantees, but also a wider community, and also through that process showing some leadership and developing things for things outside our grantees, for the larger field that we're sponsoring. So by being at the forefront, again that's unusual, I think, for a government entity, and laudable.

A couple that I thought were particularly notable there, I went to a number of sessions on data. We think of technology on the one hand as in the direct process of delivery of services. But another aspect of the technology that is being fostered with our TIG grants is management of the nonprofit, of the grantee, using the technology to gather data.

So one of the things that was talked about there was the idea of a data strategy, of being again
very intentional about your data, thinking, what data
do we need? Are we getting the data? If we're not
getting the data, then what technological innovations
and procedural innovations do we need to get the data
that is needed?

Part of that also is not waiting for those
changes and those technologies, but also maximizing the
amount of information and direction and the ability to
make good decisions off the data that already exists.

It was pointed out that a lot of grantees have
lots and lots of data they collect for us, for their
own internal processes, for other funders, and so on.
But making the most out of that, integrating it, is
also important.

There's a lot of data, for instance, in case
management systems at the grantees. And so there was
some thought about trying to maximize and pull out and
analyze case management system data, put it, for
instance, on dashboards for realtime decision-making,
wake up in the morning, draw up the data that you're
having, and make decisions for that day.

So that was important and highlights the idea
ultimately that LSC itself should -- there's a lot of
data that is in our systems that I know are being
consolidated, and there's a lot of data that to some
extent is going to be available as we work with the
grantees on that. But the data that's in the grantees,
at an abstract or filtered level, could also help guide
us, ultimately.

Another thing that I wanted to note is that I
had a session and a meeting with the Self-Represented
Litigant Network, and I wanted to point out that they
are expanding their operations. They've gotten a
grant. They've established some administrative
capacities and institutional capacities. So they're
doing some very interesting work.

So that's a future opportunity, and I invited
them to go ahead and comment on our activities and, if
we have regulatory matters or what have you, to be
aware of that. But also, it highlighted the changes,
and I'm not saying that we haven't changed, but I think
that there has been a change over the decades of the
existence of this organization in the way that it works
with the idea of self-represented litigants.
I think that in the distant past there was this idea that that's not what we do. We in fact replace the idea of self-represented litigants. And now it's clear, as we've changed over, to assist and facilitate that as an aspect of delivering service to everyone, as pointed out in our recent report.

The one thing that I would add to that is that realizing that there has been an institutional change, I think it's worthwhile to go back and to look at things like Board resolutions and Executive Orders as we audit and look back in the accumulated precedents of the past, particularly regulations from my own aspect in the Committee, but other aspects of the way that the organization is organized.

To the extent that we haven't adapted everything to reflect that change towards self-represented litigants as part of our strategy, we should look to that. So that's that.

The final thing I would say is that it was the 15th anniversary, the 15th TIG conference, and it's a maturing entity. It's a maturing program. And I would say that one thing I would maybe think considering
improving on this is we do evaluations, and they were very committed to evaluation, and I thought that was great.

But I would say that what I couldn't tell is I couldn't tell which one of the TIG programs has the maximum impact. And part of that is that I think the evaluations that were most powerful were ones that were not just the program itself, but looked to outcomes that are more generalizable.

So they had a thing on online intake and they were saying, okay, this is going to increase the speed of the online intake. We can account for this for how many hours it takes to do this per unit. And they talked about efficiency, something that is generalizable, and then they argued for a wider adoption of online intake as part of the intake process.

So if you have a hundred dependent variables, basically, in your evaluations of the TIG projects, it's harder to say which of them has -- if you have five dependent variables, ten dependent variables, it's easier to tell which ones produce the biggest bang for
the buck and therefore are targets for replication.  

So as we mature and develop a database of projects, being able to distinguish among the 500 different projects which ones really were the most powerful could be helpful going forward.

So I enjoyed my visit to the TIG conference. Thanks for encouraging me to go, John. And that concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

Gloria? You want to second that report, I'll bet.

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: First, when you were giving appreciation statements, I do want to thank the non-Board members who have carried us through the work we've been doing. I see Allan Tanenbaum is here. And I'm grateful in a personal way to him and Herb Garten and Frank Strickland for what they do. But also, they are wonderful walking companions in the morning.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: And I was remiss in not recognizing them. Allan has been a real trooper. And
let's not forget Paul Snyder and Dave Hoffman.

PROFESSOR VALENCE-WEBER: That's what I'm going to next.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Oh, okay.

PROFESSOR VALENCE-WEBER: Paul Snyder and David Hoffman specifically on the Audit Committee, where we have been in a big uphill reinvention on the Committee, as well as going into performing specific audit tasks, and their help in our understanding how those tasks can best be done, has really been quite impressive. As I say, I only had one course in auditing for lawyers, and believe me, it was a short, fast course. And I needed that help from Paul and David.

I second Charles' review of the TIG conference. It was my first time, and I'm appreciative of the opportunity to attend. Charles and I coordinated which of the many riches we would go to so we didn't overlap because there were four sessions at any given time period.

I went to sessions on what you might call special problems -- reaching special populations; that
would include not just what we talk about, about rural
people or ethnically identified cultures, but I went to
an incredible presentation given on how to, reach from
intake to final service, the LGBT community, the
lesbian/gay/transsexual/bisexual community, which was
amazing both in the technology presented, but by the
presenter's sensitivity to tell us what it is we need
to be aware of, even the right nomenclature. How do
you collect the data? And that was quite important.

That connects to Charles' concern about the
data. That was running through all the sessions that I
attended in terms of what do you collect? What do you
measure? And I was most impressed by including the
LGBT people who are addressing outcomes.

It isn't just that we increase the intake and
who uses the website and loads up different programs,
but also how do we measure what is the ultimate result
once the grantee is done with what it has performed?
And that was very important.

Then, overall, as I mentioned yesterday, it
was a very interactive, synergistic effect. And I was
amazed by the degree of collegiality among people, some
of whom were lawyers, some who were not lawyers, and then also people who are outside of LSC in any formal affiliation but are the people working in technology development who see that legal services place at their particular approach, new takes, could be of use.

Obviously, some of the people are marketing to law firms and for commercial purposes. But I was interested in their attendance and why they were there; and also the international people, including the people from British Columbia, and the expert from the Netherlands was absolutely incredible and impressive. And he's working with several countries on how you might be able to even inform people that they have a legal cause of action.

Then the other thing I did since our last meeting was I went to the western states meeting of executive directors and staff that took place in Albuquerque. And that was right after the innovation grants had been announced, so it was a very interesting set of conversations, to hear about that as well as how people, particularly in the western states where you have large geographical territory and small populations
-- and unlike many of our grantees, many of these people are working where there is no likely to be private donor, foundation, and really scraping hard to get what little they have in the way of either state funds or other means to find funding. And that was quite useful for me to hear that, and I learned a lot of things about how our grantees, under these demanding conditions, perform.

Then what I mentioned this morning at our meeting with the ABA, where the Access to Justice Commission in New Mexico and the state Supreme Court and all the stakeholders in the state had the Washington state people who are now the regulators and the directors of the Washington state alternative to JD-trained lawyers, something called Limited Law something-or-another. It's LLLT.

They were there for a day-long meeting that was quite important. And then there have been continuing discussions that are going on now in New Mexico about this. It's something we might think about as a program for us, but I wouldn't do it just yet.

They are now into their second month, and we
want to see what happens, as well as other options being considered. They mentioned at least five other states where they see these being considered, so we'll have more later on to hear.

The last item is that the Federal Bar Association is having its annual Indian Law Conference in Scottsdale in April. I'm on a panel there discussing Legal Services Corporation history and tribal courts, which actually starts in the Johnson Administration's OEO programs, what was then called LSP, Legal Services Program.

So that will take place in April. But I had to submit a draft before Christmas, which I have. And we'll see what happens after that. And I think that's it.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. Thank you, Gloria. Thank you, Charles. Thank you to the members.

MR. MADDOX: Charles?

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes, Vic?

MR. MADDOX: I just want to quickly follow up on Father Pius's comments regarding pro bono. I couldn't help noting that one of our former Board
members, Tom Fuentes, must be smiling at us now because he was an ardent Republican.

He was the long-time chairman of the Republican Party in Orange County, California, a strong and long supporter of President Ronald Reagan, and at the same time a strong advocate and proponent of pro bono legal services during his time on the Board and before that.

His motto was, much as the doctors might say, "Lawyer, heal thyself." And I think he was just slightly ahead of his time when he served on the Board.

So I appreciate everything Father Pius said in that regard.

FATHER PIUS: I hold Tom's seat on the Board.

MR. MADDOX: Yes, you do. Yes, you do. Some of us had the pleasure of serving with him on the Board before Father Pius and I think maybe Gloria took their seats. It was an honor to serve with him, and I think he's probably pretty pleased.

The other thing I wanted to follow up on is -- I meant to mention this in the meeting this morning, but I couldn't find it -- the ABA, Steve Grumm sends
around the Access to Justice legal blog every so often, and I always read it.

There was an article in it last week -- it was the January 19th email; I assume everybody gets that email, I do -- and the blog entry says, and this goes to the question of low bono that we've talked about before -- the blog entry says -- oh, gosh, now I've lost it -- essentially, the ABA pushes back on the notion that there is a dearth of affordable legal services for those of moderate income, which I thought was kind of remarkable.

The panel Dean Minow led at Duke University, we talked about this at some length. I think Judge Cooke yesterday mentioned it. And there seems to have been a consensus among the Board and perhaps others that there is in fact a problem of those of moderate income.

So the memo from the Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services dated December 20, 2014 to the ABA Commission on the Future of Legal Services says, "The popular press and to some extent the legal profession tend to advance the notion that legal
services for those of moderate incomes are inaccessible because they are unaffordable." So they're setting up the proposition that essentially this is a myth.

Then the premise is, "There is no question that legal fees for complicated matters that are billed by the hour can be out of reach for many. However, the average annual household income in the U.S. is about $50,000. And for a vast proportion of personal legal services, fees are reasonable and affordable for those of moderate and modest means." Then the memo proceeds with its analysis and citations and whatnot.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: It's not this Committee.

MR. MADDOX: It was the Standing Committee on the Delivery of Legal Services, so I guess that's a different committee. So maybe there's some tension inside the ABA.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: There must be.

MR. MADDOX: But I just commend that article to everybody on the Board, and maybe some of those at LSC as well. It might be interesting to see --

CHAIRMAN LEVI: We should send it to Mary and to William.
MR. MADDOX: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: William's futures group ought to --

MR. GREY: I think they're on the committee. They're on this committee that Jim is on.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: There's a storm in the East, and some of our staff and my colleague here to the right are having to take an earlier plane. That's unfortunate. But it's pressing us a little bit more than I'd like.

But I'd like to hold any further member reports until we get the Committee reports done, if that's okay. So Gloria, if it's one minute, literally, because she has to leave at 11:00.

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Thank you, Victor, for reminding us of that blog mail. And look on that mail. Also there's an article on the Washington state LLLT.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Sorry about the storm in the East and the weather and all. I'm thinking about weather to rearrange our meetings so that the Board meetings are not necessarily on the last day in the
morning, maybe the day before, and we reorganize some
things so that we aren't in this continual --

DEAN MINOW: Just reorganize the weather.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. Exactly. Well, and the
travel situation is tough. I understand it. And this
is your weekend. The schedule has us done at 11:30,
this Board meeting, in a closed session. Whether we
have to defer the closed session or not, I'm not sure.

Jim?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Thank you, John. I'd like
to give a brief report on six subjects. First, I'll
give you an overview of our basic field grants for
2015. Second, I'll provide a few additional details
about the Technology Initiative Grant conference, if my
computer catches up with me.

MR. MADDOX: Maybe you need a grant.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Right. Anybody have a
grant for this? There we go. It's Becky's laptop.

Next, I'm going to explain some changes we're
making in the application process for Pro Bono
Innovation Fund grants for 2015. I'll give you a brief
overview, an update, on what we're doing to improve our internal business processes.

I'll give you a quick update on our work under the Public Welfare Foundation grant and a grant from the Margaret A. Cargill Foundation. And finally, I'll give you my annual report on our FOIA compliance, our Freedom of Information Act compliance.

For basic field grants for 2015, we used the term "competition" to describe the application and review process for three-year grants as opposed to renewals, which are the decisions that we make about whether to give a grant that had previously been approved for three years in years two and three.

The term "competition" in reality is something of a misnomer. In the last round of so-called competition, we had one service area where there was more than one applicant, which is fairly typical. It would be unusual for us to have a year where we had more than three true competitions for service areas.

The general practice is that we get one application per service area, and it's the applicant that is currently holding the grant. This has been the
case for some time. The multi-applicant competition
this past year was for the service area in Southeastern
Michigan that includes Detroit.

As you've heard previously, we have a new
grandee in American Samoa. This is the first time
we've had a grantee in American Samoa since 2007. We
first had a grantee in American Samoa in 2004, and they
held the grant for three years.

That grantee ran into some problems, which as
I recall resulted in a jail term for one of the
officers of the grantee. We have been trying to
develop an applicant in the years since, and last year
finally had some success.

So we are using funding that has been held in
reserve for the past couple of years to help get the
new grantee up and running, and we hope that they will
be delivering services by the middle of this year.

We had one consolidation of grantees in New
Jersey. Ocean-Monmouth and South Jersey are now served
by the same grantee. We still maintain two separate
service areas, but there's a single grantee now serving
both of those areas. So we still have 134 grantees.
We added one in American Samoa but we lost one in New Jersey.

MS. REISKIN: When you say we combined service areas, is that the first time that's -- I've never heard that before.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We didn't actually combine the service areas.

MS. REISKIN: You just have one company doing two?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. Yes. We have one grantee serving both service areas, yes.

MS. REISKIN: And has that happened before?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. The process this year of reviewing grant applications improved our focus on applicants' fiscal compliance. We're doing more every year to improve the quality of the information we get from grantees about their fiscal competence, and we're also improving our evaluation of the information that we get.

This is reflected in our increased use of special grant conditions and short-term funding. Even if we decide to award a grant, there are other
mechanisms that we can use if we have any concerns about the performance of the grantee. Those include grant terms shorter than three years and the imposition of special grant conditions. I'll give you some numbers on how those tools were used this year.

I'm just going to plow ahead, and if the computer gets behind me. We updated the information that we requested from grantees in the fiscal portion of the application. A few years ago we revised the application form itself to have a special section related to fiscal issues, and each year, based on the experience of the prior year, we update and improve the quality of the information that we request from our grantees.

We score -- we give a numerical rating -- to the fiscal portion of the application. And each year we review whether our scoring criteria are correct, whether we're weighting different fiscal factors in the appropriate way, and whether we're being consistent in our evaluation of the fiscal components of the application.

In this past grant cycle, we have 27 grantees
that had special grant conditions attached to their grants. Of those 27 grantees, 19 of the special grant conditions were imposed for fiscal reasons. We had 13 grantees that were funded for less than three years, and six of those got short-term funding for fiscal reasons.

This graph shows our track record over the past few years in the length of the grant terms associated with the grants that we've made. So in this past grant cycle, we had 15 service areas, as I mentioned, that got less than three-year funding.

MR. MADDOX: Jim, can I just ask you, when you say fiscal reasons, can you explain that just generally? What are fiscal reasons?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. I'll give you a specific example. We have one grantee which for the past two years has been very late in getting their audited financial statements done, completing their audits. They're required to submit their audited financial statements by April. It's been December before they've been able to get them to us.

I think that's a red flag. I think if an
organization is not able to timely issue audited financial reports, there's something up there. The quality of the legal services that the grantee provides are good, but there's been an issue there, I think related to turnover in the administrative functions of the grantee.

They're on six-month funding for the current year. We want them to know that they're not going to get past July 1st if they don't manage to get their audited financial statements in on time. Last year we put them on one-year funding, and for the second year in a row, the audited financial statements came in in December. Not good enough. We wanted to send a very strong message that we have higher expectations of our grantees.

Yes, Laurie?

MS. MIKVA: Is this information public, posted anywhere in some way?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Laurie's question was whether this information is public, whether it's posted anywhere. Who our grantees are is definitely -- I'd have to defer to Janet on that, whether the length of
the grant term -- it's certainly public -- if we got Freedom of Information Act request, the public is entitled to know that. I'm not certain whether there's any proactive disclosure of that, and defer to Janet.

MS. LABELLA: Thank you, Jim. At this point, no, although I think it may be something to consider. We send out the grant award letters, which have the funding term on them. And then when we post for the competition season who was in competition, it lists the programs.

So consequently, people can go in there and figure it out. If you were in competition last year and you're in competition this year, that means you got a one-year grant. But there is no posting that says, these are the awards that were granted.

MR. MADDOX: Jim, aside from whether the individual grantees or that information is public, are the larger community of grantees aware that X number of grantees are on short funding and it's because of fiscal reasons and the like?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Well, I always make my PowerPoint presentations available to the National
Legal Aid and Defender Association, which circulates them. So this information that you're seeing right here will be out on the street on Monday. Is that right, Don Saunders?

MR. SAUNDERS: Or shortly thereafter.

(Laughter.)

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: This graph shows the number of grantees that had special grant conditions imposed over the past four grant cycles. And as you can see, we've had a steady uptick of the last couple of years in the number of grantees with special grant conditions.

This next graph shows what the reason for the imposition of the special grant conditions is. It breaks it down into four categories: fiscal oversight; compliance; programmatic, that is, quality concerns about the legal services that the program is providing; and migrant-related issues.

The blue bar is fiscal oversight, special grant conditions related to fiscal concerns. And as you can see, there's been a significant increase in the number of special grant conditions relating to fiscal
MS. REISKIN: Do you attribute that to you guys are doing a better job of monitoring, documenting, and getting on it, or more problems?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I attribute it to the former. We have much better information now than we did in the past, and we analyze it much more carefully with people with the right skill sets.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think it's the direct result of the Task Force.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: It is very much a direct result of the recommendations of the Fiscal Oversight Task Force.

I'd like to move on to a few facts, some of which you've heard before, about our Technology Initiative Grant program. Our appropriation for Technology Initiative Grants for the current fiscal year was increased by Congress by 16 percent. It went from $3.45 million in FY 2014 to $4 million in fiscal 2015. That's an all-time high. And I think that reflects a vote of confidence by the Congress in the work that we've been doing in technology.
I want to give you a particular example of a situation where we publicized a Technology Initiative Grant to very good effect. We made an award in Maine to Pine Tree Legal Assistance to add to their highly-regarded, award-winning website, Stateside Legal, that provides legal information for military families and veterans. They wanted to add a component dealing specifically with the legal problems of women veterans.

Carol Bergman and Carl Rauscher have done a terrific job over the past few years in publicizing every Technology Initiative Grant we make and issuing local press releases in addition to a comprehensive national press release.

We offer to our grantees to help them stage press conferences and get the involvement of their Senator or Congressperson in announcing the grant. This is federal money that's being brought into the district. It's something that elected representatives should get credit for.

So Carol and Carl worked with Nan Heald in Portland on a press conference that was attended by and
participated in by Senator Angus King of Maine, a former two-term governor of Maine. And I went up there for it because I wanted to make a statement about how important this is.

It was a magnificent event. They held it at Portland City Hall, which is a beautiful, classic building, in a room called the State of Maine Room, which is a high-ceilinged room with a fireplace and chandeliers and fancy draperies.

They had television coverage from Maine Public Broadcasting, including both the public television station in Maine and the public radio affiliate in Maine. They had the local Fox affiliate, the television affiliate, cover it; the Portland newspaper. Senator King's office put out several press releases about this.

It was very well-attended, very well-covered, and it was a topic that is of great interest to people and of great appeal: veterans, women veterans. They had clients there who had been served by Pine Tree Legal Assistance, veteran clients, who were able to talk to reporters one-on-one about their experiences
I want to use this, and I had hoped to talk about this at the TIG conference if I'd been able to go, as an example of how we can highlight the good work we do in terms that are comprehensible to people. The icing on the cake was this.

Recently Senator King issued what they call a "Dear Colleague" letter to the 99 other Senators explaining to them what is available on Stateside Legal, and also explaining this new component dealing with women veterans.

He explained it as constituent service, and he encouraged all of them to do what he does, which is to have a link to statesidelegal.org on his personal website for the Senate. And in the course of his letter, he mentioned a couple of times that all this was funded by Legal Services Corporation.

So I just think this is a great example of success in technology, innovation, and the legislative component all coming together to present a great picture about the work that our grantees do and what it is that the Legal Services Corporation funds.
I really appreciated it when Senator King said -- in the course of his remarks he pointed to me -- I don't think he could remember my name -- and he said, "And this guy came all the way from Washington for this."

(Laughter.)

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: But the reaction of the media there was, this must be a big deal because of all these people who are here. It was terrific. More of that, please.

A few facts about the TIG conference, which you've heard. We had record attendance, a 37 percent increase over our prior record, which was just last year. We had attendees from I believe it was 43 states -- I'm sorry, there's an error in the slide -- one territory, and four countries. This next graph charts TIG conference attendance going back to 2010. You can see a significant increase there.

As people who have attended mentioned, the TIG conference is something special. There is a sense of community about it, a sense of innovation, entrepreneurship, energy, optimism, a real can-do
attitude.

We talk internally about whether we should be doing more to expand the attendance at the conference dramatically, and we're of mixed minds about it because we don't want to lose the specialness that we have around the event. I think if we do increase, we should do it gradually because first-time attendees become converts.

(Cell phone rings.)

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: But it's a very significant increase in attendance over the course of the past couple of years.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: That was probably somebody who couldn't get into the TIG conference.

(Laughter.)

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Now, one thing we ask ourselves every year is, who isn't coming to the TIG conference who should be? There's a self-selection about the group that decides to go to the conference, and who out there isn't doing what they should in technology that might benefit from attending the conference?
So starting a few years ago, we began to offer scholarships to TIG. We would pay the attendance and the travel expenses for representatives of grantees that had never received a Technology Initiative Grant previously or had received only one long ago.

This year we refined that process, and we've created what we call TIG fellowships. We awarded 12 fellowships -- this was a competitive application process -- where each applicant had to identify a particular technology project that they hope to undertake during the course of the coming year. And the applicants are people who are not on the list of usual suspects for attending the TIG conference.

The fellowship covers the cost of attendance at the conference, and it also includes a mentor from another legal aid program, another LSC-funded legal aid program, and at least three webinars for the fellows. So we've added an educational component and a coaching component beyond just mere attendance at the TIG conference. And we follow up to see what happens to those who attend, those who've attended in the past on scholarships, and we'll do this now with the
fellows, to see, are their programs now submitting applications for TIGs, and if they are, are they getting them? So we're really trying to branch out and expand the size of the community that's involved in the TIG program.

As Lynn mentioned earlier at the joint meeting with the ABA Pro Bono Committee -- my slide will catch up with me in a minute -- Congress in the current fiscal year increased our Pro Bono Innovation Fund appropriation by 60 percent, from $2.5 million to $4 million. Yes, Harry?

MR. KORRELL: Jim, I want to ask you one quick question about the TIG conferences. It seems like they're not necessarily our constituents, but one participant in the legal services world that needs help from a technology standpoint is the courts.

Do we do any outreach to court systems, court personnel, to expose them to the kinds of things we're doing? Because a lot of the feedback we get at some of these events are good reports from courts or our grantees or others who are working with the courts on technology programs that make the courts more
accessible, which can solve some of the burdens on the pro bono and legal services systems. Do we do anything with these TIG conferences to reach out to courts and show them the kinds of things that are possible?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We do it much more broadly than the TIG conference. We have good working relationships particularly with court administrators, and that's where the technology happens.

Glenn Rawdon has a good relationship with the Conference of State Court Administrators, which is the administrative equivalent of the Conference of Chief Justices. They're involved in the self-represented litigation network that we participate in.

A lot of these projects, when they deal with TIG projects, if they deal with court forms or technology applications to assist in the completion of court-approved forms, step one in that process is uniform forms throughout the state.

Our solutions can work only if we get buy-in from the courts. We can come up with a great technology idea, but if the product that results, when someone completes the form, is not going to be accepted
or isn't transmissible to the court, we haven't
accomplished anything. So they're very much involved
in what we do.

PROFESSOR VALENCE-WEBER: Jim, that was the
director of the California courts process, and it's way
beyond forms.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. That's Bonnie Hough
from California, who's a mainstay at these conferences.

Yes.

As Lynn mentioned earlier, last year we had 79
applications for our Pro Bono Innovation Fund grants
and made 11 awards. Those aren't great odds. And we
also saw that the total amount of funding requests far
exceeded the money we had available to expend. We had
$2.5 million to give out in grants, and we got
applications totaling $15.3 million.

The process of applying is labor-intensive,
and the process at LSC of reviewing 79 applications is
very labor-intensive. We had five people last year on
our review team.

So we decided this year to see if we couldn't
improve the efficiency of the process to impose less
burdens on those who aren't likely to succeed in their application and impose less work on the review team that we assemble.

So that's why we're having a letter of intent process this year to precede the formal, more detailed application, to do an early screen and weed out those that we don't think stand a realistic prospect of being funded.

The letter of intent requires much less detail than the full application does, and it's much less time-consuming to review. We're hoping that we can winnow the initial group of those that express interest down and have fewer submit complete applications and expedite the process for everybody.

We have the time to do that this year, which we didn't last, because we now have the program up and running and the letters of intent are due, as Lynn mentioned, at the end of February. We've also done some hiring to help staff this program. We hired a coordinator, who is working both on Pro Bono Innovation Fund grants and disaster grants, and we're going to be adding another program counsel in the Office of Program
Next I want to report on a couple of things we're doing to improve LSC's internal business processes. We are implementing the recommendations that we got as a result of a business process review conducted by the consulting firm of Barker & Scott.

We're creating what we call a data portal, which will offer one-stop access within LSC to all data and documents we have for every grantee. And the portal will be integrated with our grants management system.

We're in the process of moving toward a new grants management system. The software that we use to process applications, which is outdated, the system that we have now, was good when we purchased it, but it has been customized over time to deal with our particular circumstances to such an extent that we can no longer upgrade with the upgrade that the manufacturer issues because you simply can't overlay their upgrades on the customization that we've done.

This is just critically important to what we
do in making grants and monitoring grants. We expect to complete selection of a vendor for a new grants management system at the middle of this year and to deploy the new system next year so that it's fully operational by April of 2016.

I'm going to dispense with my slides at this point because they're moving too slowly.

A quick update on the Public Welfare Foundation grant. We're completing work on our online toolkit for tracking outcomes. The toolkit will include examples of outcome reporting systems currently used by other funders and by individual LSC grantees. The toolkit will also provide recommendations for best practices.

Grantees will be able to choose their own method for tracking outcomes based on their needs and practices. We are not going to impose a uniform system for tracking outcomes. We expect to be able to test the toolkit in February, and we'll offer a demo of the toolkit to the Board.

As you know, we also received a grant from the Margaret A. Cargill Foundation of $1.2 million. We've
received $800,000 of that grant already. The purpose
of the grant is to develop a legal services response
plan and delivery system following disasters in the
Midwest, and to do it in coordination with other
disaster relief providers such as FEMA, the Red Cross,
the American Bar Association's Young Lawyer Division,
et cetera.

We awarded two subgrants in December to Iowa
Legal Aid and to Legal Aid of Nebraska. These are
substantial grants. The Iowa grant was $367,700, and
the Nebraska grant was $400,000.

LSC has regarded as a leader in civil legal
aid in disaster situations. The Cargill Foundation
approached us about this grant because of the
reputation that we have for quality in this area. This
is an area that also provides an opportunity for us to
showcase the importance of legal aid, and to explain in
very human, relatable terms the difference that legal
aid can make in circumstances that anybody could
imagine themselves in.

If you're a victim of a disaster, of a flood
or a tornado, and you lose all your identification, how
do you begin to go about the process of applying for assistance, filing insurance claims, et cetera? There are just many day-to-day issues with a legal component that come up immediately after a disaster that even people of means can imagine themselves being in and understanding why people who don't have means would need free legal assistance.

Finally, I wish I could show you my graphs on our FOIA compliance record, our Freedom of Information Act compliance record. I will send you all, email you, my slides. But they tell a wonderful story.

In each of the last three years, we have processed exactly the number of Freedom of Information Act requests that we've received in each year. I emphasize this not merely because compliance with any legal obligation should be important to us, but because the Freedom of Information Act is a good government act. And we always want LSC to be looking good by any good government measurement standard.

This sends a message about tone at the top. It sends a tone about institutional values. And I have a graph -- I'll just hold up my hard copy of it -- but
this graph charts the average response time to a Freedom of Information Act request over the past four years at LSC.

In 2011, the average response time was 223 days. Last year it was 14-1/2. The line at the bottom of this graph is the statutory requirement of a response within 20 days, and in each of the last three years we've been below, every year.

MR. MADDOX: Could you send that over to the Justice Department?

(Laughter.)

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We will. And actually, the Justice Department, we have to file an annual report with the Justice Department, which we'll be doing in February. And they rate FOIA compliance by agencies and other entities that are subject to the Freedom of Information Act request.

Last year we were rated within the top 10 percent, and this year we're looking for a perfect record. They have a color-coded scale where dark green is the best. We're looking for all dark greens, and are optimistic that we're going to get that rating this
We also did some things in the past year to ensure that we have systems in place to promote compliance long-term. We did training programs for all managers and staff. I issue a memo to everybody within the Corporation every February about the importance of compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

Ron and I get weekly reports on the status of pending Freedom of Information Act requests so that we have early notice if anything seems to be getting stale. We have an online tracking system for the status of pending requests so that if someone has submitted a request, they can go online and see where it is in our process and when they're likely to get a response.

We're also being proactive in disclosing information without awaiting Freedom of Information Act requests, and we're using social media tools to highlight information that we think the public should have easy access to.

That completes my report.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Jim.
Questions?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN LEVI: Inspector General?
DEAN MINOW: I'm so sorry I have to leave and miss the meeting. Someone, maybe John, will do the report for the Governance Committee, and I'm sure we'll indicate how pleased we all were with the review of both the Inspector General and the President, and put to the vote the resolution that we have there. So everybody, safe travels.
CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, should we just do that right now? You sort of gave half the report. Why don't we just do the other half and adopt the code while you're here.
MOTION
DEAN MINOW: If you don't mind, I'd be happy to move it. It's with changes, as were discussed. There were two sets of changes. One was inserting the word "any" in two places, and the other is making sure, per Harry's good catch, that the reporting of conduct is not to the manager but to the office so that it's not caught up in that hierarchical issue.
So here's the resolution, and with that amendment, all in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

DEAN MINOW: Any abstentions?

(No response.)

DEAN MINOW: Okay. It carries. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: That concludes your Committee's report. Everybody amended the agenda to allow that. Safe travels.

Mr. Inspector General?

MR. SCHANZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have with me today a newly minted for LSC, but with a boatload of experience as an Assistant IG for Investigation, Dan O'Rourke. You'll hear from him in closed session.

What I want to do, though, first off is advise. I hope you know this, but at the risk of making sure that you do, Jim doesn't make a lot of his decisions in a vacuum. A lot of his decisions are based on OIG work and OIG collaboration with
Management, and that was not clear. So at the risk of tooting my own horn, I will reference that and hope that Jim will endorse that.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Second.

MR. SCHANZ: Thank you.

We have a process that I brought with me from the Department of Justice. It's called a Management Information Memo, otherwise known as a MIM. It's a method that is fully documented in writing from IG to President of the Corporation, and it's a way to transmit information formally, in writing, on what we discuss in our biweekly meetings, which gets to a lot of the data that Jim uses for his decisions.

We've sent two MIMs, and these came up in discussion yesterday. And one was on the need for reviewing the 990s, and more detailed data in the grant competition process. So we advised Management -- these are not reported on our website or in the Semiannual Report, but these are the other duties of an Inspector General's office to ensure that Management is as efficient and effective as possible.

So the two MIMs that we issued during the past
reporting period had to do precisely with gaining more financial information before Management makes a decision on the grant competition. I'm very proud of that. That's why I'm bringing it up to you.

The other one had to do with recruiting, and we suggested to Management that they access USAJOBS. And we provided to give them guidance on how to do that so that recruiting reaches the right audience. So those were the two MIMs that we provided during this period, in addition to, as I said, biweekly meetings and talking with the President on issues that may be related to grant competition or even grant performance.

I do want to correct the record on two things I said during the Board meeting. Yes, we are following up on our peer review. We've provided that information to the peer reviewer, and they have assessed it and gotten back to us on our actions taken on the recommendations. I believe they got the exact same report that is in your Board book.

I also want to mention that I have a 2015 work plan. And I wasn't going to burden it with you (sic) by my performance standards; this is to be discussed
with the Board and presented to the Board. So we'll be
sending it to you electronically unless you would like
to have a copy of it now. We do have hard copies
available of what the OIG plans to do in fiscal year
2013 -- or 2015. I'm sorry, I'm going backwards in
time.

That being said, I think we have a very busy
agenda this year. We usually do, the results of which
are disclosed on our website and in the Semiannual
Report to Congress.

I did mention earlier I will be meeting with a
couple of the staffers of the new Congress in early
February; I was a little bit too busy to do it
immediately. But we agreed to discuss that with them,
our work plan, our Semiannual Report to them, in early
February.

If there's any questions, like I said, I
wanted to set the record straight on the followup to
the peer review, which we have done. I wasn't aware of
that, and Mr. Seeba is on the line right now if he
wants to embellish what I've said. In working with the
peer reviewers, we take the recommendations to heart,
and I've already implemented all of them.

I mentioned also, and I want to underscore today, that we've instituted a continuous monitoring process, at which point we have an individual who will provide me periodic, and upon request, reports of how our audit staff is functioning.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, thank you, Jeff. And let me just say you made that report to the Audit Committee, and I assume that there'll be ongoing reporting during the year.

MR. SCHANZ: Right.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes?

FATHER PIUS: In the peer review, is there followup from the group that does the peer review? Do they look at your implementation of their concerns and sign off on those or express an opinion? Or is it just sort of a one-shot deal?

MR. SCHANZ: They will. The person who did it was a deputy IG, not a permanent IG. They now have a permanent IG, and we deal IG-to-IG on the followup issues.

FATHER PIUS: The other thing, and it's just a
suggestion -- in doing the reviews for both you and for
the President or your own personal evaluations, one of
the things that struck me about Jim's is that he had
last year's goals and then how he accomplished them.
Yours was focused on the statutory stuff, which is
great.

But to the extent to which you've mentioned
some of the goals and the doctrine for the goals of the
IG's office for the upcoming year, you could consider
whether or not you should include some of that in your
own personal evaluation as well next year, to list the
goals you had at the beginning of the year and the way
in which they came to be implemented, not just simply
the statutory responsibilities.

MR. SCHANZ: Okay.

FATHER PIUS: I think that would help round
out the self-evaluation. But otherwise, thank you for
that report. We're always pleased with the work that
the IG does and its collaboration with us and the
important role that the IG has in oversight.

MR. SCHANZ: Well, that's for the entire
community, as you know. Every agency has their own IG,
and I deal with them usually IG-to-IG at our monthly meetings. And we have an annual conference where cross-cutting government issues are surfaced and to see whether we have information that other IGs can use and vice versa.

There are databases there of common findings. And it's a shame the Dean isn't here -- it came from the RAT Board. The RAT Board was sunsetted, and now it's called the Recovery Operations Center, which every IG has access to to go see what they found in disaster-related areas, which would be one good example.

We won't be going into it without knowledge if we do any audits of the Cargill Foundation or Sandy, where funding was provided to IGs. And of course, the big example there is Katrina. And this was prior to this Board to my tenure here, but the LSC did not have their hand out for Katrina funds, which I thought was a failure of Management. And I'll get off my soapbox. Because that wouldn't have happened today.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: You're right as to that.

MR. SCHANZ: Any questions or comments?
CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

MR. SCHANZ: And then we have an investigative report that we'll discuss with you in closed session.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: We now turn to the resolution commending and recognizing Sharon Browne, as I mentioned, and ask that we have it -- I guess it doesn't need a second. It's a resolution. Can we vote on it? All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any opposition?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

Now, the Finance Committee.

MR. GREY: Mr. Chairman, the Finance Committee held a very efficient meeting, as usual. There were two issues that I think I should bring to the -- well, one action item and one issues.

MOTION

MR. GREY: The action item has to do with the Consolidated Operating Budget for 2015, and we'd submit that for the Board's approval.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?
(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. GREY: The second issue is the memorandum that was presented to the Finance Committee by the Treasurer after approval from the President with regard to deposits of LSC funds.

Both the Treasurer and the president have approved a process where they will explore insured investments in line with accepted practices to try to get us the highest rate of return -- which is not very high these days -- but nonetheless, they are pursuing that, and have done so on our behalf. I want you to know that that has been done.

That concludes the report of the Finance Committee.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Audit Committee?

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Audit Committee met on January 22nd in both open and closed session. We discussed the Committee's evaluations for 2014 and goals for 2015. We received the presentation of the 2014 annual financial audit
from the Inspector General's office, and in absentia from Nancy Davis, the WithumSmith+Brown partner who is the outside auditor. The audit was a clean audit with no management letter, so that was a very good result for the Corporation.

We received the LSC Form 990 for 2014. We received a briefing by the Inspector General, and we had a briefing by General Counsel on the risk matrix for the Corporation. We focused our attention on the referrals by the Inspector General's office to the OCE and the followup by OCE on that. We had a very, I think, good discussion led by Paul Snyder and Lora Rath. So that was very helpful.

There is one matter for the Board's attention and action. We considered and voted on recommending a resolution to the Board to amend the 403(b) Thrift Plan. That resolution is in the Board book at page 121, I believe.

The resolution, just to briefly summarize, makes four amendments to the 403(b) plan, all of which have been reviewed with legal counsel and the plan provider. They allow former employees to take partial
distributions, which currently is not allowed but is apparently common.

They amend the provision limiting a spouse who's been married for less than a year to take a distribution in the event of, I believe, death of the participant. They change some other provisions, including the way in which time of service for some contract employees or temporary employees is evaluated, moving from the actual method to an estimated method.

MOTION

MR. MADDOX: So we recommend that the Board approve the resolution that's in the Board book.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. MADDOX: That completes my report.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

Ops and Regs?

MR. KECKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Operations and Regulations Committee met on Thursday of this week. We received a report on the activities in
furtherance of the Corporation's strategic plan. At this time, the recommendation was to maintain the goals and initiatives behind those goals of the strategic plan.

We also received an update on the regulatory agenda for the Corporation, and have made an amendment to that to include work that will be expected in the next couple of sessions on the 45 CFR Part 1628 fund balances.

There are two items for the Board to consider, and both of them involve publication for comment at this time. First is a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that is to be published regarding 345 CFR Part 1640, which is an extension and specification of the application of federal law regarding federal funds to LSC recipients. The notice is provided to you in the Board book beginning at page 205 and preceded by a memo explaining that matter.

MOTION

MR. KECKLER: The recommendation of the Committee is for that Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to be published.
CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. KECKLER: Thank you. The second item for the Board's consideration is that, as was discussed in the Committee, we are updating the data and estimates regarding those eligible for our migrant grant services. And a report that was commissioned via the Department of Labor has produced a set of updated figures on that.

Based on that report and analysis -- which Board members should have a copy of the report itself, which is quite interesting, a memorandum from the Department of Labor and their contracted analysts -- based on that report, we are submitting new agricultural worker population data for comment.

I know that people in the field, as was discussed in the Committee, are reviewing that report and its methodology and would like to comment on this. But at the current time, what Management is asked is to publish the plan for updating the population data as
a Request for Comment.

In your Board book, what would be published in the Federal Register is at page 224. But I think there's a couple of tweaks and updates to it, and so you'll find that in the packet that's at your desk that's also designated page 224.

It says, "Legal Services Corporation Request for Comments: Agricultural Worker Population Data for Basic Field Migrant Grants." That is to be published for 45 days of comment.

MOTION

MR. KECKLER: The Committee voted to recommend publication of this.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. KECKLER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. That concludes the report of the Operations and Regulations Committee.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

We have had the Governance and Performance
Review Committee report, unless somebody thinks we forgot something in the rush there.

MR. KORRELL: Can I comment on that, John? Just a comment on that report. I just want to make sure that that change that was made to the slick, formatted ethics document is also reflected in the internal documents of the Corporation.

I was just concerned that if the edit made it into the slick version, I want to make sure it also made it into the official documents. I assume it did.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, the slick version says "Draft" on it, so it's not the --

MR. FLAGG: That will be the official document, both internally and externally. And the changes that the Board approved will be included in that.

MR. KORRELL: Great. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: The Institutional Advancement Committee met. We went over the continuing results of our fundraising efforts. We discussed the year-end and other new grants that have come in, and then also had a good discussion about the formation of a Leaders
Council.

MOTION

CHAIRMAN LEVI: The charter of that and the resolution establishing it are contained at page 154 of your book, and the Committee -- that is our only action item -- recommends the establishment. There was a lot of discussion about possible membership, but that is not what is being voted today. It's just simply the resolution on page 154.

So that is our only action item, and all in favor of that?

FATHER PIUS: Just a quick discussion of it, very quickly. I notice that the composition of the board is entirely left to the discretion of the Chair. Should it be broader approval of the entire Board for that, or the approval of the Chair of the Advancement Committee, I think? I think it's the Chair of the Advancement Committee that determines the composition of the Leadership Council.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: No. No.

FATHER PIUS: Did I read that wrong?

MS. RHEIN: I believe that it was the
Institutional Advancement Committee, as a Committee --

FATHER PIUS: As a Committee?

MS. RHEIN: Will vote on the membership and make recommendations for members.

FATHER PIUS: And is that recommendation then given to the Board, or is it just left within the -- because it's considered a subcommittee of the --

CHAIRMAN LEVI: We wanted to keep it in the subcommittee level and not put it to the Board level. And I think there is good reason not to. That was the thinking, to keep a little bit of distinction. We've been listening to -- yes. So there's no confusion. These are not at the Board level. Thank you.

All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Now Father Pius or -- Gloria is not here, so Father Pius?

FATHER PIUS: No action items. We discussed the purpose and the evaluation of the Committee, which I think was a very good discussion, and some of our
future topics.

Then we had a very good presentation by leadership from a number of our grantees, facilitated by a member of the Meyer Foundation. I do hope we send out gratitude to the Meyer Foundation for making him available to us. I was grateful to have him here and to provide his insight.

One thing I personally was a bit disappointed about afterwards -- I think it would have been nice to have videotaped that, and I'm surprised that we didn't have a video of that and make that available because I thought that would have been quite valuable to the field. And we should perhaps reconsider what we do and don't videotape. That's my own thought on that; we didn't discuss it.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: I shared that view, particularly when we're bringing programs in from like Puerto Rico. But you're not speaking --

FATHER PIUS: Yes. But the leadership --

CHAIRMAN LEVI: We had somebody from Idaho.

FATHER PIUS: Alaska.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Alaska. Exactly. In fact,
there was somebody that kidded Harry, and I was
thinking, well, she came from Alaska.

FATHER PIUS: So that's the report of the
Committee. Thank you.

MR. KORRELL: John, I want to comment on that
Committee. I particularly appreciated the panel on
leadership. It's interesting to hear about programs
and what they do, and that's always interesting. But a
panel like that focused on leadership and a challenge
that's going to be facing, as we heard from statistics,
 necrly all of these programs in the next decade.

So first, I really appreciated a focused
panel. A comment I had hoped to make or a question I
wanted to ask, and we just ran out of time: Nearly all
of these programs have their executive directors as
home-grown. And comment was made that that's a
particularly good thing.

I wonder if that is always the right thing,
and that maybe, somewhere, someone could give some
thought to whether having leadership that comes from
outside of a program might be good. Because I do think
there's --
FATHER PIUS: Well, homegrown in the sense that they're from the LSC community. But a number of the ones we had were transplants from one office to another. So it would be interesting what the percentages of those are, those who are executive directors who were previously engaged as either deputies or legal services workers within their institution.

Certainly they're within the legal services community, and I think you almost have to have that. But whether they're from the organization, that's a good question. It is a very good question. And I think you're actually right. Sometimes some entities need an outside person, and I think a number of people talked about that, where they did actually consciously decide that they needed an outside person.

MR. KORRELL: But I look like at Jim as an example. Right? Jim has not been, as far as I know, the president of a legal services-type organization before he took over this, and it's been terrific. Right? And so I'm not sure that you have to look only within legal services to provide good leadership.
FATHER PIUS: Yes.

MR. KORRELL: And just given some of the problems that we see, I wonder if maybe encouraging leadership -- I know the boards perform some of that function, but --

FATHER PIUS: That's an interesting question. and it's one perhaps we should explore more. My impression is that it is a community that tends to be very insular or historically has been very insular because of the closeness of that.

Part of that is due to the very long-term, long-serving executive directors. And I was struck, especially by the representative of the Meyer Foundation, his observation that we're sort of in a retirement bubble which is about to burst. That is, we're going to get probably a great number of long-term executive directors who are going to be retiring over the next five to ten years.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Indiana Legal Services just went through a very significant leadership transition. I think their executive director had been with the organization for more than 40 years and been
executive director for more than 40 years. His replacement is a partner from the Baker Daniels firm, who I think at one point early in his career may have done some legal services work. He did in Massachusetts. It's now coming to me. But he has experience in government at a high level, as counsel to two governors of Indiana. He is a very distinguished appellate practitioner, having argued more than 200 reported appellate cases. This is somebody who did not come up through the ranks within that organization or any other legal services provider. I believe that they did the search using Management Information Exchange, MIE, which assists many legal services organizations that are looking for new executive directors. So the search process was obviously broad enough to bring in someone like him, who doesn't fit the usual profile. I was very impressed with his credentials.

MR. KORRELL: And I know I occasionally see and get recruiting information from nonprofit law firms, focused on one issue or another, and they often attempt to grab lawyers from private practice. I don't
see that much, though, from legal services firms.

There is a bias for hiring from within, and for some of
the reasons that we heard about.

But it may be something for the field to
consider, for us to consider, as we're encouraging best
practices, maybe using something like MIE or some other
source to broaden the search, because there may be
people not quite as good as Jim but like Jim that could
bring their talents to something like a legal services
organization.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: And we're seeing the
retirement bubble both ways. From the private sector,
there may be people who wish to donate their time in
another way.

The comment on videoing is a comment that
Martha would have made, too. If you don't video, you
don't have the chance to post it. You don't have to
post it because you video'd it. And you also can edit
it.

So Becky and Carl -- Carl's not in the room,
maybe -- but I think this is something that -- and I
understand we often have our tech staff running to pro
bono, whatever, fund receptions.

But I think we do need to consider whether future panels, in addition to the justices and what have you, do get video'd because there were things in that panel, and I think it struck all of us, that might have been helpful to other grantees, and they could have clicked on it and seen it.

They would have been interested. And it could have been helpful to them. So it's just something in this day and age would seem like an appropriate step.

Is that your report?

FATHER PIUS: That's it.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Who's doing the Pro Bono Innovation Fund? Jim did report on it in his talk, so I don't know -- but it's also on the Task Force itself.

MS. JENNINGS: Right. Ron and I were talking, and we thought, in the interest of time, just to direct people to the briefing book for the update since most everyone has had an update. But if anyone has any questions regarding the Pro Bono Task Force, we'd be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think we got the update this
morning, and thank you very, very much. It was striking to me, when someone said that report came out two years ago, how much has been done in that two-year period. So Harry and Martha -- not here -- you should feel good about the movement you have helped to motivate.

MR. KORRELL: It's really the people who are doing the implementing. It's too easy for it to sit on the shelf, and I think the people doing the implementing are doing a great job.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Consider and act on other business?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Then we have to vote to authorize a closed session.

MOTION

FATHER PIUS: So moved.

MR. KORRELL: Second.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)
(Whereupon, at 11:26, the Board was adjourned to Closed Session.)

* * * * *

* * * * *