LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION
BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PROVISIONS COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

Friday, February 4, 2005

2:35 p.m.

The Melrose Hotel
Potomac I and II
2430 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

David Hall, Chairman
Maria Luisa Mercado
Ernestine Watlington (by telephone)
Frank B. Strickland, *ex officio*

OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT:
Lillian R. BeVier
Robert J. Dieter, Chairman
Herbert S. Garten
Florentino A. Subia
Thomas R. Meites

OTHERS PRESENT:

Helaine Barnett, President
Jonathan Asher, Acting Special Counsel to the President
Michael Genz, Director, OPP
Althea Hayward, OPP Staff
David Maddox, OIG Staff
Edward Jurkevics, OIG Consultant
Joyce Raby, OPP Staff
Glenn Rawdon, OPP Staff
Carla Smith, OCE Staff
Evora Thomas, OPP Staff
Richard (Kirt) West, Inspector General

C O N T E N T S

MOTIONS: 3, 14

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN HALL: We are going to call the order
the Provisions Committee. We are running -- we had
rescheduled. I apologize. Based on some other
meetings that were scheduled, we are scheduled to start
at 2:30. So I would apologize to the public for you
having to wait.

I, for the record, would like to note that
members of the Provisions Committee are present: Maria
Luisa Mercado, Mr. Subia, Ernestine Watlington, who is
a member of this committee, we are trying to connect up
by phone if we are able to.

MS. WATLINGTON: I am here.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Oh, okay. Wonderful. Good.
So Ernestine is with us. Mike McKay, we don't think,
will be joining us.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN HALL: So I would like to begin by
first asking for an approval of the agenda.

M O T I O N

MS. MERCADO: So moved.

MS. SUBIA: Second.

CHAIRMAN HALL: All in favor.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you.

APPROVAL OF THE COMMITTEE'S MEETING MINUTES

OF NOVEMBER 19, 2004

CHAIRMAN HALL: There were some minutes from our meeting of November 19th of this Provisions Committee. And so I would at this time like to get an approval of the minutes as well.

M O T I O N

MS. MERCADO: So moved.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Is there a second? All in favor of that?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN HALL: All right. Thank you very much.

Today we have some special presentations and we would like to begin with those. Our first one is on the mapping project, a project that the Office of the Inspector General initiated and has been spending a lot of time on. And so Kirt West, our inspector general, is going to be leading that presentation. So I would

like to turn it over to Kirt and we can begin.

PRESENTATION ON MAPPING PROJECT

MR. WEST: Thank you, Chairman Hall, members

of the Committee. The Office of Inspector General is

completing its three-year project in the evaluation of

Legal Services mapping and it will shortly be issuing a

final report for the LSC Board of Management with our

findings. We are doing this under our, you know,

authority to work on effectiveness and efficiency of

LSC's programs and operations.

The comments of the eight LSC grantee

participants, many of which were -- have been provided

in your board book, clearly indicate that they believe

mapping offers significant benefits on the local and

state levels. The evaluation participants have told

our office that they would like to continue to have

access mapping on at least an annual recurring cycle

and that they believe the capacity would be useful to

other grantees.

I believe there is a good chance at our July

meeting that you will be hearing from a number of the

executive directors from the California area where --

one of the areas we did our mapping project and you

will be able to hear from the grantees directly.

At this point, I would like to turn the floor

over to my assistant inspector general for resource

management, Dave Maddox, who is the project manager of

the evaluation project, and he will provide the

informational briefing to the Board.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, Kirt.

We hope that our presentation here today will

prove that mapping is not rocket science, but we also

do realize that it is not exactly a commonplace item

within the Legal Service community at this point in

time either. So if at any point in time we get

technical or we are somewhat unclear, please jump in

and ask us questions at any point in time.

Computerized mapping is a tool that is

commonly used by government agencies and non-profit

organizations to serve widely disbursed social needs.

Examples would include U.S. Departments of Justice,

Housing and Urban Development, Health and Human

Services, Fannie Mae, ARC and United Way, all of whom

we have spoken with in the process of this presentation.

In an organization, such as LSC, that provides service grants based upon the number of persons in poverty per geographic area, the application of poverty and service mapping as a management tool initially and still does appear a natural fit.

The objective of the fair and balanced evaluation was to determine the utility of mapping to improve program quality as part of the OIG mission to promote efficiency and effectiveness in the activities and operations of LSC and its grantees.

The goals of the project are to prototype methods and then define significant map products, establish the benefits of mapping to all stakeholders, determine if mapping is adaptable in both urban and rural legal services environments, evaluate if mapping could be implemented in a manner that does not pose too high of a technical barrier or cost. We will address the question of cost in our concluding statements, but let me say that there is several reasonable ways to implement mapping in an affordable manner.

If you will allow me to give you a brief overview. In phase one of the project, we produced a wide spectrum of legal services maps, which the Georgia executive directors and their staffs assessed. After several iterations, we learned a number of dos and don'ts about legal services mapping. The conclusion of the first Georgia project was presented to the prior board in January 2003 and the phase one report was released in November of that same year.

The general conclusions, now affirmed in phase two, are, maps provide a detailed picture of the geographic distribution movements of poverty populations. Maps strengthen planning and resource management by providing a visible tool -- a visible model of the legal services environment.

Maps improve promotion and fund-raising by showing the distribution of need and the contribution of legal services to the low income community. Maps measure the degrees of access to federally funded legal services by income eligible persons.

And phase two, which started in late 2003, was essentially a stress test of legal services mapping in

some of the nation's most extreme poverty environment, including both dense urban and sparsely populated rural areas.

In Southern California, the OIG worked closely with five grantees who served five of the Nation's top 15 counties in terms of poverty growth and roughly 4 million income eligible persons. In Georgia, which provides a good cross section of urban and rural poverty areas, we produced updated map books using the 2000 census in the most case data.

In Montana, during the summer of 2004, the OIG completed an accelerated project within five weeks. Executive director Klaus Sitte, of Montana Legal Services Association, and his staff presented some of that work at the September 2004 Provisions Committee in Helena, Montana to illustrate the extreme rural legal services challenges and the outreach required of their work. They have already used the maps for state planning and currently are using them to support legislation.

New products defined were created in phase two. Using the lessons learned in phase one, we

created several new map products, including a core map
book with 25 maps useful to any legal services
environment, total grantee activities and legal matters
maps, neighborhood level maps, standards of accurate
mapping of urban and rural areas and a summary of all
available census poverty data by LSC defined service
area.

In the evaluation project as a whole, we
produced over 400 maps for the eight participating
grantees. I would now like to introduce Edward
Jurkevics, a consultant who has worked with the OIG
throughout the mapping effort. Ed will show you some
of the maps we produced.

MR. JURKEVICS: Thank you, David.

Well, I would like to draw your attention to
the screen where I thought we would maybe look at some
of the maps. You know, first, maps can provide a
national perspective and these two maps, you may recall
at the last time the phase one was presented to the
Board, these were the last maps that were of that
presentation. So I thought we would pick up right
where we left off at that time.

In the left -- the darker colors on the left-hand side of the map would indicate higher poverty populations and you can see there is some dots. Maybe you can see at the front. I can barely see the grantee offices and regional offices on top. And on the right-hand side, there is a change in poverty between the census, the two census, the 1990 and the 2000.

As you know, the census drive is a funding formula for LSC grantees and what is notable about the map is that the bicoastal effect, the yellows and oranges are growth in poverty populations and the blues are relative declines so that the grantees in the darker of the blue would have lost a higher percentage of their funding when they went to the new funding formula, whereas the yellows and the oranges would have seen an increase in funding.

What is interesting and what this map has indicated and we have other data you won't be seeing today, but we can show you, is that there is a real differential shift in poverty populations. It doesn't just sort of all rise and fall like the level of the ocean in a tide the same in the nation. There is very

differential changes. So as the -- with the decennial census, there is not much change in that. Sometimes things will be out of proportion funding wise.

Now this next map is of the service area of Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles. And here this is again a map of the poverty where the darker reds indicate higher poverty. And some of the highest poverty areas are right here around the office.

And the executive director -- I am going to jump sort of to the conclusion -- we made about 40 maps for -- on Neighborhood Legal Services and their executive director, Neal Dudovitz, had just sort of a summary comment. In his view, the maps can be used by NLS for management, for fund-raising and ultimately he thinks they could also be used for advocacy, although we didn't develop any of those under this program.

He is favorable to devoting some staff time and some budgets to mapping and he is looking for a way to keep going with it. And I am going to show you some of the maps that maybe you can see what he saw in the program.

First of all, that was the other maps and now

the blue dots that I have put over the top show his

cases that are closed. And one of the things you will

notice is that this is still Los Angeles county and

above. There is three grantees in the county. And he

closes cases outside of his service area. Those are --

he has a health grant, a county wide health grant. So

that is one of the reasons. And even then there is

still some cross utilization outside of service area

that people call this help line or that help line, sort

of the closest facility.

        This generally is a map that shows you demand

and supply and sort of -- you know, the best sort of

surrogate we have for legal needs is this 125 percent

poverty population. You know, that is the nominal

eligibility for -- to be eligible for services. There

is other measures, but in general, the 125 percent

poverty is that cutoff. So underneath, you can see the

demand for legal services and the need and on top of

that, the supplies that met them in that year.

        So what you would not want to see is, you

know, very great red uncolored -- spots that aren't

covered by blue cases. That would be an area of

concern for you. And one of the things that we have seen -- by the way in all of our mapping from program after program, that the dots look a lot like the data underneath in general.

So, you know, it is often -- I will tell you, the executive directors, they wait in trepidation to see these maps. They worry that they are not serving where the poor people are concentrated, but in general, in fact, they are rather admirably. There is often some pockets of problems that need outreach, and so on, that are identified, but in general, we have found the programs to be highly efficient in their work.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Just to stop you for a second so that I am clear. All of the blue dots in the kind of white areas here is areas where there is not heavy poverty.

MR. JURKEVICS: No. We didn't color them because they are outside of NLS' service area. Those are served by the Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. So that relates to --

MR. JURKEVICS: Right, but Los Angeles County keeps going all the way down here and they have a

statewide health grant so they are covering cases that are outside their LSC service area with another grant.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. JURKEVICS: So now we took that -- you know, what we had was cases over persons and poverty and we can compute that ratio to see how many cases are being closed in a census track, let's say, per person in poverty. And the range here is from, like, seven here to down less than one here. And you will be interested to note for about -- there is about -- the national average is something over two cases closed per person of 125 percent poverty. So a hundred people at the 125 percent poverty level nationwide. So 2 percent.

So one of the things is we recall in the last map the two great concentrations of poverty, there is one in the San Fernando Valley here and one in the San Gabriel Pasadena area. And we know that the colors are a little bit darker here. The service is a little bit higher here and a little bit lower here.

So we zoom in, we get a little bit closer to this so we can see and it is pretty much verified that

the service level seems to be higher in the left poverty area as opposed to the right and we talked to Director Douglas about this and he said that in -- I guess in early 2001, they took over the programs. There was a consolidation under the state planning and they took over the programs in Pasadena and the San Diego valley and they knew that there was a -- that they were underperforming and they had worked devilishly hard to repair that, to bring equality of service across the service area.

And in fact, this map sort of indicates what happened is that in the following year, the red increased in cases closed here. So they were able to raise the cases closed here. But, you know, this is one of the great ironies in this business is that the resources are finite and you can dip out a cup of water from one bucket and put it in another one, but you can't create more water. And here is where the resources came from.

So they lost services in their core service area where NLS was based before and they moved them over here, but there is a winner and a loser. You

maybe get better equality, but, you know, it is a finite step. It is an interesting way to demonstrate how resource constrained in fact things are and how inelastic the supply is. They just can't create much more services that easily.

This is one of the maps that he liked, which shows his health case closures and the reason he liked this was he was able to show the funders that, in fact, he wasn't just concentrating services in the core areas, but he was reaching the outlying areas up in the high desert here and closing cases in Lancaster and so on. So it is -- it shows the funder that -- how the results of their activities.

Now I have moved just east a little bit to the area of Inland Counties' Legal Services by Irene Moralis. And this is the same map, the cases over their income eligibles. They have some different challenges. One is that there is this big inland California of deserts and they still have to serve these areas like Needles and Blythe and Barstow and these high desert areas.

In the meantime, in the west part of their

area, this is the L.A. basin, which is -- you know, what is going on there is that people that are economically pressed are fleeing the housing prices in L.A. and they are moving out into these areas. So this is the highest growth area in the country with vast tracts of land. And what is surprising is it is not just middle close growth, it is the growth in poverty there is very high at the same time.

Now this is a map that shows ICLS' intake methods in response to this. And they have -- I think in 2000, they finally set up a telephone hotline and they say that the walk-ins here, in office visits are going on in the core urban areas, but out here in the outlying areas, they are using outreach methods, clinics and the telephone hotlines are starting to be able to get to those areas and as -- and because circuit riding is fairly expensive and they have been circuit riding out to those areas. So this shows the results of their telephone and they want to continue to measure these methods.

Now I have some comments from ED Morales. And first of all, she feels that this mapping can help her

with fund-raising from special grantors and encourage
her private bar involvement in outlying areas. She
wants to use mapping as an internal management tool in
her project planning and with community partners to
help identify gaps in programs services and to figure
out some strategies to get those gaps. She has -- they
are not -- they don't have a lot of great technical
people on their staff and she was -- would like some
ongoing assistance from LSC so she can get this mapping
going in her program.

Now I have moved down to -- the NLS maps were
just to the north that we looked at at the beginning
for Neighborhood Legal Services. This is core Los
Angeles -- Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles. Bruce
Iwasaki is the executive director of this program. And
here, these areas, the central and south central L.A.
represent some of the most intense poverty in the
nation.

And this map was something that Bruce Iwasaki
thought was a very useful map because it could be used
for -- it shows access, it shows where outreach is
necessary, it shows the logic of their object placement

and it can be used by staff or to funders in the public. And you can sort of imagine a map like this would show their programs and activities per year hanging in their office and used as a reference point because it shows what their program's contribution to this community has been.

These kind of maps have a lot of detail and you can get really in and drill down and sort of look at these neighborhoods so we can get in and really see what is going on in central L.A. and see the case closures where you can see the city blocks of poverty populations.

These darkest here, they have about 25,000 persons at the 125 percent poverty level per square miles. So here in three square miles of this area here you have as much poverty as states like Alaska or Vermont or others. So it is a really intense level of poverty as you know.

We know that all of the grantees have had a very intense interest in ethnicity and languages. And this map shows language groups and they are listed here. Chinese, Japanese, Kmer, Hindi and Korean. The

Asian language groupings. We get this data from the
census. And there is some interesting things to note
here. One is that there is a Kmer community down here
in Long Beach, there is an isolated Korean community
right here, the Koreans here, the Chinese here and then
some real mixed communities, a Chinese community here
and some isolated Japanese communities right here.

These maps are of interest to the program here
because they would be useful for potential funders and
supporters in the Asian/Pacific Islander community and
it shows how coordinated outreach can be done to these
isolated communities.

Now if we change this for the Spanish
speakers, then of course there is, you know, there is
coverage in all Los Angeles, but more interestingly, we
can isolate the Hispanic poverty population, those are
in color underneath, and the Hispanic cases that were
closed by LAFLA to see those comparisons. And one
might -- if they were looking at this map, they would
say, one of these little spots here. Why is there a
little bit of red that is not covered. Can we go and
see what is going on there. You know, that would be

the type of use for this kind of map.

Executive director Iwasaki is supportive of mapping and, in fact, even before we started the evaluation, he was looking for a way to get started with mapping and intends to make use of mapping in the future. He has pointed out some caveats. He says it takes training to learn how to interpret these maps and he cautions that maps, if not constructed carefully, can sort of misrepresent data, relying with map sort of problem.

However, he believes they can use maps for management first, like priority setting and allocation resources, they can use them for marketing, you know, to raise money from legislature, foundations, private bar and for -- and ultimately for advocacy also, for redlining priority lending identification. He believes that those will be the future use of those.

Now moving just to the south of that area into Orange County in California, this is the area served by the Legal Aid Society of Orange County and Executive Director of Bob Cohen of LASOC has used maps as a lever to form partnerships with justice organizations. And

here what we see are dots. The blue dots on top are

low income pro se litigants with the county court right

there. And underneath the colors represent the case

close density by Orange County.

And what is interesting here is that this

might be the first court legal aid partnership map.

And it is also important because it demonstrates sort

of a big picture on the legal needs and what is

supplying those in the entire county. And there is a

lot of excitement for the potential of forming these

partnerships with the courts and attacking their

problems together.

And he has another similar map where the

colors underneath the red is the poverty population of

the City of Santa Ana and the blue dots are 4,200 --

well, some of the dots are outside this area --

domestic violence incidents from the police department

of Santa Ana and the yellow dots are Orange County's

LASOC's, our grantees domestic violence cases.

And, you know, I am not going to say that this

particular map has tremendous analytical value as it

is, it is the very first map that was created; however,

this represents an unprecedented willingness for the police to share data that is confidential of domestic violence and they believe that they can look at jointly and that potentially the legal aid can be an enforcement of components of theirs and there is, again, opportunities for partnerships and building stronger relationships.

Okay. Now we went and did an update of Georgia with the new census data. The last time around the census data wasn't available and this is a map of Georgia Legal Services programs in the Dalton area in the northwest part of the Georgia state. And this had an immediate impact when it was first seen. Executive Director Phyllis Holmen, at that time, was considering closing this office and moving it to Rome because it thought there might be more private bar involvement here.

But when she looked at the map and looked at the changes of the census -- in fact, what it shows is that there was growth in poverty populations in the north part of the state where there hadn't been previously and poverty sort of along the I-75 corridor,

which is a great transportation corridor. And based on
this map, she decided to leave the office where it was
and stop consideration of moving it to Rome. So it is
sort of in a negative -- you know, had a null impact.
It was an impact map right away.

And then when we were doing this project,
Executive Director Holman requested this map. And this
is the Hispanic poverty population, that is the color
underneath. And you can see a little bit of it coming
into northern Georgia. And Georgia you don't think of
having this large Hispanic population, but they are
growing there very significantly. And on top are some
few scattered case dots. These blue dots, just a few
of them, they are where Hispanic cases have been
closed. I guess there is a few more up in the Dalton,
right around Dalton.

These maps were requested by GLSP because they
had just gotten a new grant to do outreach and case
closures for Hispanic -- for these two offices, just
Gainesville and Dalton. And she wanted to set a
baseline to say, okay, what were we doing before so
that one, they could see how the poverty population,

the Hispanic poverty populations are changing. And
then demonstrate to the funder how -- what the results
of the money. Look before and here is the case closure
afterwards. So it forms a baseline. And I think that
they are going to be very useful for that.

Ms. Holmen hopes that both of these two
offices, plus the main office down in Atlanta, are
going to be able to get started with some mapping this
year, particularly to support this one project. And
although, you know, their technical capability is again
is pretty stretched at GLSP, she feels that maps will
be useful for management and potentially for
fund-raising purposes.

This map was at the last Board meeting, I
believe an earlier version of it was also shown. So it
is a repeat. And here Steve Gottleib of the Atlanta
Legal Aid Society, these five counties are his program.
 He saw that between the censuses, he poverty
population in Gwinnett County in red there grew from 14
to 33,000 people.

And he showed this map to the county court in
Gwinnett as part of its case for more funding and he

was -- as a result, and this map wasn't all of it. His personal, you know, representation was part of it, but the map formed an evidence base and he received a grant to help turn that Gwinnett office from a part-time clinic to a full-time staffed office. So it is a map that produced a positive effect for his program, you know, well within in excess of his efforts to participate in this evaluation.

Now you were all, I think, in Montana several months ago and you may have seen this map at that time. What happened is that the Montana State Bar provided us the number of attorneys per zip code and we mapped it. So you can see the colors underneath. There is no attorneys out here. There is very few attorneys in these yellow areas and a smattering of these in these orange areas around Missoula and Helena and -- primarily.

And the red dots, which there are a few over land, are the PAI cases that were closed by MLSA in a year. So we are looking where the attorneys are and where they are participating. And they were using this map to go to the bar to seek greater bar involvement.

And if you recall, back in the east part of the state there is virtually no attorneys. So it is very difficult to get bar involvement out there.

And then onwards MLSA Director Klaus Sitte used this and three other maps to promote a bill, which is going on right now, sponsored by the Montana Equal Justice Task Force, that will set up an interim commission to study the need for legal services for low income Montanans and to allocate state funding for that. So he has taken those and the state centers are looking at it and it is now up to the Justice Committee for review. So it has been through one subcommittee and that is proceeding forward. So they are using these tools for advocacy.

That is the end of the map program. I have a couple of other remarks I would like to make. One is that there is other programs that weren't part of our evaluation that have taken up mapping. Eastern Tennessee, we have seen them do some mapping. Washington State, who I think has been a leader in these technology adaptations is doing -- they have a statewide justice community organization effort and

they are just getting going with mapping as part of that, as an integral part of that statewide justice community planning process.

And very impressively, we have also -- the Legal Services of Northern California, again, it was not part of this evaluation, we have found that they have been going very strong. They are probably the most accomplished mapping grantee with regard to mapping. They use mapping, they claim -- their claims to us is for internal resource management and greatly for advocacy. They use it for advocacy and they have produced some very interesting advocacy maps and some good examples of results.

They have trained four -- I am sorry, six staff attorneys to run the software to make maps on their own. They say that they can support something for a presentation. They can whip up a map in a couple of hours, if not days. And six staff attorneys do and make these maps. And I think it is a pretty interesting and impressive result of what can be achieved.

And I am going to conclude in somebody else's

voice and that is a participant who hasn't been represented by the maps here and that is Greg Knolls of the grantee from the Legal Aid Society of San Diego. And, you know, I must say, as an aside, that Mr. Knolls was skeptical of this project to start -- when we started. You know, he thought it was an OIG project that was coming and, you know, what good could come out of that in participating with it. But, you know, when he started to see them, the maps for him in the evaluation served to show him the benefits. And he has now stated that in retrospect, before the project, he was unable to identify, analyze or in any meaningful way communicate the concentrations for potential of actual clients.

He has shown the maps to his board and he plans to use them to target outreach and request additional funding to focus services more intensely in certain geographic areas. He intends to adopt mapping. And while he does send the message that he would not like to see an unfunded mandate that all programs must find their own resources to make maps, he doesn't want an unfunded mandate, he has expressed the specific

requests for continued LSC support for mapping.

One, he would like LSC to provide training to the grantees in making and using maps. Second, he would like LSC to use its scale and clout in getting the costs down for individual programs to use its scale for this mapping. He would like LSC to provide, negotiate and provide linkages to other national data sets from outside service agencies, like Fannie Mae and HUD, that are meaningful indicators for where the needs are and he feels that LSC can facilitate that rather than a hundred and fifty grantees individually running around and doing it.

And he has suggested that LSC provide initial support and continued support for a five-year period so that mapping can become institutionalized with grantees. And with his words, I will end there and I thank you very much.

MR. MADDOX: Thank you, Ed.

Clearly, this was just a small subset of a number of maps we have, but basically the evidence supports the conclusion that mapping technologies can make a significant difference in the quality and

effectiveness of access to justice efforts by making
them very, very visible and also concentrating on very
strategic, oriented information, management information
such as the needs -- legal needs in the low income
population, legal services provided, the scale and
impact of initiatives and programs, the relationships
between all three, which ultimately create new
management questions, potentially scary at first, but
ultimately that provides insights and leads to new
strategies.

In making it possible for grantee managers to
employ resources better for executive directors and
boards to make a better case for new resources, to
provide useful data for advocates work and to leverage
national partnerships with courts, the bar and social
and justice organizations and it enables the
legislatures to see the challenges and contributions fo
LSC and grantees in their state or district.

In terms of ways to move forward, the key
question facing LSC management is how to assist the
grantees in this area. With limited resources in both
TIG and M&A funding, we offer a number of observations

that could be helpful in developing a strategy and minimizing costs.

From our experience, there is limited field capacity to produce maps on an individual basis. The cost of mapping declines substantially with experience and there is large economies to be gained from a coordinated effort.

There are several cost-effective alternatives in our opinion. For instance, one middle of the road approach that would put Internet tools in place so that willing grantees and LSC could download census data to make quality maps themselves with desktop software. Such a program would be outlined to include a partnership with an organization already using web mapping to establish a poverty mapping web server where grantees could download census data for their services.

Several of the organizations I mentioned earlier, HHS, HUD all have expressed interest in such a partnership, some of which have even mentioned the word pro bono in the conversation. An expansion of this basic idea would enable grantees to map their client locations using privacy protected online services.

LSC would offer continued support to the evaluations' participants and other interested grantees in the adoption in the use of mapping. LSC could separately develop an in-house mapping capability to support internal planning and performance evaluation. We have good reason to believe this program, as outlined, would provide nationwide legal services mapping capability for just under $200,000 a year or $1,400 per grantee. The cost would most likely be somewhat front-loaded in the early year.

Based on this cost estimate, the OIG believes that such an approach would be cost justified based upon the broad base of benefits that we have documented throughout our project. Of course, the potential return on investment from greater access to mapping to the grantees and LSC must be considered against all other costs associated with other potential investments LSC could make.

But the evidence is very strong supporting further investment in mapping. The consultants used in this evaluation are, of course, available to support LSC in planning, costing and in further implementation

efforts. We thank you for your time and would be happy to take any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you both for a very excellent presentation. I do have a list of questions, but I would refer to other committee members who might have some to begin with.

MS. MERCADO: The figure that you just mentioned a minute ago, Mr. Maddox, the $200,000 a year, is that for a nationwide cost to cover all the grantees?

MR. MADDOX: That is correct. That does not include grantee labor to actually create the maps, but that would include training, software arrangements that are currently in place. Basically through the TIG program, grantees can get the mapping software at very heavily discounted prices currently.

MS. MERCADO: How much did it cost us to do this mapping for the three-year period of time that we had under the inspector general. And I have that somewhere in one of my budgets, but do you recall that offhand how much that cost?

MR. MADDOX: An off the head estimate -- as

with any technology investment, and this is part of the reason this concept evaluation was done with the OIG -- because a lot of the cost to figure out how to do it in a cost effective manner are up-front, but an off the head estimate of consulting money that we have used it is going to range around $600,000. But that is an off the head estimate.

MS. MERCADO: Well, I mean, I knew it was in the hundreds of thousands. I was just trying to remember if that were the cost for just doing five or six programs that we did, then how does it equate with 200,000 nationwide for all the grantees?

MR. MADDOX: We have learned numerous lessons. Our -- just so you know, from what we spent with the initial Georgia project when we spent roughly $200,000 there and then when you go to Montana, we have cut those costs -- that cost 25,000. So in terms of lessons learned, how you make those investments, that is why when we through out this dollar of $1,400 per grantee, that is the kind of lessons learned.

For instance, one of the costs associated with mapping is a process by which case addresses become

mappable. They get assigned latitudes and longitudes.
 Throughout our projects, we have scaled it down from
20 cents an address to 10 cents an address and only
recently have we found about new breakthroughs and
partnerships where it could be basically a penny per
address.

Extrapolate that over the million cases LSC
grantees provide annually, that is $10,000. But in
terms of the incremental reductions in investments, you
know, I think that is where our project has led to
substantial cost savings nationwide from any kind of
mapping effort.

MS. MERCADO: I mean, you said that $1,400
would be for, I guess, the actual technical cost, but
the labor to input the information and to get the
mapping that is required, I mean what would that cost
average because that means you are pulling people away
from doing actual client delivery of services by doing
this mapping. What is the labor amount that you would
use allocated to each of those programs?

MR. JURKEVICS: You know, this is an important
point. The way that we envision this going forward is

to provide some infrastructure support, but the grantees would map for themselves. In this evaluation, that didn't occur. There was a contractor down in Georgia that made all these maps. The maps were made by an outside professional organization. That is why they are so beautiful and, you know, so highly finished. We would see going forward, they would be much more utilitarian in nature as the grantees made their own.

We find that the grantees we talked to, they believe that there may be -- the first time the person makes the first map might take a few days for them to learn the software. They have to take a training course. There is online training as part of the TIG program. You have to sit down for several hours to learn that and get going, but after that, they think that making a map is a few hours, that it is not something that takes days and days. And it may -- not every organization may use attorneys to make those. That was the advocacy cases.

In other cases, we would see the mapping being done by the person that runs the case management

system, sort of the IT person, may be the person that adopts the mapping. And so it may not represent an extra staff load in any way whatsoever in those types of cases.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Is it your sense that mapping is providing the grantees with some information that they really did not have at their disposal in the past or is it just taking that existing data and putting it together in a more succinct and certainly eye appealing way because there is a difference between --

MR. JURKEVICS: You know, there is two sides to that. One is that we did find the executive directors in general had a great intuitive sense of their service area. They know their patch of dirt pretty well intuitively; however, it is surprising that they have never seen detailed census data to find out where the poverty populations actually are and then when you get into language and ethnic communications, they have notions that they have heard that there might be a community over there, but they certainly don't know those demarcations, they have never seen it.

And in general, they are not -- do not know

very well where their cases lay. So that is usually a

surprise to them because they don't have a real sense

of how the cases distribute geographically because the

case management system -- they can tell them how many

were brief service and extended service and how many

were done in housing and so on. They can find that out

at the end of the year through a statistical report,

but they have no sense of where they are.

So and, you know, a lot of this when you

distribute social services, a core denominator is the

geography, is the awareness of things and they don't

really have that at all. No. So I would say that they

are -- the programs largely, this whole field, unlike

other social service organizations -- HUD does not do

this, but this field here at LSC is driving blind. It

drives by looking in the rearview mirror. You know,

there is no sense of planning strategically on how this

is going using this geographic stuff.

MR. MADDOX: Well, I think that brings up a

point that mapping would be an excellent tool for state

planning. It is, you know, kind of sets of the road

map is what does the local poverty distribution look

like and in many cases in Georgia where there is 159

counties, they have county wide poverty population

numbers. That is it.

When we were able to bring that down to a

census group level, this is complete new information

that they have never seen before and as we saw even on

a county perspective, they were able to use that quite

a bit for fund raising to actually be able to display

that to others and say, "This is the challenges that we

are facing."

One of the maps we did not show, but we also

did some maps where we computed a number of income

eligible persons per attorney in a service area and

just some of the sheer numbers you see there, in

Georgia, there were a couple of service areas that one

attorney for fifteen thousand income eligible persons.

In Montana, there was an area where you had

one attorney per 26,000 income eligible persons. Just

the ability to kind of display that information of the

size of the challenge and in many cases, the ratios

that we computed of persons served, cases closed for

income eligible when we talk about ratios of 1 percent,

2 1/2 percent on a national basis, 7 percent in certain

neighborhoods, it gives you a size of the scope of the

challenge.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Both of you have given some

examples of how programs have been able to use it for

fund-raising at the local level, i.e., going to, I

guess, a donor or to the state legislature. Should we

extrapolate from those examples that if we were to do

this in a system wide basis, that it would be a tool

for helping LSC and its requests to Congress and being

able to make a more powerful or informed case at that

level or is this something that only as a tool at the

local level for that goal of fund-raising?

MR. MADDOX: The feeling within the OIG, and

we can talk to the congressional relations people who

would know the Hill relations much more, but in terms

of presenting a persuasive case for the size of the

challenge, maps, you know, are one page marketing

device in the right hands of showing what is going on

in someone's state or congressional district -- and in

many cases, you are, you know, showing even not your

biggest fans sides of the contribution of what you do

in their area can only be a positive in congressional relations work I believe.

CHAIRMAN HALL: The 200,000 a year, was that on the assumption that LSC would be absorbing all of that cost or would some of these partners that you named who are also interested in doing some of this would -- is this after they have contributed whatever they might or is this saying that is what the figure is. If we could get HUD or somebody else to go in with us on this, that would drop?

MR. JURKEVICS: You know what? I can answer that. We have assumed that there would be some cost recovery for those organizations. You find a partner that may not -- you may not bear the full freight, but you have to pay some money. You may. However, it is very interesting.

Some of these organizations are very politically oriented of themselves and HUD, for instance, money wasn't their primary importance. What was a justification of the other good that they were serving that justified their own programs and their own budget. So you don't know how -- you know, depending

on the organization that you partner up with, there
could be -- it could be much more favorable for the
Corporation than what we outlined as the $200,000.

CHAIRMAN HALL: And I guess David and Kirt
would be here would probably the best person to answer
this, but does the OIG see itself or that office having
a continuing role in this, the expertise that you have
developed, the time that you have committed to this?
Is this a project that you now see handing off or is
this another way in which you can provide quality
enhancement to the effort?

MR. WEST: I think at this point, it is really
something we have to hand off. This is really a
programmatic responsibility. I think it is something
for management and the Board to decide, you know, if
they are interested in this, when they might be
interested. I mean, that is really your call. We did
this to show here is a tool.

I think the expertise really lies in Ed and
the other consultants as opposed to internally with our
office. So I would -- I think we are pretty much at
the end of the road and now it is, you know, what is

the next step if there are any. And understanding, as
Dave said, the tremendous cost constraints that Helaine
has and the challenge in her budget and, you know,
where you spend your money and what you do and that.

But I also wanted to say I think that your
question about the political, you know,
ramifications -- and this is just sort of speaking
personally, maybe not as the IG, I think it would be
tremendous. I think it would show some people what
they really have in their communities, their
legislatures, that this is what you have got.

And I think it could be probably not only on
the national level, but obviously on the state level
for state politicians in terms of funding and for bar
associations. This is what it really is. This isn't
somebody's guess, this isn't somebody's intuition, but
here are some hard numbers.

CHAIRMAN HALL: You've certainly provided us
with some other testimonies from executive directors of
people in the field about how favorable they were to
that. Would you, again, extrapolate from your
experience with them that most grantees in the field,

assuming it is not an unfunded mandate, would feel that this was a tool that they would be given that would help them do their work better? And I don't know how large your survey of grantees is, but what would you conclude as to their reaction if LSC was to say yes, this is something we are going to try to institutionalize?

MR. MADDOX: They would be very excited. I mean, they are at the point of asking LSC for resources and help, but they are also scratching their own heads, looking at their own dollars and saying how much of my own money would I be willing to pony up to this. And as such, I think they are very serious about adoption. So they are looking at all strategies that are open to them at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MR. WEST: But I would suspect, like any other issue, there is some people who are a little more savvy to technology than others and there is some that would probably be very resistant and it would be like anything else. Kind of like 20, 25 years ago when computers first came around.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Sure.

MR. WEST: Some of us didn't embrace it as fast as others.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. Okay. Any other questions from committee members?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, thank you very much. Very informative presentation.

We are now going to have a presentation on the technology initiative grants. So if those folks could come forward. Michael?

MR. GENZ: Thank you Mr. Chair and members.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Do you need a moment to set up first before you get started? I don't want to --

MR. GENZ: Just a moment.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes.

MR. GENZ: We just have to switch the computers.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. Take a moment, please. We don't want to rush you.

PRESENTATION ON TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE GRANTS

MR. GENZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members

of the Committee. I am Michael Genz of the Office of
Program Performance. In our presentation today about
the technology initiative, I am going to start with
Congress.

Congress initiated funding for the technology
initiative grant program in 2000. They did so in
response to LSC's request for special funding to use
technology to increase services to clients. This, in
turn, was from the Legal Services Corporation's
strategic plan. It was identified as one of its two
major goals increasing the provision of legal services
to eligible persons and studying the possibilities for
that. Other than getting significant increased
funding, we determined that at least for brief
services, by far the best way to do that would be to
invest and explore in technology.

So that first year 2000 funding for TIG was 5
million, 2001 it was $7 million, 2002 it was $4.3
million and 2003 it was $3.4 million, last year, 2004,
it was 2.9 million and this year we are down, to 2005,
to 1.2 million.

We fund technology grants based on three

principles: innovation, replication and sustainability.

Innovation, in this context, is looking at new ways to deliver services to clients. We are not interested in just buying new servers or computers or things like that, but our emphasis in looking at grant applications is what can be done that hasn't been done that could spread the services that we have.

The second principle is replication. Even the wonderful innovation might not be particularly helpful and useful if it is built in one area and it works fine there, but then the next time anybody uses it, they have to spend virtually the same amount of money to do it again. So it is important to look at projects where you can do something and get learning and resources and code and what have you that can be spread to other places.

The third principle is sustainability. It wouldn't be helpful to a project to have something wonderful happening over the three years of the grant, but then when the grant is over if the program will not or cannot keep up the good work that happened from that project. So you look particularly carefully with

respect to projects that have a lot of personnel costs or may have key one lines that have to continually be paid. And we ask programs to say that they are interested and will sustain the projects.

Glen Rawdon and Joyce Raby, two of LSC's front line stewards of the program, will make our presentations. They will address the major accomplishments that our grantees have achieved through the projects that they have done, the challenges that we and our grantees have faced and what we have learned from them and where we go from here from what we have achieved to what we need and want to achieve to complete the process Thank you.

MS. RABY: Hi, I am Joyce. So before I really talk about the information that is on the slide, I want to give you a little bit of context. We are going to talk a little bit about the statewide website. In 2001 LSC undertook an initiative to develop single statewide websites for each and every state, territory district and commonwealth that we had responsibility for.

The original idea was to create a template, a way to easily, and for a modest amount of money, create

a basic infrastructure that could be easily replicated by our program. One template became two and it became apparent that some programs wanted a highly customizable template and had the technical staff to support it; other programs had virtually no technical staff and wanted as much assistance as possible in implementing a website.

So there are actually two templates. One that allows for great flexibility, but requires greater technical expertise, and one that requires very little technical expertise, but there are limits on page design and layout for example.

We had originally hoped that we would be able to fund a single year at a modest price of $50,000 and see a complete and functional website at the end of that year. It soon became clear that we needed to extend that time frame and provide additional support as developing not only the legal content was more complex than anticipated, but developing the critical partnerships with other social service providers resulting in essentially a one-stop shop for low income clients was more time consuming than we had originally

anticipated.

In response, we created second and third year grants. The second year grant is another year of development for $25,000 and the third year grant funds actually two additional years of $25,000. We hope these grants not only continue to support the websites, but also then serve as transitional years so that the program has an opportunity, then, to absorb the ongoing costs, which hopefully by that point are much lower.

So we have now 48 websites in 48 states, also in the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for a total of 52. Thirty-eight of those sites have significant content for our client community. And I am going to talk a little bit about a couple of stats here. Persons receiving community legal education services via websites increased from 2002 to 2003 from 1.9 million to 4.2 million.

This information comes from the management reports, which are reports that our grantees submit to us along with CSR data. The persons receiving pro se assistance via websites increased from 1.7 million in 2002 to 2.6 million in 2003. The sites offers the

community legal education information in multiple languages and using multimedia.

MR. RAWDON: One of the other major accomplishments has been our partnership with the courts. As you know, if you are working on pro se, you need a friendly court. It doesn't do any good to provide a litigant with papers and ways to get into court unless the judge once there is sympathetic to his cause and willing to participate and we have done lots of work with the courts on this.

One of the earliest projects was in California starting with the I Can Project. I think many of you have seen this, but this is a touch screen kiosk system where a user can come in and after receiving instructions in audio, as well as on screen, fill out simple forms and all that are needed. And the Orange County court partnered with us on that initial project. We were actually a minor funder in this.

This is one of the advantages as a TIG process, we get other partners in other funding with very low leverage, and it has now expanded to several other states, including the next one on the list which

is Minnesota where we are also partnering with the courts there to expand I Can into that project as well.

Now another project that we have been working on to get partners is a HotDocs project that we have gotten. And if you don't know, HotDocs is a document assembly program. This is a way so that people can take premade forms and complete these on line and it can be very, very effective.

Attorneys have been using these for years, but legal services has been very slow to adopt because of the cost involved with this and as we will explain later about the donations, we have created a national HotDocs server so that we are able to provide this service to our grantees through the TIG program at no cost to them.

Well, this has been attractive to the courts. So the courts in California, through the initiative, the courts are actually doing their court forms in HotDocs and then posting them on our server. And we have just done a new grant issued to Idaho where the courts there have agreed to do 300 different court forms and put all of those court forms on our website

in HotDocs format and these are 300 court forms that
the people in Idaho never had before. The pro se's
never had these resources. So by having them, we have
been able to make these partnerships.

CHAIRMAN HALL: And again, this is just an
aside, but I thought, based on some prior experience I
had, that Arizona was kind of a leader in this field in
trying to create, you know, automated pro se. Is it
that they -- we didn't --

MS. RABY: Are you talking about the Maricopa
County and the kiosks?

CHAIRMAN HALL: Right. Right.

MS. RABY: Yes, for the most part -- in the
reading I have done, and Glenn you can correct me if I
am wrong, but the kiosks ended up being poorly placed
and they weren't really supported very well and for the
most part are not now in use.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Oh, okay. Maybe public
comment or is it --

A PARTICIPANT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, having
learned a little about that in the comment, I think
there is a fascinating lesson in the failures that

occur when there isn't the right kind of partnership.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

A PARTICIPANT: And so I think what they are doing here is far, far --

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MS. RABY: So to pick up from Montana, I mean, obviously you guys were in Montana shortly -- or a little while ago and know about the video conferencing and that clearly required a pretty significant partnership with the court. If the court had not allowed them to represent clients via video conferencing actually in the courthouse, that is a project that would not have been successful.

The other one, in Alaska, TIG funded six remote workstations in rural courthouses in Alaska and in Alaska, rural can be very, very rural. And I know from working with the statewide coordinator there that it was one of the first times that all of those courthouses really worked together. The court agreed to take on the maintenance of the workstations.

They manage the ongoing needs of their workstations, the connection to the Internet to allow

access to the statewide website, the Alaska statewide
website, and they also provide personnel that assists
anyone who sits down at the workstation to then
accomplish something.

The other part of the grant was we took the
Alaska program, created a series of family law
tutorials in PowerPoint and the interesting part about
that was they used audio screening because most Eskimo
and Native American cultures in Alaska rely on a spoken
rather than a written language.

For Alaska, the ability to create audio files
that could then be triggered from the website that
actually read aloud the text that is on the website was
especially important. And you can actually go to
Alaskalawhelp.org, should you have the desire to, and
listen to a series of tutorials that are done in Upic,
the predominant language, that is in -- spoken in rural
southwest Alaska.

And Missouri is on the list because we funded
a very small pilot project again placing workstations
in courthouses. Again, the courthouse was -- agreed to
do the maintenance and support of those workstations.

And it has been so successful that now all of the court forms in Missouri are being converted to a document assembly project and then posted on to the statewide website and they are looking to expand the workstation locations within Missouri, not with our funding, but with their own.

MR. RAWDON: As Mike mentioned in the beginning, one of the things we have looked for all along since the TIG funding has been limited is replication and as Mike said is what we mean by this is trying to do something very cost effective. As Joyce pointed out, we did the templates in 2001 and now the 52 different websites that are running all these templates instead of each of them having to design their own.

Well, some of the other ones that we have done the replications is the I Can EIC, earned income credit, program that we did. We started in 2002 with a grant to do this and started in California. Now it has spread to have state income tax returns available also in Massachusetts, Maryland, Montana and North Carolina, but for the federal, it is available to any of our

legal services partners around the country at no cost to them.

So by investing once in I Can EIC, we have made this available to every program in the country. And if you want to see how cost effective it is, you can see that last year alone, $3.2 million, which is actually more than this year's TIG budget, was returned to low income wage earners in the 44 states and we hope that it will continue to grow like this and even more will be returned this year.

MS. RABY: And for a little twist on replication, Iowa, leveraging money from another funder and from TIG, created a position called the Technology Advocate. And the Technology Advocate was really to sort of look out for those opportunities in the drafting of new technology laws, in the changeover for cable operators and any place where the voice of a low income person might have an impact on how those services were then deployed.

And they -- in Iowa, what that ended up meaning was that they worked a lot with senior centers around the state to establish Internet accessible

workstations available for public use that directed folks to the Iowa statewide website. And what TIG did, in terms of the replication piece, was TIG then loved that idea, thought it worked very well and then created a category in the RFP to fund additional technology advocates around the country. So we now have technology advocates in Georgia, New York and as of 2004, in Colorado.

And I am going to keep talking. So this -- Montana. Once again, video conferencing. Clients in remote areas can meet with attorneys, attorneys can appear in court. I think you really do have to sort of envision what it must be like to encompass those really vast geographic areas and be able to make that happen without having to get in a car and drive for several hours.

Maine. While not successful in terms of client service, which we touch on later in the presentation, they do use video conferencing for their board meetings, for staff meeting and training, for community meetings and trainings and during -- in Maine, during a lot of the wintertime, that is actually

a huge benefit to the program and does sort of continue to allow them to be much more productive.

MR. RAWDON: And through a TIG grant that we give to Hawaii, they have made a successful program for training community partners. They developed a database there that allows them to make easy referrals between legal services and some of the community providers. Instead of having to drag everyone into the office to train them, they set up video so that they can train them by video and then when there is ever a new legal issue or something that they also think would be useful for these community partners to know, they are able to do that training by video as well so that people aren't traveling back and forth. They can have it done in their own offices.

Now one of the other major accomplishments we have done is helping to upgrade the infrastructure. And by infrastructure, we mean the technology capacity of the program internally, such as their computers, their phone systems, their connectivity to the Internet and such like that. And so by doing this many times, we can improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the

programs themselves.

A very good example is that in 2000, one of our first grants was to the Bay Area Legal Services in San Francisco and the Oakland area so that that new emerged program could bring everyone up to the same standard, a common case management system, a common phone system and all, and now through a grant that we did last year, they were able then, using that infrastructure that we built upon, to be able to go to a centralized intake unit that is very, very sophisticated so that hotline staff workers can say which areas of law they are available to take and what languages they can take and then the system will route it specifically to those so people will get help on their area in law in a language that they speak. And so by bringing up the infrastructure, we are able to do that.

We have also done some interesting projects in Virginia and Arkansas where they have moved statewide, the six programs in Virginia and two in Arkansas, they have moved to a single case management system and this was done over an ASP model, that is application service

provider, so that they didn't have to put any of the computers and equipment and all that in their office to run the software. It is all done by an outside vendor. All they have to do is have Internet access.

And so for any location where they have Internet access, they can get into their case management systems and they also, using sophisticated telephone technology, have been able to get a single 800 number for the entire state, but depending on the prefix of the caller coming in, it is routed to the appropriate office.

Well, this is a tremendous advantage for intake. No longer do you have to say, okay, well, in this area is this number and this area is this number. You can have one area statewide to provide that to all your community partners and put it in posters and all of the social offices around the state and it is very, very useful to them.

And also it is a tremendous savings when they want to do training on the state's management system, they can do a statewide meeting and train everyone because they are all on the same system. We also did a

grant last year to the Legal Services of New York,
which we, you know, refer to LSNY, and they call it
their technology integration project. And they are
going to be integrating network, voice, database
applications, the maintenance of their computers.

All this is going to be done in their system
wide network that allows them to be able to do, you
know, system wide intake that they have never been able
to do even though they have 11 different offices. And
so by having TIG, we have been able to make these types
of upgrades on those types of systems.

MS. RABY: And now we are going to talk about
Mississippi. Mississippi was in need of a pretty
significant upgrade to their technology infrastructure
and we started in 2001 working with Mississippi and
they did -- we funded a very small pilot that began to
test some basic components done in Mississippi: what
kind of services were available, what kind of vendors
were available, how large an area of the state did they
cover, what kind of telephone service was available,
what was the LATA setup.

Once we got finished with that pilot project,

they were successful in applying for a statewide
infrastructure that was going to be shared by the
northern program and the southern program together.
This system does handle all of their case management
needs, a standard suite of office productivity tools:
word processing, spreadsheets, databases, PowerPoint.
It is also a voice over IP systems and it is a single
statewide telephone system.

That means two things. One, it does create a
single statewide intake number so only one number
around the state has to be used to access legal
services, but it also, because it is their own
telecommunications set up, it does mean that their
overall long distance costs will continue to go down.

So this is a pretty significant increase in
Mississippi. It has been sometimes a struggle to get
them to sort of adapt to a completely new system that
is several jumps from where they were before, but it is
a great example where technology was actually able to
move a more traditional program forward.

Louisiana was encouraged by what they saw was
happening in Mississippi, applied for a statewide

coordinator grant, wrote a statewide technology plan
all of the programs in Louisiana working together.
They were successful in 2004 in putting together an
application for a statewide case management system. It
is their first time all of the programs have agreed to
work together on a single technology project.

Alabama is a recently configured single
statewide program. They have been looking at what is
going on in Mississippi and Louisiana. They applied
successfully in the 2004 round for statewide
coordinator and we will, I am sure, see a successful
application in 2005 or at least an outstanding
application in 2005 for a statewide technology plan.

MR. RAWDON: Another thing we are very proud
of is the way we have been able, through using the TIG
grants, to get the grantees to adopt templates and
standards. And you may ask, well, why do we want to
have standards. Well, I always use the illustration
from banking. If each bank had its own standard for
its ATM machine, you couldn't use an ATM from any other
bank. I mean, but the way it is, I -- you know, when I
travel, even in London or Australia or somewhere, I can

put my ATM card in and get money out of my account.

Well, legal services programs need incentives to do the same types of standardization. And TIG has been able to do this with a carrot instead of a stick because what we have been able to do is with every one of our statewide website grants, they agree, to receive the money, that they will use the national index and that they will work with the other standards that we have created.

For example, the national index was a project that we started with NLADA and others. It is kind of like the west key numbering system so that every piece of content on our statewide websites are coded so that if it is on a specific area of the law in Mississippi and it is on the same area of law in New York, they will be using the same number.

Well, you may ask why is that important. Well, if you look at the next part of the slide, which is XML, this is, you know, to be technical, that means extensible markup language, but in lay terms, it is a way for people to be able to communicate between different databases and different websites and exchange

information.

And this is going to be important because we are the biggest law firm in the country if we will act like it. And we are able to post something for an advocate working on a social security case in New York and as soon as we finish with this XML project, which has been ongoing for the last couple of years, an advocate in New York will be able to search that website and find any pleading that has been filed by any advocate on -- across the nation and use that for their own research. For the same, it becomes important for clients to be able to find information from other states. They will be able to find that as well when they do a search because using XML, we can exchange that data.

It is also going to have a bearing on things such as mapping because using XML, once we get this into our case management systems, that is going to make it very easy for us to take the information from their case management system and use that with an XML enabled mapping program so that they will be able to use their maps more efficiently.

It also, in a pilot project that we are doing in Washington, has tremendous potential for the ability to refer cases. Right now the CLEAR program, which is the hotline in Washington, when they take in a case it needs to refer to the pro bono program, all they do is check a little box on the screen and automatically, that is picked up and moved out to a web server.

An e-mail is sent to the organization, the pro bono program, that needs to have that case referred to them. What they do then is they click on it, bring up some basic information so they can check conflicts. If they have no conflict, they click another button, download the file, it imports that into their case management system.

Before, in Washington, you would print it out, walk to the fax machine, fax it, the other organization would go get it, they would check the conflict, and they would have to type it all over. And they were able to show that hundreds more cases were be able to then be done in the time that they save working on this.

And then the last one is the HotDocs. I

mentioned that earlier, the document assembly. By

working with our national developer group, instead of

eery place having to do every pleading, they are

sharing with one another, they are working together.

We are doing national trainings on it so that they can

all work together and share this so that with our

limited resources, we won't be doing things twice.

Another thing that we have been able to do

with TIG is to get extra money. And I want to point

this out because this year, when we went from the 2.9

million down to the 1.2, that 1.7 million, as I

understand it, went into a census adjustment so that

that 1.7 will go to the programs, some of the programs

for the census adjustment. But that is 1.7. That is

it will ever be.

With TIG, we leveraged that money so that with

most of our grants, there is other money coming in from

other sources. So if that 1.7 were in TIG, it would be

3 or $4 million, maybe even more, that would be going

to the program. For example, Lexis-Nexis agreed to

donate $125,000 to the HotDocs project so that where

one of the barriers to our program before in doing

document assembly was the cost, now they can't say that because they have gotten the software to do it for free.

The other one is on the Live Help project. Now that is a really nice, new project that we had so that someone that is working on the website will be able to click on a button if they get into trouble and there will be a chat window that will come up and they can talk to a person live and answer the question or they may be able to get to a hotline worker directly. This is brand new, it has just been started, by Cisco and one of their partners, the Shore Group, is donating over a hundred thousand dollars in software and technical assistance to this project.

Washington Law Help has been so successful with our statewide website there that the Washington attorney general has pledged a hundred and sixteen thousand eight hundred and seventy-five dollars for them to develop consumer law content for the immigrant community and we just got back from Texas where Randy Chapman there told us that the Texas Law Help and the Travis County Law Library working together are

receiving a $375,000 grant to work on content for the Texas Law Help.

This is all made possible because TIG got these projects started, people in the communities see the benefit and they are willing to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars to make these successful.

MS. RABY: So now we are going to talk a little bit about the challenges we face with projects and a little bit of context here. You know, we all understand that when you fund innovation, it is, by its very nature, as likely to fail as it is to succeed. And what TIG has strived to do is to do new things, to do things that have never been done before and so the likelihood that we are going to occasionally run into failure certainly increases when you do that.

We know that risk is part of the formula. TIG grants are not paid out in a lump sum, they are paid out on an incremental basis. A grantee when it is awarded, a grant gets a small, initial payment. There then a payment schedule is set up with a set of milestones, instructions for successfully documenting the completion of those milestones and then another

incremental payment is made and then the process begins
again.

So we have sort of attempted to fund or seed
innovation, but minimize our exposure in terms of
money. So one of -- I am going to talk about the two
big things that people run into when they begin to --
or reasons that projects don't always -- aren't always
successful. And one is dedicated personnel.

Projects often fail because there is not
sufficient personnel dedicated to the project. And I
think we have gotten better at being able to identify,
in a budget or in an application, where we have
assigned a portion of the project is 25 percent of this
person's time and 5 percent of this person's time, but
that is not a really -- that is not an effective way to
implement a project. We have encouraged our programs
to dedicate specific technology personnel and/or office
staff to the implementation of technology projects.

One of the other things we have done to
encourage the use of dedicated personnel is the
creation of matching funds. Some of our grant
categories do require that grantees come up with

matching funds. That can be from their own budget, that can be from other grants, that can be from other partners in the state, but just it is a way to encourage that that personnel, then, is dedicated to the project and it is also to ensure that the programs are invested in the project from the beginning.

That has its good side. The bad side is sometimes we get to the second item, insufficient investment from other resources. Programs will determine that they have -- they believe that they have sufficient and matching funds only to find out that that grant doesn't come through or that the other programs aren't able to contribute as much as possible. And that is a real indicator of a project that is not going to be successful.

And sometimes it just doesn't work. We have had a couple of cases where grantees -- for example, DNA was putting together a series of workstations around its program area, largely covering a desert. Those were to contain a lot of document assembly, the statewide website, information and materials for pro se's and they wanted to use satellite technology in

order to download that information to make it available in this really large service area.

The satellite technology when they got ready to implement, simply didn't work. They weren't able to make that connection. Fortunately by the time it was determined that wasn't going to work, DSL was becoming available in that area and they were able to make use of DSL.

The Virgin Islands ran into a similar situation. They attempted to use satellite technology in order to cover their service area, which is multiple islands. When they got ready to actually purchase the bandwidth from the satellite provider, the satellite provider said that the satellite was full and that they didn't have enough customers to justify launching another satellite.

And so they waited around a while and fortunately DSL became available and that was a way that they addressed it. But sometimes when you run into projects, it is simply a matter of the technology didn't work as originally anticipated or it was not available in a way that it was going to be compatible

with a project.

We fund a lot of case management projects. Case management is critical to a sound and appropriate technology infrastructure. There are just times when it doesn't work and it cannot work in a variety of ways. We had a program in Indiana that attempted to use the case management system and hosted in-house across the state of Indiana, they are a single statewide program. After about a year and a half, it became clear that the program that they had chosen was not going to work in that configuration and they went to a subsequent off the shelf product that was designed to work that way.

Nevada worked with a vendor for a long time creating a new case management system that would also have been connected through their telephone system and what they hoped would happen was private volunteer attorneys would be able to sit at their desks and, via the web, make their telephones available as another intake worker and that they would be able to provide, on a regular basis, intake services as a volunteer to the program.

As part of a state visit, program visit to the site, it became clear that not only was the case management system not up to minimum standards, but the telephone system never really -- never fully delivered on the promise of being able to increase their private attorney involvement. So just those are a few examples on the case management system.

We did, in response to the problems with -- that grantees sometimes encounter in the selection and implementation of case management systems, fund a grant in 2003 that created -- sort of did an industry review of all of the grant packages -- I mean, the case management packages that were out there in the legal services community.

They narrowed it down to the eight most popular packages and did a series of what -- a sort of consumer report type manual that sort of showed all of the features, the different functionality, the different costs associated for licensing for seat or for -- or by site and the different configurations that the software was made available in. That, as of last count, has been downloaded 196 times from LS Tech and

LLI to be used by any program free of charge, LSC or not. Those were just the folks that gave us their e-mail address as an identifier.

We sent a survey just before the holidays to all of those e-mail addresses to give an evaluation of what people thought the usefulness and effectiveness of that manual was, but it was a one-time comprehensive review and then research on case management and provide that free of charge to all of our grantees.

Sometimes we do really great projects that are very well executed and they are not used. And I am going to talk about two of them. In Maine, this is the video conferencing project that we talked about a little bit earlier in the presentation. It was designed originally to be a system that would allow volunteer attorneys to provide services to clients in remote and rural Maine, primarily the northern part of Maine. They did a significant amount of outreach and marketing to their private attorney community and no one volunteered.

So it was well executed, it did everything it was supposed to do, the grant was implemented the way

they had originally envisioned, but for whatever reason, it didn't result in any increase in any private attorney involvement.

In Utah, it is a very similar scenario. They created, in close collaboration with their courts, a website that allowed for pro se individuals who were in the process of creating the documents they needed to file on behalf of themselves to post those documents onto our website and then private attorneys who had been trained and vetted and were willing to review those documents would be able to log onto that website, they would receive an e-mail them there was something there available, make a review of those documents and then send comments or suggestions back to the pro se individual. It was an attempt to sort of address that intervention for an attorney in that narrow opportunity where they make a critical difference.

Once again, they did significant outreach. They did continuing legal education classes. They went to the Bar Association state meetings. Everybody loved, thought it was a great idea and nobody volunteered. So I mean, sometimes our challenge is

simply that we have done a well executed project, but it just doesn't -- it doesn't work as we anticipated in terms of making a difference.

MS. MERCADO: Just in the rural, part of it is the lack of there aren't many attorneys in private practice to begin with.

MS. RABY: Absolutely. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Just to find out how much more you have to present only because we have a major -- another major item. Do you have a sense of how much more?

MR. RAWDON: We could skip ahead some of you want.

MS. RABY: We have about five more slides.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MS. RABY: We will just flip through.

CHAIRMAN HALL: If you could, only because I want to try to get to all of the things on the agenda and we have to stop at 4:30.

MS. RABY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN HALL: So we are --

MR. RAWDON: Quickly, let's go here. These

are some of the projects that we have got well

underway, but there is still a lot left to do. And so

what we want to be sure of is that the TIG staff -- you

know, now that we have laid the background all of this,

we have got a lot of these good projects going -- like,

we would like to see the full integration of the

websites into the delivery system.

Live Help is going to be doing some of that,

but there is still a lot to do. We don't want to see

the websites as just sitting out there by themselves.

It should be integrated into the use of the hotline

workers, all of our staff and attorneys using this, all

the community partners. We want to see it very well

integrated.

The same with document assembly and

multimedia. We have two grants this year that are

going to take the multimedia tools that we developed

through a 2001 TIG grant and make sure now that any of

our grantees can develop multimedia presentations and

punch them out under the statewide website.

We mentioned XML and ECLEAR. These are well

underway now, but they are still not there. There is a

lot that we can do to take these and reach the full potential on those so that when one program anywhere in the country needs to refer to any other program, they will be able to click a button and refer that case electronically.

Knowledge management so that we can improve the work of our hotline workers so that they have more good advice to give. Advocate websites. We want to be sure now that we have got the client part of the website that the information is there for our advocates, that there is tools for our pro bono attorneys, that we really see the full potential of these websites to make our lawyers better lawyers and give them more tools to serve.

MS. RABY: Legal Aid University. It is a grant that we funded that is a partnership with the New England Training Consortium that actually creates web-based classroom materials that educate our attorneys. And I will leave it at that.

MR. RAWDON: Yes. What will the funding cuts mean? In 2004, we had 83 applications requesting $6.9 million. Okay. Our funding was at 2.9. So you can

see that there were quite a few grants that we weren't able to make. Many of those were very worthwhile grants for good projects, but we didn't have the money to make those even at 2.9.

Of that, 28 grants went out to support our website projects and that was over a million dollars. And so if at the 2005 level, you would knock off a million dollars to try to take care and sustain your website, you can see you have only got a couple hundred thousand dollars left for all these other worthwhile projects. So that trying to sustain whatever we put in place is just not sustainable at the 2.7 million.

And at 2006, the $5 million level that the Board approved at the Montana board meeting, this would allow us to sustain these efforts. It is really important that we are able to get our story to Congress to show how much good work has been started, how much there is left to be done and how much this leverages the money that they give to us, just how far the reach is with it.

And the TIG staff has been working hard with GRPA and NLADA and other partners to get this message

across, but, you know, anything else that we can do,
just call upon us, anything that we can do to get this
story across, we are more than willing to help.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Great. Thank you very much.
You don't have to run off right away, but thank you for
an interesting presentation. I guess one of the
pressing questions, and it may have been implicit in
your last comment, is, is the reason for this drop that
we have seen over time from the first grant, that is
from the first allocation from Congress to now, the
product that we haven't told the story because if one
was to hear the successes that you have achieved to
this in this period of time, you would have to believe
that this is making an important contribution to the
delivery of legal services.

But yet I see a pattern, based on the funding
that you gave in the beginning, Michael, of it going
down. So is it that we haven't told our story or has
there been an assumption that this is one of those
allocations that as you do the work, it should go down?

MR. GENZ: There is always room to tell the
story better and I am sure there is something there

that we could do better than we could. Without going into great detail, the patterns of decisions in the years don't pay the clear picture at all. I mean, some of these were -- some of these years were LSC recommendations that the amount go down because of other funding issues.

In this last one, both houses come up with numbers higher than 2.9 on their individual side. Somehow what happened in Congress didn't reflect a negative indication of this particular project, but I think there is no doubt that the chairman's point is well taken that we can tell our story better.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Okay.

MS. MERCADO: Just real briefly, but I mean, isn't the flip side of that saying that all the work that you have done, especially in some of the programs where you can just roll over and use the templates of the work that we have done to make us more effective or at least to spread out more the delivery of legal services to poor people, is that at a minimum to maintain, we would need to have the $5 million in the tech line item for that and that maybe we need to be a

little bit more aggressive about presenting that point
because in effect, you could almost say that some of
that prior money would be wasted if we are not able to
upkeep and to continue the work that we are doing. And
I am assuming that for the 2006, the 5 million is
central to sustain the program.

MR. GENZ: Exactly. That is a very good
point. What we have built today just has been a lot of
innovation and we have things at a certain point that
where they are now ready to spread from one or two or
three places all over the country, but that spreading
hasn't happened. Websites are a little further along,
but again, that hasn't happened. So yes, we feel very
strongly that this would be a bad time to say -- to
declare victory and leave, that this is the time to
spread and that requires a significant investment to
keep going.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, I would just suggest
that I think this is an area that we need to delve into
even more deeply than we were able to do now because I
think, you know, technology has some tremendous
potential in helping us achieve a long-term goal.

I would suggest that once we find out what the funding actually is, and especially if the unfortunate scenario happens and we don't get the 5 million, which we feel is necessary to sustain us, that we have another discussion as to, you know, what strategies do we have to develop to keep these things going and is it partnering with other entities because I do think this is a pathway that we need to explore more.

So I apologize for not being able to spend more time talking with you about some of the broader ramifications of all of this, but we do need to move on. So I would just suggest that once we know for sure how things are looking for the next fiscal year that we should try to get you back on our agenda.

MR. GENZ: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN HALL: I am sure. Thank you very much.

The last major item is a project that this committee has discussed on numerous occasions and it is on the mentoring project and Helaine, I think, is going to introduce that for us.

REPORT ON MENTORING PROJECT

MS. BARNETT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the Equal Justice Conference last April in Atlanta, Frank Strickland and I had a meeting with representatives of LSC's leadership and diversity advisory committee where we discussed possible approaches creating an LSC mentoring project to develop a core of diverse, new leaders capable of carrying on the legacy of federally funded legal services.

We invited the counsel to flush out their proposals and to make a presentation to the Board at its June meeting. At the June meeting of the Board of Directors, Lilian Johnson, on behalf of LSC leadership and diversity advisory council made a presentation to this board Provisions Committee on a proposed mentoring project.

After discussions by members of the Board, the Board asked that staff work on redefining the concept to make suggestions and recommendations on how to move forward and to report back to the committee. Pursuant to the Board's direction, we established an internal mentoring project committee to work on further

developments of the project.

We also solicited input from various external groups, such as NLADA, CLASP and MIE. The result of these discussion is the outline and proposal for our pilot leadership and mentoring program that is included in your board book. I would like to share with you that we have kept the three members of the advisory council informed of our deliberations and have shared with them our proposed outline for comment to which they responded the proposal was very thoughtful and thorough.

Three members of the LSC mentoring project committee are here today to make a brief presentation to the Provisions Committee on our proposed mentoring project.

Carla Smith, program counsel in the Office of Compliance and Enforcement will present highlights of the proposed mentoring project.

Althea Hayward, program analyst, in the Office of Program Performance, will discuss the open issues of the project.

And Evora Thomas, program counsel in the

Office of Program Performance, will conclude with our

proposed next step.

We are making this presentation to you today

to make sure that we are headed in the right direction.

I will now turn the presentation over to Carla.

MS. SMITH: Good afternoon, everyone. In the

essence of time, I am going to be very brief, but I

wanted to give you a synopsis of the proposal for the

pilot leadership and mentoring program. This is

included, I believe, in page 54 of your booklet.

As stated to you previously, we had several

members as a committee with members of the legal

services community. It was during this time and

through research of our own that we found there was two

major theories regarding mentoring, one on one

mentoring and group mentoring.

There are pros and cons to each. The one on

one mentoring involved a more intimate setting for the

parties involved in which there is a more

confidentiality and again, the more intimate setting.

Group mentoring, we found, exposes the mentor, as we

like to say the protégé, to more diverse leaders and

more diverse opinions and experiences.

As a committee, it was decided that we would try to group -- try to pilot that where it actually combined both of these theories. It was decided -- I should say before we start that some of the number of participants and the duration really will depend on the availability of funding, which will be discussed later by my colleague, but we would hope that this will be a 18-month pilot project in which we would have 20 participants, 10 mentors and 10 protégés.

The panel -- it was discussed that there will be a panel that will be formed, which will include LSC staff and mentors of the legal services community. The protégés will be matched with a primary mentor, but they will be expected and encouraged to reach out to other mentors in the pilot project.

To cultivate the group mentoring aspect of the program, it was decided that there would be three sessions. The first session will include the orientation, the training leadership management and diverse -- training regarding leadership, management and diversity. The curriculum will be developed by LSC

with help from NLADA, CLASP, MIE and ABA hopefully.

The second session will occur midpoint through the 18-month pilot and that will include additional training, a group activity will be initiated and also presentations from leaders in the legal services community.

The third session will be the conclusion of the project and additional training, if needed, will be given at that time. It was decided that after each session, that the participants will receive evaluations so that we would have feedback from them immediately after to analyze later. Also, I should have stated that the participants, once chosen, will also receive an evaluation as to what are their needs and what are their expectations of the pilot.

Although the executive directors of the participants will not be directly involved, we do know that their comments will be beneficial to us. So they will also be given evaluations to fill out and will be consulted during the project.

To cultivate the one on one aspect of this proposal, we are going to require that the participants

meet with one another at least once before each session and during this time, they will have to -- after each meeting, they will have to report to the panel their meeting and discuss what occurred during that time.

The participants will also be encouraged to reach out to their mentor, or the mentor reach out to the protégé, during this time through e-mails and phone calls. And again, we are going to encourage the protégés to reach out to other mentors as well.

It is our hope that after this, the conclusion of this project, that LSC will be able to assess whether or not the objectives of this pilot program was met and what needs or what training needs to be done to further this. We hope that this will the start or the beginning of creating a mentoring program that will be beneficial to all in the legal services community.

And now I will give you to Althea Hayward.

MS. HAYWARD: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name is Althea Hayward and we are particularly excited to be here to give you feedback from the internal committee about our discussions and deliberations on the mentoring process.

My task is to briefly highlight for you just a few of the unresolved issues of which the committee continues to deliberate. First and foremost, as Carla indicated a few moments ago, we are internally discussing the issue of funding the pilot project. As a committee, we have not yet settled on the total cost projections for this project. There are some direct and indirect expenses we are sure will have to be addressed.

There are ongoing discussions about these costs and about which LSC funds may be available to handle or support this project. It may be that some of the expenses connected with the project, particularly those related to the participation of protégés, may have to be borne by the programs from which the protégé or by which the protégés are employed.

The second issue that we are contemplating is the actual number of participants, both mentors and protégés. A critical issue of this nature will be determined when the funding concerns have been resolved. We will know then just exactly how much we can do based on the amount of money available to us.

And then thirdly, we have continuing conversations and discussions around the issue of eligibility criteria for the protégés. The committee has recommended that we look at a five-year ceiling or requirement for protégés. We are conducting some research, however, because we are not sure that we would have enough of an applicant pool based on that five-year level.

So our research is not yet completed. We are doing that internally based on the records available at the Corporation. These are three of the main issues right now that we are contemplating and Evora Thomas will tell you about the next step.

MS. THOMAS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I want to start by saying that staff is very appreciative of the opportunity to take this notion that has come to the Board and to bring forth, from an embryonic state, a project that all seem to believe is important for the justice community nationally.

You have heard an overview of how the project is to be structured and some of the concerns that we

are continuing to wrestle with. We have identified
approximately six next steps that we are going to have
to address in order to maintain the momentum of
bringing this to fruition.

The first of these is to affirm the
partnership. It has already been mentioned that we
have been in collaboration through our discussions with
NLADA as well as MIE, which his the management
information exchange. We would want to move toward a
further clarification of the roles of those entities
and any other partners, such as CLASP and perhaps the
ABA, that has expressed an interest in this project.

First, to define the role that each of these
partners would play in the overall project and then
secondly, to move to a formalization of the
relationship, whether that be through letters of intent
or, in some instances, the organizations may have to
obtain authorizations from their governing body, but we
want to look concretely at those particular things as
we move forward.

The second thing that we will be addressing is
refining and finalizing the selection process. And by

that, I mean that we are going to look more specifically, as Althea mentioned, at qualifications. We are going to analyze data that is available and being aggregated through LSC's Office of Information Management to make sure that we are looking realistically at qualification levels for both the mentors and the protégés.

Secondly, in the selection process, we have begun to create applications, but we will want to revisit those and to look at them in a more specific way than the broad brush that we gave to the initial drafting.

We would like to finalize time lines. And again, all of this is going to be driven funding availability for the project, but we need to structure the time lines within the application process itself aside from the overall time line for the project. And then finally, within that selection process, we made reference to the use of a selection committee and we need to finalize the qualifications and compositions of that selection committee.

The third thing we want to address more

specifically is curriculum. Two of the partners that
we have mentioned are NLADA and MIE that have had some
experience, specifically with leadership development
initiatives, and we think that it is prudent that
rather than beginning all over again, that working
together, we can benefit from the experience and
knowledge base that they bring to bear on this
initiative. And so we will be looking to them to
assist us in the development of training modules, the
appropriate content for those models.

Secondly, we will be identifying appropriate
faculty. We don't want to presume that the individuals
who serve as mentors ought to also be presenters of the
subject matter. And so we bifurcated that and there
may be overlapping, but initially, at least, we need to
look at the next two separate categories.

And then thirdly, we want to begin to address
the logistics issue where geographically would be most
appropriate, where from an atmosphere context it would
be most appropriate to house and to support the
training sessions.

The fourth area is marketing and development.

As with any new initiative, we would like for this to be something that we see a wide publicity, wide level of publicity from the inception. We also would like for there to be an opportunity for feedback from the community.

One of the things that the committee proposes is a presentation during the Equal Justice Conference in May. That conference is May 6th through 7th in Austin, Texas. Ideally, that would also be an opportunity to launch the project, but whether we are able to actually take this presentation to that level is contingent upon whether the funding is in place for us to have made commitments that can assign a start date.

The overall -- another aspect of marketing and development would be communications through other means, such as the web LSC has, the LRI, we would post content there, we would broadcast, through LSC resources, to all of our grantees and then identify other print media to make the information related to this new project available.

Evaluation is something that we believe is

important at all levels of the project and so we have identified someone within the LSC staff that will design both pre, contemporaneous and post project evaluation for the pilot.

And then the final aspect that we will be spending a great deal of time analyzing and have alluded to previously is the funding scenario and looking at what options are available to fund this initiative and whether there are other partners that might be in a position to help us to do so.

So succinctly, this is where we are at this point in the development and we are very excited about the project, anxious to bring it from skeletal to full body development and we, again, appreciate the Board's indulgence in doing it.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Well, we appreciate the time and effort that all of you have put into it and I applaud the work that you have done and read the outline and certainly have appreciated even more hearing from you.

We don't have a lot of time because we are about to run over. I guess one question I would at

least like to get some clarity on is that you have certainly mentioned unresolved issues and there are some other things you need to begin to kind of finalize. Do you have a sense of when you would have a, you know, full blown project that you are ready to initiate? Is that three months from now, six months from now? Do you have -- Helaine, do you want to address that?

MS. BARNETT: We are optimists, but we do have some significant open issues to resolve. I think as Evora said, you know, our goal was to have it ready to launch at the Equal Justice Conference. We will still work towards that goal, although it is not clear we will be able to do that. At the very minimum, we will do a presentation on where we are at and present it in --

CHAIRMAN HALL: Yes. And I know the cost issue that you are looking at. Do you have any parameters that you are operating under now as to what the program would actually cost or is that still too premature to even through out numbers?

MS. HAYWARD: It is premature.

MS. BARNETT: It is premature.

CHAIRMAN HALL: It is premature? Okay. It is good to follow your committee.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN HALL: I guess one issue I would raise, which came out in the comments, is that as a way of dealing with the costs, you mentioned the possibility of asking the program to kind of fund the protégé and I can certainly understand that.

I would just ask the committee to look carefully at the down sides of that, which programs that are strapped for funds who may have a person who would be ideal for this program might feel -- depending on what they would have to put up. I mean, if it is $500, not a big deal, but if it is something that may be more significant than that, then that may be the determining factor as to whether they even participate. So at least from my personal perspective, I would hope that one is sensitive to the impact that this would have on the program and the fact that it may run away some of the people you want.

Are there any other brief or quick questions

from the Committee or other members of the Board? I
don't want to run over too much into the next program.

MR. MEITES: In looking at the materials, it
was unclear to me exactly what was meant by, you know,
effective leadership in the legal services community,
which would be the mission of this project. So it
would be helpful, I think, if that was flushed out a
little bit more in terms of what that means so that we
would have sort of measurable, quantifiable goals to
determine that this program is, you know, successful at
doing what we think that it is supposed to do.

It is a little unclear to me whether this is
to help future directors or we want educate people
about lobbying opportunities or, you know, working
largely in the community or what it is.

And then the other thing is that Cincinnati
has this management information exchange. You know,
they have a pamphlet, a booklet on leadership within
the legal services community and it is important that
we don't duplicate their efforts because as I
understand it, they concentrate quite a bit on, you
know, this sort of an effort.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Maria?

MS. MERCADO: Yes. Mr. Chairman, just sort as a point of reference, this mentoring project is sort of a result of probably almost a two-year term, I believe, that we spent on diversity leadership within the legal services community in conjunction with partnerships with the American Bar Association, the National Legal Aid Defender Association, and we have actually three what I would call conferences, sessions really flushing out a lot of these issues. And I am amazed that there were some recommendations in light of it that came out of it both, you know, from NLADA and legal services and I am sure that we have those documents available.

It might be helpful I think, especially since most of the members on this board were not part of that process, to get some of that information because that gives us a blueprint for where it is and where we want to go with it. And basically it was, to some extent, the grain of our leadership, not only the grain of our leadership, but the fact that most of the leadership was male and most of the leadership was white.

And those were very concrete factors because

we have grant conditions for anyone bidding for money

that they have diverse leadership in their grants and

their grantees and we also had to look within our own

shop and we also had to look, you know, within the shop

of our national grantees. How do we develop leaders of

the future. I mean, some people have been directors

for 20 years, 15 years, however many years and what is

being done to make sure that you are integrating some

new leadership in that process.

And so there has already been a lot of work

and I agree with you as far as not duplicating some of

the work that has already been done, but rather

furthering and making it more finite as to what it is

that we want to see happen. And it might be that it is

going to require some partnership with the ABA or NLADA

or MIE to help fund some of this because I think for a

lot of programs, it will be problematic to spend one or

two or three of their who they consider possible

leaders, you know, to three or five or six sessions

within a couple of 18-month period of time to develop

them.

Unfortunately because of those type

constraints, that if you have an opportunity to have that lawyer or that staff person do X amount of work within their program, that that is going to take priority over this. And so how do we incorporate it to where it actually is a proactive initiative on behalf of legal services to do that.

And we actually did get some specified funding for that in one of our budgetary years, but I don't believe that we have followed up with that by making sure that we have some continuing funding in our budget to deal with it.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Any other quick questions from board members or reactions? Well, your opening question, Helaine, was, you know, are we on the right track and at least from my perspective, I feel you are and appreciate the work that is being done and would ask that you take into consideration the questions and comments that you have heard from the Board today and, you know, continue to move forward. So and again, thanks to the committee for all of your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN HALL: We are over our time. The

next item on the agenda is public comment. So if there is some public comment, we would like to receive it at this time.

(No response.)

CONSIDER AND ACT ON OTHER BUSINESS

CHAIRMAN HALL: Hearing none, is there any other act or business to come before this committee?

MR. MEITES: I would like to just interject that at the -- before we adjourn, while there is so many people here who weren't here earlier, that the Finance Committee met after a closed session and put the action without inviting public comment regarding the budget mark issue.

And so it is my intention when that is brought to the Board, anybody that is interested in that at that time, you can participate at that time and also the IG will present the information basically that it presented to the Committee. And I apologize for neglecting that, but that is about the best we can do I think at this point.

CHAIRMAN HALL: Thank you, Rob, for doing that.

Hearing no other action or business, the Provisions Committee meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:40 p.m., the meeting of the Provisions Committee was adjourned.)

* * * * *