LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS

> MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

> > OPEN SESSION

Saturday, January 21, 2012

9:12 a.m.

Westgate Hotel Versailles Ballroom 1055 Second Avenue San Diego, California 92101

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

John G. Levi, Chairman Martha Minow, Vice Chair Sharon L. Browne Robert J. Grey Jr. Charles N.W. Keckler Harry J.F. Korrell, III Victor B. Maddox Laurie Mikva Father Pius Pietrzyk, O.P. Julie A. Reiskin Gloria Valencia-Weber James J. Sandman, ex officio Richard L. Sloane, Special Assistant to the President Kathleen McNamara, Executive Assistant to the President Victor M. Fortuno, Vice President for Legal Affairs, General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary Mattie Cohan, Senior Assistant General Counsel, Office of Legal Affairs Katherine Ward, Executive Assistant, Office of Legal Affairs David L. Richardson, Comptroller and Treasurer, Office of Financial and Administrative Services John Constance, Director, Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs Stephen Barr, Communications Director, Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs Jeffrey E. Schanz, Inspector General Laurie Tarantowicz, Assistant Inspector General and Legal Counsel, Office of the Inspector General Joel Gallay, Special Counsel to the Inspector General, Office of the Inspector General Ronald "Dutch" Merryman, Assistant Inspector General for Audit, Office of the Inspector General Thomas Coogan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, Office of the Inspector General David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for Management and Evaluation, Office of the Inspector General Chuck Greenfield, National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA) Don Saunders, National Legal Aid and Defenders Association (NLADA)

Justice Earl Johnson, Jr., American Bar Association (ABA) Standing Committee on Legal Aid and Indigent Defendants (SCLAID) CONTENTS

OPEN	SESSION	PAGE
1.	Pledge of Allegiance	б
2.	Approval of agenda	б
3.	Approval of Minutes of the Board's Open Session telephonic meeting of December 21, 2011	7
4.	Approval of Minutes of the Board's Open Session telephonic meeting of November 18, 2011	7
5.	Approval of Minutes of the Board's Open Session meeting of October 19, 2011	7
б.	Consider and act on nominations for Chairman of the Board of Directors	8
7.	Consider and act on nominations for Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors	12
8.	Consider and act on delegation to the Chairman of authority to make committee appointments, including appointment of committee chairs	18
9.	Chairman's Report	21
10.	Members' Reports	33
11.	President's Report	40
12.	Inspector General's Report	73
13.	Interim report by Co-Chairs of the Pro Bono Task Force	100
14.	Consider and act on the report of the Promotion & Provision for the Delivery of Legal Services Committee	115
15.	Consider and act on the report of the Finance Committee	110
	CONTENTS	

OPEN	N SESSION	PAGE
16.	Consider and act on the report of the Audit Committee	86
17.	Consider and act on the report of the Operations & Regulations Committee	116
18.	Consider and act on the report of the Governance & Performance Review Committee	127
19.	Consider and act on the report of the Institutional Advancement Committee	127
20.	Consider and act on the report of the Special Task Force on Fiscal Oversight	88
21.	Consider and act on a Resolution thanking the members of the Fiscal Oversight Task Force for their service on the Task Force	99
22.	Consider and act on a Resolution thanking Alice Dickerson for her service to LSC	128
23.	Consider and act on a Resolution thanking John Constance for his service to LSC	129
33.	Consider and act on the request of an officer of the Corporation for authorization to receive compensation for services from a source other than the Corporation	134
24.	Public comment	130
25.	Consider and act on other business	140
26.	Consider and act on whether to authorize an executive session of the Board to address items listed below, under Closed Session	140

Motions: 7, 7, 8, 12, 18, 96, 100, 111, 112, 113, 118, 128, 129, 139, 140

CLOSED SESSION

- 27. Approval of minutes of the Board's Closed Session meeting of October 18, 2011
- 28. Approval of Minutes of the Institutional Advancement Committee Closed Session of October 17, 2011
- 29. Briefing by Management
- 30. Briefing by the Inspector General
- 31. Consider and act on General Counsel's report on potential and pending litigation involving LSC
- 32. Consider and act on motion to adjourn meeting

1	
1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(9:12 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN LEVI: I will call the meeting of the
4	Board of Directors do we know what number meeting
5	this is of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services
6	Corporation in our history? Maybe Earl Johnson knows.
7	Anyway, this is a regularly scheduled annual meeting.
8	So maybe if it's the annual meeting, it's something
9	like the 38th but that's just hazarding a guess
10	of the Legal Services Corporation's Board of Directors,
11	duly noticed, published in the Federal Register.
12	And as is our tradition, let's begin by having
13	the Pledge of Allegiance. And our California member
14	can lead us. Sharon?
15	(Pledge of Allegiance.)
16	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, everyone.
17	I've been asked, as it relates to the agenda,
18	if you look at the agenda, you'll see that item No. 33
19	in the closed session piece of the agenda, we're going
20	to actually move that up and have it be the last item
21	in the public session, before public comment.
22	So with that amendment to the agenda, could I

1 please have an approval of the agenda?

2	MOTION
3	MS. REISKIN: I so move.
4	DEAN MINOW: I second the amended proposal for
5	the agenda.
6	CHAIRMAN LEVI: And a second?
7	DEAN MINOW: I was the second, Julie first.
8	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Oh, she was? I'm sorry.
9	Julie Reiskin moved it. Martha seconded. All in
10	favor?
11	(A chorus of ayes.)
12	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Can I have approval of the
13	minutes? Is there any reason to break these three out?
14	If not, could I have an approval of all three of the
15	minutes?
16	MOTION
17	MR. MADDOX: So moved.
18	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Second?
19	MS. BROWNE: Second.
20	CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?
21	(A chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIRMAN LEVI: The minutes are approved.

1 And now we get to nominations for the Chairman 2 of the Board of Directors.

3 M O T I O N

4 MR. MADDOX: Mr. Chairman, I would like to 5 place into nomination the name of John Levi.

6 When I was a first year law student, I had a 7 professor who often said, "To ask the question is to 8 answer it." And I didn't really know what that meant. 9 But now I do, and when I say, should John Levi serve 10 another term as Chairman of Legal Services Corporation, 11 do I really need to go on?

12 John may not be uniquely suited for the position, but it's close. He assumed the post at a 13 critical time in the Legal Services Corporation's 14 15 history. There was no permanent president. The 16 executive offices were in something of disarray. There 17 were successive critical GAO reports outstanding. 18 There was anger and expressed outrage, feigned or real, on Capitol Hill, even among the Corporation's friends. 19 20 John took the helm in April of 2010 and

21 immediately set to work to put all of that right. I
22 submit that his personal commitment of time and energy

is unmatched in the 38-year history of the Corporation.
 I'm going out on something of a limb since I don't
 know all of the chairmen, but I would be surprised if
 anyone had done more.

John is the right man in the right place at the right time for the job. He's perfectly suited by training and experience, by intellect, by disposition, and by integrity. He has approached the job with complete fairness and nonpartisanship, I think, in every aspect of his work.

I remember days after my name was announced as a nominee for the Board, I actually had a call from John. And I'd never heard of him before and didn't know who he was. But that certainly set the tone for our working relationship, and I'm sure that every other member of the Board had a similar phone call.

17 So it's my great privilege and high honor to 18 nominate John Levi for another term, and I ask that all 19 of my colleagues on the Board join me in offering their 20 support to the nomination.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

22 Gloria?

1 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: I would like to second the nomination. Besides all the very big, 2 significant contributions that Victor has just outlined 3 for us, I also want to add my appreciation for John's 4 5 leadership in seeing that we do not meet this January 6 in D.C. I just learned that it is snowing in D.C. 7 (Laughter.) PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: And I recall the 8 last two Januaries in D.C. So thank you, and it's a 9 pleasure to second. 10 11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Sharon? 12 MS. BROWNE: I also want to just express my appreciation for the leadership that John has shown to 13 this Board in the past. He has unlimited energy and 14 15 vision for the Corporation. And I agree that another energetic year with John will really help the 16 Corporation in the future. 17 18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Sharon. Julie? 19 20 MS. REISKIN: Yes. I believe at the last 21 meeting, I think it was Robert who said that John makes the Energizer Bunny look lazy. And that's true. But I 22

think that the leadership team of John, Martha, and Jim, like what I said yesterday, every external assessment -- and again, we're not here as a popularity contest; we're here to do a job -- but our public perception is important, and how we relate to all kinds of people is very important.

7 On every level, all of these task forces, 8 everything, what we keep hearing over and over again is 9 the new leadership team of John, Jim, and Martha. The 10 new leadership team, fresh life. It's such a positive 11 direction that again, if it ain't broke -- and it's 12 definitely not broken.

13 So we're hearing -- that's probably the only 14 thing that everyone agrees on, but there does seem to 15 be universal agreement that this leadership team is 16 definitely working well.

17 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

18 Any other nominations?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I guess it was seconded. All 21 in favor?

22 (A chorus of ayes.)

1 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much. I'll say 4 a few words when we get to the Chairman's report. But 5 it's a privilege to serve in this role and to work with 6 all of you. How lucky for me -- I knew a couple of you 7 before I assumed this role, but how lucky for all of us 8 that we have each other and the various strengths we 9 all bring to this task here.

And the fact that you're willing to be prodded by the Energizer whatever I am, and be gracious in responding -- I will tell you, not one of you has ever turned down a request. And that's really quite remarkable. I've served on many boards. That doesn't happen very often.

16 Let's consider and act on the nomination for 17 the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors. Julie?

18

ΜΟΤΙΟΝ

MS. REISKIN: I would be very honored to nominate Martha Minow to serve another term as the Vice Chair. Everything that's just been said, she's done. Her leadership is incredible. And again, it's working well. It's a good leadership team. And I nominate
 Martha Minow.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Charles? 3 PROFESSOR KECKLER: I'd like to second that 4 5 nomination. Martha's intelligence, insight, and 6 experience have been a tremendous asset to this organization. I've had the privilege to serve on a 7 number of committees with Martha, and it's been a very 8 wonderful, educational, and collaborative experience. 9 And so I'm very happy to second that nomination. 10 11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And how about her writing our 12 strategic plan in 30 seconds yesterday? (Laughter.) 13 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other comments? 14 15 MR. KORRELL: John, you make that joke. But 16 that incident, something like that, has happened every 17 board meeting we have had, where we've been slogging around in the muck for 20 minutes and then Martha 18 synthesizes it in about 30 seconds, usually with three 19 20 bullet points, two sub-points, and we're done. If she 21 weren't our Vice Chair, we'd have to do a lot more 22 work.

1 MR. MADDOX: John, I want to associate myself 2 with everyone's remarks about Dean Minow. Yesterday, in the face of her performance on the strategic plan, I 3 asked her if she got to be dean because she could do 4 5 that, or if she could do that because she was dean. 6 But whatever it was, I suspect it was more just innate ability because it's really guite 7 remarkable. And I would hate to be on the other side 8 9 of a faculty argument at Harvard Law School. 10 (Laughter.) 11 MR. MADDOX: So I'm thrilled to be able to 12 support the nomination. CHAIRMAN LEVI: Father Pius? 13 FATHER PIUS: Don't hold me to this a year 14 15 from now. But I think it's quite a testament, really, 16 to both Martha and John that -- I think the support for 17 the two of you in the roles you're in are despite who 18 has the majority on the Board. 19 And I think the fact that you have unanimous support from both sides of the aisle, as it 20 21 were -- although it's hard to figure out where the sides are if you come to this from outside -- that I 22

think there would be support for you regardless of who
 had the majority.

3 But again, a year from now, don't hold me to 4 that.

5 (Laughter.)

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, let us hope it always is 7 that way. Robert?

8 MR. GREY: There's nothing else to be said 9 other than this, that the two of you have never asked 10 anybody to do anything you wouldn't do yourself. And 11 to me, that is the mark of true leadership. You lead 12 by example. And to that extent, we are all very 13 appreciative of the time and energy and the commitment 14 you've made to this very noble cause.

15 You and Jim and Martha have said it many 16 times. This is about America and the importance of a 17 democracy to the people who live here. And if this is 18 worth a minute, it's worth a lifetime in leaving a legacy for others to appreciate and benefit from 19 20 because we stand today on the shoulders of giants who have gone before us and have made the sacrifice to be 21 sure that we preserve the institution of the rule of 22

1 law.

You do that eloquently, and you do that with 2 3 great deduction. And for that, we thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Mr. Grey. Laurie? 5 6 MS. MIKVA: I hate to follow Robert. 7 (Laughter.) MS. MIKVA: But I didn't want to be the only 8 one here that didn't express how much I think you guys 9 are doing a wonderful job, how appreciative I am of all 10 11 that you do, and thank you. 12 MS. BROWNE: And I'm going to have to echo. Ι don't have anything else to add but praise, and I'm 13 14 honored to be on this Board and have both you and Martha and Jim as our leaders. 15 16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Sharon. All in favor of the Vice Chair -- oh, I'm 17 18 sorry. Gloria? 19 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: I join all the 20 praise for Martha and also for this trio of leaders 21 we've been fortunate to have together at this critical historical time. 22

1	I also feel especially privileged, having met
2	Martha as someone important in my own legal education.
3	And I learned a lot at that point. I continue to
4	learn now. And I find it extraordinary to be, in this
5	setting, to be her colleague because that is not the
6	way I first met Martha and have regarded her all these
7	years. So it's a great privilege.
8	CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?
9	(A chorus of ayes.)
10	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Madam Vice Chair?
13	DEAN MINOW: Well, aim embarrassed and
14	touched. I have to say it is an often over-used phrase
15	to say it's a privilege, but it is genuinely a
16	privilege to serve with each and every person who is on
17	this Board, from whom I learn so much. And your
18	deduction, your willingness to travel, your willingness
19	to take on all kinds of tasks, and the collective
20	wisdom of this group is really, really extraordinary.
21	The fact that we are putting out shoulders to
22	the cause of equal access for justice, I think, is what

1 invigorates all of us. And so I thank you all. a CHAIRMAN LEVI: The Inspector General asked to 2 say a few things, so I want to give him that 3 4 opportunity. MR. SCHANZ: I would like to jump ahead on 5 6 public comment and lead a round of applause for the 7 Board and the selections that were just made. 8 (Applause) CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. 9 10 Item No. 8. This is the moment in which you 11 all get reappointed to your committees. 12 (Laughter.) MR. KORRELL: You may find less unanimity. 13 14 DEAN MINOW: I think -- may I move that we all are reappointed to our committees, and we link arms in 15 16 so doing. 17 (Laughter.) CHAIRMAN LEVI: And so we can have a motion to 18 consider and act on the delegation to the Chairman. 19 ΜΟΤΙΟΝ 20 21 DEAN MINOW: On the delegation to the Chair. I so move. 22

1 MS. BROWNE: Second.

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?
3	(A chorus of ayes.)
4	CHAIRMAN LEVI: So now I'll give my chairman's
5	report and begin by saying I hope you will all continue
6	to serve on the committees and in the chair roles that
7	you're so ably serving in.
8	How fortunate for us, really, when you think
9	about this. We came in at the time that Vic talks
10	about, a new board without history. And I'm so proud
11	of the chairs, who have really dug in, really, to
12	understand their roles and how to run their committees
13	and really pick up the ball. And nothing has been too
14	much to ask of the committees.
15	And I think it is fair to say that almost
16	every single committee now meets by telephone between
17	our board meetings. I don't know whether that was the
18	history, but there's just too much on the agendas of
19	these committees to cover in our formal quarterly

20 meetings, and they've recognized that.

21 And rather than overwhelm ourselves and not 22 give ample time for thought, you've demonstrated the

leadership, and your committees have, to have the
 meetings in between that allow you to do thoughtful
 work and proceed in a manner that really helps the
 Corporation. So I think that has been terrific.

5 Now we have to deal with the new D.C. 6 Corporation Act. And it is my intention for all of the 7 committees that had -- I guess we would call them 8 non-board members would were serving as advisory 9 members, they, too, will be reappointed.

We'll have to have the guidance of Victor Fortuno and Jim as to what matters they may not vote on. But I believe that as long as the committees are not acting on behalf of the Board in a matter where the Board has delegated to them something, then they may continue in the manner in which they have been operating.

17 So I should make clear that on the Audit 18 Committee, I am not, as a result of the fact that the 19 Fiscal Oversight Task Force has wrapped up -- well, is 20 about to as of this meeting -- its activity, I would 21 like to formally put on the Audit Committee, and I've 22 talked with Vic about this, David Hoffman and Paul

1 Snyder, who were both members of the task force.

2	And both, I think, bring real help and
3	guidance to that committee. I believe Vic agrees.
4	MR. MADDOX: I do, John. David Hoffman is
5	actually already on the committee and participated at
6	our last meeting.
7	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. That's right. And as
8	for other committees, we may occasionally during the
9	year add a person. With the Institutional Advancement
10	Committee, with the Finance Committee, my intention is
11	those folks who are not on the Board, like Bob Henley,
12	is that they be reappointed as well.
13	Any questions?
14	(No response.)
15	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, anyway, thank you to all
16	of you for reelecting me this morning. Really, it is,
17	as I said, an honor to be your Chair. This is a very
18	compelling moment for the country. We all know that.
19	And you understand that, too. And that's why it's such
20	a privilege to be your chair.
21	This is one of a series of board meetings

21 This is one of a series of board meetings 22 we've all been fortunate to participate in and where

we've had just terrific panel presentations from around the country, and where we've heard of the very thoughtful work of our committees, and to learn of the terrific examples of pro bono work done selflessly by so many in the legal profession. Yes, there should be many more. But the stories we heard the other night here in San Diego, how compelling were they?

8 Well, 15 years ago, Judge David Tatel of the 9 United States Court of Appeals of the District of 10 Columbia, addressed the annual meeting of the 11 California State Bar that was meeting here in San 12 Diego. The year was 1997, and LSC had just come 13 through a very rough time. Funding had been cut. 14 Restrictions were put in place.

Judge Tatel had been on the D.C. Circuit for about three years, and his remarks reflected his time as general counsel at LSC, where he served in 1975 and 1976, helping to establish the newly created corporation.

In his remarks, Judge Tatel said, "I believe that powerful arguments of both public policy and justice call for expanded congressional funding of the

Legal Services Corporation." He added, "As lawyers, we all should be able to agree that access to the legal system ought to not depend on the size of one's wallet. It's a bedrock principle of our democracy that we all enjoy the same bundle of rights. For those without access to a lawyer, these rights all too often are meaningless."

So here we are today. LSC funding has been 8 Field programs are struggling to keep their heads 9 cut. above water. I know the times are different today than 10 11 they were in '97. I think we all agree they are 12 particularly challenging. We owe it to our fellow citizens to keep our vision, to attempt to see clearly 13 what's right for the country, for low-income Americans 14 who seek civil legal assistance. 15

16 This Board has been -- our Board

17 particularly -- a model of bipartisanship,

18 nonpartisanship. I hope it always will be. It always 19 should be. A force affirming that in our democracy, 20 all citizens, regardless of income, enjoy the same 21 bundle of rights, and that when at the doors have to be 22 shut at active, busy legal aid offices, and lawyers and

staff in our grantee programs across the country, in the midst of increased demand, are sent to pack their bags, it sends the signal that we are really not all that serious about access to our nation's legal system and the values that it embodies.

6 Given these difficult circumstances, I think 7 we need to convene an appropriate forum or, if you 8 prefer, a hearing, maybe as early as March, or possibly as a part of our April board meeting, so that we can 9 better understand the impact of the significant 10 11 increase in the need of our programs for services at 12 just the same time that there has been such a significant drop in LSC funding at our programs. 13

Jim's going to talk about the results of the surveys that we sent out to our grantees. And I think that you will see that that really informs this discussion.

And we need to better inform the bar and the country about the crisis in civil legal assistance. We heard that yesterday from Dean Tacha. We need to hear from the business committee, from faith-based organizations, the states, the courts, the bar, and

1 others.

We need to bring them into our conversations, 2 expand beyond the legal profession, do a better job of 3 educating our fellow Americans on the importance of 4 plain and simple boring, reliable civil legal 5 6 assistance as a value, a value just as important as the 7 matters that are sometimes regarded as sexy. Let's 8 turn boring, plain, and simple into sexy. That will help us ensure a just and fair society. 9 I want to thank all of you for your hard work 10 11 in 2011, for setting the stage for even more work in 2012. You all know you work far harder for this Board 12 than you ever expected when you accepted the 13 President's nomination, and I don't think that we have 14 15 any anticipation that next year will be any easier. 16 We said we were going to pay more attention to 17 internal controls, especially in the financial area, and we have. The Fiscal Oversight Task Force presented 18 us with a report last summer. We've received comments 19 20 on the report and its recommendations. Our thanks, 21 again, to Robert and Vic for leading this herculean effort. The report is on our agenda. We'll be 22

1 considering it this morning.

2 We launched the Pro Bono Task Force. It has 3 five terrific working groups. Our goal is to have 4 reports flowing this spring. And just the other day, 5 on Wednesday, Jim was with me in Chicago and we were on 6 the tech web committee meeting, and it was really 7 something.

8 And at the same time that we were meeting, the 9 obstacles group and the urban group were also meeting, with two-hour conference calls going on. So this is a 10 11 very, very active group. They've taken the challenge. 12 And they will be coming forth with, I think, a whole number, a huge number, of recommendations, and I look 13 forward. I want to thank Martha and Harry. They've 14 15 been working, I'm sure, overtime on this project.

Now our process for the strategic plan, as we heard yesterday, is moving, I would say. Now it's moving smoothly. We've done significant outreach, including a stakeholder survey. Our

20 information-gathering phase is nearing an end.

21 The Board is ready to move to the next phase, 22 and that is the actual development of a plan. It's a

1 priority for the Board, and I hope it's something we
2 will get done this spring. Our thanks, Charles, for
3 keeping us on track.

And the Board has had a great interest, as it should, in technology. One of the things I was told when I assumed the chair role was that, actually, LSC -- and I think you heard Jim mention this -- had the first tech summit in the legal services arena.

9 That was back in the '90s. And there hasn't 10 been another one, and it seems like it's time for there 11 to be one. So we're planning to hold a major tech 12 summit for mid-June this year.

Jim attended the TIG conference just ten days ago, and hell be sharing his impressions, I believe, with you. I hope he will -- is that part of your report? -- because I think you'll find them very compelling.

18 The tech summit will be the second, as I say, 19 in LSC history. And I think it was regarded as a 20 motivator of enormous innovation in the delivery of 21 legal services. And I look forward to the second 22 summit being just as successful.

1 The Board's Institutional Advancement 2 Committee, you heard this morning, is making progress. 3 The consultant has done sort of internal assessment 4 stage and now is moving to the external phase. We look 5 forward to his continuing work, and in my view, there 6 is no shortage of opportunity here.

7 Though I've said this at this meeting while we've been here in San Diego, I do want to point out 8 that Jim is a few days closer to marking his first year 9 as LSC President. We are extremely grateful to him for 10 11 taking us up on our offer, and we look forward to many 12 more great things; now that he's set such a high bar for himself, he's going to really have to outdo himself 13 in the second year. We're so delighted that he's 14 serving in this role. 15

I also want to officially welcome Richard Sloane -- why don't you stand up there, Richard, for a second -- who is Jim's special assistant. What have you been with us, two months? Not even. A month and a half? All right.

21 Richard has an MBA from Ohio State, a JD from
22 Georgetown. He served in the Peace Corps in Bulgaria.

A management consultant for IBM. Clerked for Chief
 Judge Clemon on the U.S. District Court for the
 Northern District of Alabama. Was in private practice,
 most recently with Seyfarth in Washington. Welcome,
 Richard.

6 As we move into the new year, I also want to particularly thank Jeff Schanz for his work as 7 Inspector General, for his relationship with this 8 Board, for providing us, agreeing to, with a fraud 9 awareness briefing at our April meeting -- and I think 10 11 maybe, in fact, we'll do that for the entire building; there's no reason why it needs to be a secret for 12 us -- so that we can get a chance to firsthand 13 experience the fraud awareness briefing that I guess 14 some of our board members have had the opportunity by 15 16 the chance that you were in their area.

But I think it's important for all of us to understand this. And those folks in the building who want to also hear that briefing, I think it's important for everyone who works at LSC to have the opportunity to see how you're doing this work, because I continue to hear from grantees around the country that when you

do these, it raises their awareness, opens their eyes.
 So you must be doing something good out there, and why
 not make it available to everybody in the building.

So we appreciate that, and we appreciate what I understand to be the close working relationship, or the appropriate working relationship, that you have, the ongoing meetings and contact that you have on a regular basis, with the President, Jim Sandman.

9 I want to thank Victor Fortuno for continuing 10 to serve as general counsel and corporate secretary; 11 David Richardson as his labors as treasurer and 12 comptroller. I also have to thank Steve Barr, who puts 13 up with my continual edits, takes all my suggestions 14 with such good humor. How many drafts do we go 15 through?

16 (Laughter.)

MR. FORTUNO: Let the record reflect that -DEAN MINOW: That he's smiling.

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That he's smiling.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, in any event, he does it 22 with great good humor and puts up with it.

1 So this may be John Constance's last board 2 meeting, probably, as our director of Government 3 Relations and Public Affairs. As we all know, John is 4 moving, or he's attempting to move, to North Carolina 5 at the end of February.

Now, we all know where North Carolina is, and it's no secret that the Board is going to be there in the fall. So we will expect him to roll out appropriate hospitality and a California barbecue.

As you all know, John came to LSC after a long career with the National Archives. We certainly will miss his advice about all things congressional. It's hard to believe that our inside-the-Beltway expert is moving out of D.C., but John assures me that he'll be available to take my phone calls, and Jim's, whenever we need -- or any of yours.

17 (Laughter.)

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And I need to remind John and 19 Jim that LSC comes to D.C. in April, and that if the 20 new Mr. Constance is not in place, then the old one may 21 not be able to go down to North Carolina quite as 22 quickly. I'm sure he's made the appropriate

1 arrangements.

2 But let's have an appropriate round of 3 applause for John. (Applause) 4 MR. CONSTANCE: Mr. Chairman, you're going to 5 6 need to teach me about billable hours. 7 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, we will. We'll be happy 8 to. I want to conclude the chairman's report by 9 thanking everyone who's provided us with support. 10 11 Special thanks to the woman who's walking around right 12 now, Kathleen Connors, who has to handle all of our arrangements, and Katherine Ward. Why don't you stand, 13 14 Katherine. Putting these meetings together --15 (Applause) 16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Putting these meetings 17 together, I've learned, is extremely complicated. And 18 when Greg Knoll here said that it appeared to him that we'd never been to San Diego -- now, interestingly, 19 20 your map, Vic, says that we were here in 1993; but down 21 here, they say there is no recollection. Now, he's been the director for 38 years, so I don't know who 22

1 came in '93.

2	But I can tell you that the San Diego program
3	said they had no idea what it meant to have a visit of
4	the full Board. They now do, and we do. And I just
5	want to say, these two staff folks, Kathleen and
6	Katherine, work extremely hard to make all of these
7	arrangements. So let's have a round of applause for
8	them, too.
9	(Applause)
10	CHAIRMAN LEVI: And so this is the new year,
11	and our Board, I know, will give it its best shot. And
12	we'll get back to work now and try to move this agenda
13	forward as best we can.
14	So thank you very much, and it's my privilege
15	to turn the mike over to the members. And if any of
16	you have anything you wish to add, to say at this
17	juncture about anything that you've been doing between
18	the last meeting, or in the last year, or anything you
19	wish to say Julie, you do. Anyone else? Thank you.
20	MS. REISKIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
21	would also like to acknowledge Bernie Brady, who's just
22	fantastic and patient about travel arrangements. She's

1 wonderful.

2	Just two quick things. One is, I was
3	fortunate enough to be able to attend the NLADA
4	conference and learned a lot, but also was able to meet
5	with probably between 75 and 100 client board members
6	throughout the country. I'm happy to share what I
7	heard from them, but a lot of passion and interest and
8	desire to help and be part of the solution.
9	And I also during that time was able to
10	introduce Jim to a man named Henry Claypool, who's up
11	pretty high at HHS. What we heard yesterday about all
12	of the health care issues, there's some opportunity
13	there for legal services to for more marriage
14	between legal services and health care advocacy,
15	particularly with dual eligible projects.
16	There's a lot of money in not a lot of
17	money, but there's going to be a lot of pilot projects
18	and need for legal representation in that. So I have
19	made so anyway, Henry Claypool, who works right
20	under Kathleen Sebelius, was very receptive, and we
21	were making some introductions and getting that word
22	out. And I think it might be a new place for more

1 medical-legal partnerships.

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Laurie?
3	MS. MIKVA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
4	wanted to say I attended a little piece of the Illinois
5	Advocates Conference, I think it's all of the
6	advocates from all of the Illinois programs are brought
7	together. This is funded by IOLTA and Illinois Justice
8	grant money.
9	It's the kind of thing LSC used to do, isn't
10	able to do any more. It's a wonderful thing. It
11	underscores what the grantees are telling us, that
12	there's nothing like coming together and teaching each
13	other about what they're doing.
14	NLADA is just not an alternative. Only a
15	couple members from all of the programs go. Here, all
16	of the advocates from all of the programs were there.
17	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Sharon?
18	MS. BROWNE: I was asked to testify
19	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes, and you did terrifically.
20	MS. BROWNE: Well, thank you. But it was a
21	great educational opportunity that it's a
22	collaboration with the courts, with the legal services,

with some of the public interest clearinghouses, to
 gather as much information as possible, especially in
 light of the economic crisis that California is facing
 as well as the nation.

5 Our courts have been hit particularly hard, 6 and it was an opportunity to see how some of these huge 7 gaps can start being filled. And so it was a very 8 informative, very worthwhile endeavor. And I 9 appreciated the effort, and Steve Barr, in putting all 10 this information together for me.

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Gloria?

12 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: The New Mexico grantee in the fall completed its search and hiring of 13 a new director, Ed Marks, who was on our rural panel. 14 15 And in reaction to other state cuts on funding of legal 16 services, not only Ed but some of the other nonprofits, pro bono organizations, are having a series of meetings 17 18 of how we're going to coalesce to respond to the dire circumstances, given New Mexico's leading poverty rates 19 20 across every area.

21 The other thing is in the fall, I was the 22 United States reviewer for the University of Alberta
Law School. And while my job there was reviewing curriculum in native studies programs, the faculty took opportunity to pick my brains about what is LSC and what do we do. And it was very interesting conversation about what goes on in Canada. And that was not the purpose of the visit, but you never know what happens.

8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

9 Father Pius?

10 FATHER PIUS: I don't think I mentioned this 11 at the last meeting; I don't think I had a chance. But 12 before I left for Rome, I had the opportunity to work 13 with a non-grantee affiliate of Southeast Ohio Legal 14 Services to host what they called sort of a warrant 15 day, so those who had outstanding warrants for them, to 16 work through them.

And they were looking for a couple things: one, a neutral place for people who had outstanding warrants to work through them; so we provided space at our church, at the church hall. We also used our contacts with the sheriff's office in Muskingum County, and in Muskingum County, it's not what you know, it's who you know to help make the contacts to have the
 cooperation in the sheriff's office.

I also used my contacts with the Downtown Clergy Association to publicize the event, to make sure the churches were seen as a good, non-threatening way to help people who might have this to approach and get help. And there were lawyers provided as well as the courts and the sheriff's office to work through these expeditiously.

I was gone on the day, unfortunately. 10 I was 11 in Rome on the day the warrant day occurred, so I 12 didn't get to see how it went. But from what I hear, it went very well. This was done on a special grant, a 13 person who's term has since expired, but a sort of 14 15 one-time grant to run these things. And she had done a couple of them. So I was happy to take a part in this. 16 17 And the other thing that I mentioned is a good

18 friend of mine works for something called the Corporate 19 Executive Board. And they've done some fairly detailed 20 research into private fraud. Some of that I've shared 21 with him and with Jeff Schanz.

22 Some of it is proprietary, of course, but some

general information that I shared with them, and his willingness to be available if anybody wants more information about their research into how to create an environment that minimizes fraud, at least in the private workforce.

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

I ought to just for a second acknowledge the presence of Justice Earl Johnson here today. He's really the dean of legal services. And I did give you sort of a sense of his long record the other night, but it's wonderful to have you here representing SCLAID, and also to -- so please stand and we can --

13 (Applause)

14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And also I want to acknowledge 15 that Don Saunders likes to attend our meetings. Works 16 very, very hard on behalf of NLADA, and is a tireless 17 supporter and a great help to us. And it's nice to see 18 you, and thank you for coming this morning.

And you've got sitting behind you our own former, now your, Chuck Greenfield. And why don't the two of you guys stand up and we'll acknowledge your presence, too. 1 (Applause)

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Mr. President?
3	PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Thank you, John. As I
4	approach my first anniversary with LSC, I'd like to
5	thank the Board for your help and support in my first
6	year. This is a remarkable board, the best I've ever
7	see. It's a thrill and an honor to work with you all,
8	and I appreciate the opportunity very, very much.
9	I'd like to thank Richard Sloane for joining
10	me and helping me out in my work. Richard has been a
11	godsend to me, and he is off to a great start. He is
12	currently, among other things, acting as director of
13	Human Resources since Alice's retirement back at the
14	end of December. So he has a very full plate.
15	We are also, as you know, recruiting for a
16	Vice President for Grants Management. We posted that
17	position this week. I've circulated it to people in
18	the foundation world and the legal services world to a
19	number of individuals, asking for their help in
20	disseminating news about the position and in getting

their recommendations on where we should be posting it.

22 So I think we're off to a good start.

21

1 It is going to be a challenging position to 2 fill because of the combination of qualities that we're 3 looking for in a person. We're looking for a lawyer, I 4 think; because the position deals fundamentally with 5 overseeing the delivery of legal services and 6 compliance and enforcement issues, it is important that 7 that vice president have a legal background.

8 But we'd also like to find someone who has 9 grants management experience, fiscal experience, 10 general management experience. Those are a lot of 11 qualities that may be difficult to find in combination 12 in a single person. Because of that, it's very 13 important that we get the word out broadly, so I'd 14 appreciate your help in spreading the word.

I'd like to cover four items this morning: 15 16 first, I'll give you a brief overview of the results of 17 the survey of our grantees that we did in December and 18 to which we've recently gotten responses; second, to describe the leadership role that LSC is currently 19 playing in technology; third, to describe a potential 20 21 communication and education initiative that we have ongoing with a pro bono consultant based in Florida; 22

and finally, to describe our current work in improving
 reporting metrics for grantees.

This graph shows the impact of funding cuts on 3 our grantees from the end of 2010 through what they 4 5 anticipate in 2012. And what it shows is that December 6 31, 2010 and what our grantees project for 2012, we will have seen a loss of 629 lawyers across our 135 7 programs, 250 paralegals, and 394 other staff, a total 8 loss of 1,273 full-time employees in legal services 9 10 programs.

11 That's absolutely devastating. As you can see 12 in the next slide, the pace of layoffs has been 13 accelerating over the past three years. The blue bar 14 represents 2010. Layoffs in 2010 would not have been 15 attributable to any decline in any Legal Services 16 Corporation funding; in fact, our funding went up in 17 2010 as compared to 2009.

What that likely reflects is reductions in other sources of funding, the perfect storm effect, the fact that IOLTA funding is going down and that in many states and localities, government support from other sources is going down. But you can see particularly in

the attorney category the dramatic increase between
 2010 and 2012.

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's not cumulative? That's
4 in each year?

5 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: That is in each year. 6 These are not cumulative numbers. The numbers that I 7 gave at the outset describe the overall losses, but 8 overall losses attributable to any reason, not just 9 layoffs but resignations, retirements, unfilled 10 positions, attrition of various sorts.

11 A majority of programs, 65 percent, are 12 freezing salaries this year; 21 programs are reducing salaries, these for employees who are already the 13 lowest paid in the legal profession. About half of our 14 15 programs, 47 percent, are reducing benefits this year. 16 Sixty-seven percent of the programs expect deficits in 17 2012. And we have received reports from 24 programs 18 that they expect to have to close offices in 2012.

We received comments on a number of the survey responses. I do want to thank all of our grantees for the effort they put into responding quickly to the request that we put out in mid-December. They had a

lot to deal with with year-end activities and the holidays, but we nevertheless, by last Friday, had heard from 132 of our 135 grantees. But here's a flavor of what's going on out there, as reflected in some of the comments we received.

6 From Bay Area Legal Services in Tampa, 7 Florida: "The loss of eight attorneys in 2011 will 8 result in Bay Area serving about 2,400 fewer clients 9 this year. Because of the 2012 reduction, we will lose 10 more attorneys, resulting in even less service."

11 From Blue Ridge Legal Services in Virginia: 12 "By March 2012, we will have lost 26 percent of our entire staff compared to the end of 2010, and we will 13 have lost 36 percent of the attorney staff we had at 14 15 the end of 2010. Our costs per case are increasing 16 dramatically, as we will have lost all benefits of 17 economies of scale. For example, we still have to maintain our Harrisonburg office infrastructure at the 18 same costs as previously, yet we have only three 19 20 attorneys there rather than six."

21 East River Legal Services in South Dakota:22 "As a result of these cuts, we are reducing intake to

1 one-half day per week. Our ability to cover the rural 2 counties of our coverage areas has been severely 3 affected by these cuts."

From Legal Aid of Western Michigan: "We will be closing the office in Big Rapids as of April 1, 2012. That office had three attorneys and a secretary serving four rural counties. The office had been open for more than 30 years."

9 Legal Aid Service of Northeastern Minnesota: 10 "Two of our offices are already at their smallest 11 sustainable size. Since we serve a rural area, closing 12 either of those offices, a likely outcome would result 13 in clients having to drive about 90 miles further each 14 way to receive services. For many, that will be an 15 insurmountable barrier."

And from Pine Tree Legal Assistance in Maine: "Ironically, Pine Tree will mark its 45th anniversary as a legal aid provider in 2012 with a lower staffing level than the program had in 1972 at its fifth anniversary."

21 It's bleak out there. We will be monitoring 22 developments carefully. We asked for this information 1 on the schedule that we did so that we could have it to 2 support our advocacy on Capitol Hill. This is the kind 3 of information we need to be able to demonstrate what's 4 going on out there at a time when the poverty 5 population is at an all-time high.

I think having this kind of information in
real time is very important to our advocacy efforts,
and as I said, I'm very appreciate to the field for
helping us out and in getting this information as
quickly as they did.

11 I'd next like to turn to some good news, and 12 that has to do with the leadership role that LSC is playing in technology. I attended my first TIG 13 The TIG conference in Albuquerque last week. 14 conference -- this was the 12th annual TIG conference. 15 16 The TIG conference is the only annual gathering of people who deal with technology in legal services 17 18 delivery.

Attendance at the TIG conference is mandatory for all programs that have received a TIG grant for the current year, so all of our 2012 TIG grant recipients were represented at the conference. And they are

required, those who have received grants, to attend two
 sessions about managing their grant and reporting
 requirements, and about evaluation requirements for the
 project that we're going to be funding.

5 The attendees at the conference, though, 6 include many people beyond those who have received TIG grants from list for the current year. They include 7 other legal services programs, court personnel, 8 representatives of pro bono programs, consultants, 9 vendors, and academics. This is the conference to go 10 11 to if you are associated with technology in legal 12 services delivery.

The programs included resource sharing for 13 best practices, technology for self-represented 14 15 litigants, rural service delivery. I was extremely 16 impressed with the quality of the programming and the quality of the presenters. This is something really 17 good that LSC is doing. LSC is playing a role in the 18 technology field that no other organization is playing 19 in connecting technology to legal services. 20

21 We'll be building on the experience that LSC 22 has with, as John mentioned, a technology summit in

June of this year. The technology summit will be by invitation only, and the invitations will be focused on people who are experts in forms of technology that can promote and facilitate the delivery of legal services to poor people.

6 We will be asking some of the participants to prepare white papers, as was done with the first 7 technology conference in 1998, with the expectation 8 that those white papers will be published after the 9 conference. The conference plan includes not merely 10 11 having the meeting in June, but developing a strategic 12 communications plan to disseminate the summit's results. 13

14 Implementation of what the summit does is 15 going to be a critical part of what the summit 16 addresses. We don't just want a group of smart people 17 talking to each other; we want to be able to act on 18 what they do at the summit.

19 I do want to recognize the very important 20 contributions of our TIG staff, who not only put on the 21 TIG conference but are critical to the planning for the 22 technology summit this June. They include Glenn

Rawdon, who leads the effort, Jane Ribadeneyra, David
 Bonebrake, Eric Mathison, and Bristow Hardin. These
 people are doing terrific work, and I think it's very
 important that we acknowledge that.

5 I next want to describe some initiatives we 6 have underway with communication and education. We've 7 talked a lot about that the last couple of days, the 8 importance of getting the word out about what legal 9 aid, legal services, is and why it's important.

We're working pro bono with a communications consultant in Florida who has worked with individual legal services programs in Florida and with a statewide pro bono initiative in Florida called the One Campaign. He has volunteered to work with us on three potential projects.

16 The first would be a public service 17 announcement for general distribution, airing on 18 television, that could be individually branded by any 19 one of our grantees and used in their local market. So 20 it would be a generic ad, but something that they could 21 attach their logo and identifying information to at the 22 end.

1 The work that he does is of extremely high 2 quality. He's already got the public service announcement that he proposes to make available to our 3 grantees in use in Florida, and has received very good 4 feedback on it. His material has very high production 5 6 values; when you look at it, your reaction is, a legal services program couldn't possibly have produced that. 7 8 It's a compliment to the quality of his work.

9 He has offered to make the public service 10 announcement that he's done available to all LSC 11 grantees for minimal cost -- none of his costs, but 12 there are production costs involved -- and also to 13 consult with them individually on how to get the 14 announcement placed because with all public service 15 announcements, placement is critical.

16 If it's running at 2:00 in the morning on the 17 cable channel that's least watched, it isn't going to 18 do much good. So getting appropriate time placement on 19 the right channel is important. There's a way to do 20 that. He knows how to do it, and he's willing to work 21 one-on-one with our grantees to get that accomplished. 22 He's interested in working with LSC because we

offer the opportunity for one-stop shopping for him.
 He can expand his reach and do something that he's
 personally very committed to and reach 135 programs
 through us, when if he had to do it one by one it would
 be very time-consuming and difficult for him.

6 Second, he is willing to try to take the 7 materials and the communications plan that he prepared 8 in Florida for their pro bono initiative, the One 9 Campaign, and to try to replicate it in another state 10 to see if it can't be scaled and used in even more 11 states.

12 His communication plan includes a video, posters, materials. By definition, it has to involve 13 local players. You can't take a generic pro bono 14 15 program on the road. One of the reasons the program in 16 Florida has been so successful is because it uses the chief justice of the state supreme court, prominent 17 18 trial judges, prominent attorneys throughout the state, who are known to people, who are folks of influence, 19 and who have been very helpful in marketing the 20 21 campaign.

22 Florida is a state that has mandatory pro bono

reporting, so they've been able to track what the impact of the initiative appears to be. And in the first year since this initiative was rolled out, their pro bono hours increased by 14 percent; whereas in prior years, they had never seen upward movement by any more than 1 or 2 percent.

7 The consultant is skeptical that the true 8 results are actually quite that good, but as he points 9 out, even if they were only half that good, that's a 10 very significant increase.

11 So he's offered to see if the model that they 12 developed in Florida might not be reproduced in one 13 other state, for starters; and if it works there, to 14 see what we might be able to do to expand it elsewhere.

And finally, he's offered to work with us, if we're interested, in developing a public service announcement for LSC itself, to get the word out about who we are. He has some ideas about how to do that.

All of these things would be part of a longer-term enterprise; no one public service announcement by itself is going to be enough to accomplish the communication and the education objectives that we've talked about. But in this
 person, I think we've found a partner who can help us
 get started.

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Is the One Campaign one case? 5 You always have one pro bono case?

6 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: My understanding is that 7 they've started out modestly. What the campaign -- he 8 did some market research before they initiated this 9 campaign, and he tried to identify obstacles to doing 10 pro bono work. And the number one obstacle he 11 identified was time. People don't think they have the 12 time to take on a pro bono case.

Now, in making that decision that they don't have enough time, they're making assumptions about how much time a pro bono case is really going to take. So they started out modestly, asking every lawyer in the state to take on one case.

I don't think they say "one case per year," they just say one case. But their theory is, once you got them hooked, they'll be back for more. So they've been -- and they have great buy-in from the judges in the state. Among the materials that he's issued are posters that some very high percentage of the state trial judges have posted on their chambers doors that say something like, "Before you ask me about your case, tell me about the one you've taken." And that sends a message to lawyers.

7 Finally, I'd like to follow up on a brief 8 report I gave at the meeting of the Institutional Advancement Committee on our work with the Public 9 Welfare Foundation on reporting metrics and outcome 10 11 measures for grantees. As I mentioned, we did receive 12 the planning grant of \$17,000. We convened our planning group. We have the possibility of an 13 additional grant of between 2- and \$300,000. 14

15 The goals of new metrics are two, to me. One, to provide better management and service delivery, 16 17 ultimately. If we have better information about our 18 programs, if they have better information about themselves, they'll be able to make more informed 19 20 decisions about resource allocation and about whether 21 what they're doing is accomplishing anything; and if 22 it's not, to try to move resources to another area or

1 try new approaches.

2 Second, we need better data to make our case, 3 both to legislators, and our grantees often need better 4 information to make their case to fundraisers. Let me 5 give you an example of how good data can be effective 6 in legislative advocacy.

John Constance gave me some materials that had been developed by a coalition called the Campaign for Funding to End Domestic and Sexual Violence. This is a group that advocates for Violence Against Women Act funding.

We literally compete with the Violence Against Women Act funding for appropriations because they, like us, are under the jurisdiction of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and Science. When they go in to make their pitch, this is the kind of information they have.

First, they demonstrate need. They have statistics that shows that one in every four women will experience domestic violence during her lifetime. Fifteen and a half million children are exposed to violence annually.

1 Rape is the most costly of all crimes, with 2 total estimated costs of \$127 billion a year. The cost 3 of intimate partner violence exceeds \$5.8 billion each 4 year, 4.1 of which is for direct medical and mental 5 health care services.

6 In 2010, a 24-hour survey of domestic violence 7 programs across the nation found that 70,648 victims 8 were served in one day. Unfortunately, due to a lack 9 of resources, there were 9,541 unmet requests for 10 services.

11 So they have statistics on the need. This is 12 their equivalent of the justice gap in some respects. 13 But then they also have information about progress, the 14 effect that VAWA funding has had over time in changing 15 some of these numbers.

16 VAWA saved \$14.8 billion in net averted social costs in its first six years alone. More victims are 17 18 reporting domestic violence to the police. There has 19 been up to a 51 percent increase in reporting by women, 20 and a 37 percent increase in reporting by men. The 21 rate of nonfatal intimate partner violence against 22 women has decreased by 53 percent. The number of

individuals killed by an intimate partner has decreased
 by 34 percent for women and 57 percent for men.

These are statistics of a type that we don't have when we go in to advocate. And I think it tells us something about what we should be aiming for and what we might be able to accomplish if we had better data reported from our grantees.

So mentioned earlier, the planning group that 8 9 we convened on January 6th did express some concerns for how we go about this. They emphasized the 10 11 importance for collaborating with other funders who are 12 already doing outcome measurements reporting or requiring other forms of data reporting from grantees. 13 And it's very important that we be sensitive to the 14 variety of service environments and other variables 15 16 affecting our different grantees.

17 And we'll take that all into careful 18 consideration as we proceed with our work. The next 19 step will be to apply for the larger grant.

20 That completes my report. I'd be happy to 21 answer any questions.

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Gloria?

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Thank you, Jim, for
 that report.

I'd like to get to your communication consultant report and the desire of that consultant to try to do a marketing-type plan for another grantee to see how it can be used in another state.

7 The discussions we're having with our New 8 Mexico grantee right now involve much of what you 9 addressed, and that includes right now we're looking 10 at -- I and some other people -- for somebody to 11 revamp, redesign, the web page, make it ore 12 interactive, a whole set of things.

And I'm looking right -- well, we're looking or some people, both more interactive web page designers and photographers to put New Mexico people in there. And how do we go about making known that we're interested in being one of the -- the new place, the new state, to try this?

19 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We'd be happy to talk to 20 him. But he's probably going to want to do an 21 assessment of what environment might be most receptive 22 to the type of initiative that they've already 1 undertaken in Florida. So he has a template that he's 2 going to try to reproduce. He doesn't want to start 3 from scratch.

And what he's done in Florida is not to work with individual legal services providers, but to work statewide with everyone who is engaged in pro bono initiatives. So that includes the bar association; the bar foundation; all legal services providers, not just LSC-funded ones; the judiciary, the courts.

10 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Right.

11 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: So this is an

12 all-encompassing approach. But we'd be happy to talk13 to him about it.

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Okay. Should Edcontact you or who?

16 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. Just have Ed call
17 me. Absolutely.

DEAN MINOW: On that point, I wonder if he might be encouraged to select a state that just coincidentally is related to some of our committee chair members on the Hill. That's just a comment. Separately from that, I wondered, Jim, 1 thinking ahead to our Pro Bono Task Force interim 2 report, if there are ways that we can connect the 3 technology best practices group with the TIG summit 4 that's coming up.

5 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. Glenn Rawdon 6 participates in that group, and I'll talk to him 7 specifically about how the tech summit might work with 8 the task force. Pro bono is definitely a component of 9 what the summit will focus on.

10 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Julie?

11 MS. REISKIN: Yes. A comment and a question. 12 The comment is, the first thing that you talked about, as you know, Jim, part of my discussion with the 13 clients was about -- even though we don't direct it, 14 but was about if cuts have to be made, where should 15 16 they be made, again not that we directed, but to help 17 the client community start thinking about that because 18 they need to have a say in it.

One of the things that surprised me was the very, very strong objection of mostly the rural clients to closing offices. And I know that it can't be helped, but what they said is that -- what they

explained to me, and this was mostly from the rural
 people, is it's cultural. It's almost like not having
 language access. It's the same thing, to not be able
 to have face-to-face.

5 And I'm not criticizing the program to have 6 had to do it. But it's very much a cultural issue, so the fact that all these offices have had to close is 7 very disturbing. And again, I'm not in any way, shape, 8 or form trying to blame the programs because they 9 didn't have a choice, I'm sure. But I just wanted to 10 11 mention that that was a very, very strong feeling on 12 the part of the rural client reps.

I did have a question or concern about the TIG program, and I'm not sure if this is the right time. But as part of my day job, I just finished being part of the TIG committee in the Colorado project because they did a disability project that was really wonderful.

19 So I was talking to the director about it: 20 "So what's your next TIG project going to be?" And he 21 said, "We're not doing TIG any more." And I said, 22 "Why?" And he said, "Because of some of the changes

1 that have had to be made; it just cost too much

2 administratively because of subcontracts and all that."

And I'm wondering, is this unique or are you hearing that from other people?

5 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We have heard that from 6 other programs, that they now weigh the costs of 7 compliance and what they have to do in connection with a grant in deciding whether or not to apply. I don't 8 9 know that that's causing other programs not to apply at But the size of the grant application that they 10 all. 11 make, it's got to be a bigger grant than it used to be, 12 I think, for many programs to apply.

I do want to mention one other piece of good news about the TIG conference this year that I forgot, by the way. As you may remember, back last April at my first board meeting, I reported on TIG applications or the letters of interest that we had received at that time.

19 I was concerned about the number of grantees 20 that have never had a TIG. And the conference seemed 21 to be focused on those who already get it, the people 22 who are looking to move their good technology to better

1 or best technology. And I was wondering about, what 2 about the ones that have bad technology? What are we 3 doing to get them to good?

If you get a TIG grant, you're not only required to attend the conference, but we fund your attendance at the TIG conference off the top of the grant. So a lot of the people who've never gotten a TIG, they don't want to incur the expense of having to go to the conference.

10 So this year, for the first time, we offered 11 TIG scholarships. And they were by application in a 12 competitive process. We offered 10 scholarships to 13 cover the cost of the conference registration fee and 14 travel experiences up to, I believe, \$1500.

We got 15 applicants for 10 spots. And I met with the 10 scholarship recipients when I was in Albuquerque, and they were delighted to be there. These were people who were soaking it up.

One of the most important benefits to them was not just the substance of the programs, but their ability to get introduced to and taken into this community of people who talk to each other regularly throughout the year. And they were very jazzed about
 it. So I was glad to see that.

But yes, I have heard about that problem, that the people are concerned about the reporting and administrative requirements of a TIG grant.

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, maybe there's a little 7 bit of a fundraising that can be done there, too, for 8 the Institutional Advancement folks.

9 Other? Laurie?

MS. MIKVA: Mr. President, I'm interested in this soliciting white papers and publishing them. I'm wondering exactly what goes into that and whether that's a model we might try and use also with presenters at our meetings as a way to get the information that we're getting out there.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I'm not sure it would work in that context. There's a prestige associated with being invited to prepare a white paper and then knowing that we're going to help you get it published. In fact, we might want to get them all published in one place; we might spread them out.

22 Because of the prominence of the summit

itself, I think there will be an incentive for people to prepare these white papers. We're not paying for the white papers. We're not going to compensate people for doing them. So they have to see something in it for them to devote the time to preparing it.

I'm not sure that the same dynamics would be
at play if we were talking about people that we invite
to present at individual board meetings. But it might
vary depending on the subject, and I think it's
something we should consider.

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Martha?

DEAN MINOW: Your presentation of the data from the survey was so compelling, and I wonder if we can get copies of that.

15 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Yes. Absolutely. I'll 16 get you not only the PowerPoint presentation but the 17 other information that I presented.

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And a number of you asked for 19 copies of Deanell Tacha's talk, and I'm told she's 20 going to give it to us early in the week and we'll get 21 it posted on the web.

But that does bring up a point, which is, we

probably should be figuring out -- and I take some of the blame for this -- to actually start to use some videography. Some of the panel presentations, I know if we posted on the web and then other grantees could actually tune in and see what was happening here in California, for example, maybe that would help them get some ideas.

8 The California programs, they were just 9 spectacular. And, as we heard, people have such 10 limited opportunity to get together, I wonder if we 11 might think about doing that. I don't know the 12 expense, but I would hope it was not too overwhelming.

MR. KORRELL: John, let me ask a question for you and maybe for Jim, too, on that topic. And that is, what do we do to publicize, apart from the Federal Register notice? What do we do publicize the subjects that are going to be talked on at these things?

Because I got to tell you, I am someone who thinks that posting something on a web portal is the equivalent of throwing it in a dark closet and locking the door. I can't tell you how many times in my office I say, "Where's the policy on X?", and somebody says,

1 "It's on the web portal." And my response is, "Would 2 you get it for me?" Because it is a pain in the neck 3 to go navigate.

These people are really busy, and I think if 4 5 you post Dean Tacha's remarks and whatever on the web portal, that the only person who's ever going to read 6 it there is the person who posted it. And I wonder if 7 we could do more to -- and you mentioned the -- the 8 reason I'm bringing this comment up now instead of 9 other business is you mentioned videoconferencing 10 11 capability.

12 I wonder, if we had a video link to these presentations and we told the field in advance, and not 13 three days in advance but three weeks in advance, of 14 15 what the basic topics are going to be covered by these 16 panels, and beat the bushes about how great it's going 17 to be to hear about the earned income tax credit work 18 being done by so-and-so, that they actually may watch these things and get some value out of it, and reach 19 out and contact people. 20

21 We would be performing one of the functions 22 that I think we're uniquely positioned to perform by

1 making that stuff available. But I just don't think that posting in on a web portal really does anything. 2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, I sort of agree with 3 I think it would be in connection with an article 4 vou. 5 about the -- it would be on a webpage that would 6 highlight it, and then there'd be a link to it. 7 But I agree with you that people have to know 8 to even go to the web page to look at it. But have you guys looked at the new website? That wasn't part of 9 Jim's report, but is that going to be -- anybody going 10 11 to talk about that today? I guess not, but it's 12 really --PRESIDENT SANDMAN: We have a new website. 13 14 (Laughter.) 15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And it's really an 16 improvement. 17 MR. KORRELL: Jim, could you bring me a copy of it? 18 19 (Laughter.) 20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: So go on there. 21 Yes, Gloria? PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Adding to Harry's 22

1 comment, not only putting it in some forms that are 2 easier for people interested already in legal services, but I mentioned this last night to somebody and they 3 said, "Are you going to put it on YouTube? Are you 4 5 going to put it on something where people can find it?" 6 If you go on any of the popular websites, you can find an amazing number of things that people are 7 interested in. I mean, Steve Jobs' graduation address 8 9 is constantly played, but also people with less reputation that Steve Jobs. They are hits. People go 10 11 on there.

12And her talk would easily have been in there.13Same drawing capacity. We need to think that way.

CHAIRMAN LEVI: I agree.

14

MS. REISKIN: I also think that would be -- oh, sorry. I also think that would be a way to make it more accessible to our client members, who certainly don't have the money to travel, but some of whom do have smart phones or internet who could watch and be part of this.

21 And I think that's really important, that they 22 stay engaged, not just client board members, but clients of legal services, who can be our torchbearers
 and carry the message. They know more than anyone how
 important this is.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: And that does remind of the results of a TIG grant a couple of years ago. LSC funded a project to create a manual for legal services programs on how to ensure that their website would show up in response to the right search terms when poor people are looking for help.

What they had found was that despite the best 10 11 information posted on the website, the website wasn't 12 popping up when people in a particular service area when looking for help. There are ways to manipulate 13 your website to make sure that it shows up high in 14 15 search results, and a program in New York put out a 16 handbook that's very pragmatic, very specific, that tells you what to do to make sure that your program is 17 going to be findable. 18

And I think the same kind of approach in technology would be helpful in directing people to the kinds of things that Gloria is talking about, wherever they're posted, whether they're on YouTube or whether

1 they're on a program website.

2	I do want to mention also that on Tuesday, LSC
3	will be doing a webinar for all our grantees on the
4	census. This will be Bristow Hardin presenting, and
5	the goal is to help programs use readily available
6	census data to project, to see what's going on to the
7	poverty population in their service areas so that they
8	can do a better job of predicting themselves exactly
9	what the impact of the census adjustment on
10	appropriation distribution might be in the future. And
11	I'll let you know how that goes.
12	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Martha?
13	DEAN MINOW: I notice the appointment of a
14	communications manager at LSC. And I don't know
15	whether it's appropriate to turn to that
16	person Elizabeth Arledge is her name for some
17	advice as the Board thinks about the strategic plan
18	with regard to public relations or otherwise.
19	I think we'd all be interested, though, to
20	know what if anything is a strategy with regard to
21	social media, whereas Gloria said the posting to
22	YouTube and other kinds of what's it called, pull as

opposed to push technology.

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: As we look ahead, in April you
3	may know the meeting is a Monday/Tuesday. And I think
4	you should hold the entire Tuesday, and it may, because
5	of the number of things that are possibly coming
6	together strategic plan, Pro Bono Task Force, fraud
7	awareness, our normal committee work it may go over
8	onto Wednesday.
9	So just that's a possibility, and maybe more
10	efficient than trying to bring people back and forth.
11	MR. MADDOX: What are the dates of that, John?
12	CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think the published date is
13	the 16th, Monday the 16th of April.
14	DEAN MINOW: You're telling us you want us to
15	be there for the 17th as well?
16	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, there's no question that
17	we're going to be there the 17th. It was published as
18	the 16th/17th. I'm saying we may even fall over the
19	18th and 19th, incidentally, are the ABA Days in
20	Washington.
21	And there might be some reason in the evening
22	of the 17th or the morning of the 18th, depending on
who from the Pro Bono Task Force comes into town and
 when we pull all of that together.

3 DEAN MINOW: And I can't.

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: You don't have to. We'll see 5 what we have to do. I know you have your reunions; you 6 might have to have them in Washington.

7 (Laughter.)

8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Okay. Mr. Inspector General. 9 MR. SCHANZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is 10 the IG's report in open session. I do have one also in 11 closed session. I want to go through this as quickly 12 as I can.

13 Throughout your tenure here as the Board, you 14 have heard a lot about GAO reports. Well, I'm here to 15 tell you that GAO also reviews the IG's. As required 16 by the Frank-Dodd Act, GAO did a report of the IG 17 community, 67 of us and counting.

And the GAO report, if you want to see what they said about the collective community of IGs -- I know you're really chomping at the bit to do that -- it's called, "The IG's Reporting On" -- I need glasses, I'm sorry -- "On Independence, Effectiveness,

and Expertise." And it's required by the Dodd-Frank
 Act. It's GAO Report 11770. It was issued September
 21, 2011.

I am pleased to report that we were not singled out. LSC IG was not singled out. It talks a lot about our independence, which we passed. It talks a lot about our effectiveness, which we passed. It talks a lot about our expertise.

9 The Dodd-Frank Act required IGs to have a 10 legal degree, and I do. It required IGs to have an 11 accounting background, which I do. And it required IGs 12 to have any skill sets necessary.

What was interesting about this was that the old ECIE, the designated federal equivalent IGs, of which I was one -- I'm not Presidentially appointed -- had more diverse skill sets than the Presidentially appointed IGs. So you have a bargain basement guy here.

So anyway, we do have the report. It's out there if you're interested in looking at it.

21 MS. REISKIN: Can I --

22 MR. SCHANZ: Yes?

MS. REISKIN: Can you give like a two-sentence
 overview of the overall effectiveness of IGs?

3 MR. SCHANZ: Very much so. I'm hesitant to 4 report it, but GAO and the CIGIE have reported that for 5 every dollar invested in IG work, there's an \$18 6 return. So that's an incredible ROI. And that's what 7 the CIGIE annual report talks about, and that is on 8 CIGIE, Council of Inspectors General for Integrity and 9 Efficiency. And the GAO reported that also.

10 The independence, other than a few things that 11 hit the press every now and then, IGs are independent 12 in appearance and in fact.

When we go through Audit Committee business 13 here, Mr. Maddox, I serve on the Audit Committee for 14 15 the CIGIE. So I am very familiar with some of the 16 policies and procedures that are coming down the pike, 17 including the new Yellow Book, which will somewhat -- and Dutch can talk to that at a later date; 18 I don't think we have the time to do that -- but there 19 is going to be some additional standards coming out 20 21 with the GAO Yellow Book.

22 And it's interesting. When I started in

1 government in 1974, the Yellow Book was a pamphlet. Ιt is now a to me. And it has some of the same 2 requirements; it's just a lot more explanation. 3 I do want to take the opportunity -- as part 4 of my performance evaluation, you graded me against my 5 6 2011 work plan. With me here is Dave Maddox, who can talk about what we did in 2011. 7 8 And we have developed -- as part of our 9 strategic planning process also within the IG, we have developed our 2012 work plan. I wanted to introduce it 10 11 to the Board first, and then we'll be posting it on our 12 website. MR. DAVE MADDOX: Thank you, Jeff. 13 Mr. Chairman, I'm going to give a very 14 15 one-minute overview of the work plan in the interests 16 of time. I think it's fairly self-explanatory. Ι 17 would just like to make a few highlights on page No. 3. For 2011, fiscal year 2011, the IG's Office 18 made 67 recommendations for improvement to LSC 19 management and grantees; identified almost \$1.2 million 20 in questioned cost; also provided almost \$2.3 million 21 in court-ordered investigative recoveries. 22

1 Flipping to the next slide, in terms of our planning process, we have a number of routine tasks we 2 do as well as new initiatives under the broad mission 3 of the OIG. It is important for us to remain flexible 4 5 at all times to address new stakeholder requests, 6 whether those be congressional, board, or management, as well as GAO actions or additional information coming 7 in on the OIG hotline. 8

9 We continuously perform risk assessments of 10 LSC and grantee operations. At the same time, we have 11 to be mindful of overall government-wide management 12 challenges, as identified by the Council of IGs.

So the next slide, on slide 5, considerations 13 going into this year. The 2012 appropriation 14 15 conference language -- it encourages the Inspector 16 General "to ensure that funds are not being used in contravention of the restrictions on engaging in 17 political activities or any other restrictions." Of 18 course, this is a shared responsibility with LSC and 19 the grantees as well. 20

21 Another item is, of course, the Fiscal 22 Oversight Task Force report, which encourages

additional coordination among the IG, management, and
the Board; encourages us to play an advisor/assessor's
role in LSC's grant management improvement initiatives;
and also to expand audit knowledge throughout the
stakeholders.

6 We have a number of functions we provide, on 7 to page 6. Just to highlight a few in a very quick 8 manner for you, we're going to be doing our own 9 five-year strategic planning this year. We will be 10 taking in considerations of what LSC's overall 11 strategic plans, goals, and initiatives are to the 12 degree we can within the IG's mission.

In terms of audit functions, page 7, of course we perform audits of LSC grantees and LSC operations, whether they be financial, compliance, or performance-related. Currently we're doing grantee internal control audits, TIG grantee audits, and in the future we're going to be doing an LSC security review that is based upon our risk assessments.

20 We continuously monitor open recommendations 21 for resolution. We'll also be conducting the peer 22 review of the Securities & Exchange Commission's Office

1 of the Inspector General.

2	On to slide 8, we oversee the annual
3	MR. SCHANZ: Which will be interesting, doing
4	SEC, because the IG recently resigned.
5	MR. DAVE MADDOX: On to slide 8. We oversee
6	the annual grantee audit process, which includes
7	issuing guidance; reviewing all the IPA reports, 136;
8	referring significant findings to LSC management and
9	tracking correction; and this year we expanded our
10	quality control reviews of the IPA's work. It's
11	currently a four-year cycle, and we do 35 per year.
12	In terms of investigative functions, we
13	investigate instances of fraud, waste, abuse, and
14	mismanagement and report those to appropriate
15	authorities. We also have a number of fraud preventive
16	measures.
17	Compliance: We have routinely done compliance
18	investigations, and we're starting a new pilot of
19	regulatory vulnerability assessments based upon the
20	congressional concerns, as highlighted in the committee
21	language.
22	Legal functions: We have our own general

counsel; we comment on legislation, regulations, an
 policies, as most recently the lesser sanctions
 discussions; we enforce subpoenas; and we have our own
 FOIA operations.

5 On to slide 11, we have our own OIG 6 administration where we do our own planning, budgeting, 7 our own office operations and information systems. In 8 addition, as resources allow, we would like to work on 9 identifying grant-making and grantee best practices and 10 lessons learned, and supplying those to all.

11 I'll open it up for comments or feedback. 12 MR. MADDOX: I just wonder, is the language you pointed to in the conference report, is that 13 14 somehow new? Or does that language appear routinely? MR. DAVE MADDOX: It's new for 2012. 15 16 MR. MADDOX: But has similar language been 17 included in previous conference reports or 18 appropriations? I mean, it seems to me that's exactly what you guys have been charged with doing since you 19 20 were created. 21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think it was in response to

22 that political cartoon.

1 MS. TARANTOWICZ: Yes. I think it was -- for the record, Laurie Tarantowicz, OIG counsel. 2 That specific language is new. It came out of 3 the -- originated in the House committee report, and it 4 5 ended up in the conference report. 6 It is, as you noted, something that we're charged to do by statute. But I think it's drawing 7 specific attention to that by the conference committee. 8 And I think that the Chairman is correct that it may 9 have originated with the work that we did in response 10 11 to Chairman Wolf's request to look into some political 12 action by a grantee.

13 MR. MADDOX: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Sharon?

MS. BROWNE: On your management and evaluation functions, you have the bullet point of evaluating grant-making and grantee best practices and lessons learned. It seems to me that that seems to be overlapping with a lot of the best practices that some of LSC's task forces are doing as well.

21 So is there a collaboration or a partnership 22 that you have with the task forces so that there's not

1 a duplication of efforts?

2 MR. DAVE MADDOX: We have a history of doing these things, going back to the mid-'90s. They're very 3 sporadic. Currently, we only have one evaluation staff 4 5 member in-house, and actually, he's been used in a lot 6 of cases to support audit functions. 7 So this is kind of a new aspirational area we'd like to go into because, as we've all identified, 8 it's an area that needs to be address. 9 MR. SCHANZ: Some of that will be addressed, 10 11 Sharon, when we do the fraud vulnerability briefing for 12 the Board and for the building in April at the request of the Chairman. Within our office, we have our own 13 14 best practices. Part of our internal initiative is to develop 15 16 databases of findings. So if we have a program in 17 North Carolina that's using money for lobbying, as a for instance, I want to be able to link that to all the 18 audit reviews or investigations that we've done to 19 identify, yes, this is an endemic problem, or this is a 20 21 one-time issues. The endemic problems we plan to share 22 with management.

MS. BROWNE: And so we will be able to integrate that into best practices to share with other grantees so that it becomes something that is available for other grantees to put into their programs and practices?

6 MR. SCHANZ: Well, we pretty much, as an IG, 7 do things on an exception basis, not a management-type 8 basis. We leave that to management. We identify 9 issues that are problematic, and that's where our fraud 10 alerts come out.

MS. BROWNE: But this is best practices. So you're looking at only fraud issues? Best practices to develop a program to prevent fraud?

14 MR. SCHANZ: That's one of our functions, yes. 15 MR. DAVE MADDOX: If I may, it's kind of 16 within the OIG mission. Recently, an item has come up 17 in terms of best practices for protecting confidential 18 information and what's being done.

19 It's an area where there's not been a whole 20 lot of oversight. We haven't really looked at this 21 area. But some reports have come to us recently that 22 have said, this should maybe be a targeted area we

1 should take a look at. And that's something we would share through management and integrate it in any shape, 2 manner, or form that the President sees best to do. 3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. 4 5 Are there any other comments or questions for 6 the IG on this? 7 (No response.) CHAIRMAN LEVI: If there aren't, I want to 8 9 thank you, and thank you for your work and your cooperation. I do think we are hearing from the field 10 11 that more is better, and that they might want to 12 have -- to the extent you become aware of things you think they might need to know, based on what you're 13 seeing, that a webinar may be occasionally a good 14 thing. We'll have to see. Jim can work that out. 15 16 But I don't know any pressing issue here, but 17 it seems if you look at the surveys sometimes, they 18 don't want to be got. They want to know what they can do to avoid being got. And I think that's what Sharon 19 is talking about. 20 MR. SCHANZ: Well, that's why we post 21

22 everything, pretty much, on our website.

1 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And that's what Harry is 2 saying, too.

3 MR. SCHANZ: Yes. That's transparency, as far 4 as I'm concerned, and it's one of my hallmarks.

5 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. But if we really wanted 6 to call it to their attention and put them on notice, 7 it may be that a webinar and taking 15 minutes, even, 8 would be worth it. I don't know. We'll leave it to you 9 guys to figure out.

10 MR. SCHANZ: Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

12 Appreciate it.

I now have to make a little change in our schedule here because -- not because he said so many nice things about me, but because he has a flight, Victor Maddox does, that I want to do the Audit Committee and the Fiscal Oversight Committee, those agenda items next in order, so that he can be here in person for them.

20 So if that's okay with everybody? Mr. Maddox, 21 will you do the Audit? Is there a report from the 22 Audit Committee?

MR. MADDOX: I'll make a brief report, Mr.
 Chairman. Thank you.

The Audit Committee met yesterday -- excuse me, on Thursday -- and we received the presentation by the Inspector General's office and the outside auditor, Nancy Davis of WithumSmith+Brown, concerning the FY 2011 annual audit.

8 I think many of the board members were present 9 for the presentation. There was discussion of one 10 deficiency found in internal controls relating to the 11 reporting of the LRAP receivable.

12 The auditors determined after, I think, 13 extensive consultation with Jim and his staff that that 14 matter would be handled by reducing the amount of that 15 receivable to reflect the actual receivable. And so it 16 was reduced rather dramatically, from about a million 17 dollars to about \$7500.

I think everyone's in agreement that that was the appropriate treatment. And other than that, I understand that the audit was clean report and that there are no other issues.

22 There was some discussion about changing -- at

least modestly accelerating the timeline for the completion of next year's audit, and I understand that management will be working with the auditors to make sure that their concerns in that regard are satisfied.

5 We received a report from the director of the 6 Office of Program Performance, Janet LaBella, regarding 7 the program quality evaluation process. It was a very 8 helpful presentation. And we had a few followup 9 questions, but I think the committee was generally well 10 satisfied with the performance of that operation.

We received a brief report from the LSC 11 12 comptroller regarding the 403(b) plan performance. We considered issues relating to the committee charter. 13 We are going to receive further comments from David 14 15 Hoffman, who was not present, Paul Snyder, who's recently joined the committee and will be acting in the 16 17 coming months to improve the committee's charter, I 18 believe, and probably have that resolved in advance of the next meeting. 19

20 We deferred discussion of the committee's 21 self-evaluation process in the interests of time. And 22 there was no other business to come before the

1 committee, so we adjourned.

22

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: There's nothing for us to act 3 on? MR. MADDOX: There is nothing for the Board to 4 5 act on. 6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. Now we're on item No. 20. And let me just 7 read a little statement for the record here and talk 8 about the Fiscal Oversight Task Force. 9 10 The Fiscal Oversight Task Force report was 11 presented to the Board in late July last year, and the 12 board opened the report to comments in the Federal Register notice on August 30th of 2011. 13 14 The Board published the report in the Federal 15 Register last August, sought public comment on the 16 report and the task force's recommendations. Comments 17 were submitted by the ABA, the NLADA, LSC union, current LSC staff members by a former LSC staff member. 18 The comments, summaries of them, and a summary of the 19 20 reaction of task force members were posted on the LSC 21 website.

We held a public hearing on December 12 to

take testimony. We very much appreciate the thoughtful
 input we have received. As you know, Robert and Vic
 served as co-chairs of the task force. Father Pius and
 I participated in the task force as members.

5 Our agenda includes a resolution in 6 appreciation of the expertise of the task force members 7 and their volunteer spirit, and the time they so 8 willingly gave to this initiative. I want to take a 9 moment to read their names into the record to again 10 recognize the collective experienced, professional 11 perspectives they brought to this report.

12 Chris Campbell, senior vice president, general 13 counsel, secretary, chief franchise policy officer, for 14 Yum! Brands.

Jane Curran, the executive director of theFlorida Bar, leading expert on IOLTA.

17 Christine DeVita, served as president of the18 Wallace Foundation and expert on innovative

19 philanthropic practices.

20 Terry Fraser, a CPA with LarsonAllen, advisor 21 to more than 100 nonprofits across the country.

22 Bob Henley, former managing partner of Ernst &

Young's Central Virginia practice, long experience in
 assessing internal controls with auditing and report on
 internal controls.

David Hoffman, former Inspector General of the City of Chicago, former federal prosecutor, and now, by happenstance, my partner.

Alan Jenkins, executive director of The
Opportunity Agenda, who has an extensive background in
grant-making.

10 Ron Shaich, co-founder of the Panera Bread 11 Company. More than 25 years serving as a CEO of major 12 companies with franchise operations.

Paul Snyder, a widely recognized expert on internal financial controls who serves on a host of audit committees for public companies, a retired Midwest Area managing partner at KPMG.

Allan Tanenbaum, general counsel, managing
partner of Equicorp Partners, deep experience in
corporate governance.

20 Nikki Tinsley, former Inspector General at EPA 21 who oversaw complex nationwide audits, largely regarded 22 as one of the deans of the inspector general 1 profession.

Doug Varley, a lawyer with Caplin & Drysdale 2 who administered grant-making programs at the National 3 Endowment for the Humanities. 4 Michele Warman, who brought us insights from 5 6 the foundation world where she's the general counsel and secretary of the Andrew Mellon Foundation. 7 I also want to thank Baker Tilly, whose 8 support provided support for the task force as well as 9 the LSC Office of Legal Affairs, which helped 10 11 coordinate meetings and materials. 12 I'd now like to ask Jim Sandman to provide the Board with his views on the task force's 13 14 recommendations. 15 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Thank you, John. 16 My experience over the past year as President of the Corporation has been consistent with the task 17 force's observations and has validated their 18 recommendations. I support the recommendations of the 19 20 task force. 21 In discharging our responsibilities to the 22 taxpayers whose money we are entrusted with spending,

1 and to the clients that the programs we fund serve, I
2 believe it is critical that LSC have a complete and
3 integrated picture of each grantee.

We need to have ready access to all 4 information we have about the grantee from every 5 6 source, and we need to be able to share that information easily among those within LSC responsible 7 for grant approvals, grants management, compliance and 8 enforcement, fiscal oversight, and program quality 9 assessment. The information flow should, in my view, 10 11 be seamless.

12 The current reality in my experience is different. Notwithstanding significant improvements in 13 communication and coordination by managers, committees, 14 and individual staff, I believe that the current 15 16 organizational structure impedes access to and sharing 17 of information about grantees that is important in identifying and managing risk -- fiscal risk, 18 compliance risk, and program quality risk. 19

In saying this, I intended no criticism of the managers or the dedicated and capable staff of the Office of Program Performance, the Office of Compliance

1 and Enforcement, and the Office of Information Management. I have witnessed and appreciate their 2 commitment to working cooperatively across offices. 3 I want to compliment particularly Janet 4 LaBella and Laura Rath for their collaborative work 5 over the past year with each other and with the Office 6 of the Inspector General. 7 8 I believe the problem lies in the structure itself, which separates functions that are all closely 9 related and not at all inconsistent with or 10 11 contradictory of one another -- program performance 12 assessment, compliance and enforcement, fiscal oversight, and information management. 13 The fact that a grantee has serious service 14 15 delivery deficiencies, for example, because of 16 ineffective intake practices, poor supervision of staff attorneys, or insufficient technology should be known 17

18 to and considered by those within LSC assessing fiscal 19 and compliance risks.

20 The functions of program enforcement 21 assessment, compliance and enforcement, fiscal 22 oversight, and information management all must merge at

some point on the LSC organizational chart. They
 certainly all merge in me. I am responsible for all of
 them.

And I have found that the current structure is not sufficiently conducive to generating the information necessary for optimal management of the Corporation. I believe that the Corporation would be better served by an integration of these functions at a lower level.

I have read the comments submitted carefully, and I have spoken to a number of employees about the task force's recommendations. I respect and am very sensitive to their concerns. I believe that how the task force's recommendations are implemented can address many of those concerns.

16 The task force wisely did not attempt to 17 prescribe the details of implementation. Nothing in 18 their recommendations, for example, requires that OPP 19 and OCE employees become fungible, or that employees 20 currently in those offices not continue to have 21 specialized functions.

22 If the Board approves the recommendations, I

will seek broad input from LSC managers and staff, and
 I will work closely with our union, particularly on
 implementation of those recommendations that implicate
 our collective bargaining obligations.

Good communication will be critical throughout 5 6 the implementation process, and I am committed to listening and keeping people informed at every step. 7 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Now, the task force report 8 include a number of important observations and 9 recommendations. I wholeheartedly agree with Jim's 10 11 assessment. And, having received and considered the 12 comments, the testimony, I think the Board is now in a position to act on the task force's reports and 13 recommendations. 14

15 We all know that implementation is critical. 16 I think we should give maximum discretion and flexibility to management to implement the 17 recommendations of the task force. My own view is that 18 task force recommendations are insightful, will result 19 20 in a better, more integrated approach to grant-making, grants management, and oversight in all of its 21 forms -- fiscal, regulatory, and program quality. 22

1 So I would like now to have a motion and a 2 second to adopt the report and to forward the recommendations of the task force to management for 3 implementation. Can I have such a motion? 4 5 MS. REISKIN: Yes. 6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: So move? 7 ΜΟΤΙΟΝ 8 MS. REISKIN: So moved. And this is really an example of leadership, of doing this thoughtfully, 9 getting the best minds involved, and having a lot of 10 11 respectful public input. I really want to commend the 12 task force and Jim and John for the way you've done it., 13 And I guess I just want to make one comment. 14 The fact that maybe combining units -- this isn't about 15 16 just combining units. It's about looking at things 17 differently. And in 21st century nonprofit management, 18 there's no -- small nonprofit, big nonprofit, no one looks at these things separately any more. 19 20 I think at one point that was appropriate. Ιt 21 isn't now. And so I'd like this to really be -- and I see the way you're going is forward-thinking. But we 22

1 don't to repeat mistakes in the past.

2	So I just want to say, I really appreciate the
3	process that you've used and the openness and
4	inclusiveness. And I so move.
5	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Can I have a second?
6	DEAN MINOW: I second. And I want to also
7	commend and thank the co-chairs of the task force, who
8	I think did an extraordinary job. And John, for
9	recruiting such a blue ribbon group of people who
10	really devoted their time and energy to this.
11	I think that this set of recommendations will
12	not only correct problems that we have had, it will
13	catapult us to be a model for nonprofit management.
14	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any further discussion? Yes,
15	Father Pius?
16	FATHER PIUS: As one of the board members who
17	was part a little bit late, but a part of the Fiscal
18	Oversight Task Force, it was a really remarkable task
19	force. The people who were involved were very engaged,
20	very knowledgeable, and very insightful.
21	And one of the things I think people we've
22	gotten a number of comments on this with some

1 suggestions and some cautions. And the one thing that struck me when reading some of the cautions that we 2 received, some of the comments that we received, is 3 that the vast majority of these concerns were raised by 4 the task force itself, that these were not things that 5 6 the task force did not think about, and think about -- with some of them, think about and talk about 7 8 at great length.

9 These were not things that were brushed over. 10 These things that people raised as critical points, 11 weighed very effectively by the task force, and then 12 came to the conclusion that it came to.

And the big point has been made, and I think it's a true one, is that this isn't just tinkering. This isn't just moving chairs around in the conference room. This is a new way of thinking, and it's part of going to be a broader way that I think we as the Board want the entity to start thinking about the way in which it does the work that it does.

This is a factor in that, a very big factor and an important factor, but a part of, I think, a longer-term change in the culture of LSC, the way in

1 which it approaches grants. And I'm grateful for the amount of work that has gone into it, the amount of 2 really careful thought that has gone into it. 3 4 And I fully trust Jim and the team that he has to implement this in a practical and appropriate way. 5 6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other comments or 7 questions? 8 (No response.) CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor? 9 (A chorus of ayes.) 10 11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed? 12 (No response.) CHAIRMAN LEVI: I want to also then say my own 13 personal gratitude to Vic and to Robert. You really, 14 really worked hard. It was almost a full-time job, and 15 16 for a year. I'm sure it drove you crazy at times. But 17 you have really gotten the Corporation to a very good place, and in thanking you, I'd also like to ask the 18 19 Board to consider the resolution at No. 21 which thanks 20 all of the members of the task force for their service, 21 and have an appropriate motion to do that. 22 11

1 ΜΟΤΙΟΝ FATHER PIUS: So moved. 2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Second? 3 MS. REISKIN: Second. 4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any discussion? 5 6 DEAN MINOW: Will we send them letters to 7 thank them? CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. Yes, they'll get a copy 8 of a formal resolution with a thank-you note. 9 10 All in favor? 11 (A chorus of ayes.) 12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed? (No response.) 13 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Mr. Maddox. Don't 14 15 miss your flight. 16 We are now back to item 13. And I Martha and Harry speak for a few minutes. It was just a brief 17 report on the Pro Bono Task Force. 18 19 MR. KORRELL: Mr. Chairman, I'll make most of 20 that report, though I'm going to ask Martha to weigh in 21 on an item or two. 22 I really just want to reiterate the Chairman's

comments he made during the chairman's report. This
 task force has been terrific. It has worked
 extraordinarily hard. Each one of these groups -- some
 of them are meeting biweekly for one- and two-hour
 telephone conferences. And I confess, I find it hard
 to keep up. I can't make all of the meetings of all of
 the subgroups.

8 DEAN MINOW: Especially when they're at the 9 same time.

10 (Laughter.)

MR. KORRELL: They are. It's really been a remarkable organization. They take their jobs very, very seriously.

As many of you know, and I'll summarize briefly here in just a second, there are five working groups focusing on five topic areas that came out of our initial task force organizational meeting. And each one of these groups is undertaking their jobs with a great deal of effort and expertise.

I think this is an example of what LSC can do best, beyond just handing out money. I think it's a terrific example of how we can leverage federal dollars into a much greater value, apart from just giving the
 money out.

I would be curious at some point -- and maybe 3 we do the same thing for the Fiscal Oversight Task 4 5 Force -- can we quantify that somehow? I mean, 6 hundreds and hundreds of hours by very senior, sophisticated, talented lawyers around the country are 7 8 going into this. It's got to be a multi-million-dollar effort, pulled together by the efforts of John and 9 Martha to twist arms and get people on this task force 10 11 and do this work. It's really been impressive.

So what's been happening? As you know, there are five working groups on the task force, one looking at Best Practices in Urban Areas; that group has done dozens of interviews and conducted a literature search.

16 Their goal is to have a draft report of their 17 work identifying some of the best practices in 18 encouraging and increasing pro bono work in urban areas 19 at the end of January as a step on the way towards 20 their providing their report to the Board in April. 21 The Obstacles Working Group --

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I should just say, and one of

1 the co-chairs of that is Doug Eakeley.

MR. KORRELL: He has been working very hard. 2 The Obstacles Working Group has allocated the 3 obstacles that they've identified to members of that 4 5 working group, and they are out doing research, 6 interviewing people, speaking with local regulators, bar associations, looking at materials -- I mean, 7 really hard work by these folks to pull together their 8 report on obstacles. They're meeting in person in 9 conjunction with ABA meetings in February in Louisiana. 10 11 Best Practices/Rural, same thing. They're 12 fanning out across at the country. They're interviewing rural providers, collecting best 13 practices. And particularly with the rural 14 15 groups -- maybe not surprising, given what we've been hearing here -- they are also collecting data on 16 17 obstacles to increasing pro bono work through the help of DLA Piper and Mattie Cohan, who's doing a lot of 18 support for these groups. 19 20 They're able to share the information that

22 Obstacles Working Group. These folks aren't working in

comes up when they identify obstacles with the

21

1 silos; they're working with each other very

2 effectively, I think.

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And I'll say, as you heard 4 yesterday, Deanell Tacha is one of the co-chairs with 5 Judge Moyer, who is from Kentucky. And I know they 6 personally have conducted tens of interviews.

7 MR. KORRELL: Right. I mean, just so people 8 get the flavor of this, Judge Tacha is not just sitting 9 at the top of a project and telling people what do. 10 She is out interviewing nearly a dozen people to get 11 their input on this. And really, when someone like 12 that comes to do the interview, it's really an 13 impressive effort.

The Big Ideas Working Group that I know Martha 14 15 is working on, looking at things like virtual local networks, using CLE requirements to encourage pro bono 16 work, using a PR campaign to educate the country about 17 18 the crisis, and I'm hoping paying attention to some of the efforts done in Florida now to educate about what 19 20 can be done -- looking at broader approaches to 21 systemic problems, including, potentially,

22 ombudspersons at federal agencies to help reduce the

1 need for pro bono lawyers.

2	We've seen repeatedly that some of the
3	agencies, like HUD or Veterans Affairs or IRS, are a
4	tremendous source of our business. And perhaps if they
5	could clean up their houses a little bit and we could
6	help them do that, then there'd be less demand on pro
7	bono. Also, looking at legal fellowships for recent
8	law school graduates.
9	The Technology Working Group and I think,
10	John, you're working on that with Jim looking at
11	things like videoconferencing, information management
12	including phone systems and data management,
13	partnerships with technology companies, and perhaps pro
14	bono contributions from some of them.
15	John, do you have anything to add to that?
16	CHAIRMAN LEVI: I want going to just say, the
17	chairs are Kate Fritz, who's the head of the Fenwick $\&$
18	West law firm in Palo Alto, and David Arroyo, who's the
19	counsel of Scripps Interactive Networks. The two of
20	them have been just all over this.
21	And some of our grantees Mike Monahan, I
22	think he's Georgia, and Terry Hamilton in Texas have

been regular contributors. And boy, I'll tell you,
 this is -- they're all over this.

3 MR. KORRELL: It really is remarkable. And in 4 addition, John, Jim, and I attended the a Pro Bono 5 Summit. I think we might be outpacing them a little 6 bit, given that --

7 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think more than a little 8 bit.

9 MR. KORRELL: I mean, seriously, this is -- I 10 have seen --

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: It's not a competition. 12 MR. KORRELL: No, it's not. But I have seen work groups like this before. You've all seen working 13 groups like this before. I've never seen anything that 14 had this much dedicated effort. And I think part of it 15 16 comes from John's whipping people, and from setting an aggressive agenda and schedule. Because it's got 17 18 people meeting regularly.

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: They're afraid of Martha.20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. KORRELL: So anyway, it's really -- it's 22 coming along great. I anticipate that we will get 1 meaningful reports from ever the working groups at the 2 April board meeting. DLA Piper is then going to take 3 the lead in aggregating all that information and 4 generating a single report so that it won't have 5 redundancies that are a little bit inevitable in these 6 kinds of things.

7 It's really been terrific. And I don't think 8 my report's complete without thanking Mattie for all 9 her work on some of these working groups, pulling 10 together the information; and the work of the DLA Piper 11 firm has been terrific in providing staffing.

I don't know if anybody noticed, but at one they had committed, I don't know, one or two people in their pro bono group; and now the entire pro bono operation at DLA Piper is providing some level of support for this. And we really couldn't do it without that kind of help.

And I'm serious that at some point it may be worth attempting to quantify the value that this task force has provided to LSC and to the pro bono community as an example of the leveraging that LSC is able to accomplish. I think it'll be -- consistent with this

1 idea that we need to come up with numbers and metrics 2 that will impress Congress, I think this is a terrific 3 one.

So anyway, Mr. Chairman, that's my report.
CHAIRMAN LEVI: And I should have said on Big
Ideas, Judge Sven Holmes, who's the vice chair of KPMG,
a former federal judge; and Teresa Roseborough has
reemerged, and she is now, I think, the general counsel
of Home Depot. And those are the co-chairs.

10 MR. KORRELL: Martha, I know you had two 11 points I think you wanted to add to the report.

DEAN MINOW: Just small comments, with adding 12 my thanks to Mattie and to DLA, and also to Harry, 13 who's a great co-chair. This is an opportunity 14 15 now -- it's a little premature, but I just want to say, everyone on the Board, if you have any interest in any 16 17 of these five groups, we'd be happy to share with you the schedule and call-in numbers, if you want to 18 contribute at this point. 19

20 When we do have the draft reports, we really 21 want your comments and suggestions. There will be 22 inevitable overlap in the sections, but we thought that
was better than not having full coverage. And I think
 we'll see some synergies, for example, between
 Technology and Rural that we already heard about some
 yesterday.

5 The final point is, I think that we thought 6 about this when we met in Cambridge, and I think it's 7 really been driven home to me in my conversations with 8 co-chairs. Ultimately, support and mobilization for 9 whatever we report will be as important as what's in 10 the report.

11 So giving some real thought to the rollout and 12 to the development of constituencies of support is something that I think is going to be the 13 responsibility of this Board. And I'm going to invite 14 us all to think about that. And that includes thinking 15 16 about YouTube or other kinds of technologies, as well as how to best approach potential partners in our 17 18 efforts, when we do have the report, to publicize it. 19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And assuming we maintain our schedule, it's our intention to have the co-chairs of 20 each of the working groups and any of the significant 21 contributing members of the task force that are 22

available actually come, and the DLA Piper folks, to
 the board meeting in April. So you will get to be with
 them.

4 MS. BROWNE: Well, I'm on the Best Practices 5 of the Rules area.

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes, you are.

7 MS. BROWNE: And I am amazed at the leadership 8 of that group and the energies that they are putting 9 into coming up with some best practices. And DLA 10 Piper, as well as Mattie Cohan, have just done a 11 remarkable job. And they deserve a big recognition 12 here.

13 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I agree with that. And we're 14 keeping them on. This group started in August, and 15 we're asking for their recommendations in March, their 16 drafts, so that we have it in April. That's a pretty 17 fast track when you're dealing with the bar.

18 Thank you, Sharon.

Anything else on thought? Because Robert Grey is the next to take a flight, so he is going on -- we're going to jump just one ahead of promotions and take the Finance Committee.

1 MR. GREY: Mr. Chairman, thank you, and to my 2 colleagues, thank you for giving me this little space 3 or window here. The Finance Committee met yesterday and 4 reviewed the consolidated budget for 2011, and 5 6 recommends to the Board a resolution approving what is a Revised Consolidated Operating Budget for 2011. 7 ΜΟΤΙΟΝ 8 The resolution outlines those areas 9 MR. GREY: that have been modified according to the expenditures 10 11 by the organization, by the Corporation. And after 12 presentation by the treasurer, we would recommend the adoption of the Revised Consolidated Operating Budget 13 for fiscal 2011. 14 15 MS. BROWNE: And that's on page 83 of your 16 board book. CHAIRMAN LEVI: And I believe it's a 17 18 resolution of the committee, so it doesn't need -- any 19 discussion? 20 (No response.) CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor? 21 22 (A chorus of ayes.)

1	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?
2	(No response.)
3	MOTION
4	MR. GREY: Mr. Chairman, we also reviewed the
5	consolidated operating budget for fiscal year 2012.
6	After discussion and presentation by the treasurer, we
7	were recommend the adoption of the Consolidated
8	Operating Budget for fiscal year 2012, found on page 93
9	of the book.
10	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any discussion?
11	(No response.)
12	CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?
13	(A chorus of ayes.)
14	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?
15	(No response.)
16	MR. GREY: Mr. Chairman, thank you. And
17	finally, there was discussion with regard to a
18	resolution that would help in assisting the staff
19	regarding the selection of accounts and deposits for
20	LSC funds, that resolution was considered by the
21	committee.
22	Suggestions were made to the general counsel

to be sure that at all times, there were two members of the staff to deal with exigent circumstances. The resolution has been properly amended and brought before us, and is before us for consideration.

5 The addition of the person -- we originally 6 had the President, the treasurer, and the general counsel. But there was one circumstance where the 7 treasurer could act alone. The vice chair made a 8 9 comment and observed that with the way we operate today, with technology and availability of our 10 11 officers, that we ought to be able to get two individuals at any time, regardless of the 12 circumstances. 13

14 It has been amended, accordingly, and allows 15 not only for the general counsel, the treasurer, and 16 the President, but any other officer of the Corporation 17 to participate if any of those individuals are not 18 available.

ΜΟΤΙΟΝ

20 MR. GREY: So I think it is properly amended 21 and before us for consideration. I would so move. 22 MS. BROWNE: I'll second.

1 DEAN MINOW: Oh, we don't have to. CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think -- well, we do. 2 This was amended. MR. GREY: 3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: So it's amended. It's moved 4 and seconded. Any further discussion? 5 6 (No response.) CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor? 7 (A chorus of ayes.) 8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed? 9 (No response.) 10 11 MR. GREY: And finally, John Constance in one 12 of his final acts of officialdom gave us some consideration of the 2013 budget, and as he does so 13 14 eloquently, reminded us that it is a moving target; but 15 commended us on the approach that we took, and that we 16 are well advised to pay attention to both the White 17 House, the OMB, and the Congress as we proceed to consider this going forward. 18

19 And that's the financial report.

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I thought he had made some 21 wonderful promise of deliverance.

22 (Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, okay. That's your
 report.

3 MR. GREY: Thank you, sir.

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: We are now on No. 14, Laurie 5 Mikva.

6 MS. MIKVA: Thank you, Mr. President -- Mr. 7 Chairman, I mean.

8 The Promotions and Provisions Committee did 9 not do anything that requires action on the part of the 10 Board. We had a presentation that we terrific, and we 11 agreed to have a telephone conference meeting in 12 February to discuss the agenda and role of the 13 committee in the upcoming year, and the

14 self-evaluations.

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I want to say personally how 16 compelling the issues of rural America seem to be at 17 this juncture, and this presentation that was in front 18 of your comment was very compelling.

And I think that you and your committee may wish to consider whether or not we should convene a special summit or meeting gathering whatever about the special issues confronting the delivery of legal services in rural America, and have it later in the
 year.

But you think about that. But I think that's something that we could pull together. And once again, as these task forces are demonstrating, the convening power that we have to bring people together around issues like this can, I think, help. And I would ask your committee, as it talks about its agenda to think about that, with management, obviously.

MS. MIKVA: Great suggestion. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN LEVI: We are now on the Ops and Regs
Committee.

PROFESSOR KECKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
 The Operations and Regulations Committee met
 on Thursday. The committee deferred a large amount of
 its business.

Just highlighting what we're planning to do in terms of taking up possible changes in response to the changes in D.C. nonprofit corporation law as well as the committee's consideration of Board protocols, and in particular, the protocol currently governing fundraising for the Corporation. Instead, the committee devoted its time to a full discussion of whether or not to publish for public comment the notice of proposed rulemaking, which you find in your board book, and which relates to the lesser sanctions authority sought by management.

6 We heard presentations from management and 7 from the Inspector General in support of this 8 regulatory change, and in support at this juncture of soliciting public comment on this proposed change. 9 And we heard also public comment indicating concern about 10 11 it and recommending that we not do so on the basis that the Corporation already had the authority and 12 flexibility that it needed. 13

The committee, after considerable discussion, 14 then voted to recommend to the Board that the NPRM be 15 16 published for public comment. One item that I 17 made -- comment that I made at the end of the meeting 18 and wanted to put in here is there was some concern 19 there and in prior meetings that whenever we put forward a notice of proposed rulemaking, we put 20 something out in the Federal Register and ask for 21 public comment and so on, that although there are more 22

1 steps to be taken, that that's the end of the story. And I wanted to make absolutely clear that 2 although that does happen on occasion in federal 3 agencies and federal entities, that's certainly not 4 what the committee and I envision for this NPRM. 5 6 We're asking for public comment because we want to know what the public thinks, and we want to 7 know suggestions and revisions and changes that might 8 be necessary. And when we get it, we'll take them 9 seriously, and I personally expect that there will be 10 11 some changes to the regulation based on that. 12 ΜΟΤΙΟΝ PROFESSOR KECKLER: So with that, I note that 13 the Board would need to approve publication in the 14 15 Federal Register of the notice of proposed rulemaking, 16 and I so move.

17 FATHER PIUS: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any further discussion on it?19 Julie and then Laurie.

20 MS. REISKIN: Yes. First of all, I have 21 absolutely no fear that the train has left the station; 22 with Charles chairing, I think you've been open and

supportive of full debate and inclusion, as has the
 rest of the Board.

I'm still going to vote against it, and the reason is that it just still feels like we're making policy around a few bad apples. And it just -- we have so much good stuff going on, I guess I just have concern about like why are -- I think what we have and what we're doing is working.

And this just seems like a lot of distraction 9 for a relatively small problem -- not that we ever want 10 11 to let bad things go. But I guess I feel like we have 12 tools that can work. So I do really respect your process and everything. I just wanted to explain why 13 I'm going to vote no, and it's not about fear that 14 people wouldn't be listened to because I don't believe 15 16 that at all.

17 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Unfortunately, the experience 18 of this Corporation is that anything, no matter how 19 minor, can be used and blow up. And I think we have to 20 take note of that history.

21 Laurie?

22 MS. MIKVA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I dissented in the committee, and am against it now. I agree with Julie that I don't think that Mr. Keckler is not going to consider any -- and the committee will fail to consider any comments that are made. I think two of the three provisions ostensibly, any way you look at them, certainly can be regarded as designed to obtain compliance.

8 One of them just looks punitive, sounds punitive. When we talk about, we talk about weapons 9 and punishing. And I guess I was persuaded thought 10 11 it's not necessary, that there are other ways to deal 12 with the grantees in a time of really low morale in the field, at a time when we're trying to improve 13 communication with the grantees. I think this sends 14 15 the wrong message, even to just put it up for notice 16 and comment. Thank you.

17 MR. KORRELL: Mr. Chairman?

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes, Harry?

MR. KORRELL: I'd like to speak in favor of it. With all due respect, I do think that talk of weapons and punishing tend to come from those who are opposed to the proposal as opposed to those who support

1 it.

I would note that this is authority that management has wanted for some time. I have a great deal of respect for the management of LSC. They want this flexibility. They want this authority. I recognize that it is only a few bad apples.

7 But as we saw in a conversation earlier in our 8 board meeting today, one person publishes a pamphlet 9 and we get something in the congressional record 10 directing the OIG to pay more attention to us. It is 11 only a few bad actors.

12 And I don't view this as a commentary or 13 message to the field that we think there's widespread 14 problems. The problem is, there are some bad actors, 15 and I think management is asking for some more 16 flexibility and authority to deal with those few bad 17 actors and maybe make them even fewer.

This is something that management wants. It's something that the OIG thinks management ought to have. And for those reasons, and for the reasons articulated in our committee meeting, I support the proposal and encourage my fellow board members to vote in favor of

1 it.

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Sharon and then Martha. MS. BROWNE: I'm going to encourage the board 3 members to vote in favor of having this interim remedy 4 5 available to management and staff as they go out into 6 the field. Of course, there's no requirement that the intermediate conditions be imposed. But it is an 7 8 opportunity for management to have more flexibility in what it does do. 9

I think the more tools that are available to management, the better off they can do their job. And it also just makes the field pay attention. And I think they are just as well aware of the bad apples, and they don't want to be put in the same barrel. And this gives an opportunity for management to take those bad apples out.

DEAN MINOW: So I take Julie and Laurie's comments very seriously, especially since they are pretty close to the ground here. But I also think that the process of notice and comment is precisely open enough to hear about such issues as tone, and how this would be received, and whether there's some

1 alternative. So I fully support this step.

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other comment? Gloria? 3 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Hearing from our 4 grantees, they're concerned about what they at times 5 feel as inappropriate pressures and pushes that they 6 get.

7 And at the same time, having been part of entities as well as involvement in the running of a law 8 school, I know you have to have flexibility and 9 something between the swat on the hand and an atomic 10 11 bomb kind of explosion to really have an enterprise 12 this large be successfully managed not only at the top level, but also what happens on the ground with real 13 people's lives. 14

15 So I'm asking if it's permissible to really 16 abstain at this vote, and then ultimately, when the 17 proper procedure that Charles and the committee have 18 undertaken, seen the result that comes back after all 19 the waiting and the comments, those comments, I will 20 make my decision on voting.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's fine.

22 All in favor?

1 (A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed? 2 MS. REISKIN: No. 3 MS. MIKVA: No. 4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Abstentions? 5 6 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: Abstain. CHAIRMAN LEVI: It carries. 7 Is there any more from your committee? 8 PROFESSOR KECKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 9 No, that concluded the business that we could conclude 10 11 at the Operations and Regulations --12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: So you'll be meeting again 13 before April? PROFESSOR KECKLER: I think that we will be 14 15 having a telephonic meeting in which we can talk about 16 our goals and at least a preliminary consideration of 17 some agenda items that we would need to talk about. 18 Thank you. That conclusions the report of the Operations and Regulations Committee. 19

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.
21 MS. REISKIN: May I ask a question?
22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes.

1 MS. REISKIN: Is there a defined in regulations timeline of how long the notice and comment 2 3 period is? 4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. 5 MS. REISKIN: So that all gets --6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I think Mattie -- we have 7 8 some flexibility there. Mattie, can you address that? MS. COHAN: Yes. What was drafted in the 9 draft NPRM is a 60-day comment period, which was chosen 10 11 kind of in a balance of wanting to leave a sufficient 12 amount of time for anyone who wants to comment without having it drag on forever. We would have to do at 13 14 least like -- the basic assumption is like 30 days. 15 But on something this important, a 60-day comment PDR 16 seemed a lot more appropriate. 17 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you. MR. KORRELL: Mr. Chairman? When will this 18 19 get published?

20 MS. COHAN: I go back and --

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: In a few days.

22 MS. COHAN: I'm going to guess by the end of

the week or the beginning of next week -- you know,
cleaning it up and making sure there are any last typos
taken out of it; getting the fully signed copies over
to the Federal Register, and once they have it at the
Federal Register, it usually takes about two days for
them to post something, and then it's usually published
a day after that.

8 MR. KORRELL: Thank you.

9 MS. COHAN: Oh, if it helps people to 10 understand, also, once it's published, we'll also have 11 that up on our website and an email will go out to all 12 grantees telling them with the link of where they will 13 the reg, the notice of proposed rulemaking, that it's 14 available for them to review and when the comment 15 period is.

16 FATHER PIUS: As long as it's not long.
17 MS. REISKIN: No. Just will we get a copy and
18 will we get that email also?

19 MS. COHAN: Oh, certainly.

20 MS. REISKIN: And if there are particularly 21 client members who want to read it but who don't have 22 email, can they call the office and get it mailed? MS. COHAN: Absolutely.

1

MR. KORRELL: Mr. Chairman, this is something 2 on the website I think will get read. 3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Probably will be. That's 4 5 okay. That's okay. But we -- Okay. Enough on that. 6 The Governance Committee. DEAN MINOW: Mr. Chair, the committee met and 7 we deferred until later time full discussion of our 8 self-evaluation. We heard a report from John Constance 9 about the implementation of GAO recommendations, most 10 11 of which are well on their way, and there's a plan for the fulfillment of each of the remaining ones. 12 And we considered and approved a proposal for 13 the evaluation of the President and other officers, and 14 I have since shared with the members of the committee 15 16 the self-evaluation that Jim Sandman already has provided. Thank you, Jim. And we heard from the IG on 17 his second annual evaluation, and commended him for his 18 work. 19 20 And we concluded, and that is the end of the

21 report of this committee.

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any questions?

1 (No response.)

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Then the Institutional
3	Advancement Committee met this morning. We had a
4	briefing from our outside consultant, Robert Osborne;
5	his work continues. We had a report in open session
6	from Jim Sandman about the grant from the Public
7	Welfare Foundation. There is no current action for the
8	Board to take. And that was the business of the
9	Institutional Advancement Committee.
10	We are now on the resolution of thanks to
11	Alice Dickerson, which is in your board books. If I
12	could have a motion to
13	DEAN MINOW: She's not in the room.
14	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Hmm?
15	DEAN MINOW: She's not in the room.
16	CHAIRMAN LEVI: No. She's not in the room
17	because she's no longer
18	MOTION
19	MS. REISKIN: So moved.
20	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Second?
21	FATHER PIUS: Second.
22	CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: And then we have a resolution
3	of thanks to Mr. Constance. We've all been saying what
4	we think, but with all seriousness now, John, you've
5	done a spectacular job. Sometimes you can't say thank
6	you enough. I hope you understand the depth of the
7	feeling of this Board for the work you've accomplished,
8	and for really taking us by the hand as we came in the
9	door and making sure we knew which way to turn.
10	So we're very much in your debt. So could I
11	have a motion on the resolution?
12	MOTION
13	DEAN MINOW: I make a motion, and note that
14	there is no time limit on the resolution indicating an
15	actual farewell. But with that comment, I am happy to
16	support this resolution of a statement of appreciation.
17	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Second?
18	FATHER PIUS: Second.
19	CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?
20	(A chorus of ayes.)
21	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.
22	And before we move to public comment, let me

1 also enter a thank you to the San Diego

2	program they're not here this morning but for
3	hosting us; for all of the panel members, the speakers,
4	who came from distances, at times not fully convenient
5	for them, to be with us; and all of the awardees for
6	their work. This has been yet another very special
7	meeting, and we're very grateful to those here who
8	hosted us.
9	Now public comment? Mr. Constance?
10	MR. CONSTANCE: As a reminder, Mr. Chairman,
11	that I soon will be a member of the public
12	(Laughter.)
13	MR. CONSTANCE: I just wanted to say a word
14	or two to you and your colleagues on this Board. Your
15	energy, John, and your vision are absolutely contagious
16	to not only the people in this room but everyone in the
17	field.
18	Your deduction, Martha, in terms of your time
19	has just been incredible. And each and every member of
20	this Board has served with great honor and distinction.
21	I must say this also, that the legacy of this
22	Board will be Jim Sandman. If this Board had done

nothing, nothing, but hire Jim Sandman as the President
 of LSC, they would have served the legal aid community
 in the United States quite well.

I also say that your two client members have set the bar at a height that will never, ever be surpassed in the future. And by their presence and by their eloquent words, they remind us that it is all about the client.

9 And when Greg Knoll and his staff close their 10 eyes at night, I'm sure the visions that come up in 11 their minds are the children that they try to keep with 12 their families, and the battered women in shelters that 13 they try to protect, and the people that they try to 14 keep in their homes.

I just hope that this Board and all of us in the future, when we close our eyes at night, remember that Greg Knoll and his Army, and all the other people across the country, are out there for not a lot of remuneration but with an awful lot of deduction.

20 I thank you very much for giving me an21 opportunity to serve.

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Mr. Constance.

1 (Applause)

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Mr. Saunders? MR. SAUNDERS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 Congratulations to you and thanks to you and Dean Minow 4 5 for your election today and continued service and 6 leadership to the field. I think we at NLADA and the entire community you speak for so appreciate your 7 leadership and commitment to the cause. 8 Around five years ago, I was talking with an 9 LSC staffer about this guy that they were hiring who 10 11 lobbied for the Archives for about 30 years. Ι 12 wondered at the time about, what connection could there be between lobbying for the Archives and this crazy 13 14 work? When I first met John Constance, he answered 15 16 my question with a simple but wonderful phrase -- I'll always remember it: "I thought it was about time I 17 18 stopped preserving the Constitution and went about making it more of a reality," which I think is a 19 20 wonderful statement of the work he's done here. 21 He's been a true professional and a personal delight to work with. He's obviously a passionate and 22

successful advocate. One of the things I admired most
 about John, and you just heard it, is how much he cares
 about the actual staff and clients in the field whose
 work he has made possible.

5 He has a wonderful reputation among my 6 colleagues throughout the country. They can tell how 7 much he actually cares about what he's doing. And 8 being something of a lobbyist myself, that's not 9 something you often say about your compatriots; they 10 can lobby for anything. But John felt it deep in his 11 soul.

12 On behalf of all of them, I wish him well as 13 he moves down to my old neck of the woods. As they say 14 about John's new home, if God is not a Tarheel, then 15 why is the sky Carolina blue?

16 (Laughter.)

MR. SAUNDERS: We wish for nothing but blueskies for John and his family. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Don.

20 Earl Johnson?

21 JUDGE JOHNSON: My comment is more in the 22 nature of a request. As some of you know, I have been researching and writing a book on the history of civil
 legal aid starting in 1876 up to the current day. And
 I have, 250,000 words later, reached the current day.

So in the next month or so, I'm going to be calling a number of you, and members of the staff as well, to do telephone interviews regarding what's happening in the current day. And I hope that you will be willing to take those calls and answer the questions in those interviews.

I have enjoyed very much this opportunity which came to me to appear on behalf of SCLAID, and have the opportunity to see what's happening on the Board. And I was very much impressed with the quality of the discussion and actions taken, although I had some disagreement with one of those.

16 I thank you very much, and look forward to 17 talking with you in the next month or so.

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Earl.

19 Any other public comment?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Hearing none, we can consider 22 and act on -- oh, yes. We need to move to No. 24. I

1 should have actually handed -- consider and act on the request of an officer of the Corporation for 2 authorization to receive compensation for services from 3 a source other than the Corporation. 4 5 DEAN MINOW: You mean 33? 6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That is No. 33 we are considering right now in open session. And what is 7 this about? I'm not informed. There is a memo in 8 here? Oh, I see. Yes, I do know what it's about. 9 10 Yes. It's in the back of your -- it's at page 352. 11 MR. KORRELL: John, does someone from management have a presentation on that, or are we just 12 to read the memo? 13 14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And there is a resolution that 15 provides this possibility here on page 353. Does 16 management have a view on this? PRESIDENT SANDMAN: This is -- if Dave 17 Richardson wants to speak to it, this is a personal 18 request. Under the LSC Act, an officer of the 19 20 Corporation may not receive any compensation for 21 services other than their work for the Corporation 22 without the express approval of the Board. And so

1 Dave's request is set forth in his memo.

2	CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, the question that I have
3	about this is, the resolution is open-ended. And I
4	think that in a normal professional setting, if
5	additional work begins to interfere with regular work,
6	I don't want this to be used as the Board's blessing of
7	an interference with the ability to carry on the full
8	and complete functions at the Corporation.
9	And as long as you and Jim read it that way,
10	I'm okay with it. But it doesn't have a limitation in
11	there or any such admonition. And I do not want it to
12	be used against the Corporation in some am I reading
13	that incorrectly?
14	DEAN MINOW: May I suggest
15	CHAIRMAN LEVI: So long as he renders services
16	outside and services do not interfere.
17	DEAN MINOW: Do not interfere.
18	CHAIRMAN LEVI: I guess that's sufficient.
19	MR. KORRELL: John, I agree with you, and I
20	think your concern is addressed by the language.
21	CHAIRMAN LEVI: It is, yes.
22	MR. KORRELL: I'm just curious if I assume

this is something that has been the subject of some conversation between Mr. Richardson and management, that it's not just coming to the Board fresh. And I'm curious if might has a position on it. I'd like to be informed of that.

6 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Dave informed me of the 7 tax consulting work that he has done, and I thought it 8 appropriate -- I noted the requirement in the Act that 9 the Board approve, and told him that he needed to bring 10 it to the Board for approval.

I have noted absolutely no negative impact on his service to the Corporation from the outside activities that he's seeking approval for. So I have no objection to it.

DEAN MINOW: So I have no problem with it, either. I just would assume that the way we will implement this is that should there ever be a concern about interference with his paid operations for LSC, that you would let us know, Jim.

20 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Certainly.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: See, what I'm more -- this 22 puts the Board in the middle of management's management

of its operation, which I really don't like to put boards into. And if we need to bless this, I guess that's okay.

But then from now on, I don't want the Board 4 to be involved in this, at all. This should be within 5 the purview of management. And I want to make sure 6 this resolution, which has this last line in here, 7 8 doesn't confer that responsibility back up to the Board and put us in the middle of running day-to-day 9 operations because I don't believe that that's the role 10 11 of a board.

MR. KORRELL: John, I think just part of the problem is the statute requires us to weigh in on this particular point. But beyond that, I agree.

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, it does. But it 16 requires us to --

FATHER PIUS: But the determination of whether this interferes with his LSC duties, we should make explicit, is the President's determination and not ours.

21DEAN MINOW: It's the President's.22CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's what I think.

1 FATHER PIUS: So we could add the line, "his LSC duties, as determined by the President." 2 3 DEAN MINOW: As determined by the President. CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. That's what I think we 4 should do. 5 6 DEAN MINOW: That would be good. That's a 7 good amendment. CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. Because otherwise, it 8 seems to me it's going to be determined by us. 9 10 ΜΟΤΙΟΝ 11 FATHER PIUS: And if we're doing that, if we 12 could change the language from "the Board and President have in informed" to "have been informed," then that 13 14 would make the English major in me happier. CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's good. 15 16 MS. REISKIN: Hear, hear. If that's a motion, 17 I second that. CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes. That's a motion and 18 that's a second. Any further discussion? 19 20 (No response.) 21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor? 22 (A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Mr. Richardson, for
 your dedication.
 MR. RICHARDSON: Thank you, sir.
 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And now -- I have to find
 where the agenda is -- I think we're at consider and

6 act on other business. Is there any other business to 7 come before us?

- 8 (No response.)
 - ΜΟΤΙΟΝ

10 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Now we have to move to go into 11 an executive session.

12 DEAN MINOW: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Closed session. All in favor?

14 (A chorus of ayes.)

15 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN LEVI: We'll take a break here for a

18 minute.

19 (Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., the board adjourned20 to executive session.)

21 • * * *

22