

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OPEN SESSION

Saturday, January 24, 2015

9:36 a.m.

Westin Colonnade Hotel  
180 Aragon Avenue  
Coral Gables, Florida 33134

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

John G. Levi, Chairman  
Martha L. Minow, Vice Chair  
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

## STAFF AND PUBLIC PRESENT:

Lynn Jennings, Vice President for Grants Management  
Wendy Rhein, Chief Development Officer  
Rebecca Fertig Cohen, Special Assistant to the  
President

Ronald S. Flagg, Vice President for Legal Affairs,  
General Counsel, and Corporate Secretary

David L. Richardson, Comptroller and Treasurer,  
Office of Financial and Administrative Services

Carl Rauscher, Director of Media Relations, 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

Daniel O'Rourke, Assistant Inspector General for  
Investigations, Office of the Inspector General

David Maddox, Assistant Inspector General for  
Management and Evaluation, Office of the  
Inspector General

Lora M. Rath, Deputy Director, Office of Compliance  
and Enforcement

Janet LaBella, Director, Office of Program  
Performance

Jane Ribadeneyra, Program Analyst, Office of Program  
Performance

Allan J. Tanenbaum, Non-Director Member, Finance  
Committee

Rafael E. Rodriguez Rivera, Community Law Office,  
Inc., Puerto Rico

Charles Hey-Maestre, Executive Director, Puerto Rico  
Legal Services, Inc.

Barbara Prager, Executive Director, Coast to Coast  
Legal Aid of South Florida

Kris Knab, Executive Director, Legal Services of  
North Florida

Joan Boles, Deputy Director, Bay Area Legal Services

Vanessa Henry, Board Member, Three Rivers Legal  
Services, Inc.

Melissa Pershing, Florida Bar Foundation

Don Saunders, National Legal Aid and Defenders  
Association (NLADA)

Robin C. Murphy, National Legal Aid and Defender  
Association (NLADA)

## C O N T E N T S

OPEN SESSION	PAGE
1. Pledge of Allegiance	5
2. Approval of agenda	5
3. Approval of minutes of the Board's Open Session meeting of October 7, 2014	5
4. Approval of minutes of the Board's Open Session telephonic meeting of November 17, 2014	5
5. Consider and act on nominations for the Chairman of the Board of Directors	6
6. Consider and act on nominations for the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors	7
7. Chairman's Report	9
8. Members' Reports	17
9. President's Report	43
10. Inspector General's Report	70
11. Consider and act on resolution recognizing Sharon L. Browne for her service on the Legal Services Corporation Board of Directors	77
12. Consider and act on the report of the Finance Committee	77
13. Consider and act on the report of the Audit Committee	78
14. Consider and act on the report of the Operations and Regulations Committee	80
15. Consider and act on the report of the Governance and Performance Review Committee	80
OPEN SESSION (Cont'd)	PAGE

16. Consider and act on the report of the Institutional Advancement Committee	84
17. Consider and act on the report of the Delivery of Legal Services Committee	86
18. Report on implementation of recommendations of the Pro Bono Task Force and the Pro Bono Innovation Fund	93
19. Public comment	94
20. Consider and act on other business	94
21. Consider and act on whether to authorize a Closed Session of the Board to address items listed below	94

## CLOSED SESSION

PAGE

22. Approval of minutes of the Board's Closed Session meeting of October 7, 2014	
23. Management briefing	
24. Inspector General briefing	
25. Consider and act on General Counsel's report on potential and pending litigation involving LSC	
26. Consider and act on list of prospective funders	
27. Consider and act on prospective members of Leaders Council	
28. Consider and act on motion to adjourn meeting	

Motions: 5, 5, 6, 7, 69, 77, 80, 81, 83, 85, 94

## 1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 (9:36 a.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Good morning, everybody. It's  
4 my privilege to call to order the duly noticed meeting  
5 of the Legal Services Corporation, our first meeting of  
6 015, and ask that we rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.  
7 You want to lead it?

8 (Pledge of Allegiance.)

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

11 M O T I O N

12 DEAN MINOW: So moved.

13 MS. REISKIN: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

15 (A chorus of ayes.)

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

18 M O T I O N

19 MS. REISKIN: So moved.

20 DEAN MINOW: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

22 (A chorus of ayes.)

1           CHAIRMAN LEVI: We're now on number 5, which  
2 is consider and act on nominations for the Chairman of  
3 the Board of Directors.

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

6           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes.

7                           M O T I O N

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

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

20           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

21                   Second?

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

1 enthusiastically second.

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other nominations?

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

5 (A chorus of ayes.)

6 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Abstention?

9 (No response.)

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

12 M O T I O N

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

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: That's all right.

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

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

20 MS. REISKIN: This leadership team has been  
21 amazing, and it's worked. And if it ain't broke, don't  
22 fix it. And so, again, I think that you guys together

1 have been an amazing team. We're just so lucky to have  
2 this. And the leadership has reflected in all of the  
3 success that we've had as an organization.

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

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

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any other nominations?

17 (No response.)

18 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

19 (A chorus of ayes.)

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Abstentions?

1 (No response.)

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

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

15 Each of you should take a moment, I think,  
16 really and be proud of your own efforts, you can think.

17 Because when we've asked you to help, you have. And  
18 you've helped beyond measure, and you've helped one  
19 another.

20 I think you all know your own individual  
21 contributions to the operations of various Committees.

22 You can actually see` the fruits of your efforts. We

1 have a few more years to go in our tenure, and we're  
2 determined to make them count.

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

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

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

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

17 I think back to where we were when we joined  
18 the Board, an important organization that had some  
19 challenges at that time is now much stronger, even  
20 though there are, in many ways, more serious challenges  
21 in the world. And I'm just honored to have the chance  
22 to continue to serve.

1           CHAIRMAN LEVI: I just want to then go right  
2 into the Chairman's report and say that, of course,  
3 we're missing one of our Board members. We're going to  
4 have a resolution saluting her. But I would be remiss  
5 if I didn't, as a really first principle here,  
6 recognize the contribution of Sharon Browne.

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

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

19           But I want to start with that and also then  
20 say to thank the programs yesterday, the programs that  
21 came from the Virgin Islands, from Puerto Rico, from  
22 Florida. The presenters to the Delivery of Legal

1 Services panel, those folks covered great distances,  
2 and also put a lot of thought into what they wanted to  
3 tell us.

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

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

14 They're not in the room -- Becky is. Becky,  
15 welcome back. I don't know how we managed without you.

16 Somehow, we did. Bernie is out in the hall. These  
17 meetings move so seamlessly now, you can only imagine  
18 what they were like when we started. But we've gotten  
19 used to this. It's a high bar.

20 Marcos, Carl, Carol's not here, Jim, the IG  
21 staff, you all come to these meetings and you put up  
22 with us, too. We're grateful for your work. The TIG

1 staff. Janet's still here. Wendy Rhein is here, Wendy  
2 and Janet I see. Did I miss anybody? Lynn. Lora, and  
3 Ron. In any event, all of you. David.

4 DEAN MINOW: All the OIG staff.

5 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Jeff is sitting back there.  
6 David. I saw David at the TIG conference. Laurie. We  
7 are really very grateful to all of you. And I know  
8 that the hours you put in are certainly long and often  
9 with great pressure, and we appreciate what you're  
10 doing.

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

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

22 So next year I'm thinking -- when I asked you

1 all for suggestions, Charles made them. And we looked  
2 into them, and it looked like they all worked. And so  
3 I would suggest that we should go to South Carolina,  
4 where we haven't been for years and years and years, a  
5 year from now; and then to Albuquerque, New Mexico,  
6 Gloria's home state, where we haven't been for a long  
7 time; and then to Vermont.

8 Vermont, I think the LSC Board has never been.

9 That is also an opportunity -- and again, at the TIG  
10 conference we heard folks from Ontario give very  
11 compelling presentations about what they're doing to  
12 reach rural populations.

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

18 I should say it's our 40th year, but this was  
19 the 15th year of TIG. And the 15th year conference was  
20 300 people. The energy in that conference was -- and  
21 maybe Gloria and Charles will say something in the  
22 members' reports -- but you could just feel it. And

1 I'm sure next year will be even larger.

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

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

16           So it seems to me we now have the benefit of  
17 much greater understanding. We have a President that's  
18 terrific. I know I burdened everybody with the 40th.  
19 But I think that we ought to, on our radar, understand  
20 that we do have a strategic planning process that we, I  
21 believe, are responsible as a part of our service to  
22 fulfill and to put together one that is helpful to

1 those that follow us and guide us through the end of  
2 our tenure.

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

7           DEAN MINOW: Ernie Banks passed away.

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

11          MR. SCHANZ: Mine, too.

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

14          DEAN MINOW: Absolutely.

15          CHAIRMAN LEVI: Absolutely. So now Jim is the  
16 hero of our 60s, and he is really the hero of our 60s.

17          And let me tell that Jim won't tell this about him  
18 because he sent this little note to the Management --  
19 he didn't send it to the Board -- to say he'd had a  
20 little bit of a mishap.

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

22          And if you can see, the medical profession really did

1 a fantastic job under his eye. But Jim is here with  
2 us, having had a fall, and he has really had a  
3 remarkable recovery because that guy is a go-getter,  
4 too. And he keeps himself in shape, and that has paid  
5 tremendous benefits.

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

10 (Applause)

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: And that's my report.

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

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

19 I also wanted to report on -- you guys had  
20 authorized me to go on a program quality visit to  
21 understand, really in detail, how they work so that I  
22 can help work with the staff to help figure out, how do

1 we get clients involved?

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

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

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

18 But the program really liked the idea of  
19 having client involvement. And I confirmed today that  
20 they didn't just say that to me, that they've actually  
21 said that to some other people. Because I was a little  
22 worried.

1           And the LSC staff were fantastic. We did a  
2   debrief, and they came up with some really good things  
3   going forward of what kind of training people might  
4   need, what kind of skill sets we want to look for, and  
5   then how to go about it.

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

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

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

22           Well, in this day and age, that's how it is.

1 There's no professional board any more that doesn't  
2 have lay people. There are lay people that evaluate  
3 hospitals. On every medical board, there's doctors and  
4 there's lay people. On any professional board, that's  
5 how it is now, and that's how all reviews are done.

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

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

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I certainly wonder that, too.

1 I'm sure we all did.

2 Father Pius?

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

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

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

22 I don't think that's a universal view, but I

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

17 I hope that the rest of the legal services  
18 community can see what can happen when we look at the  
19 Congress as collaborators in this work and not as  
20 enemies who want to destroy the poor. And so I hope  
21 that this is a sign of great continuing work that will  
22 go on. So that's the first part.

1           The second thing that I want to say is one of  
2 the things that sort of disappoints me, just personally  
3 -- and I live far away so I don't really get to be  
4 involved nearly as much as I would like with some of  
5 our grantees. And so when I come to these meetings,  
6 it's great to meet some people.

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

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

21           If you want to just very briefly, just in a  
22 minute or so, just talk about your own involvement with

1 LSC and what brought you to LSC and the passion you  
2 have for that issue with the housing issues that you  
3 found. There's a button on your microphone to turn it  
4 on.

5 MS. HENRY: Good morning to the Board. I am  
6 from Gainesville, Florida. I came to know about Three  
7 Rivers and their wonderful services for a complex with  
8 171 families living in bad, poor conditions -- ceilings  
9 caving in, rats, roaches you name it, it was there,  
10 sitting on wet land.

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

18 Right now I'm dealing with another complex  
19 that has severe mold issues. Families are being  
20 displaced. They've moved out of their homes into  
21 hotels, to come back and in two months the mold has  
22 returned. They've torn out structures to no avail. So

1 we've contacted city mayors and HUD to come out and  
2 personally inspect these units, what they're paying  
3 for.

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

11           So I thank you for being here and inviting me.

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

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

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

1 MS. HENRY: For four months.

2 FATHER PIUS: So it's still very new.

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

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

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

13 (Laughter.)

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

18 FATHER PIUS: And I think Vanessa is a prime  
19 example of what informed and passionate clients can do  
20 to help legal services meet its goal for helping the  
21 poor. So Vanessa, thank you for your service, thank  
22 you for your passion, and thank you for your leadership

1 up in the Three Rivers area.

2 MS. HENRY: Thank you. Yes, sir.

3 (Applause)

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Charles?

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

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

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

20 Another observation, general observation, that  
21 I had is, as mentioned, there were 300 people there.  
22 There were multiple sessions going on. There's some

1 social interaction and very positive relationships in  
2 that crowd which basically is fostering a culture of  
3 innovation that we're doing here, sponsored.

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

14 A couple that I thought were particularly  
15 notable there, I went to a number of sessions on data.

16 We think of technology on the one hand as in the  
17 direct process of delivery of services. But another  
18 aspect of the technology that is being fostered with  
19 our TIG grants is management of the nonprofit, of the  
20 grantee, using the technology to gather data.

21 So one of the things that was talked about  
22 there was the idea of a data strategy, of being again

1 very intentional about your data, thinking, what data  
2 do we need? Are we getting the data? If we're not  
3 getting the data, then what technological innovations  
4 and procedural innovations do we need to get the data  
5 that is needed?

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

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

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

22 So that was important and highlights the idea

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

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

15           So that's a future opportunity, and I invited  
16 them to go ahead and comment on our activities and, if  
17 we have regulatory matters or what have you, to be  
18 aware of that. But also, it highlighted the changes,  
19 and I'm not saying that we haven't changed, but I think  
20 that there has been a change over the decades of the  
21 existence of this organization in the way that it works  
22 with the idea of self-represented litigants.

1           I think that in the distant past there was  
2 this idea that that's not what we do. We in fact  
3 replace the idea of self-represented litigants. And  
4 now it's clear, as we've changed over, to assist and  
5 facilitate that as an aspect of delivering service to  
6 everyone, as pointed out in our recent report.

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

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

19           The final thing I would say is that it was the  
20 15th anniversary, the 15th TIG conference, and it's a  
21 maturing entity. It's a maturing program. And I would  
22 say that one thing I would maybe think considering

1 improving on this is we do evaluations, and they were  
2 very committed to evaluation, and I thought that was  
3 great.

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

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

18           So if you have a hundred dependent variables,  
19 basically, in your evaluations of the TIG projects,  
20 it's harder to say which of them has -- if you have  
21 five dependent variables, ten dependent variables, it's  
22 easier to tell which ones produce the biggest bang for

1 the buck and therefore are targets for replication.

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

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

9           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

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

12           PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: First, when you  
13 were giving appreciation statements, I do want to thank  
14 the non-Board members who have carried us through the  
15 work we've been doing. I see Allan Tanenbaum is here.

16           And I'm grateful in a personal way to him and Herb  
17 Garten and Frank Strickland for what they do. But  
18 also, they are wonderful walking companions in the  
19 morning.

20           (Laughter.)

21           CHAIRMAN LEVI: And I was remiss in not  
22 recognizing them. Allan has been a real trooper. And

1 let's not forget Paul Snyder and Dave Hoffman.

2 PROFESSOR VALENCIA-WEBER: That's what I'm  
3 going to next.

4 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Oh, okay.

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

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

21 I went to sessions on what you might call  
22 special problems -- reaching special populations; that

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

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

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

20           Then, overall, as I mentioned yesterday, it  
21 was a very interactive, synergistic effect. And I was  
22 amazed by the degree of collegiality among people, some

1 of whom were lawyers, some who were not lawyers, and  
2 then also people who are outside of LSC in any formal  
3 affiliation but are the people working in technology  
4 development who see that legal services place at their  
5 particular approach, new takes, could be of use.

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

15 Then the other thing I did since our last  
16 meeting was I went to the western states meeting of  
17 executive directors and staff that took place in  
18 Albuquerque. And that was right after the innovation  
19 grants had been announced, so it was a very interesting  
20 set of conversations, to hear about that as well as how  
21 people, particularly in the western states where you  
22 have large geographical territory and small populations

1 -- and unlike many of our grantees, many of these  
2 people are working where there is no likely to be  
3 private donor, foundation, and really scraping hard to  
4 get what little they have in the way of either state  
5 funds or other means to find funding. And that was  
6 quite useful for me to hear that, and I learned a lot  
7 of things about how our grantees, under these demanding  
8 conditions, perform.

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

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

22           They are now into their second month, and we

1 want to see what happens, as well as other options  
2 being considered. They mentioned at least five other  
3 states where they see these being considered, so we'll  
4 have more later on to hear.

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

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

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

18           MR. MADDUX: Charles?

19           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes, Vic?

20           MR. MADDUX: I just want to quickly follow up  
21 on Father Pius's comments regarding pro bono. I  
22 couldn't help noting that one of our former Board

1 members, Tom Fuentes, must be smiling at us now because  
2 he was an ardent Republican.

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

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

12       So I appreciate everything Father Pius said in that  
13 regard.

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

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

20           The other thing I wanted to follow up on is --  
21 I meant to mention this in the meeting this morning,  
22 but I couldn't find it -- the ABA, Steve Grumm sends

1 around the Access to Justice legal blog every so often,  
2 and I always read it.

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

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

18           So the memo from the Standing Committee on the  
19 Delivery of Legal Services dated December 20, 2014 to  
20 the ABA Commission on the Future of Legal Services  
21 says, "The popular press and to some extent the legal  
22 profession tend to advance the notion that legal

1 services for those of moderate incomes are inaccessible  
2 because they are unaffordable." So they're setting up  
3 the proposition that essentially this is a myth.

4 Then the premise is, "There is no question  
5 that legal fees for complicated matters that are billed  
6 by the hour can be out of reach for many. However, the  
7 average annual household income in the U.S. is about  
8 \$50,000. And for a vast proportion of personal legal  
9 services, fees are reasonable and affordable for those  
10 of moderate and modest means." Then the memo proceeds  
11 with its analysis and citations and whatnot.

12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: It's not this Committee.

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

17 CHAIRMAN LEVI: There must be.

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

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: We should send it to Mary and  
22 to William.

1 MR. MADDOX: Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

19 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Sorry about the storm in the  
20 East and the weather and all. I'm thinking about  
21 weather to rearrange our meetings so that the Board  
22 meetings are not necessarily on the last day in the

1 morning, maybe the day before, and we reorganize some  
2 things so that we aren't in this continual --

3 DEAN MINOW: Just reorganize the weather.

4 (Laughter.)

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

10 Jim?

11 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Thank you, John. I'd like  
12 to give a brief report on six subjects. First, I'll  
13 give you an overview of our basic field grants for  
14 2015. Second, I'll provide a few additional details  
15 about the Technology Initiative Grant conference, if my  
16 computer catches up with me.

17 MR. MADDOX: Maybe you need a grant.

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

20 Next, I'm going to explain some changes we're  
21 making in the application process for Pro Bono  
22 Innovation Fund grants for 2015. I'll give you a brief

1 overview, an update, on what we're doing to improve our  
2 internal business processes.

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

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

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

20 The general practice is that we get one  
21 application per service area, and it's the applicant  
22 that is currently holding the grant. This has been the

1 case for some time. The multi-applicant competition  
2 this past year was for the service area in Southeastern  
3 Michigan that includes Detroit.

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

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

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

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

1 We added one in American Samoa but we lost one in New  
2 Jersey.

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

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

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

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

12 MS. REISKIN: And has that happened before?

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

20 This is reflected in our increased use of  
21 special grant conditions and short-term funding. Even  
22 if we decide to award a grant, there are other

1 mechanisms that we can use if we have any concerns  
2 about the performance of the grantee. Those include  
3 grant terms shorter than three years and the imposition  
4 of special grant conditions. I'll give you some  
5 numbers on how those tools were used this year.

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

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

22 In this past grant cycle, we have 27 grantees

1 that had special grant conditions attached to their  
2 grants. Of those 27 grantees, 19 of the special grant  
3 conditions were imposed for fiscal reasons. We had 13  
4 grantees that were funded for less than three years,  
5 and six of those got short-term funding for fiscal  
6 reasons.

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

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

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

22 I think that's a red flag. I think if an

1 organization is not able to timely issue audited  
2 financial reports, there's something up there. The  
3 quality of the legal services that the grantee provides  
4 are good, but there's been an issue there, I think  
5 related to turnover in the administrative functions of  
6 the grantee.

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

16           Yes, Laurie?

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

19           PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Laurie's question was  
20 whether this information is public, whether it's posted  
21 anywhere. Who our grantees are is definitely -- I'd  
22 have to defer to Janet on that, whether the length of

1 the grant term -- it's certainly public -- if we got  
2 Freedom of Information Act request, the public is  
3 entitled to know that. I'm not certain whether there's  
4 any proactive disclosure of that, and defer to Janet.

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

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

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

21 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Well, I always make my  
22 PowerPoint presentations available to the National

1 Legal Aid and Defender Association, which circulates  
2 them. So this information that you're seeing right  
3 here will be out on the street on Monday. Is that  
4 right, Don Saunders?

5 MR. SAUNDERS: Or shortly thereafter.

6 (Laughter.)

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

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

19 The blue bar is fiscal oversight, special  
20 grant conditions related to fiscal concerns. And as  
21 you can see, there's been a significant increase in the  
22 number of special grant conditions relating to fiscal

1 matters.

2 MS. REISKIN: Do you attribute that to you  
3 guys are doing a better job of monitoring, documenting,  
4 and getting on it, or more problems?

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

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

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

14 I'd like to move on to a few facts, some of  
15 which you've heard before, about our Technology  
16 Initiative Grant program. Our appropriation for  
17 Technology Initiative Grants for the current fiscal  
18 year was increased by Congress by 16 percent. It went  
19 from \$3.45 million in FY 2014 to \$4 million in fiscal  
20 2015. That's an all-time high. And I think that  
21 reflects a vote of confidence by the Congress in the  
22 work that we've been doing in technology.

1           I want to give you a particular example of a  
2 situation where we publicized a Technology Initiative  
3 Grant to very good effect. We made an award in Maine  
4 to Pine Tree Legal Assistance to add to their  
5 highly-regarded, award-winning website, Stateside  
6 Legal, that provides legal information for military  
7 families and veterans. They wanted to add a component  
8 dealing specifically with the legal problems of women  
9 veterans.

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

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

21           So Carol and Carl worked with Nan Heald in  
22 Portland on a press conference that was attended by and

1 participated in by Senator Angus King of Maine, a  
2 former two-term governor of Maine. And I went up there  
3 for it because I wanted to make a statement about how  
4 important this is.

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

10           They had television coverage from Maine Public  
11 Broadcasting, including both the public television  
12 station in Maine and the public radio affiliate in  
13 Maine. They had the local Fox affiliate, the  
14 television affiliate, cover it; the Portland newspaper.

15           Senator King's office put out several press releases  
16 about this.

17           It was very well-attended, very well-covered,  
18 and it was a topic that is of great interest to people  
19 and of great appeal: veterans, women veterans. They  
20 had clients there who had been served by Pine Tree  
21 Legal Assistance, veteran clients, who were able to  
22 talk to reporters one-on-one about their experiences

1 with Pine Tree.

2 I want to use this, and I had hoped to talk  
3 about this at the TIG conference if I'd been able to  
4 go, as an example of how we can highlight the good work  
5 we do in terms that are comprehensible to people. The  
6 icing on the cake was this.

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

12 He explained it as constituent service, and he  
13 encouraged all of them to do what he does, which is to  
14 have a link to [statesidelegal.org](http://statesidelegal.org) on his personal  
15 website for the Senate. And in the course of his  
16 letter, he mentioned a couple of times that all this  
17 was funded by Legal Services Corporation.

18 So I just think this is a great example of  
19 success in technology, innovation, and the legislative  
20 component all coming together to present a great  
21 picture about the work that our grantees do and what it  
22 is that the Legal Services Corporation funds.

1           I really appreciated it when Senator King said  
2 -- in the course of his remarks he pointed to me -- I  
3 don't think he could remember my name -- and he said,  
4 "And this guy came all the way from Washington for  
5 this."

6           (Laughter.)

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

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

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

1 attitude.

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

9           (Cell phone rings.)

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

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

15           (Laughter.)

16           PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Now, one thing we ask  
17 ourselves every year is, who isn't coming to the TIG  
18 conference who should be? There's a self-selection  
19 about the group that decides to go to the conference,  
20 and who out there isn't doing what they should in  
21 technology that might benefit from attending the  
22 conference?

1           So starting a few years ago, we began to offer  
2    scholarships to TIG. We would pay the attendance and  
3    the travel expenses for representatives of grantees  
4    that had never received a Technology Initiative Grant  
5    previously or had received only one long ago.

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

14           The fellowship covers the cost of attendance  
15   at the conference, and it also includes a mentor from  
16   another legal aid program, another LSC-funded legal aid  
17   program, and at least three webinars for the fellows.

18           So we've added an educational component and a  
19   coaching component beyond just mere attendance at the  
20   TIG conference. And we follow up to see what happens  
21   to those who attend, those who've attended in the past  
22   on scholarships, and we'll do this now with the

1 fellows, to see, are their programs now submitting  
2 applications for TIGs, and if they are, are they  
3 getting them? So we're really trying to branch out and  
4 expand the size of the community that's involved in the  
5 TIG program.

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

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

17           Do we do any outreach to court systems, court  
18 personnel, to expose them to the kinds of things we're  
19 doing? Because a lot of the feedback we get at some of  
20 these events are good reports from courts or our  
21 grantees or others who are working with the courts on  
22 technology programs that make the courts more

1 accessible, which can solve some of the burdens on the  
2 pro bono and legal services systems. Do we do anything  
3 with these TIG conferences to reach out to courts and  
4 show them the kinds of things that are possible?

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

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

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

19 Our solutions can work only if we get buy-in  
20 from the courts. We can come up with a great  
21 technology idea, but if the product that results, when  
22 someone completes the form, is not going to be accepted

1 or isn't transmissible to the court, we haven't  
2 accomplished anything. So they're very much involved  
3 in what we do.

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

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

10 As Lynn mentioned earlier, last year we had 79  
11 applications for our Pro Bono Innovation Fund grants  
12 and made 11 awards. Those aren't great odds. And we  
13 also saw that the total amount of funding requests far  
14 exceeded the money we had available to expend. We had  
15 \$2.5 million to give out in grants, and we got  
16 applications totaling \$15.3 million.

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

21 So we decided this year to see if we couldn't  
22 improve the efficiency of the process to impose less

1 burdens on those who aren't likely to succeed in their  
2 application and impose less work on the review team  
3 that we assemble.

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

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

15           We have the time to do that this year, which  
16 we didn't last, because we now have the program up and  
17 running and the letters of intent are due, as Lynn  
18 mentioned, at the end of February. We've also done  
19 some hiring to help staff this program. We hired a  
20 coordinator, who is working both on Pro Bono Innovation  
21 Fund grants and disaster grants, and we're going to be  
22 adding another program counsel in the Office of Program

1 Performance to assist with the Pro Bono Innovation  
2 Fund.

3           Next I want to report on a couple of things  
4 we're doing to improve LSC's internal business  
5 processes. We are implementing the recommendations  
6 that we got as a result of a business process review  
7 conducted by the consulting firm of Barker & Scott.

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

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

22           This is just critically important to what we

1 do in making grants and monitoring grants. We expect  
2 to complete selection of a vendor for a new grants  
3 management system at the middle of this year and to  
4 deploy the new system next year so that it's fully  
5 operational by April of 2016.

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

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

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

21 As you know, we also received a grant from the  
22 Margaret A. Cargill Foundation of \$1.2 million. We've

1 received \$800,000 of that grant already. The purpose  
2 of the grant is to develop a legal services response  
3 plan and delivery system following disasters in the  
4 Midwest, and to do it in coordination with other  
5 disaster relief providers such as FEMA, the Red Cross,  
6 the American Bar Association's Young Lawyer Division,  
7 et cetera.

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

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

21 If you're a victim of a disaster, of a flood  
22 or a tornado, and you lose all your identification, how

1 do you begin to go about the process of applying for  
2 assistance, filing insurance claims, et cetera? There  
3 are just many day-to-day issues with a legal component  
4 that come up immediately after a disaster that even  
5 people of means can imagine themselves being in and  
6 understanding why people who don't have means would  
7 need free legal assistance.

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

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

20           This sends a message about tone at the top.  
21 It sends a tone about institutional values. And I have  
22 a graph -- I'll just hold up my hard copy of it -- but

1 this graph charts the average response time to a  
2 Freedom of Information Act request over the past four  
3 years at LSC.

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

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

11 (Laughter.)

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

18 Last year we were rated within the top 10  
19 percent, and this year we're looking for a perfect  
20 record. They have a color-coded scale where dark green  
21 is the best. We're looking for all dark greens, and  
22 are optimistic that we're going to get that rating this

1 year.

2           We also did some things in the past year to  
3 ensure that we have systems in place to promote  
4 compliance long-term. We did training programs for all  
5 managers and staff. I issue a memo to everybody within  
6 the Corporation every February about the importance of  
7 compliance with the Freedom of Information Act.

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

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

21           That completes my report.

22           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you, Jim.

1 Questions?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Inspector General?

4 DEAN MINOW: I'm so sorry I have to leave and  
5 miss the meeting. Someone, maybe John, will do the  
6 report for the Governance Committee, and I'm sure we'll  
7 indicate how pleased we all were with the review of  
8 both the Inspector General and the President, and put  
9 to the vote the resolution that we have there. So  
10 everybody, safe travels.

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Well, should we just do that  
12 right now? You sort of gave half the report. Why  
13 don't we just do the other half and adopt the code  
14 while you're here.

15 M O T I O N

16 DEAN MINOW: If you don't mind, I'd be happy  
17 to move it. It's with changes, as were discussed.  
18 There were two sets of changes. One was inserting the  
19 word "any" in two places, and the other is making sure,  
20 per Harry's good catch, that the reporting of conduct  
21 is not to the manager but to the office so that it's  
22 not caught up in that hierarchical issue.

1           So here's the resolution, and with that  
2 amendment, all in favor?

3           (A chorus of ayes.)

4           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

5           (No response.)

6           DEAN MINOW: Any abstentions?

7           (No response.)

8           DEAN MINOW: Okay. It carries. Thank you.

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

12           Mr. Inspector General?

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

18           What I want to do, though, first off is  
19 advise. I hope you know this, but at the risk of  
20 making sure that you do, Jim doesn't make a lot of his  
21 decisions in a vacuum. A lot of his decisions are  
22 based on OIG work and OIG collaboration with

1 Management, and that was not clear. So at the risk of  
2 tooting my own horn, I will reference that and hope  
3 that Jim will endorse that.

4 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Second.

5 MR. SCHANZ: Thank you.

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

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

22 So the two MIMs that we issued during the past

1 reporting period had to do precisely with gaining more  
2 financial information before Management makes a  
3 decision on the grant competition. I'm very proud of  
4 that. That's why I'm bringing it up to you.

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

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

20           I also want to mention that I have a 2015 work  
21 plan. And I wasn't going to burden it with you (sic)  
22 by my performance standards; this is to be discussed

1 with the Board and presented to the Board. So we'll be  
2 sending it to you electronically unless you would like  
3 to have a copy of it now. We do have hard copies  
4 available of what the OIG plans to do in fiscal year  
5 2013 -- or 2015. I'm sorry, I'm going backwards in  
6 time.

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

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

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

1 and I've already implemented all of them.

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

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

11 MR. SCHANZ: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Yes?

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

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

22 FATHER PIUS: The other thing, and it's just a

1 suggestion -- in doing the reviews for both you and for  
2 the President or your own personal evaluations, one of  
3 the things that struck me about Jim's is that he had  
4 last year's goals and then how he accomplished them.  
5 Yours was focused on the statutory stuff, which is  
6 great.

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

15           MR. SCHANZ: Okay.

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

21           MR. SCHANZ: Well, that's for the entire  
22 community, as you know. Every agency has their own IG,

1 and I deal with them usually IG-to-IG at our monthly  
2 meetings. And we have an annual conference where  
3 cross-cutting government issues are surfaced and to see  
4 whether we have information that other IGs can use and  
5 vice versa.

6           There are databases there of common findings.

7       And it's a shame the Dean isn't here -- it came from  
8 the RAT Board. The RAT Board was sunsetted, and now  
9 it's called the Recovery Operations Center, which every  
10 IG has access to to go see what they found in  
11 disaster-related areas, which would be one good  
12 example.

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

21           CHAIRMAN LEVI: You're right as to that.

22           MR. SCHANZ: Any questions or comments?

1           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

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

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

9           (A chorus of ayes.)

10          CHAIRMAN LEVI: Any opposition?

11          (No response.)

12          CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you very much.

13          Now, the Finance Committee.

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

18                           M O T I O N

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

22          CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

1 (A chorus of ayes.)

2 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

3 (No response.)

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

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

15 That concludes the report of the Finance  
16 Committee.

17 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Audit Committee?

18 MR. MADDUX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The  
19 Audit Committee met on January 22nd in both open and  
20 closed session. We discussed the Committee's  
21 evaluations for 2014 and goals for 2015. We received  
22 the presentation of the 2014 annual financial audit

1 from the Inspector General's office, and in absentia  
2 from Nancy Davis, the WithumSmith+Brown partner who is  
3 the outside auditor. The audit was a clean audit with  
4 no management letter, so that was a very good result  
5 for the Corporation.

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

14 There is one matter for the Board's attention  
15 and action. We considered and voted on recommending a  
16 resolution to the Board to amend the 403(b) Thrift  
17 Plan. That resolution is in the Board book at page  
18 121, I believe.

19 The resolution, just to briefly summarize,  
20 makes four amendments to the 403(b) plan, all of which  
21 have been reviewed with legal counsel and the plan  
22 provider. They allow former employees to take partial

1 distributions, which currently is not allowed but is  
2 apparently common.

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

10                                   M O T I O N

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

13           CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

14           (A chorus of ayes.)

15           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

16           (No response.)

17           MR. MADDOX: That completes my report.

18           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

19           Ops and Regs?

20           MR. KECKLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The  
21 Operations and Regulations Committee met on Thursday of  
22 this week. We received a report on the activities in

1 furtherance of the Corporation's strategic plan. At  
2 this time, the recommendation was to maintain the goals  
3 and initiatives behind those goals of the strategic  
4 plan.

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

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

19 M O T I O N

20 MR. KECKLER: The recommendation of the  
21 Committee is for that Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to  
22 be published.

1           CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

2           (A chorus of ayes.)

3           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

4           (No response.)

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

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

18           I know that people in the field, as was  
19 discussed in the Committee, are reviewing that report  
20 and its methodology and would like to comment on this.

21           But at the current time, what Management is asked is  
22 to publish the plan for updating the population data as

1 a Request for Comment.

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

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

11 M O T I O N

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

14 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

15 (A chorus of ayes.)

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

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

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Thank you.

22 We have had the Governance and Performance

1 Review Committee report, unless somebody thinks we  
2 forgot something in the rush there.

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

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

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

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

17 MR. KORRELL: Great. Thanks.

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

1 Council.

2 M O T I O N

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

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

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

20 CHAIRMAN LEVI: No. No.

21 FATHER PIUS: Did I read that wrong?

22 MS. RHEIN: I believe that it was the

1 Institutional Advancement Committee, as a Committee --

2 FATHER PIUS: As a Committee?

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

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

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

14 All in favor?

15 (A chorus of ayes.)

16 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Opposed?

17 (No response.)

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

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

1 future topics.

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

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

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

19           FATHER PIUS: Yes. But the leadership --

20           CHAIRMAN LEVI: We had somebody from Idaho.

21           FATHER PIUS: Alaska.

22           CHAIRMAN LEVI: Alaska. Exactly. In fact,

1 there was somebody that kidded Harry, and I was  
2 thinking, well, she came from Alaska.

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

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

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

18 I wonder if that is always the right thing,  
19 and that maybe, somewhere, someone could give some  
20 thought to whether having leadership that comes from  
21 outside of a program might be good. Because I do think  
22 there's --

1           FATHER PIUS: Well, homegrown in the sense  
2 that they're from the LSC community. But a number of  
3 the ones we had were transplants from one office to  
4 another. So it would be interesting what the  
5 percentages of those are, those who are executive  
6 directors who were previously engaged as either  
7 deputies or legal services workers within their  
8 institution.

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

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

1 FATHER PIUS: Yes.

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

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

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

19 PRESIDENT SANDMAN: Indiana Legal Services  
20 just went through a very significant leadership  
21 transition. I think their executive director had been  
22 with the organization for more than 40 years and been

1 executive director for more than 40 years.

2 His replacement is a partner from the Baker  
3 Daniels firm, who I think at one point early in his  
4 career may have done some legal services work. He did  
5 in Massachusetts. It's now coming to me.

6 But he has experience in government at a high  
7 level, as counsel to two governors of Indiana. He is a  
8 very distinguished appellate practitioner, having  
9 argued more than 200 reported appellate cases. This is  
10 somebody who did not come up through the ranks within  
11 that organization or any other legal services provider.

12 I believe that they did the search using  
13 Management Information Exchange, MIE, which assists  
14 many legal services organizations that are looking for  
15 new executive directors. So the search process was  
16 obviously broad enough to bring in someone like him,  
17 who doesn't fit the usual profile. I was very  
18 impressed with his credentials.

19 MR. KORRELL: And I know I occasionally see  
20 and get recruiting information from nonprofit law  
21 firms, focused on one issue or another, and they often  
22 attempt to grab lawyers from private practice. I don't

1 see that much, though, from legal services firms.  
2 There is a bias for hiring from within, and for some of  
3 the reasons that we heard about.

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

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

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

20 So Becky and Carl -- Carl's not in the room,  
21 maybe -- but I think this is something that -- and I  
22 understand we often have our tech staff running to pro

1 bono, whatever, fund receptions.

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

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

11 Is that your report?

12 FATHER PIUS: That's it.

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

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

22 CHAIRMAN LEVI: I think we got the update this

1 morning, and thank you very, very much. It was  
2 striking to me, when someone said that report came out  
3 two years ago, how much has been done in that two-year  
4 period. So Harry and Martha -- not here -- you should  
5 feel good about the movement you have helped to  
6 motivate.

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

11 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Public comment?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN LEVI: Consider and act on other  
14 business?

15 (No response.)

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

18 M O T I O N

19 FATHER PIUS: So moved.

20 MR. KORRELL: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN LEVI: All in favor?

22 (A chorus of ayes.)

1                   (Whereupon, at 11:26, the Board was adjourned  
2 to Closed Session.)

3   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22