LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MEETING OF THE PROMOTION AND PROVISION FOR THE DELIVERY OF LEGAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

Monday, October 1, 2012

3:09 p.m.

Hilton Durham Hotel
3800 Hillsborough Road
Durham, North Carolina 27705

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Laurie I. Mikva, Chairperson
Sharon L. Browne (by telephone)
Victor B. Maddox
Father Pius Pietrzyk, O.P.
Julie A. Reiskin
John G. Levi, ex officio

OTHER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robert J. Grey, Jr.
Charles N.W. Keckler
Harry J.F. Korrell, III
Martha L. Minow
Gloria Valencia-Weber

STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

James J. Sandman, President
Rebecca Fertig, Special Assistant to the President
Victor M. Fortuno, Vice President for Legal Affairs, General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary
Lynn Jennings, Vice President for Grants Management
Jeffrey E. Schanz, Inspector General
David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for Management and Evaluation, Office of the Inspector General
Carol Bergman, Director, Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs
Carl Rauscher, Director of Media Relations, Office of Government Relations and Public Affairs
Janet LaBella, Director, Office of Program Performance
Bernie Brady, LSC Travel Coordinator
Allan J. Tanenbaum, Non-Director Member, Finance Committee (General Counsel, Equicorp Partners)

George Hausen, Executive Director, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Eric Mittelstadt, Deputy Director, Utah Legal Services
Pat Muller, Information Technology Manager, South Carolina Legal Services
Michael Prince, Information Technology Manager, Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas
Sean Driscoll, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Madlyn Morreale, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Yvette Stackhouse, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Hazel Mack, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Celia Pistolis, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
David Sobie, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Gray W. Wilson, Legal Aid of North Carolina, Inc.
Andrea E. Lorey, South Carolina Legal Services

Chuck Greenfield, National Legal Aid and Defender Association (NLADA)
Don Saunders, National Legal Aid and Defenders Association (NLADA)
Terry Brooks, American Bar Association
Dennis Stone, Charlotte School of Law

C O N T E N T S

P R O C E E D I N G S

(3:09 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: I call to order the Promotion and Provision for the Delivery of Legal Services Committee meeting.

I guess first thing, if people could -- members of the Committee could identify themselves, starting with you, Julie.

MS. REISKIN: Hi. I'm Julie Reiskin.

FATHER PIUS: Father Pius Pietrzyk.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Laurie Mikva.

MR. MADDOX: I'm Victor Maddox.

MS. BROWNE: Sharon Browne.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Welcome, Sharon. Thank you.

The first item of business is approval of the agenda.

M O T I O N

FATHER PIUS: So moved.

MS. REISKIN: Second.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: And then approval of the minutes from the July 27, 2012 meeting.

M O T I O N

MS. REISKIN: So moved.

FATHER PIUS: Second.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: All in favor.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: If our distinguished panel would bear with us for about five minutes, this Committee would like to talk about future committee meetings. And I guess, Janet LaBella, if you could tell us sort of where we've been, where we're still going, and then if anyone on the Committee wants to sort of weigh in with other ideas for where we should be going, that's what we're looking for.

MS. LABELLA: Sure. Thank you, Laurie.

About a couple of meetings ago, the Committee had come up with a listing of suggested topics for future committee meetings, and these were divided into a top tier and a slightly lower tier of different topics.

We've run through a few of those. As you know, we had the resource development best practices at the last meeting. And we have the grantee use of technology for today's meeting.

So there are some other topics on that list. We are not confined to that list if you have some other ideas. There are a couple of those topics that are not quite right for, say, the next meeting or the meeting following that. For example, we have on there the report on staff assessment of the TIG program; that is not ready, so I wouldn't suggest that for a little while.

But some of the other topics that would be available, one is the strategic planning in times of funding cutbacks -- that's the other side of the coin, if you will, from the resource development discussion, where you're looking at how do you strategically plan if there are continued or funding cutbacks that would require closing offices, reducing staff, or reducing other resource allocations throughout the program.

So that is one possibility. Another, of course, is the grantee use of data. You will actually see a little bit of that today. However, as you know, the Public Welfare Foundation project is just getting underway at LSC, and so that might be one also that might be better to leave for a little while.

PAI best practices and model programs -- while that's connected to the Pro Bono Task Force, it certainly could be a stand-alone presentation dealing with PAI best practices throughout the country. So that's one, I think, that's worthy of consideration.

We can look down at the second tier where there's some on succession planning and leadership development; also looking at how to use client satisfaction feedback and to use it in a way that can promote an understanding of the needs of the client community, and also what the outcomes of the services are that have been provided.

And another good one, actually, in these times, I think, would be the recruitment and retention of quality advocacy staff. That is a challenge for a lot of programs, particularly in rural environments.

So there's a lot of possibilities here. Now, Laurie had mentioned one the other day.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: That credit of goes to John Levi, our chairman, but --

MS. LABELLA: So go ahead, Laurie.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: He's not here to discuss it. It was LEP in view of -- is it the Justice Department?

MS. LABELLA: Right.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Regulations that have come down on that. And I guess courts throughout the country are now looking at this.

MS. LABELLA: Correct, in order to provide interpreters in the courts. And so that is an area we had touched on quite a while ago, actually, is the limited English proficiency projects and what programs are doing with respect to that.

But this adds another dimension, which is collaborations with the courts with having adequate interpretation in the courts. So that's another possibility, is to look at that.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: And I think now, just briefly from the Committee, if people had ideas about the ones that Janet LaBella has suggested, or new ones to put on the list.

Yes, Ms. Reiskin?

MS. REISKIN: Well, if we do the LEP thing, please make sure that we also include effective communication for people with disabilities, which is a huge issue with courts.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Thank you.

MS. REISKIN: And an area of substantial violation.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: That's great.

MS. REISKIN: But in terms of the PAI, I'm really interested in that. But my question is, would Ops -- I mean, until we fix the reg, it doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Would Ops & Regs do that?

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Yes, Mr. Keckler?

MR. KECKLER: Let me appreciate your concern, Julie. But I'll also say that it would be useful, if we are thinking about doing the regulation. Ops & Regs is based up with some regulations, the limited sanctions regulation and then the third party contracting regulation.

So this is obviously on our radar screen, given the task. It's something that we probable began to be able to look at in April in some way or nor. But the more groundwork that can be laid with this, the more useful our rulemaking will be because this rulemaking is a policy rulemaking. It's a policy-style rulemaking that's designed to maximize, ultimately, the dollars that are spent on PAI for the most bang for the buck.

And so if this Committee or, Janet, if -- any information that you can have about the amount of dollars that is allocated to this in different programs and the outcome of those dollars, yes. Then we can start looking at -- it just would be helpful in crafting the regulation, then, to try to encourage, through regulatory processes, grantees to adopt those kinds of things that have been shown to be most effective.

So this Committee is really about what things have been shown already to be most effective. And then that'll cycle back, and it'll be very helpful. That's all I'm saying.

MR. LEVI: Well, can I say, I think that rulemaking should be in your Committee, not this Committee. And I think that a lot of work on the PAI rule is being done by, and has been done by and will continue to be done by, then, the implementation group as it relates to the pro bono task force.

And what I would encourage this Committee to do, then, as members is to attend those sessions that have to do with the PAI rather than having competing -- I think we'll stretch ourselves too thin, and we have other topics to cover.

So that's just a helpful suggestion. I don't know if it's one that --

MS. REISKIN: Well, that was my question, is what's most helpful around that. Is it helpful for us to stay out of it and let other things happen, or --

MR. LEVI: Well, not stay out of it. It's that another group has already waded heavily into it.

MS. REISKIN: Well, that's what I meant. I mean --

MR. LEVI: Yes. And so I think --

MS. REISKIN: -- to not do another thing or to do another, that's what I was asking.

MR. LEVI: What I would suggest is that those of you that have an interest in it and -- this is clearly going to be an important implementation topic.

There'll be a subcommittee dealing with the PAI work of the implementation task force group. That's my sense of what will happen.

And I think those of you on this Committee or any other on the Board that are interested in that ought to sign up for that Committee because otherwise, we're going to have --

MS. REISKIN: Right. I understand.

MR. LEVI: -- too much to -- that's what I would recommend.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Thank you. Anything else?

MS. BROWNE: This is Sharon. And I've looked over the list, and I think it's really tremendous what we have here, and there's a lot of work that can be done.

One thing that I would think we might want to consider, and I don't think it would be too onerous to do a program, is on your second tier, the succession planning and the recruitment and retention of quality advocacy staff. I think those two can go together.

But as we do our studies and we look at our grantees, we're noticing that we really do need to provide some guidance or some suggestions on how the grantees can do succession planning and leadership development.

So I would like to see something along -- a program on those lines, but then to follow it up with a white paper or some guidelines that we can put online to help the grantees because there is a population for our executive directors that, before too long, they need to really be paying attention to succession planning. And I don't think enough has been done in this area.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: I think that's a really good idea. Is there something already on the website -- am I making that up -- on succession planning?

MS. LABELLA: There probably are some things on succession planning.

MR. MADDOX: Microphone.

MS. LABELLA: Thank you. Yes, there are some things on LRI, I'm quite sure. we did have a training at LSC on succession planning. We could probably build on that. I see George nodding his head that this is a good topic. I think it's a timely topic.

MR. HAUSEN: Our board -- I'm sorry. The Legal Aid of North Carolina board just did extensive work on that in an effort to get rid of me, I think.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Thank you.

Julie?

MS. REISKIN: There's a lot of stuff on this in the not-for-profit world in general. So again, if we do that, I wouldn't think it only -- you know, I'd look outside for those resources where there's a lot of expertise developed.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Good idea.

Mr. Maddox?

MR. MADDOX: Yes. Thank you, Laurie. Just on a totally unrelated front, from time to time I raise this, and I had it come to my mind again today as we were talking about Veterans' Affairs. You know, 12 percent of the LSC-eligible cases that were closed in 2011 involve income maintenance that are from one or another areas of the Federal Government that have hundreds of billions of dollars in collective budget, whereas we have 3- or 400 million.

Not many of those cases were veterans' benefits; only really about a thousand of them, 800 of them, but tens of thousands from Social Security and TANF and unemployment compensation and the like.

I wonder if there isn't a way for us to look into finding somehow that we can eliminate some of this workload from grantees by getting more of the other agencies whose primary responsibility ought to be to make sure that the people who are entitled to those benefits are aware of them and that the mechanism in place, either through its ombudsman or some sort of public advocate in each of these agencies.

I mean, the Veterans' Affairs benefit went from 50 billion to 100 billion from 2000 to 2009, and ours went down by 50 million in that period. So, I mean, that's another way of looking at increasing the sort of efficiency that, in a time of reducing budgets, if we can find a way of eliminating workload.

Of those 12,000, or that 12 percent of those cases, 73 percent of that, or about 83,000 cases, involved counsel and advice or limited action without litigation. And that sounds to me like the kind of advice that could easily be provided by somebody who's employed by the agency responsible for those benefits.

MR. LEVI: That's a topic in our -- that's in our strategic plan.

MR. MADDOX: Okay. Well, good.

MR. LEVI: Again, another item for implementation. But you figure that out, please.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Okay. Well, thank you, members of the Committee. And I would like to turn it over to Janet LaBella to introduce our panel.

MS. LABELLA: Well, good afternoon, everyone. I'm very pleased this afternoon to introduce this great panel discussion regarding how LSC grantees are using technology to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of program operations and service delivery.

The discussion is going to focus on the uses of technology in program operations that range from online intake to document and knowledge sharing, employee performance metrics, and case outcome assessments and measures. I want to thank the panelists in advance for sharing their expertise and experiences with you and the greater legal services community.

Our panelists today are, starting from right next to me on my right, Pat Muller, who is the IT manager at South Carolina legal services; and to her right, Michael Prince, who is the IT manager at the Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas; and Eric Mittelstadt, who's the deputy of Utah Legal Services; and George Hausen, who needs no further introduction, who is the executive director of Legal Aid of North Carolina.

So we're going to lead off with Pat. And as I mentioned, she's the IT manager at South Carolina Legal Services, which is a statewide law firm consisting of nine offices, a statewide intake office, and 110 employees.

Pat will tell us about the challenges that South Carolina Legal Services faced after a merger or preexisting programs in 2002, expansion of the service area to cover the entire state, and the steps that the program took to meet the challenges, and how it's moving forward now to further increase the efficiencies brought on by technology.

So Pat, off to you. And please interrupt, ask questions, and if anyone uses techie terms that you don't understand, make sure to ask what they are.

MS. MULLER: Good afternoon. I do first of all want to thank the LSC President for inviting South Carolina Legal Services to participate on this panel, along with my executive director, Andrea Loney, which is in the room, the chair of the Legal Services Board, and all of the board members, for giving us this opportunity.

As Janet has spoken, my focus this afternoon is on the technology planning at South Carolina Legal Services. And once we merged into one entity in South Carolina, we were confronted with outdated infrastructure across the board.

You had lots of offices come together that had a myriad of all types of technology, particularly from the infrastructure of the wiring, the hardware, the software. And we also had a case management system that everybody was trying to access over the state that was not built to accommodate the size of the staff at that time, and an intake office that was working under onerous conditions, where in order to get a case to another office, they were using pcAnywhere, which was a modem dial-up thing to transfer a case across the state, which took FEV to do.

So what we did was also we developed a technology committee. That committee has representatives, which we still have, of staff across the state with ad hoc board members. And arising from that committee, we decided that overlooking and analyzing the technology existing, we needed an IT assessment done as well as a security audit of our entire statewide firm. There were also budget challenges then that we had to consider.

But going along with that, we did contract with a vendor to do the technology assessment and the security audit. And once they had done the assessment, then they also helped us prioritize what was most important to change in order to facilitate a more efficient use of the technology, thereby delivering more efficient services to clients.

And part of it, of course, was the network, which meant a lot of the infrastructure, the wiring and the connectivity between the offices. We had to do that. We had to change a lot of that. We had offices that weren't connected.

So in order to reach those, we had to use another protocol. It also meant that we had to upgrade the computers and the software on computers because the programs were using different types of software.

One of the things that hindered the effective delivery of client services was the case management system. And the South Carolina Bar Foundation provided the funds for us to get a new case management system that is truly web-based. It has become the efficient tool of service delivery for our clients.

They also provided funding for the intake office, enhancing the phone system there, buying new software, also allowing us to update the infrastructure at the intake office.

There have been great and tremendous improvements by us making a lot of improvements, to where I cannot cover all of them today. But as you can see from the graph, it's better network management, completely.

The connections are much faster. The security has been augmented to really ensure that the confidentiality of the client information is there. And also, when you're having to access data outside of the office, that there is a secure portal for that.

It's also improved the collaboration among the advocates and among the management team, whereas they can share cases, collaborate on cases, and therefore helping to move along the service delivery to clients.

The next thing we want to talk about again is the case management system. It's truly web-based. Wherever an advocate or staff person is, as long as they have internet access, they can access a client file. The documents are uploaded to the client files, so they can be on the phone with another advocate or anyone and talk about the case and actually look at the data and the client documents that are in the case.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Ms. Muller, I have a quick question. Can that be made available to pro bono attorneys as well, or is it completely --

MS. MULLER: Yes. Yes. And actually, a good thing -- under the case management system, our new case management, we actually electronically transfer cases to the pro bono program. So it's one time. Once our intake office enters the data and determine it's a pro bono referral, that case is electronically sent to pro bono.

And also, for pro bono attorneys and PAI attorneys, there is a mechanism within this case management system that they can be a user on it, and it's secure enough where we can cordon off where their caseload is and they are only able to see their cases and manage their cases and enter time. That is a component of that case management system.

Some of the -- well, the current project --

MS. REISKIN: Could I ask a follow-up?

MS. MULLER: I'm sorry?

MS. REISKIN: When the pro bono attorneys are generating documents or letters, do they have to send it to your office for you guys to post on the system, or can they --

MS. MULLER: No. No.

MS. REISKIN: -- can they put their documents right in their --

MS. MULLER: Yes. If you are a user, it's a document management component. And they just attach their file, and it uploads it.

MS. REISKIN: Even the external users can do that?

MS. MULLER: Uh-huh, because once you're given access to it, you get a security level. And they can actually upload their documents there.

We're about to embark on an online intake, which is a TIG project for South Carolina Legal Services. And it will move a lot of the intake burdensome calls, where they stay in the queues longer. This way they'll have 24/7 access to our intake. And the same case management system that we use now, it will be a part of that system. Okay?

We are also in the process of upgrading the telephone system for the intake office. Even though the software was updated about five or six years ago, as you know, technology evolves. So it's becoming out of date, and so we are now in the process of vetting vendors to upgrade the telephone system.

Part of the case management system, again, is the automated documents. There are documents within the system that allow attorneys to collaborate and get approval for representation of specific clients under specific grants. We have documents that are created by the staff, so that is a part of the case management system.

Moving forward, we are looking and talking about implementing a SharePoint for the statewide law firm, going paperless, and also the mobile technology, where not only will the public be able to access and download, which they can at, if you have a smart phone, our websites, but also be able to do an online intake by using their mobile technology, because you know that's where everybody is going.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: So do we have any other questions for Pat?

MR. LEVI: Janet, do we ever survey our grantees to see how many of them, say, in the current year are planning to go out to bid for software or a new intake system so that they could actually collaborate together and maybe potentially get an efficiency by having it be a larger contract? Have we ever thought about doing that, or do we do that?

MS. LABELLA: You know, we have started to think about that, John. It's something that has been a little bit back-burnered that I think we should move up to a front burner. And it's looking at to what extent LSC might be able to facilitate that. And I know it has some interest with --

MR. LEVI: Well, the reason that I suggested it is because you remember, just a few months ago, we were in San Diego and they had just put in something that seems quite similar to this. But I'll bet that --

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: That was one of my questions, Ms. Muller, is did you talk to other programs?

MS. MULLER: Yes. And I'm going to say this back to Mr. Levi. What we did -- I kind of beat of a dead horse to death when I take on a project. I really do. And I knew we had to move from that case management system, so I started doing my homework.

But we went to Georgia, and we looked at their case management system. We talked to the staff there, and it was pros and consent. Not only did I do that, the top four vendors across the legal services programs, we invited them in for an in-person presentation and question-and-answer before the technology committee. We did that.

We vetted them out. We went back and forth. And we ended up with the one that we have now -- not calling any names -- but now most of the legal services programs are moving to that. And, you know, it's going to make it easier in that we can then join with other legal services programs and be able to share a lot more the transferring of cases around the United States. You'll be able to do that. So we did. We actually did.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Mr. Korrell?

MR. KORRELL: Yes. Ms. Muller, you mentioned a computer system and security audit. What does that cost to do, just out of -- I have no clue, and I wonder if this is the kind of thing that --

MS. MULLER: I believe -- it was done in 2007, and at that time I believe it was around 30,000.

MR. KORRELL: I just wonder if that's the kind of thing that anyone would ever do on a pro bono basis. Right? It's a service. We talk about lawyers providing pro bono services. And I don't know if anyone has any experience with --

MS. MULLER: Yes.

MR. KORRELL: -- getting that kind of assistance. And is that something that we can do at the national level to encourage or roll out -- it just seems like there are opportunities -- if you didn't have to spend $30,000 on that, you could spend $30,000 on --

MS. MULLER: Right. And it's very necessary, particularly for legal services programs, to keep up with the technology or where your holes or weaknesses are. It polarizes those things, you know. But they walked with us through prioritizing and then giving recommendations, which we ended up implementing in a phased approach.

MR. KORRELL: It just seems -- it's similar to John's question. You're undoubtedly not the only legal services organization that is going through that. There are obviously lots and lots of others. And there could be some economies of scale in the contracting and doing that kind of work.

DEAN MINOW: Unless it means that it will take three years to get it done.

MR. KORRELL: Right.

MS. MULLER: Thank you.

MR. KORRELL: Thank you.

MS. LABELLA: Okay. Next, Michael Prince, who is the IT manager of Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas. He manages four IT professionals on a network that supports over 225 users and spans 15 branch offices across 106,000 miles.

So this is a huge program, and distance is clearly a challenge. So Mike will discuss how using SharePoint -- which is a knowledge-sharing work space; is that right, Mike?

MR. PRINCE: Yes.

MS. LABELLA: -- has helped unify staff and make service delivery more cohesive, again across this huge program geographically and with a lot of employees.

MR. PRINCE: Thank you to the board chair and the members. Thank you for inviting me to do this presentation. I get excited, so I've got to sit down. I usually stand up to do this presentation, but I get excited and I start running around the room about this particular product.

But I'm here to present to you SharePoint. SharePoint in itself is a platform. It's a single platform that does a lot of things. It's a multi-user platform.

This is our service area for Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas. We have about 15 branch offices, and we cover about 114 counties. We're particularly spread out. So when you think about it, we're actually one of the big three in Texas.

So we're trying to come up -- we tried to come up with a program that would give us an opportunity to collaborate. And in collaboration, we came up with SharePoint. And I know you're saying, what is SharePoint?

Well, like I said before in the presentation, SharePoint is pretty much a multi-faceted, multi-purpose platform used for connecting people. Now, this is not something new. It's just like looking at Word. If anybody up there ever used Word or Excel or Internet Explorer, it's just that easy to do. It's just that easy to implement.

And as well, it's just that easy to put on someone's desk, give them a little bit of training and maybe a pamphlet, and like they actually pick it up quicker than they would Word or Excel. It's the easy button. That's really what it is. I know everybody's seen the easy button. I'm going to try to stay with my -- by this time, I'll be running around the room.

But anyway, anybody can learn to use it. We pride ourselves on making it as easy as possible because we have so many different users. We have the attorneys. We have the support staff. We have the paralegals. And they all have different learning curves. So we presented them with something that was more easy.

So we just pushed a button one morning and it was, boom, on everybody's desk. But we still had questions. And those questions were, who does this support? Who does this help?

It helps the individual. It helps the team, depending on which team it is, or it could help just a particular branch. It could even help the entire enterprise. But other than that, it helps the internet or extranet. Everybody has an internet access. Everybody has an intranet that they use. This takes the place of all that, and is on one single platform.

The one thing that we've also pushed amongst -- or tried to push into our people's minds, that this is a community. It's a big community that shares very easily the interaction and expertise of other attorneys that may be in a different part of Texas. This may be their calendar. This may be their reminders, may be the work flow. It could be anything that you actually work on on a daily basis.

One of the things that we've implemented, and one of the first things that we implemented, was practice groups. Because we have so many different attorneys that are under the Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas umbrella, we had to implement a group or training groups or practice groups that would give everybody an opportunity to share information or share documentation.

And this documentation may be anywhere from a pleading. It could be a divorce -- because with lawyers, just like with anyone else, if it's got good wording in the documentation, we may want to reuse it and you may want to pass it on to someone else to say, look. This is a good document to use.

So for our family practice group, we have a consumer practice group. We also have a housing practice group and a government benefits practice group for our VA lawyers. We also have an employment practice group. But one of our newest practice groups is impact litigation.

This was brought up about two months ago, and this actual impact litigation was brought about because we had a problem with our Dallas housing authority. And we're not the only place or the only company, the only legal aid organization, that may have a problem with the housing authority.

So we put information out there so that the attorneys in other cities could see what we were fighting against in impact litigation and say, okay, look. We could use that same product or that same template and implement it here in Lubbock, even though they may be doing it in Dallas.

And then Lubbock picked it up and took it to Abilene. And Abilene picked it up and took it to San Angelo. So it just kept on growing and growing and growing. So we implemented that last one --

DEAN MINOW: Could I ask a question?

MR. PRINCE: Yes?

DEAN MINOW: So how much of it is open beyond your offices to other lawyers and how much is it closed?

MR. PRINCE: All of it is closed.

DEAN MINOW: All of it? All of it's closed?

MR. PRINCE: Yes. Yes, this is just for internal use. It can be for external, but it's just for internal use right now.

We have implemented a beta program, which is just a test program, so that we have a license to have a secure connection to pro bono attorneys so that they can actually log into SharePoint under a secure connection and give outside counsel through their pro bono cases.

DEAN MINOW: And that's because of the software license?

MR. PRINCE: Yes. It has a secure license.

DEAN MINOW: It's not because the information is sensitive?

MR. PRINCE: Well, the information is sensitive. Don't get me wrong. But if they've taken that case and that is theirs, it is their case that they can look at within SharePoint. And this is, again, in the test beta phase of our program.

Here's our family law practice group. Within the family law practice group -- if you can make that out; it's a little small -- is a calendar. And within this calendar, they present to themselves -- they present to the users different types of programs or different types of documentation that they may want to use within the family law practice.

This has been used very widely. It's a bigger program -- it's one of our biggest practice groups because that's mainly the higher percent of what we do at Legal Aid. Again, this is the Legal Aid SharePoint, and we'd just like to present to you, this is how it looks. It's kind of user-friendly to us.

We made it to where the committee decided, IT committee decided, what makes it look simpler? And just clicking on something one time and not having to go through and read makes it a simple, useful product to everyone involved who use it under the umbrella.

One of the things that we found ourself on the right side -- because we read left to right -- most of our important information, as you can see, is on the right-hand side of SharePoint.

But one of the things that we found also is the color. It's very easy on the eyes. It's calming because it's not all bold and blue and orange. It's just a simple green. It's a simple olive. It's a simple white. So that, again, enticed our users to use the program.

Here's one of the facets of SharePoint that we would like to share. This is MySite. MySite is pretty much just like Facebook. But within Facebook, you see everybody. Within MySite, you get to know the attorneys or the support staff that you will probably never get to see unless we had a meeting.

So what we try to do is we try to get people to buy in. And in Texas, there's a lot of rivalry going on, so MySites are very popular. I tried to make mine to where -- I'm a 49ers fan, so I get kind of shut out of all the groups. Plus I'm from Georgia. So that doesn't help me at all.

(Laughter.)

MR. PRINCE: So I got a Texas A&M friend. That's because they just got in the ACC, but that's good. One o the things that you can see on the screen is you have colleagues. You have organizations. You have, you know, tips and topics and notes.

But in the colleagues, which is -- if you were to log into any MySite for anyone on our network, the colleagues are really by teams. I mean, we have the OU people that are colleagues. We have the Texas A&M colleagues. And during the Red River shootout, there's a lot of junk talking amongst -- on MySite, but it allows our users to get to know someone that may be 250, 275 miles away.

And it gives you an opportunity to actually see who you're talking to, so if you need to call someone, it familiarizes you with the person and what their likes and dislikes, and if they have a cat, you know. You may want to ask them some kind of question to break the ice because you maybe have never talked to them before. MySite is very big. It's just like the Facebook for our organization.

We also have clinics. In SharePoint, we have clinics that are updated by our EJVP personnel. Now, these people go out to the clinics. They set up the clinics. They run the clinics. And these clinics are updated on a weekly basis because they may change. Some of the clinics, you can walk in and you can just get help from them.

Some of these clinics you have to make an appointment to. So we have a calendar within SharePoint that is sitting outside of SharePoint on DMZ, which is the dirty side of the network for the public to use if they needed to set up an appointment. And the appointment actually comes in through SharePoint and into the pro bono or EJVP inbox and allows them to set them up an appointment.

So it's very easy to use because there's only three lines -- your name and your address and what you want to be seen for. And that clinic, they know that

that may be the Martin Luther King clinic at the Martin Luther King Center, and allows them to see the calendar as they are filing out a question-and-answer little sheet that they have up there on SharePoint.

But is also allows the EJVP personnel, again, to change. If there's a closing or if there's bad weather or if there's something like that in the area, they can put it out on SharePoint, and SharePoint will actually put it out on our website because the two are interconnected. So if they need to go to the clinic and it's closed, they'll know ahead of time, before they go out.

One of the other facets of it is we see that people spend a lot of money on support ticket programs, support ticket software. One of the things that we did a few years ago was we spent $17,000 just on software support so that we could give our users an opportunity to put in a support ticket for help if their monitor is not working, if their internet access has gone down, if their keyboard is not working, if they kicked the surge protector and they just don't know they had kicked it. It gives them an opportunity to put in a support ticket through SharePoint.

And what's big about this and what helps the IT department out -- because we are a small department and we are servicing a lot of people -- it gives us an opportunity to sit around -- I mean, to look around all of our tickets and set up a uniform way of servicing these people.

When a ticket comes in through SharePoint, because we haven't spent any money on it, the ticket is actually staffed within five minutes of it being put in. Within 15 minutes, as the IT manager, I get a notice if it hasn't been, all from SharePoint.

And within 30 minutes, we are already on the job of trying to get the ticket worked out. If we can't get it worked out in 45 minutes, it's up to another level automatically through SharePoint, and that's where we're either calling a vendor or we're calling for another part. So all that works within SharePoint and our ticketing support system that we built within SharePoint.

Some of the reasons that we also tried to get an understanding from not just our users, but from other programs that we've talked to -- Georgia, Florida, Washington; we've talked to a lot of different organizations from when we went to the TIG conference, and it allowed us to share with them some of the five reasons that we saw to use this particular program.

And for one, it empowered the user. It empowered the user to have something of their own, to put in some ticket, to give themself an identity within the network. It delivered relevant information.

They could share documentation. They could share briefs. They could share decrees within the organization that may give them an idea on what they need to do for their client. It promotes that collaboration amongst all of -- everyone in Legal Aid of NorthWest Texas.

But more than anything, it's cheap. And I saved it for last because I think I think it's very important, that we implemented this program for less than $1,000.

We have an organization called Tech Soup that has given nonprofit organizations an opportunity to implement something that the private sector has implemented with thousands of dollars; we do it for just $1,000. And I think that in itself is a good caveat, to say, okay, look. We're going to do this, and not only because it'll help us, but because we don't have to spend a whole lot of money.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Any questions for Mike?

MR. KORRELL: What was that organization called, again?

MR. PRINCE: It's called Tech Soup.

MR. KORRELL: Tech Soup. Is that national?

MR. PRINCE: Dot org. It's on the internet.

MS. REISKIN: Yes. All nonprofits can get it.

MS. LABELLA: All right. Thank you, Mike.

MR. PRINCE: Thank you.

MS. LABELLA: And now Eric Mittelstadt, who is the deputy director of Utah Legal Services, and has worked at Utah Legal Services for over 20 years, will tell us about how Utah Legal Services has embarked upon the A2J Author online intake system, and also how the program has utilized technology for performance evaluations. Eric?

MR. MITTELSTADT: Thank you. Thank you for having me. As Janet said, I'm going to tell you about two of our technology projects. They were both developed through TIG grants; I'm going to sound a little bit like a commercial for TIG grants here at the beginning. I assume for this audience that's all right.

A little bit of background about Utah. Utah Legal Services has been the statewide program in Utah since 1976. We have just four offices in Utah, and part of the reason for that is that the population in Utah is very centralized around the Wasatch Front, which is Ogden, Salt Lake, and Provo at the front of the Wasatch mountain range.

About 70 percent of the state's population is there, and then it's a very large state with vast rural areas. Some of the counties in the state have less than one person per square mile. So access to our services is always a concern to us, and so the online intake system really was developed to be an additional access point to our services. We keep an eye, and I'll have some statistics for you on how it's used in the rural areas.

Along the same lines, we try to very much be a statewide law firm instead of a collection of offices, four offices. And so what we call our TIG metrics project was really developed as a way to ensure quality services and equality of services across the state.

So to start with our online intake process, it starts, of course, with our statewide website, this also developed through a TIG grant. And you can see prominently displayed -- the arrow has actually been added for this presentation, but prominently displayed, you get into the system through our website.

It's an A2J guided interview. And if you haven't had exposure to the A2J system before, what that is, it also -- this is maybe the last time I'll mention this, but it also developed through a TIG grant, not by us but by the Chicago-Kent School of Law.

What it does is it provides this little person here -- they call it an avatar -- who walks you through the system. And so this person comes up and begins asking you questions. And you walk along this path, and as you get further down, you can see -- it's a little hard to tell on the slide, but at the end there, the last picture is our banner, the Utah Legal Services banner. So you arrive at our office by the time you've filled out all the information.

This piece of software, A2J, is also used a lot for pro se pleadings. And typically, as you walk along the path there, you reach the courthouse at the end, as you get your pleadings prepared.

So in our case, it's gathering the information that we need to see if someone is eligible for our services. And so it begins by asking questions. There's an awful lot of information, as you know, I expect, that we have to gather to see if someone if eligible for our services.

We ask all applicants about domestic violence, and there are some safety precautions built into the program if people are on a computer that might be compromised. We also ask about military service, which was a topic this morning. And we ask about disability, and again, the myriad of other pieces of information that we need to gather to see if someone if eligible.

And then we get into the specific legal

problem identification. People self-select what issue they have, and if it is something that we can't handle, they get that and get some simple referrals out of the system. And so it's a self-selecting process that helps them understand what we can and can't do for them.

And so the result of that is that for clients that use the system, it makes the process more efficient for them, and it also saves time for us. The end result of the system for us is that clients have an option by the time they've filled out all the information online.

If it's during our regular intake hours, they can choose to chat with an intake advocate right then, where there's an online chat feature. They can choose to call in on a special number that puts them to the front of our queues; so if they've taken the time to enter the information themselves, they get to the front of the line. Or they can set an appointment to call back in at anyone time when, again, there'll be someone waiting for them as opposed to waiting in the regular telephone queues.

I can tell you that in Utah, we get about 20,000 phone calls a year, requests for assistance. We have a staff of five intake workers, four of them bilingual in Spanish, who just answer the phone all day. And so we try to keep hold times down, but necessarily, they're not always that short.

So this is a way for clients to get into our services without the wait. And our intake workers tell us that by having the information already in there -- they still have to go through and verify the information that's been entered before the case is passed on, but it decreases their time of doing that by about half of what it would take for a normal intake.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: How could you verify it?

MR. MITTELSTADT: Well, they verify it by talking to the client. So we don't require other verification unless questions arise. But they go through and make sure that the questions were answered correctly.

There are some things -- for example, what makes up a household, and what income needs to be counted in what way -- that can be complicated questions. And they have to verify it and make sure that it was all done correctly.

So it has been used more in rural areas. It been used more in rural areas than in the urban areas. It's been an additional access point for folks that are in the hard-of-hearing and deaf communities. It has been mentioned by DV advocates that we work with, domestic violence advocates, that it's a way folks can contact us if they are sometimes not able to talk on the phone; they can access our services this way more privately. And of course, it allows for 24-hour access in that way.

Currently, this system has been in place for about a year, and just about 6 percent of our intakes are done through this system. But it's growing, and we think it's an important new access point for clients.

Any questions about that specifically?

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Yes. I had a question, which is, have you had any way to gauge -- it seems to me that clients are often not very good at identifying what their legal problem is. Any way of knowing whether those people are getting lost in the system?

MR. MITTELSTADT: Well, one thing that we think is a positive sign is that more of the clients who use the online system and make it to the end end up being eligible than the ones that call us on the phone. We think that's a self-selecting process; they're educated as they go through the system about what we can do and what we can't do.

I don't know that we have a very good way of finding out if folks give up on the system, although at ever turn, if the system ever identifies you -- it says, if you've told us you have a criminal case, we can't do that; here are some referrals. It also includes information on how to access us to talk to a live person, and also on our grievance process. So hopefully, if someone has misunderstandings, they contact us another way.

All right. The second thing I'm going to talk to you about is our performance metrics system. And this is a TIG grant that was just completed. The purpose of this was to increase the objectivity in our annual evaluations.

We do an annual evaluation process, and the hope was that by using some of the data that already exists in our case management system, pulling it out in a way that's easy for people to understand, that we can sort of increase the objectivity and quality of our work that way.

So what happens with this system is that, once a quarter, when logging into the case management system, some reports pop up for every person in the program. And once the person gets a chance to review their own charts, then the next day, when their supervisor logs into the system, those same charts pop up for them.

And the real theory, the overview of this, is that our hope is that it necessarily will make staff and supervisors talk about these issues, and focus in on good supervision and the provision of good quality services.

So it's a little bit of force feeding of these reports that come four times a year. They can be pulled up at any time and reviewed, but they come up automatically, whether you like it or not, four times a year.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Could you give some examples of what information is contained in these reports?

MR. MITTELSTADT: I'm glad you asked, Jim.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Any time.

MR. MITTELSTADT: So to just walk you quickly through these charts, what you're looking at here -- and I won't go into a whole lot of detail because the time won't really allow it today -- but this is a chart that basically shows the number of cases that you've closed and the amount of time that you spent on them.

So this particular slide is for short service cases, A and B closure codes in the LSC parlance. And it shows six months' worth of cases. It's divided into two quarters. The total graph is six months, and it's divided by color into two quarters.

And the line that cuts through is the amount of time that each person spent on those cases. So you might see here that, for example, Tyler, one of our advocates, closed many fewer cases in this area than the other people he's being compared to.

There are some reasons for that, and one of the things that's important to know about this, we see these charts very much as not an ending point for judgment, but as a beginning point for conversation. We want to generate conversations between supervisors and staff about what's going on and why we see these numbers.

Tyler was a very new advocate at this time, and we'd expect him to have somewhat lower numbers, and we'd expect him to spend more time on his cases. So we're seeing some of that here.

At any rate, that's the sort of thing that we're looking for, but again, not as a judgment for staff but as a starting point for conversations with their supervisors. Similar graphs like that are used for extended service cases. So it's sort of divided into short service and extended service.

Here's another graph that comes up. What this shows is cases that sit without activity. So we have programming in our case management system that if you haven't been in a case doing anything for 30 days, the case turns blue. If it's been 60 days, the case turns yellow. And if it's been 90 days, the case turns red.

Now, we have cases that can sit for 90 days -- they're on appeal, long processes. But we think, as a best practice, people ought to be going in and checking on those cases at least once a quarter to just verify that nothing else needs to be done.

And so once a quarter the chart comes up and shows folks, are they staying on top of their cases? That's basically what we're trying to get at here. Are they going in and making sure, checking their cases, nothing's falling through the cracks?

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: So if you just pull it up and look at it, it will go back in a blue category?

MR. MITTELSTADT: That's correct. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Or do you have to actually take an action?

MR. MITTELSTADT: There's no -- right, right. So you can fool the system. And again, our goal isn't to catch anybody on this. Our goal is to hopefully have staff go in and be doing regular reviews of their cases so that that's not an issue. If we get staff who are really trying to fool the system, maybe we'll have to do something about that.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: No. I just --

MR. MITTELSTADT: No, all our staff are good, hard-working folks who want to do better and appreciate -- for the most part, appreciate a view of making sure they're on top of things.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: No. I really was just saying whether one had to take action because there's lots of reasons not to take action. But it's not looking at that. Thank you.

MR. MITTELSTADT: So here's another chart that just shows simply the time spent on client cases and the time spent on projects. So we all have projects if we're doing statewide domestic task force work, things that don't apply to a specific client. We bill that to projects.

But we expect, for our really case-handling staff attorneys, that they're going to be spending 70 to 80 percent of their time on direct client services. And so this chart just simply pulls out of their time records those numbers, and shows you how much time they're spending in the blue on direct client services and the orange on projects.

And again, we can sort of track that to what other responsibilities they may have. Some of this -- it is very dependent on the timekeeping, so some of this just leads to better timekeeping habits. That can certainly affect this. Also, all the case data is based on closed cases. So it's another very big incentive to get your cases closed timely, as each quarterly report is coming up.

So again, this is a brand-new project for us this year. We sort of suspended our usual annual evaluation process and asked all staff and supervisors to just spend time with these charts and graphs to decide what's the most helpful here.

Is there some other way we can lay them out, or other information we can provide, that would be more helpful? And then we're setting goals for the coming year based on these charts, and we're going to track those and determine how best to use this information.

It's information already existing in our case management system. Just trying to pull it out in a way that's helpful and more decipherable to staff.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Are other programs using either of these at this point, or are you unique?

MR. MITTELSTADT: I know that there was a program, I want to say in Kentucky, that had an evaluation system that was very similar to this, and we based some of our things on that. It was also a TIG project that was before ours.

And there are many programs doing online -- well, not many, maybe; I think there's like ten to fifteen programs doing online intake now, and some of them are using the A2J technology, too. But it's relatively new.

MS. LABELLA: Right. There's an increasing number of programs that are doing online intake. It's been nice to see that increase over the years. And many of them use the A2J Author model. Others don't use the A2J interface, but they have active online intake projects as well.

And I think, as George mentioned, North Carolina has an online intake project as well. And that's not A2J Author. Is that right?

MR. HAUSEN: We do use A2J in our --

MS. LABELLA: Oh, you do use A2J?

MR. HAUSEN: -- for our clinical custody stuff and domestic violence.

MS. LABELLA: But not for the online intake?

MR. HAUSEN: No. Oh, we do?

MS. LABELLA: Yes? Yes? Oh, for that as well. Okay. So that is a very good interface. It has met with a lot of success. It's very easy for the applicants to fill it out and answer the questions.

And so now George will tell us about another use of technology with North Carolina, and that is how they capture and illustrate outcome measures in order to inform resource allocation and program assessment.

MR. HAUSEN: I apologize that you have to listen to me again. Had I known we had an option to have somebody who really know what they're talking about, I would have given you our IT person, who's in the audience in case we need to get in the weeds. And I also probably would have saved poor Becky Fertig hours of exasperation in all of this.

We have a statewide case management system.

This is a -- when you go into our system, an advocate would look at this. And they have this choice of menu options that we do. And basically, I'm going to talk about three sets of outcomes.

We have the substantive outcomes that we deal with for our grantors -- to meet our mission, to meet our strategic planning. So LSC outcomes and our grantor outcomes, those are important to us.

And I'll talk about economic outcomes. Those are relatively new. We use those -- we thought at first we would use those to convince legislators and others that we're a $20 million program but we're bringing in $80 million worth of benefits to our client population. And by and large, that is the case.

And then the third set of outcomes, we have geographic outcomes. And I'll show you some maps and I'll try to run through this for you.

The first set of outcomes, these are what our advocates put in. These are screenshots of our case management system. Again, our case management system, statewide. It's remote access. Our managing attorneys, our practice group managers, have access to each individual case file.

Our advocacy director has access to these. She can check on the quality of the work. She can check on the timeliness of the work being done. We can run reports on files that haven't been opened in a while. And we can check on the quality of the work through the case management system.

The outcomes here are put in by the advocates at case closing. So here's a very simple one for the mortgage foreclosure project. But we start to drill down here because we get funded by the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation and the North Carolina Housing Finance Agency, and they want different sets of data, and we need to know some of this information.

So again, these are just screenshots with different levels of detail. Here's one for family law. Again, these are easily checked off. But these are time-consuming for advocates, so staying on them, getting them to close the cases properly, that's a management issue. So if it's not done properly, it's really our fault.

Again, different levels of data here.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: George, what do you do to share the results of this internally with people? It seemed to me that one of the ways to encourage compliance with this would be for your staff to see the use to which this is put and to see how impressive the numbers are.

MR. HAUSEN: Yes. Our advocacy director, we share these with our regional manager. We have meetings about these. Again, the reports are run, and she cracks the whip when she needs to to get people to do this. And we look at these -- again, these are important for our grantors. We want to make sure that we're producing what we said we would produce, so we monitor these pretty regularly.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: I guess I'm asking, though, does your staff see the value of the information, or is it just a hassle for them?

MR. HAUSEN: I don't think it's just a hassle. I think they do see the value, perhaps not this so much. And I think we could probably do a better job of refining this. I think we have -- there's a large set of data that they get to select from.

Sometimes it's overwhelming, and sometimes they can check off five things. And I sometimes wonder if they see the value of that because there's so many to select. But it is valuable because we have -- in Legal Aid of North Carolina, we have in excess of 80 funding sources, so we have to meet different needs. And each one has to be tailored.

The beauty of this system is that Gray Wilson, our IT person, can change a lot of the independent variables here and we can change these in-house to meet the needs of whatever funding source we're trying to comply with.

I think, though, the economic outcomes that I'll get into a little bit here, they have a little more cachet. And I'll talk about how we use those internally. I think that we start to see that in the next screen.

These are the consumer outcomes from 2010. And you'll see here, these were divided up by region and office. When you see the economic outcomes here, it does create a little competition. And the reason we wanted to do this at first, we have 20 offices and we do have somewhat of a philosophy of soft boundaries.

So it's not exactly fair to say that one office is doing more housing than another or bringing in more income than another because sometimes they're sharing -- they're co-counseling. They're sharing resources. But it does give you an idea of where the impact is in terms of our benefits.

Now, one of the things we used this for in-house was that a couple of years ago, we felt that with the downturn in the economy, we were running about 36 percent of our cases in family law. And our unemployment, our income maintenance programs, needed to be boosted.

And so I don't have the slide here. It was in the previous set that we had. We wanted to show what our benefits outcomes were. And just telling people, well, you needed to change your intake analysis, your case acceptance guidelines, we wanted to see -- we wanted our offices to do more of that work.

And we really got traction when we showed them the numbers they were bringing in. Our program brings in about $12 million worth of benefits, all the way from Social Security to food stamps, the range, and showing that what the offices individually were doing really helped them reduce the custody, some of the custody work that we were doing, and focus on the income maintenance stuff at a critical time in our clients' juncture there during the recession.

So using this internally was good. We've used this legislatively, the total outcomes. You go to the state legislature. You want to show them how many federal benefits you're bringing in.

And I would like to just take issue with Mr. Maddox's statement about the VA. And I had this discussion with Dean Minow. It would be great if they would create ombudsmen inside the VA to help people get the benefits.

The fact is, though, that from our point of view, they're shrouded in obscurity. The programs are set up to keep people from applying and to keep people from getting the benefits. Not only do we see that at the VA, but we see that in public benefits programs here in the state.

They change eligibility. I'm pretty sure they have an algorithm that can say, you know, if we don't give them this information, there'll be so many clients who don't apply for food stamps. It's a fact that 50 percent of the people who are eligible for food stamps do not even apply for them.

And some of that is because they don't know about it. Some of it is they don't want to stand the indignity of standing in line for them, either. But a large number of our clients don't even know about them.

MR. MADDOX: Can I just ask you, do you think that's an access to justice issue, though? I mean, that's a welfare benefits issue. Is that a function of the judicial system not providing access to justice because, you know, somebody doesn't have a lawyer and can't negotiate the foreclosure process? I see those as two very different things.

MR. HAUSEN: We don't get involved in the application process outside of our outreach efforts, telling people, go after this. When they are rejected, we're a law firm. We don't want to get in the business of being the public benefits advocate.

MR. MADDOX: Right.

MR. HAUSEN: We want to be in the business of securing those rights when they're denied, and that's what we try to focus on.

But part of our outreach has to be -- you know, holistically, when we're talking to a group of domestic violence victims or somebody else, a group about housing, we want them to know what other benefits they're eligible for.

MR. MADDOX: Right. And I appreciate that. Can you just anecdotally give us any sense for how much time legal aid lawyers or paralegals or staff generally have to do that sort of outreach, which doesn't really involve dealing with legal issues; it's just sort of like looking at a case holistically and saying, well, you've got other issues, too; let's talk about those?

I mean, is it much? Is it a little? It seems like it might not be much. And I wonder if I'm just sort of chasing windmills here.

MR. HAUSEN: I think it's contained in the other outreach we do, so I don't see it an extra. There may be some marginal time that we put into that, but I think it's contained in a lot of the other stuff that we do for all of the substantive law areas that --

MR. MADDOX: For instance, in our fact book, we have this category of cases that are closed that don't really involve much action, counseling and advice only. Does outreach fall into that category, or is that something else?

MR. HAUSEN: No.

MR. MADDOX: Is that something more than outreach?

MR. HAUSEN: Our advice -- our A and B stuff -- you look at our numbers, our A and B stuff averages -- it's not just a phone call. Those cases average about two and a half hours. So they're doing a lot more than just telling people where the best pizza place is or the dry cleaner. They're giving specific legal advice to specific legal questions, and we have to code it as A or B.

But there's a lot of work going on in there. There's two to three hours of work going into those cases. Sometimes it's just a phone call with advice, but by and large, there's real lawyering going on.

MR. MADDOX: And is it your sense in that counsel and advice category that if we said, well, you know, you really are entitled to this benefit from that agency, here's their number -- that if we did that, then when they call that number they're going to get the runaround, or they're going to be put into that algorithm that says, how do we not give these people benefits?

MR. HAUSEN: Right.

MR. MADDOX: Is that kind of ultimately your thinking of what happens there?

MR. HAUSEN: I think that happens, yes. Yes. But I just wanted to address the fact that I don't think an ombudsman there -- I'd love to see that. That would significantly lower the rejection rate, I believe, and we would save -- we would save a lot of time.

MR. MADDOX: Right.

MR. HAUSEN: All right. So we have the economic outcomes here. And so the two reasons were, we wanted to induce the staff to do this work internally; and we think once we get this right -- and we've been working with other providers on how do you put a financial tag on a housing outcome. If you get somebody public housing, how do you -- what do you tag that with?

And so we've come up with a schedule of things that, all right, if you get somebody into public housing, we're going to -- the economic value of this is they're going to be in there for five years, on the average, and so this is what we're going to peg it as.

And so this just gives us, again, an idea of what the program is worth so that we can go to funders and say, if you fund us, here's the return on your investment. So that's what this is for.

And then the last set of outcomes is geography. We want to know where we're making an impact. And you can look -- you can do outreach all day. You can decide where your -- what churches, what community organizations you're going to to reach the outcome.

But if you've got a map that shows census-tracked poverty levels, and you plot -- you geocode the cases that you have, and we can geocode every one of our cases, you can get a good sense of where you're penetrating.

We do annual work plans in each of our offices, and we have a staff that -- staff, I say staff, it's David, essentially -- who puts these maps together in every locale, all 100 counties. He can break these down into municipalities, into counties.

And we run these maps, and the local managers can sit with their staff and say, look. Look at this area here. Fifty percent or more of the population is in excess of 185 percent or below poverty, and we've generated three or four cases. What do we need to do in this area to make sure we're penetrating the poverty population? You get a great visual here.

We can do this not only by census track and poverty population, but I think some of our maps -- and I don't think we included one here -- we can do a map that has minority population. We do African American. Where do they live? How are we penetrating that community? Native American, we can penetrate that community. How many cases are we generating in those neighborhoods, in those communities?

And again, this can be used externally as well. The common misperception about our program is that, by and large, we're a poverty program and we serve mostly minorities. Well, in Legal Aid of North Carolina, 52 percent of our clients are white. Only 40 percent are minority, or African American.

And we can show that on the map, that we're penetrating every community, that we're representative of the entire state of North Carolina. And we deserve to be funded for that, whatever your ideology might be. We reach every demographic group, every cohort, and we're a program that serves everyone.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Thank you. Janet, I have a question. Do you know how many programs -- or maybe you know, Mr. Hausen -- similarly track their data?

MS. LABELLA: There is, again, a growing number of programs that do that. And one thing that Legal Services Corporation Office of Program Performance has been doing for about a year or so is when we go on program quality visits, we do some rudimentary mapping as well that we then share with the program.

We do it by offices. We do it by counties so that we can also get an idea, before we go in for a program quality visit, as to what is the distribution of the case activity. And it's something that has been very beneficial to programs when we have shared that with them.

And then we've also provided some technical assistance with those programs when they've asked, well, how can they do that? So it is something that, I think, programs are really appreciating because it demonstrates, as George said, very visually and graphically, what is the reach? You know, is there a community of a particular minority or other access issues that you haven't reached?

And then you know, we need to plan an outreach activity exactly right here. And so it is very beneficial for planning purposes, and also to assess the relative services of different offices and counties.

You know, one thing that I think has been noted over the years is where you have a physical presence, you have most of your cases closed still around that physical office.

MR. HAUSEN: That's right.

MS. LABELLA: And so this demonstrates again, particularly in rural areas, are there any areas that are underserved? So more and more programs are using it as a tool to plan strategically.

MR. HAUSEN: The software to do the mapping, I think, David, about $800. And David will put you to sleep on American community survey discussions. If you want to have census data, talk with David. You know, he knows it backwards and forwards.

And there's national trainings every year on the stuff. And really drilling down into this is helpful for us to know. It's a great visual.

MS. MULLER: I just wanted to point out to the group again that the case management system we have has also integrated in it GIS mapping.

MR. LEVI: In Utah, what was the response of your staff? Were they part of this?

MR. MITTELSTADT: They were part of this.

MR. LEVI: And they bought into the notion? And did they find the evaluative aspect to it to be reasonably fair and accurate in predicting things?

MR. MITTELSTADT: For the most part. I won't claim 100 percent joy about the system. But for the most part, the staff appreciate a little more objectivity in the evaluations, and want to see where they maybe can find some ways to do a better job. They're open to that sort of feedback. So it's been mostly positive.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: With what level of specificity can staff see information about other people? What you showed had names of people.

MR. MITTELSTADT: Yes.

PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Do you give that to them?

MR. MITTELSTADT: Yes. Yes, that's been a debate about how we wanted to do that. And right now, what the staff see are exactly what you are seeing. So we group folks by the type of --

MR. LEVI: Are those names the real names, or is this --

MR. MITTELSTADT: The names are the real names.

MR. LEVI: Under the Open Meetings Act or something?

MR. MITTELSTADT: All part of the same staff, all trying to do the same good work. And, you know, there are a lot of variables. So folks that are in different offices but doing similar work -- for example, our Provo office covers the vast central portion of the state, so every one of their cases, nearly every one of their cases, involves a great deal of travel. And so they're going to necessarily see different numbers based on that.

And so the staff have to understand, too, that again, it's not a point of trying to judge people or come to conclusions based on this. It's just a way for us to see what's going on out there, for folks to look at their own numbers and to track that, and to have good conversations with their supervisors on --

MR. LEVI: Well, as an employment lawyer, should you have a staff member who became ill or something for a period of time so their numbers look funny, does that create an issue of privacy that you have to explain?

MR. MITTELSTADT: In terms of talking about what the differences are?

MR. LEVI: And why this one fell off and that one didn't, and -- I don't know.

MR. MITTELSTADT: Not a bridge we've crossed.

MR. LEVI: I'm a little nervous about --

MR. KORRELL: For what it's worth, John, I think it's really good because it motivates people.

MR. LEVI: Well, it does motivate.

MR. KORRELL: You can just be careful of what you say. I think it's great for people to look and see, jeez, I don't want to be that guy.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: They're about to put us on mapping.

MR. MITTELSTADT: It's been an interesting debate, and we've had some folks who have said what they'd really prefer to see is just their own numbers to be able to track those and set goals based on their own numbers, or --

MR. LEVI: Well, I just meant the others could have an A, B, C, or whatever rather than a name. But that's --

MR. MITTELSTADT: Yes. That's been an

interesting discussion in the program, and we'll see where that takes us.

MR. LEVI: And that might be motivation enough. I don't know. I'll leave it to Harry.

(Laughter.)

PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: I'd like to know, when you were thinking of setting up the system, what input or notice that your attorneys and staff got. And what do you have for continuing conversation and input about the system?

MR. MITTELSTADT: Yes. And I don't know that's an important aspect of this. Any time you're doing a performance evaluation system, having staff buy in, you can do probably more harm than good if you don't involve people in the planning of this.

And so, based on very early versions of this, very different versions of this, they had a chance to give input. And again, this is information that, really, they've had. The information is there in the case management system. You can generate reports like this.

We've had sort of very complicated reports you could pull up for many years. People tend not to look at them because they're very complicated and hard to decipher. And so this is an attempt to bring that information out in an easier-to-understand way. But it's something that people are used to looking at and used to tracking.

MR. LEVI: Well, one other thing. When you do take this on the road, and this is a public forum, if those are really the people's names as opposed to masking the names, I would suggest you mask the names in the future, or however you're going to do it if there are performance issues lurking there. That's just another suggestion that Harry may not agree with.

(Laughter.)

MR. LEVI: But I'd be careful about that.

MR. KORRELL: No charge for that advice.

MR. MITTELSTADT: We'll take that under advisement, Chairman. Thank you.

MR. LEVI: In any event, this was very, very interesting. But it's not my meeting. But it's about to be, and that's what I want to warn you.

MS. LABELLA: All right. I do want to thank the panel very much for coming.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Thank you, panel. That was great. I'm not a techie. I found that really, really helpful.

MR. LEVI: Will we see you this evening? I hope so.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: They got a better dinner offer.

MR. LEVI: So five minutes --

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: No, no. No, no. Public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: Other business?

(No response.)

M O T I O N

FATHER PIUS: Move to adjourn.

MR. MADDOX: Second.

CHAIRMAN MIKVA: All in favor?

(A chorus of ayes.)

(Whereupon, at 4:27 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.)

* * * * *