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Motions: Pages 4, 4 and 23
Chairman Reiskin: I'm going to call to order the Communications Subcommittee of the Institutional Advancement Committee meeting. Can I have a motion to approve the agenda, please?

Motion

Father Pius: So moved.

Chairman Reiskin: Second?

Mr. Levi: Second.

Chairman Reiskin: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

Chairman Reiskin: Thank you. And can I have an approval of the minutes of the subcommittee meeting on January 29th?

Motion

Father Pius: So moved.

Chairman Reiskin: Second?

Dean Minow: Second.

Chairman Reiskin: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Okay. I'm going to turn it over to Carl to give us an update on our analytics.

MR. RAUSCHER: Okay. Today I want to talk about a new communications tool we're developing around our technology initiatives, and then a couple of new things we've done on social media, and have a quick look at how our web page is doing since it's fully in place now.

The new product we're calling LSC's Tech Download. This is still in development, although we hope to have it out and around by next week. It's intended to answer a couple of things that came up at the last board meeting. Martha raised a question about how we might reach out and let people who are not in the tech community know about the dynamism of what we're doing. And I talked to Julie and Gloria about that, too.

We intend to distribute this newsletter beyond the tech community to everyone who gets LSC updates, to the 5,100 people who follow us on Twitter, et cetera, so that what we're doing in the tech community will be seen by those folks. Most of reporters who cover legal
affairs are among those audiences. So there's a threefold purpose to it. The first is to be a useful resource to the tech community itself; second, to get the word out beyond the tech community what we're doing; and third, it will help fill a void in our coverage. One of the features of LSC's Tech Download will be a profile of a successful TIG grant and program.

Now, we've been very good at getting publicity announcing the TIG grant. We do targeted press releases. We get good local coverage. But following up and showing how these things are successful is something we haven't done as well. This will give us the vehicle to do that.

We can compile a whole list of successful TIG projects, much like the client success stories, which will be useful for reporters. It'll be useful on the Hill. It's a good thing to do, and this is going to help us do it.

In addition to a profile of a successful TIG program, each mailing will also have big news of the day, something we're calling apps for that, which are
critical reviews of apps that we think will be useful
to the legal aid community, and a calendar of upcoming
technological events.

This is just a beginning. We're still
tweaking. Glenn Rawdon wants to do Q&A with tech
leaders for this as well. So I think it's a good,
flexible concept that will help shine a light on one of
the best things we do, which is the technology programs
we have going.

Now, I'll just talk about our social media
efforts here quickly. We continue on a steady, rapid
rate of growth in Twitter. We are by far the most
followed Twitter account in the legal aid community.
We gained 263 new followers since I reported to you
last. Our engagements are up a little bit on a monthly
viewpoint, and our impressions are down just slightly.
But basic good, steady growth.

Facebook. It may seem like we had an
incredible quarter since we went from 3,594 impressions
to 26,549. The truth of the matter is we had an
incredibly bad quarter the time before, and this is
more in line with what we did. The reason they were
down so much in the last report was we were focused on
our web page and simply were not putting as many things
up on Facebook.

    Now that the web page is up and running, we're
returning to our normal efforts. We're up to 922 fans
from 839 the last time I talked to you, and when we
began the year, we were at 816.

    In LinkedIn, we fewer impressions this last
quarter, but we actually gained almost a hundred new
followers. And we're up about -- since most of the
gains came in this last quarter, a little bit more than
a hundred since the beginning of the year.

    These were the five most popular tweets. A
couple of days -- well, I think it was about a week
before the LRAP deadline came, we decided to send out
reminders via Twitter, and almost 3,000 people clicked
on them. We did a similar thing with Justice Works
when it was recruiting for the Rural Summer Legal
Corps.

    The third thing is a retweet we did of William
Hubbard's incredibly good speech at the ABA tech show,
and it was circulated around. The fourth is a link to
a video. Jim moderated a panel with three LSC grantees talking about their Pro Bono Innovation Fund at the Pro Bono Institute annual conference. Marcos and I went over and shot a video and I live-tweeted it, and it was very popular.

And the final thing there is a great NPR story on the D.C. Housing Court and the perils of going into that court without a lawyer. And that was popular, and we retweeted it several times, actually.

Now, on March 1st, Jim went to St. Louis. This was a trip designed around outreach, outreach to a donor community and outreach to the press. While there, Jim met with some of the largest donors to our grantee there, Legal Services of Eastern Missouri. He gave a speech at St. Louis Law School, which Steve Hanlon and his staff really did a great job of promoting. And we leveraged both social media and regular media around it. This was all one day.

So Jim appeared on a CBS radio show called The Charlie Brennan Show. He met with Tod Robberson, the new St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial editor, and several staff members. This resulted in a blog post on
the Post-Dispatch site, which was picked up by several
other newspapers as well.

The local public radio sent a reporter, who
live-tweeted Jim's speech as he gave it at St. Louis,
and broadcast it as well. And in the local legal
paper -- it's not up here -- but Missouri Lawyers
Weekly also ran a story on it. So it was a pretty
thick day for Jim and for coverage as well.

There was also a social media campaign aspect
to this. We tweeted as much as we could, and
retweeted. And during the day, about a thousand
people, or a thousand impressions, were recorded. The
tweets from other organizations were mostly from Legal
Services of Eastern Missouri, but you see the very high
number of impressions using keywords -- Jim Sandman,
Legal Services Corporation, or LSC. Those were some of
the hashtags that the NPR reporter used. And you can
see how popular her live-tweeting was.

We also live-tweeted the Senate briefing that
John and Jim attended on veterans. And we had some
success with that. We had about 160,000 impressions,
but we also were able to do reach figures here. An
impression tells you it's been clicked on. It could be one person clicking 159,000 times. But users show you how many people actually opened it, and it was more than 31,000, which I think is pretty significant. The video we shot of this briefing was viewed 224 times, which I also think is significant.

This was the aforementioned Pro Bono Institute panel that Jim moderated. I live-tweeted it. We got a reasonable amount. They weren't really using a shared hashtag; it wasn't as easy as some other places. But our video of this, which we roost on Vimeo, was seen 40 times, which is good.

We tried something different this time from the last board meeting. We usually will send out social media saying, the videos of the board are there. This time, both with the board and with the TIG conference, we sent out specific social media invitations, as it were, to each different video. And it resulted in a significant rise in impressions and engagements.

You might be interested that by far, the most watched video was Judge Gergel's incredible speech,
which we cut separately and put on the web page. And
the rapid fire text sessions were also the most popular
part from the TIG conference.

And this just basically shows you the traffic
around our new website. As you can see, we're almost
half as many as last year already. And we're on a
trajectory to break the usage figures from 2014, which
were by far the highest we've ever had because of all
of the publicity around the anniversary. So the new
web page seems to be starting out well.

And that concludes my report.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Fantastic. Questions or
comments? Martha?

DEAN MINOW: This is great, great
developments. I'm wondering, with the upcoming
announcement about Microsoft, if there's a social media
campaign related to that.

MR. RAUSCHER: We have a number of things
planned. It will be the lead story in this newsletter.
That's why we're holding it. Susan Beck at American
Lawyer magazine will be filing a story that day about
it. She's already interviewed Jim, and she's
interviewing some other folks as well. We're planning on an op-ed in one of the Hills the next day to keep it going, so yes. And social media will be tweeting live the entire White House thing.

DEAN MINOW: That's all great. But I guess I was thinking a little bit more systemically on the social media front because there are opinion-markers in the tech community, in the legal community, who, if lined up, if prepped, could be tweeting, blogging, whatever, that day.

MR. RAUSCHER: Well, our problem with that is the announcement is made in an event that is closed to the press. So that presents certain challenges. That's why I've arranged with Susan head of time to do this story, because it's not available to her.

Now, an improvement is there will be some livestreaming, and that will be possible. I should also say we're working with Microsoft, and they're doing reach-outs into the main tech community with a press release that we've already developed.

DEAN MINOW: Thanks.
CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Gloria?

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: With regard to the just-initiated Rural Fellows Program, are you planning some kind of special coverage for them at some point? I say that because these people are going out to remote rural areas, many of them quite picturesque as countryside, but also very vivid pictorial views of what kind of settings and people they are working with.

MR. LEVI: Could I ask, some of you may have to shut your mikes off because too many are on.

MS. RHEIN: So to answer that, Gloria, we are working with the communications director also at Equal Justice Works. Carl and I have had several conversations already about how we're going to be able to get local stories, both to support the grantees in their local communities, but also things that could potentially be more national in scope, whether it's NPR or others, because the students -- it's a very compelling story, both the locations themselves, the communities that will be served, but also the very specific kinds of projects that these students will be working on. So we want to make sure that we take
advantage of this first opportunity.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Jim?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I want to thank Carl for
the absolutely terrific job he did with my trip to St.
Louis, but emphasize that we could not have done what
we did there without the on-the-ground support we got
from our grantee, Legal Services of Eastern Missouri,
and Dan Glazier, their executive director.

I was very impressed at how well integrated
that program and Dan are into the community there, not
just the legal community but the broader community.
And they have a PR firm they've worked with for years
that was indispensable in getting us the introductions
that we needed to be able to pull it off.

So a successful visit like that really depends
both on support from Carl and on-the-ground involvement
and deep community connections with the grantee.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Harry?

MR. KORRELL: A quick question for Jim. So is
a visit like that followed up with specific asks from
local foundations and supporters, either for LSC or for
the local grantee? Or do we just kind of get goodwill
and then hope that down the road it pays off?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: It's at the grantee level. One of the sessions I had kicking off the day was with bar leaders, leaders of law firms, and members of their board of directors. And that was pretty explicitly an ask for money.

MR. KORRELL: Did it work?

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I don't know.

MS. RHEIN: I coordinated with the development director of that particular program to work with her on who was going to be in that room for Jim's visit. And they wanted to use it as an opportunity to bring in existing donors and a handful of prospects to be able to both thank them --

MR. LEVI: For the grantee, not for LSC.

MS. RHEIN: Right, yes, to support the grantee in particular. And they were going to -- they're following up individually with their board chair as well for additional asks and cultivation.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Martha?

DEAN MINOW: Will there be any law students working here this summer? Because I'm wondering if
that person could be recruited to be a social media
correspondent over the course of the year.

I look at something like SCOTUSblog, which is
entirely run by law students. Law students are the
posters. Now, there's obviously a more intrinsic
interest in following what the Supreme Court does than
what we do, but there's still interest in what we do.
And it just strikes me it would be a pretty cool thing
for a law student to do, to be the legal services
blogger. And that's just a thought.

MR. GREY: Robert Grey.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We do have law student
interns. One of them is the Helaine Barnett fellow.
Helaine personally funds a fellowship for a student at
New York University Law School. The Barnett Fellow
does a rotation through various offices of LSC, and
that will include the Office of Government Relations
and Public Affairs.

MR. LEVI: Do you have a fellow? You have
somebody?

MS. RHEIN: I have an undergraduate intern for
the summer, yes. But again, just for the summer.
MR. LEVI: And do we have a law student intern otherwise, or just undergraduate?

MS. RHEIN: No. There are law student interns in many different sections of the organization over the summer.

MR. LEVI: Okay.

DEAN MINOW: Well, not to introduce any complexity, but to have some notion that this is a competitive possibility that someone can list on their resume and that they are accountable to someone over the course of the year would be an incentive for law student. And you'd get pretty good cheap labor as well as knowledge about what social media vehicles their peer group might be using. These days, it's more Snapchat, my sense is, than it is Facebook.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: We're going to talk about the youth brochure next month because I misunderstood who was to do what. It was totally my fault. But we will have something for you guys to look at.
Did anyone have any other items of business?

I have one thing I wanted to discuss.

MR. LEVI: The agenda says a youth pamphlet.

DEAN MINOW: She said that's next month.

MR. LEVI: Oh, next time?

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Yes. Yes, I apologize.

MR. LEVI: That's okay.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: So following up on the visit that was just talked about, there's been conversations about what visits -- what states are we as a board, as a group, not going to see. And so a list has been put together, and there's not very many holes in it.

When they looked at every place that Jim has gone and every place that we've gone -- I think everyone was asked to say where have you been -- there's not very many holes. But there are a few, and so hopefully we'll be able to look and see where it makes sense to coordinate.

Staff put together, Jim put together, five criteria of what has to be in place for -- not "has to," but what should be in place for a visit to happen.
So don't just go just to go, but is there something happening that we could take advantage of? Is there something where there might be some media going on? Is it a place where we want to shine attention on the program? I don't remember all of them, but that's the gist of them.

And so I think Jim and John, and I'll help, will be working on looking at where those line up. Was that sent to the whole board, that list of --

MS. RHEIN: The initial list of locations was shared with all of you, and if you had places to add to that list, if we missed something. And thank you to those of you who did identify places we missed. And then the list with the criteria actually was just shared with you and with John and with Martha, Jim.

MR. LEVI: Well, my hope here is to create a deliberate process --

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Exactly.

MR. LEVI: -- that we can leave -- well, that we'll work on in the next few years, but then we'll turn over to those that come in after us. Where the board has been sort of a spindle of rotating around the
country, by the time you get back to a state, it's 15 to 16 years. That's almost a generation.

And it seems that there is value in calling the legal community, and even beyond, together to talk about these issues, to give some presence to LSC, have the local folks remember who we are and why we are. Sixteen years seems like a long time. And so it seems if we could cut that in half, or even more than that -- we certainly don't need to go every year, although there probably are places we do need to go every year, and think about it.

But I think that as we think this through and become more deliberate about it, I think it will help LSC and its grantees in the future. And that's what we ask Julie and her committee to think about doing, organizing for us.

So there are some states we haven't been at all, and there are some, I think, we have never been to.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Right.

MR. LEVI: And I don't know. We might want to think about fixing that because they have one congressman and two senators at a minimum, just like
everybody else.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Exactly. And it's also a show of goodwill to every single community, to make sure that no one feels forgotten about, and also just to get to see programs in a different way. I sent you guys a copy of the report I did on my learning journey, and I can talk about that at the board meeting on members' reports if anyone has questions.

But it does give you a very different perspective of a program to do an individual visit versus a whole herd of us showing up. So I think it's something that we will continue to refine and, like John said, leave with a process, and also a way to use our resources well.

If anyone is going somewhere anyway, that doesn't mean legal services has to sponsor it. But if someone is somewhere and they can -- even if it's just an hour visit or something, John's always said that's a good thing to do, and I agree.

Anything else on that?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Is there any other business
anyone has?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Is there any public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Okay. Can I have a motion to adjourn?

MOTION

DEAN MINOW: So moved.

FATHER PIUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN REISKIN: Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 3:11 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.)

* * * * *