Judicial Council of California . Administrative Office of the Courts

455 Golden Gate Avenue · San Francisco, California 94102-3688

www.courts.ca.gov

REPORT TO THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL

For business meeting on: December 14, 2012

Title
Equal Access Fund: Distribution of Funds for Partnership Grants

Rules, Forms, Standards, or Statutes Affected
N/A

Recommended by
State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund Commission
Jeffrey Ball, Cochair
David Lash, Cochair

Agenda Item Type
Action Required

Effective Date
December 14, 2012

Date of Report
November 26, 2012

Contact
Bonnie Rose Hough, 415-865-7668
bonnie.hough@jud.ca.gov

Executive Summary

As stated in its report on the *Equal Access Fund: Distribution of Thirteenth Year Equal Access Fund Partnership Grants*, the State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund Commission requests that the Judicial Council approve the distribution of $1,624,000 in Partnership Grants for 2013, according to the statutory formula in the state Budget Act and approve the commission's findings that the proposed budget of each individual grant complies with statutory and other guidelines.

Recommendation

The Legal Services Trust Fund Commission recommends that the Judicial Council approve the distribution of $1,624,000 in Equal Access Fund partnership grants for distribution to the following legal services agencies for programs conducted jointly with courts to provide legal assistance to self-represented litigants:

Asian Pacific American Legal Center
Asian Language Self-Help Family Law Workshops (Orange) ……..……..$45,000

Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach
Northern San Mateo County Restraining Order Clinic ……$70,000

Bay Area Legal Aid
Housing Law Clinic (Contra Costa) $65,000

Bet Tzedek Legal Services
Building Community & Expanding Access to Legal Services
in Los Angeles County ……. $85,000

California Rural Legal Assistance
Landlord/Tenant Pro Per Clinic (Stanislaus) $60,000

Central California Legal Services, Inc.
Elder Abuse Access to Justice Partnership – Fresno and Tulare Counties $90,000

Contra Costa Senior Legal Services
Senior Self-Help Clinic.....$25,000

East Bay Community Law Center
Consumer Law Clinic (Alameda).....$40,000

Elder Law and Advocacy
Imperial County Bilingual Conservatorship/Guardianship Clinic.....$45,000

Family Violence Law Center
Alameda County Domestic Violence Self-Representation Assistance ……$25,000

Greater Bakersfield Legal Assistance, Inc.
Kern County Orders Project $55,000

Inland Empire Latino Lawyers Association
Small Claims Advocacy & Awareness Project (Riverside/San Bernardino) $25,000

Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles
Santa Monica Self-Help Legal Access Center.....$40,000

Legal Aid Foundation of Santa Barbara County
Legal Resource Center in Lompoc $50,000

Legal Aid of Marin
Unlawful Detainer/MSC Calendar Assistance…….....$50,000

Legal Aid Society of Napa Valley
Small Claims Assistance Project $25,000

Legal Aid Society of Orange County
Central Justice Center Self-Help Center and E-Filing Project.....$65,000
Limited Conservatorship Clinic.....$25,000

Legal Aid Society of San Diego, Inc.
San Diego County Conservatorship Assistance Project……$45,000
Unlawful Detainer Assistance Program (South County).....$40,000

Legal Aid Society of San Mateo County
San Mateo County Landlord/Tenant Clinic.....$30,000

Legal Assistance for Seniors
Partnership to Assist Guardianship Litigants (Alameda) ……. $40,000

Legal Services of Northern California
Civil Harassment and Small Claims Mediation Project (Butte) ……$26,000
Mother Lode Pro Per Project (Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Placer) $58,000
Restraining Order Clinic (Solano) $30,000
Consumer Assistance Clinic (Yolo)..... $40,000

Los Angeles Center for Law and Justice
Young Parent's Day $25,000

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County
Pasadena Consumer Debt Relief $55,000
San Fernando Civil Harassment Project $45,000

Pro Bono Project Silicon Valley
Family Court Settlement Project (Santa Clara) $45,000

Public Law Center
Orange County Courthouse Guardianship Clinic $25,000
Orange County Spanish Language Self-Help Dissolution Workshops …….. $60,000

San Diego Volunteer Lawyer Project
North County Civil Harassment Restraining Order Clinic.....$50,000

San Francisco Bar Volunteer Legal Services
Family Law Assisted Self-Help (FLASH) Project …….. $45,000

Senior Citizens' Legal Services
Conservatorship and Elder Abuse Project (Santa Cruz, San Benito) …… $30,000

Watsonville Law Center
Language Access to Court Project (Santa Cruz).....$50,000

Total $1,624,000

The text of the commission's report and its attachments are found at pages 7–49.

Previous Council Action

The Judicial Council has approved the proposed distribution for each of the past 12 years based on the recommendations of the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission.

Rationale for Recommendation

For the last 13 years, the state Budget Act has contained a provision for the allotment of $10 million to an Equal Access Fund "to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice." (Assem. Bill 1464, Stats 2012, ch. 21, pp. 14-18; Stats. 2011, ch. 33, pp. 17–21; Stats. 2010, ch. 712, pp. 21–25; Stats. 2009, ch. 1, pp. 18–22; Stats. 2008, ch. 268, pp. 32–36; Stats. 2007, ch.171, pp. 40–42; Stats. 2006, ch. 47, pp. 26–30; Stats. 2005, ch. 38, pp. 9–11; Stats. 2004, ch. 208, pp.16–17; Stats. 2003, ch. 157, pp. 11–12; Stats. 2002, ch. 379, pp. 30–31; Stats. 2001, ch. 106, pp. 73–74; Stats. 2000, ch. 52, pp. 78–79; Stats. 1999, ch. 50, pp. 55–56.)

In 2005, the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act was approved by the Legislature and the Governor. That act established a new distribution of $4.80 per filing fee to the Equal Access Fund. The estimated revenue from filing fees for the fund is $5.7 million per year. Those revenues have been collected by the trial courts since January 2007.

The Budget Act requires the Judicial Council to distribute the Equal Access Fund monies to legal services providers through the State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund Commission. The State Bar created the commission to administer the law regulating attorneys' interest-bearing trust accounts (IOLTAs). (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6210 et seq.; State Bar Rules Regulating Interest-Bearing Trust Fund Accounts for the Provision of Legal Services to Indigent Persons, rule 4.)

The Budget Act states that "[t]he Judicial Council shall approve awards made by the commission if the council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines. . . . The Judicial Council may establish additional reporting or quality control requirements. . . ."[1] All recipients of partnership grants conduct an annual evaluation of the effectiveness of the

[1] The Budget Act language is attached in the commission's report, at page s 16-18.

programs, which are required to submit their evaluation results to the commission by March 1, 2014.

Under the Budget Act, the Chief Justice, as Chair of the Judicial Council, appoints one-third of the voting members to the commission—five attorney members and two public members, one of whom is a court administrator. The Chief Justice also appoints three nonvoting judges to the commission—two trial court judges and one appellate justice. (The membership roster is attached in the commission's report at pages 43–45.)

There are two grant programs, IOLTA-Formula grants and partnership grants. The Budget Act provides that 90 percent of the funds be distributed to legal services agencies according to a statutory formula (the IOLTA-Formula grants). The remaining 10 percent of the funds are to be distributed as partnership grants to legal services programs for projects conducted jointly with the courts to provide legal assistance to self-represented litigants. The process for choosing the legal services programs to receive these partnership grants is stated in the commission's report at pages 11–14.

Distributing the funds to the commission will allow it to carry out the terms of the Budget Act and put the partnership grant funds into the hands of legal services providers that will enter into joint projects with the courts to provide legal assistance to self-represented litigants. The fiscal year for these grants commences January 1, 2013.

The commission's report on the allocation of the Equal Access Fund shows that the commission has followed the statutory requirements and the additional criteria proposed in a report to the Judicial Council at its August 1999 meeting.

Comments, Alternatives Considered, and Policy Implications

The recommendations have been approved by the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission as required by law. The statutory scheme does not contemplate public comment.

There are no viable alternatives to distributing the funds according to the recommendations of the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission. The Budget Act requires the council to approve the distribution if it finds that the statutory and other relevant guidelines are met.

Implementation Requirements, Costs, and Operational Impacts

Partnership grants will require the courts that have elected to participate in joint projects with local legal services providers to cooperate in the manner proposed in their grant applications.

AOC staff will work with the staff of the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission to oversee administration of the Equal Access Fund, including fulfillment of requirements for reports on the commission's administration of the fund. Staff will also provide support to the commission (including the one-third of its members appointed by the Chief Justice) to facilitate administration of the Equal Access Fund.

The recommendation contained in this report will have no direct fiscal effect on the courts; nevertheless, the courts will indirectly benefit from assistance provided to self-represented litigants. AOC staff support will be covered by the provision for administrative costs in the Budget Act appropriation.

Relevant Strategic Plan Goals and Operational Plan Objectives

This recommendation helps implement Goal 1 of the Judicial Council's strategic plan, Access, Fairness, and Diversity, by increasing representation for low-income persons.

Attachments

1. Attachment A: Report of the State Bar Legal Services Trust Fund Commission

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM

180 HOWARD STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-1617 TELEPHONE: 415-538-2252; FAX: 415-538-2529

DATE: November 19, 2012

TO: The Judicial Council of California

FROM: David Lash, Co-Chair
Jeffrey Ball, Co-Chair
Legal Services Trust Fund Commission

Stephanie Choy, Managing Director
Legal Services Trust Fund Program

SUBJECT: Equal Access Fund: Distribution of Thirteenth Year Equal Access Fund Partnership Grants

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 1999, the Judicial Council (the "Council") budget has included the Equal Access Fund for grants to provide free legal assistance to indigent Californians. These grants are made through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission of the State Bar of California (the "Commission").

Each year the Equal Access Fund is authorized by the State Budget Act. The Budget Act of 2012 includes a basic budgetary allocation from the General Fund of $10,392,000 and additional funding from the Trial Court Trust Fund in the amount of $5,482,000 less $274,100 (5% administration of funds). These funds are to be distributed in two parts: 90% of the funds are distributed according to the statutory Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts ("IOLTA") formula; the remaining 10% of the funds are distributed as discretionary grants to partnership projects between legal aid and court programs. The Budget Act also provides for funds for the cost of administration.

You first took action to implement this Fund in 1999, adopting procedures for the Chief Justice to appoint a third of the members of the Commission and approving protocols and policies established by the Commission. Each year since 1999, you have approved the award of grants.

At your August 2012 meeting, you approved distribution of the 90% of funds allocated to IOLTA-Formula grants in the total amount of $14,665,927. These funds were allocated according to a formula set forth in the IOLTA statute (Business & Professions Code sections 6210 et seq.) and pursuant to procedures already in place for determining eligibility and administering grants.

Since that time it has been determined that filing fee income, which represents a portion of the Equal Access Fund, may fall as much as $500,000 below initially projected levels. For that reason, prudence dictates that the amount to be distributed in Partnership Grants should be limited to $1,624,000, representing $55,547 less than the originally-calculated value of this grant fund.

It is timely and appropriate for the Council to now approve the distribution of the 10% of Equal Access Funds set aside for discretionary 2012-13 Partnership Grants in the total amount of $1,624,000 pursuant to the Budget Act of 2012. These competitive grants fund partnerships between legal aid organizations and the courts, for projects to help unrepresented litigants at or near the courthouse.

INTRODUCTION – THE BUDGET ACT

The Equal Access Fund, initially created by the Budget Act of 1999, has been continued in each subsequent Budget Act, including the 2012 Budget Act. The Budget Act allocates Equal Access Funds to the Council for distribution of grants to legal services providers through the Commission. The budget also provides for funds for the cost of administration. A copy of the Budget Act of 2012 is Attachment A.

Since 2005, the basic Equal Access Fund budget allocation has been supplemented with the Uniform Civil Fees and Standard Fee Schedule Act, approved by the Legislature and the Governor. That Act established a new distribution to the Equal Access Fund of $4.80 per filing fee. Through these fees, the Equal Access Fund has been supplemented by amounts ranging from about $2.5 to $6.4 million annually.

Total projected grant year income available for distribution in 2012-2013, as reported in August, is as follows: 1) the basic budgetary allocation of $10,392,000 pursuant to the Budget Act of 2012; 2) additional funding from the Uniform Civil Fees Act in the amount of $5,482,000, less $274,100 (5% for administration of funds) pursuant to the Budget Act of 2012; 3) additional filing fee revenue of $693,960 per amendment of the 2011-12 contract; and 4) $1,614 of interest, for an aggregate estimated 2012-2013 Equal Access Fund total of $16,295,474.

Current filing fee receipts indicate the strong possibility that this income for 2012-13 will be $500,000 less than originally estimated, Therefore the sum available for allocation through Partnership Grants should be reduced by no less than 10% of this anticipated shortfall.

The Budget Act establishes two kinds of grants for distribution, IOLTA-Formula Grants and Partnership Grants:

IOLTA-Formula Grants: At its August meeting, pursuant to the Budget Act of 2012, the Council approved distribution of $14,665,927 (90% of grants funds) to fund IOLTA-Formula Grants. These grants are allocated to eligible legal services providers according to a formula set forth in California's Interest on Lawyers' Trust Accounts ("IOLTA") statute. Additionally, an amount equal to 5% of the grants is set aside for administrative costs, shared by the State Bar of California and the Administrative Office of the Courts, in a total amount of $793,700.

Partnership Grants: The Commission now requests that the Council approve distribution of the grant funds that have been set aside for Partnership Grants to IOLTA-eligible legal services providers for "joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance available to pro per litigants." With the addition of $50,000 of undistributed Partnership Grant Funds from 2011-2012, and the deduction of $55,547 of anticipated filing fee shortfalls, total funds available for 2012-2013 partnership grants equal $1,624,000.

The 2012-13 year will mark the thirteenth round of Partnership Grants. This report describes the process and criteria that the Commission uses to select the successful applicants, and

provides information about the successful proposals, which are listed and described in Attachment B.

Partnership Grants. In 2012, thirty-three projects throughout California have received $1.62 million in total 2011-12 "Partnership Grants," in grant amounts ranging from $25,000 to $80,000. Only recipients of IOLTA and IOLTA-Formula Grants are eligible to apply for these grants, which are awarded to maximize the impact of this funding across areas of legal need, population types, and geographical regions. In the 2012-13 grant cycle, $1,624,000 will be available for Partnership Grants. Funding is provided on a calendar year basis.

As set forth in detail below, the Partnership Grants process begins with evaluation of proposals by Legal Services Trust Fund Program staff and a committee of the Commission. This evaluation encompasses several criteria, including but not limited to ensuring the impartiality of the services and assurances of program effectiveness and fiscal stability. Partnership Grants are considered "seed money" to encourage new projects; consequently, grants for ongoing projects have in the past been reduced significantly after three years of Partnership funding, and have generally been terminated after five years unless extraordinary conditions dictated to the contrary, as defined by written commission protocols.

Request for Proposals

In August, the commission issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) for Partnership Grants to all programs currently receiving funding from the Legal Services Trust Fund Program. Notice of the RFP also was distributed to local court personnel. The RFP in Attachment C sets forth selection criteria.

Selection Criteria

The Budget Act contains four essential elements for Partnership Grants:

- Recipients must be organizations that are eligible for a Legal Services Trust Fund Program grant.
- The funds must be used for joint projects of legal services programs and courts.
- The services must be for "indigent persons" as defined in the Trust Fund Program statute.
- The services must be for self-represented litigants.

In 1999, the Commission convened court staff, legal services program directors, and AOC staff to work with Trust Fund Program staff to develop grant-making processes and set criteria for partnership grants. This group concluded, and the Commission concurred, that it was important to give courts and legal services programs considerable latitude to develop effective models to address the needs within their particular communities. Each round of grants funds a range of projects, including projects in both urban and rural areas and in larger and smaller counties, and those that address different areas of law. Grantees include both new and continuing projects.

In 2008, the Partnership Committee of the Trust Fund Commission reviewed established grant policies and priorities, and after careful consideration, affirmed most of the policies. One minor

change was to soften their practice of terminating funding after five years where exceptional and compelling circumstances so dictate, particularly in rural areas or where disasters have struck. Since that time, deteriorating economic conditions have reinforced the wisdom of this determination. This policy has therefore been continued to the present grant cycle.

Consequently, while this year's grantees include some new projects and first-time programs, there are also three projects that are being funded to continue services beyond their fifth year of service. These projects serve seriously under-resourced regions of California. Two of these are substantially rural areas, and one is in a county with substantial agricultural activity and is located in a particularly depressed urban center. The Commission has instructed staff to advise these projects that this continuation of funding is exceptional and should not be anticipated in future years.

As in past years, we sought and received proposals that span a wide range of substantive, procedural, technical and programmatic solutions. All are required to provide the following:

- A letter of support from the applicable court's presiding judge.

- Written agreements between the legal services programs and the courts. As part of the grant process, we require recipients to develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the cooperating court indicating how the joint project, the court, and any existing self-help center, including the family law facilitator (as appropriate), will work together.

- A plan for an appropriate level of direct supervision of paralegals and other support staff by a qualified attorney.

- A plan to anticipate and meet the needs of litigants who are not within the legal services provider's service area or are ineligible for their services. While this can be a challenge for organizations with limited funding, a number of applicants have developed collaborations with other legal services providers that facilitate a broad availability of services.

- A plan to address the needs of unrepresented litigants who do not meet the financial eligibility requirements (e.g., by providing general information in the form of local information sheets, videos, workshops, etc.).

- A clearly stated policy regarding administration of financial eligibility standards, and established protocols to observe that policy.

- Protocols to minimize conflicts of interest, or to address them as needed, including: resources available to individuals who cannot be served for any reason; the relationship between the provider and the pro per litigant; and other similar issues.

- A plan for project continuity, including efforts to identify and secure additional funding within three years and to be free of Partnership support after five years.

- A multi-phase evaluation plan including such components as surveys, interviews, focus groups, courtroom observations, and file reviews, with a commitment to report on both qualitative and quantitative project results within three months of the end of the grant year.

Because all recipients of the Partnership Grants are organizations that already receive IOLTA Grants and IOLTA-Formula Equal Access Fund Grants through the Legal Services Trust Fund Program, they are already subject to requirements for oversight and reporting that are in place. The commission has also developed additional reporting requirements and evaluation procedures to apply specifically to the work to be done under these additional grants. Grantees are provided with special training and assistance in developing and executing evaluation plans.

Review and Selection Process

The Chief Justice continues to appoint one-third of the members of the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission, plus three non-voting judges who serve as advisors. All of them participate actively in the commission's work, with each serving or having served on one of its three standing committees, which include the Eligibility and Budgets and Partnership Grants committees.

The Partnership Grants Committee is responsible for evaluating the partnership grant proposals and recommending proposals to the full commission. (The judges participate fully – and vote – during committee considerations; they participate fully but do not vote in full commission deliberations.) A list of the members of the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission and the members of its Partnership Grants committee is provided in Attachment D.

Committee members were each assigned primary responsibility to review three or four applications, and were then divided into evaluation "teams" with a Trust Fund Program staff member providing support and background and conducting any necessary follow-up.

Committee members were given an evaluation form (Attachment E) which provided a structure for assessing how well each proposal met a set of thirteen discretionary criteria that together give a broad but accurate picture of program strategy and organization.

After completing these individual reviews, committee members met in evaluation teams to discuss specific concerns and issues with respect to specific projects. The full committee then met on October 19, 2012 to identify promising proposals and develop preliminary tentative allocations based on individual and subcommittee evaluations. This meeting also identified numerous issues for further investigation by Trust Fund Staff.

Committee members participated in a conference call on November 9 to assess the results of these investigations and reassess the preliminary allocation recommendations. This meeting led to additional questions which staff brought back to applicant programs for their further responses. The full committee met on the morning of November 19 to finalize its slate of grant recommendations, which was presented to the full commission for its approval that afternoon.

The commission is satisfied that all grant proposals represent well-conceived projects that warrant support with partnership grant funding.

Overview of Applications and Proposed Grants

For the $1,624,000 available in grants, the commission received 37 applications totaling $2,156,419. The grant applications represent broad geographic diversity as well as diversity in substantive areas of law and the nature of services to be provided. We received proposals for refunding from 29 of the 32 currently-funded projects, from seven projects that are seeking first-

time funding, and one project that was previously funded from 2004 through 2008 and now proposes funding for substantial restructuring of project operations. Of the four projects that did not seek refunding, three had already received five years of partnership grant funding.

All of the recommended grants involve collaboration between at least one legal services program and one court. Some are creative partnerships among multiple legal services programs, courts, and local community groups. Several propose to utilize technology to make services more accessible, and all would be located at, or in close proximity to, the courthouse.

The recommended grants reflect a mix of geographic areas and program types. All include a high quality of work to be performed, high demand for services, and innovative approaches to maximizing the impact of the grant. The Commission is requesting your approval for the following grant awards:

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER
Vietnamese Self-Help Centers and Family Law Workshops..... $45,000

ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER LEGAL OUTREACH
Northern San Mateo County Restraining Order Clinic $70,000

BAY AREA LEGAL AID
Contra Costa County Housing Law Clinic $65,000

BET TZEDEK LEGAL SERVICES
Building Community & Expanding Access to Legal Services
in LA County $85,000

CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE, INC.
Stanislaus County Landlord/Tenant Small Claims Pro Per Clinic $60,000

CENTRAL CALIFORNIA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.
Elder Abuse Access to Justice Partnership –
Fresno and Tulare Counties $90,000

CONTRA COSTA SENIOR LEGAL SERVICES
Contra Costa Senior Self Help Clinic $25,000

EAST BAY COMMUNITY LAW CENTER
Consumer Law Clinic $40,000

ELDER LAW & ADVOCACY
Imperial Court Bilingual Conservatorship/Guardianship Clinic $45,000

FAMILY VIOLENCE LAW CENTER
Domestic Violence Self-Representation Assistance Project $25,000

GREATER BAKERSFIELD LEGAL ASSISTANCE, INC.
Orders Project in Kern (OPIK) $55,000

INLAND EMPIRE LATINO LAWYERS ASSOCIATION

Small Claims Advocacy & Awareness Project (SCAAP) $25,000

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES
Santa Monica Self-Help Legal Access Center $40,000

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY
Legal Resource Center – Lompoc $50,000

LEGAL AID OF MARIN
Marin Unlawful Detainer - MSC Calendar $50,000

LEGAL AID OF NAPA VALLEY
Small Claims Assistance Project $25,000

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF ORANGE COUNTY
Central Justice Center Self-Help and E-Filing Project $65,000

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF ORANGE COUNTY
Limited Conservatorship Clinic $25,000

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN DIEGO
San Diego County Conservatorship Assistance Project $45,000

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN DIEGO
Unlawful Detainer Assistance Program $40,000

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN MATEO COUNTY
San Mateo County Landlord/Tenant Clinic $30,000

LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR SENIORS
Partnership to Assist Guardianship Litigants $40,000

LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
Civil Harassment and Small Claims Mediation
Project (Butte County) $26,000

LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
Mother Lode Pro Per Project $58,000

LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
Solano County Restraining Order Clinic (SCROC) $30,000

LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA
Consumer Assistance Project (Yolo County) $40,000

LOS ANGELES CENTER FOR LAW AND JUSTICE
Young Parent's Day $25,000

NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
Pasadena Consumer Debt Relief (CDR) $55,000

NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY
San Fernando Civil Harassment Project..... $45,000

PRO BONO PROJECT SILICON VALLEY
Family Court Settlement Project $45,000

PUBLIC LAW CENTER
Orange County Courthouse Guardianship Clinic $25,000

PUBLIC LAW CENTER
Orange County Spanish Language Self-Help Dissolution
Workshops $60,000

SAN DIEGO VOLUNTEER LAWYER PROGRAM, INC.
North County Civil Harassment Restraining Order Clinic $50,000

SAN FRANCISCO BAR VOLUNTEER LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM
Family Law Assisted Self-Help Project (FLASH) $45,000

SENIOR CITIZENS LEGAL SERVICES
Conservatorship & Elder Abuse Project (CEAP) $30,000

WATSONVILLE LAW CENTER
Language Access to the Court Project $50,000

TOTAL OF ALL PARTNERSHIP GRANT ALLOCATIONS:.....$1,624,000

Highlights of each of project are listed in Attachment B.

NEXT STEPS: TRUST FUND COMMISSION AND JUDICIAL COUNCIL

Legal Services Trust Fund Commission. At its meeting on November 19, 2012, the Commission reviewed partnership grant proposals and selected projects for funding for the 2012-13 grant year.

The Commission and the Legal Services Trust Fund Program staff will be responsible for administration of these Equal Access Funds in tandem with IOLTA revenues and contributions to the Justice Gap Fund. The Commission will continue its oversight of the EAF grant program, including review of expenditure reports and program-owned evaluation. With respect to partnership grants, each program funded for a new Partnership project must submit a Status Report after the sixth month of the grant year, indicating progress toward implementation of the project and any remaining obstacles to be resolved before the project is fully operational. All programs must submit an end-of-year Evaluation Report three months after the close of the grant year, including quantitative measurements of services provided, an accounting for its expenditure of grant funds, and a narrative report describing the results of the inquiries it had described in its evaluation plan. These materials are used by committee members and Trust Fund Staff when assessing proposals for refunding of ongoing projects.

Judicial Council. The Budget Act provides that "the Judicial Council shall approve awards made by the Commission if the council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other

relevant guidelines." It is requested that the Council approve the distribution of $1,624,000 in Partnership Grants for 2012-13 to the projects, and in the amounts, identified in Attachment B.

SUMMARY OF COUNCIL ACTION REQUESTED

In conclusion, it is timely and appropriate for the Council to approve, at its December 2012 meeting, the distribution of $1,624,000 in Partnership Grants pursuant to the Budget Act of 2012. Council approval in December is necessary to enable appropriate grant administration to fund projects for the period beginning January 1, 2013.

Attachment A: Budget Control Language, Budget Act of 2012

BUDGET ACT OF 2012: PROVISIONS GERMAINE TO THE EQUAL ACCESS FUND

Assembly Bill No. 1464
CHAPTER 21

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1.00. This act shall be known and may be cited as the "Budget Act of 2012."

{….}

0250-101-0001—For local assistance, Judicial Branch 17,753,000

Schedule:
(1) 45.10-Support for Operation of the Trial Courts 6,201,000
(2) 45.55.010-Child Support Commissioner Program 54,332,000
(3) 45.55.020-California Collaborative and Drug Court Projects 5,748,000
(4) 45.55.030-Federal Child Access and Visitation Grant Program 800,000
(5) 45.55.050-Federal Court Improvement Grant Program 700,000
(6) 45.55.070-Grants-Other 745,000
(7) 45.55.080-Federal Grants-Other 775,000
(8) 45.55.090-Equal Access Fund Program 10,392,000
(9) Reimbursements ..... −59,665,000
(10) Amount payable from the Federal Trust Fund (Item 0250-101-0890) ..... −2,275,000

Provisions:
1. In order to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice, the funds appropriated in Schedule (8) are to be distributed by the Judicial Council through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission to qualified legal services projects and support centers as defined in Sections 6213 to 6215, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code, to be used for legal services in civil matters for indigent persons. The Judicial Council shall approve awards made by the commission if the council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines. Ten percent of the funds in Schedule (8) shall be for joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance available to pro per litigants and 90 percent of the funds in Schedule (8) shall be distributed consistent with Sections 6216 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code. The Judicial Council may establish additional reporting or quality control requirements consistent with Sections 6213 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code.
2. The amount appropriated in Schedule (1) is available for reimbursement of court costs related to the following activities: (a) payment of service of process fees billed to the trial courts pursuant to Chapter 1009 of the Statutes of 2002, (b) payment of the court costs payable under Sections 4750 to 4755, inclusive, and Section 6005 of the Penal Code, and (c) payment of court costs of extraordinary homicide trials.

0250-101-0932—For local assistance, Judicial Branch, payable from the Trial Court Trust Fund 1,826,195,000

Schedule:
(1) 45.10-Support for Operation of the Trial Courts 1,390,697,000
(2) 45.25-Compensation of Superior Court Judges 306,829,000
(3) 45.35-Assigned Judges 26,047,000
(4) 45.45-Court Interpreters 92,794,000
(5) 45.55.060-Court Appointed Special Advocate Program 2,213,000
(6) 45.55.065-Model Self-Help Program 957,000

(**7) 45.55.090-Equal Access Fund 5,482,000**
(8) 45.55.095-Family Law Information Centers 345,000
(9) 45.55.100-Civil Case Coordination 832,000
(11) [sic] Reimbursements ....−1,000

Provisions:

1. The funds appropriated in Schedule (2) shall be made available for costs of the workers' compensation program for trial court judges.
2. The amount appropriated in Schedule (3) shall be made available for all judicial assignments. Schedule (3) expenditures for necessary support staff may not exceed the staffing level that is necessary to support the equivalent of three judicial officers sitting on assignments. Prior to utilizing funds appropriated in Schedule (3), trial courts shall maximize the use of judicial officers who may be available due to reductions in court services or court closures.
3. The funds appropriated in Schedule (4) shall be for payments to contractual court interpreters, and certified and registered court interpreters employed by the courts for services provided during court proceedings and other services related to pending court proceedings, including services provided outside a courtroom, and the following court interpreter coordinators: 1.0 each in counties of the 1st through the 15th classes, 0.5 each in counties of the 16th through the 31st classes, and 0.25 each in counties of the 32nd through the 58th classes. For the purposes of this provision, "court interpreter coordinators" may be full- or part-time court employees, and shall be concurrently certified and registered court interpreters in good standing under existing law.
The Judicial Council shall set statewide or regional rates and policies for payment of court interpreters, not to exceed the rate paid to certified interpreters in the federal court system.
The Judicial Council shall adopt appropriate rules and procedures for the administration of these funds. The Judicial Council shall report to the Legislature and the Director of Finance annually regarding expenditures from Schedule (4).
4. Upon order of the Director of Finance, the amount available for expenditure in this item may be augmented by the amount of any additional resources available in the Trial Court Trust Fund, which is in addition to the amount appropriated in this item. Any augmentation must be approved in joint determination with the Chairperson of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and shall be authorized not sooner than 30 days after notification in writing to the chairpersons of the committees in each house of the Legislature that consider appropriations, the chairpersons of the committees and appropriate subcommittees that consider the State Budget, and the chairperson of the joint committee, or not sooner than whatever lesser time the chairperson of the joint committee, or his or her designee, may determine. When a request to augment this item is submitted to the Director of Finance, a copy of that request shall be delivered to the chairpersons of the committees and appropriate subcommittees that consider the State Budget. Delivery of a copy of that request shall not be deemed to be notification in writing for purposes of this provision.
5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon approval and order of the Director of Finance, the amount appropriated in this item shall be reduced by the amount transferred in Item 0250-115-0932 to provide adequate resources to the Judicial Branch Workers' Compensation Fund to pay workers' compensation claims for judicial branch employees and judges, and administrative costs pursuant to Section 68114.10 of the Government Code.
6. Of the funds appropriated in Schedule (1), which will be transferred to the Trial Court Improvement Fund in accordance with subdivision (b) of Section 77209 of the Government Code, up to $5,000,000 shall be available for support of services for self-represented litigants.
7. Upon approval by the Administrative Director of the Courts, the Controller shall transfer up to $11,274,000 to Item 0250-001-0932 for recovery of costs for administrative services provided to the trial courts by the Administrative Office of the Courts.
8. In order to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice, the funds appropriated in Schedule (7) are available for distribution by the Judicial Council through the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission in support of the Equal Access Fund Program to qualified legal services projects and support centers as defined in Sections 6213 to 6215, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code, to be used for legal services in civil matters for indigent persons. The Judicial Council shall approve awards made by the commission if the council determines that the awards comply with statutory and other relevant guidelines. Upon approval by the Administrative Director of the Courts, the Controller shall transfer up to 5 percent of the funding appropriated in Schedule (2) to Item 0250-001-0932 for administrative expenses. Ten percent of the funds remaining after administrative costs shall be for joint projects of courts and legal services programs to make legal assistance

available to pro per litigants and 90 percent of the funds remaining after administrative costs shall be distributed consistent with Sections 6216 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code. The Judicial Council may establish additional reporting or quality control requirements consistent with Sections 6213 to 6223, inclusive, of the Business and Professions Code.

9. Funds available for expenditure in Schedule (7) may be augmented by order of the Director of Finance by the amount of any additional resources deposited for distribution to the Equal Access Fund Program in accordance with Sections 68085.3 and 68085.4 of the Government Code. Any augmentation under this provision shall be authorized not sooner than 30 days after notification in writing to the chairpersons of the committees in each house of the Legislature that consider appropriations, the chairpersons of the committees and appropriate subcommittees that consider the State Budget, and the Chairperson of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, or not sooner than whatever lesser time the chairperson of the joint committee, or his or her designee, may determine.

10. Sixteen (16.0) subordinate judicial officer positions are authorized to be converted to judgeships in the 2012–13 fiscal year in the manner and pursuant to the authority described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (c) of Section 69615 of the Government Code, as described in the notice filed by the Judicial Council under subparagraph (B) of paragraph (3) of subdivision (c) of Section 69615.

11. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and upon approval of the Director of Finance, the amount available for expenditure in Schedule (1) may be increased by the amount of any additional resources collected for the recovery of costs for court-appointed dependency counsel services.

12. Upon approval of the Administrative Director of the Courts, the Controller shall transfer up to $556,000 to Item 0250-001-0932 for administrative services provided to the trial courts in support of the court-appointed dependency counsel program.

13. Upon approval of the Administrative Director of the Courts, the amount available for expenditure in this item may be augmented by the amount of resources collected to support the implementation and administration of the civil representation pilot program.

14. Upon approval of the Administrative Director of the Courts, the Controller shall transfer up to $500,000 to Item 0250-001-0932 for administrative services provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts to implement and administer the Civil Representation Pilot Program.

15. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the 2012–13 fiscal year, the Judicial Council shall allocate $385,000,000 of reductions in funding contained in Schedule (1) as follows: (a) no more than $235,000,000 shall be allocated to each trial court based on each court's proportionate share of total statewide trial court reserves, and (b) no more than $150,000,000 shall be allocated based on each trial court's proportionate share of the 2011–12 fiscal year Trial Court Trust Fund allocation. Upon approval of the Director of Finance and no sooner than 30 days after notification in writing to the committees of each house of the Legislature that consider the State Budget, the Judicial Council may offset either of these reductions through transfers from any other item within the Judicial Branch's budget.

16. This item includes a one-time augmentation of $73,000,000 to offset the reductions in trial court funding in the 2012–13 fiscal year, based on transfers as follows: (a) $23,000,000 transferred from the State Trial Court Improvement and Modernization Fund, and (b) $50,000,000 transferred from the State Court Facilities Construction Fund.

17. Of the amount appropriated in this item, $46,000,000 of planned expenditures for the Court Case Management System project shall instead be redirected to offset reductions in trial court funding in the 2012–13 fiscal year.

[….]

Attachment B:

PROPOSED 2012-13 PARTNERSHIP GRANTS PROJECTS

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
1.	ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL CENTER	*Vietnamese Self-Help Centers and Family Law Workshops in Orange County*	Orange	Third year	The project will (1) conduct two family law workshops at the Lamoreaux Justice Center (LJC) to assist SRLs with the dissolution process; (2) station a staff attorney at one or two self-help centers (SHC) to provide in-language assistance to SRLs with family law and other legal issues; and (3) conduct community outreach and education training about APALC's services and the court system. The bilingual workshops mirror the series of three-part dissolution workshops currently conducted at LJC by the court's SHC staff.	$45,000
2.	ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER LEGAL OUTREACH	*Northern San Mateo County Restraining Order Clinic*	San Mateo	New project	This project will provide culturally and linguistically competent domestic violence restraining order services for northern San Mateo County residents, particularly the Asian and Pacific Islanders. The project will operate two weekly clinics to provide an overview of the requirements for a domestic violence protective order and the legal process to obtain an order, including assistance completing paperwork. Completed forms will be couriered to the Redwood City court for filing and TROs will be returned for distribution to litigants. Court accompaniment will be provided for permanent restraining order hearings.	$70,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
3.	BAY AREA LEGAL AID	*Housing Law Clinic*	Contra Costa	Second year	The Clinic provides information, assistance, and referrals to low-income self-represented litigants with legal issues related to landlord-tenant and unlawful detainer law. Assistance provided includes information on landlord and tenant rights and obligations, information on the UD process, document preparation for UD Judicial Council pleadings and other common pleadings, such as applications for a temporary stay of eviction, assistance with the submission and filing of the forms, and referrals to other social and legal service providers.	$65,000
4.	BET TZEDEK LEGAL SERVICES	*Building Community and Expanding Access to Legal Services*	Los Angeles	New project	Access to conservatorships will be enhanced via two delivery models: ■ Integration of pro bono attorneys at existing self-help clinics to undertake "group signings" of completed petitions at various locations throughout the county. ■ Utilization of technology to expand access to litigants in remote locations. Bet Tzedek Legal Services (BT) and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) are working to develop software to allow litigants to complete the necessary forms on their own, with remote assistance provided by BT. Once finalized, the software program will first be loaded for field testing on computers in the Antelope Valley Courthouse's Self-Help Center.	$85,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
5.	CALIFORNIA RURAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE, INC.	*Landlord/Tenant Small Claims Pro Per Clinic*	Stanislaus	Fifth Year	Pro per litigants receive the following services and resources from the Clinic during business hours: Information and how-to packets; standard form letters and pleading templates; Judicial Council forms; 1:1 assistance in understanding how to file an answer, complaint, other pleading or document; presentations on the small claims court and unlawful detainer process; referrals and other related information services. Based on evaluation feedback, more attention will be paid to preparing litigants for trial.	$60,000
6.	CENTRAL CALIFORNIA LEGAL SERVICES, INC.	*Elder Abuse Access to Justice Partnership*	Fresno and Tulare	Fourth year	The project provides services to self-represented petitioners and respondents and includes information and guidance on the necessary steps to obtain a restraining order or conservatorship. Other project services include assistance with new petitions and obtaining Letters of Conservatorship for self-represented litigants for general, dementia and limited conservatorships over the person and probate Code Section 2628 small estates. Services will be extended into Tulare County as the previously-funded elder abuse prevention project in that county is folded into this project for purposes of efficiency and economy.	$90,000
7.	CONTRA COSTA SENIOR LEGAL SERVICES	*Senior Self Help Clinic*	Contra Costa	Fifth year	The clinic provides assistance in a number of civil matters, including elder abuse TROs, unlawful detainer actions, consumer protection, credit disputes, and other financial issues affecting the elderly. Conservatorship workshops are being offered to all self-represented litigants who need assistance with conservatorships of the person (limited, person and person dementia).	$25,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
8.	EAST BAY COMMUNITY LAW CENTER	*The Consumer Law Clinic*	Alameda	Fourth year	The Consumer Law Clinic offers training, counseling, and initial information and paperwork assistance for low-income people who are being sued by debt buyers or creditors. The project also provides advice on negotiations with creditors, and advice on consumer rights and debt collection practices violations. EBCLC attorneys, volunteer attorneys, and law students conduct 1:1 consultations and provide assistance to those who need more help.	$40,000
9.	ELDER LAW & ADVOCACY	*Bilingual Conservatorship/ Guardianship Clinic*	Imperial	Fifth year	The clinic offers bilingual full-service assistance to persons seeking conservatorships, limited conservatorships and guardianships or alternatives. Pro per litigants complete questionnaires designed to elicit all the information necessary for the staff attorney to prepare documents for filing a conservatorship or guardianship petition. Staff assists with service of notice, fee waivers, attends all probate proceedings, and assists with all court paperwork after the final hearing. Litigants are given Due Diligence Declaration templates listing ten steps that should be taken to locate persons entitled to receive notice when whereabouts are unknown. For conservatorship participants with fee waivers, the clinic takes responsibility for obtaining certified copies of final documents.	$45,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
10.	FAMILY VIOLENCE LAW CENTER	*Domestic Violence Self-Representation Assistance*	Alameda	Third year	The DVSRA Project is a collaborative project of Family Violence Law Center (FVLC), Alameda County Bar Association Volunteer Legal Services (VLSC), and the Self-Help Center of the Alameda County Superior Court (SHC). The DVSRA Project provides paperwork assistance for pro per petitioners and respondents seeking to file or respond to petitions for temporary restraining orders. FVLC and VLSC volunteers provide assistance to petitioners at a clinic near the Hayward courthouse; VLSC assists respondents thru existing family law clinics in Fremont and Oakland.	$25,000
11.	GREATER BAKERSFIELD LEGAL ASSISTANCE, INC.	*Orders Project in Kern (OPIK)*	Kern	Third year	This project offers 1:1 assistance to pro per litigants in family law cases to obtain and understand their Order After Hearing (OAH) and Judgment and proceed with next steps. An experienced bicultural project paralegal helps individual litigants prepare and file necessary paperwork. GBLA has produced a video in English and Spanish that helps litigants understand how a court order works.	$55,000
12.	INLAND EMPIRE LATINO LAWYERS ASSOCIATION	*Small Claims Advocacy and Awareness Project (SCAAP)*	Riverside, San Bernardino	New project	SCAAP will present a case in Small Claims Court and how to collect a judgment. The service model of the project will be three-session, all-day clinics: • How to Present Your Claim (informational session followed by role play) • How to Collect Your Judgment (informational session with examples of completed forms) • How to Collect Your Judgment Forms Preparation Clinic (document preparation by IELLA volunteers and staff) Four monthly clinics will include one in Spanish.	$25,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
13.	LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES	Santa Monica Self-Help Legal Access Center	Los Angeles	Third year	The Self-Help Center provides individual assistance for family law, civil complaints and harassment and unlawful detainer matters, and consumer and debt collection matters. Unlawful Detainer Trial Preparation Clinics are offered twice a month; Debt Collection Workshops are held weekly. LAFLA currently staffs the project with a full-time attorney and full-time paralegal. The Center also relies on JusticeCorps volunteers and other volunteers.	$40,000
14.	LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF SANTA BARBARA COUNTY	*Lompoc Legal Resources Center*	Santa Barbara	Sixth year	This project functions as a walk-in information and assistance center for self-represented litigants. Project staff offers 1:1 consultations and general legal information in numerous substantive areas to assist patrons in preparation for court and to help them understand the court processes and procedures. Staff also provides assistance with completion of legal forms and applications.	$50,000
15.	LEGAL AID OF MARIN	*Unlawful Detainer – MSC Calendar*	Marin	Second year	The primary goal of the Mandatory Settlement Conference ("MSC") Calendar project is to favorably resolve as many unlawful detainer actions as possible before trial. The Court e-mails Legal Aid of Marin ("LAM") the calendar on Tuesday to give the program time to check for potential conflicts and to schedule pro bono attorneys for the Thursday MSC Calendar. Staff and volunteer attorneys provide face-to-face negotiations with all parties authorized to settle the matter prior to trial. Settlements are confirmed on the record and memorialized in writing. Cases that do not settle proceed to trial the following week.	$50,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
16.	LEGAL AID OF NAPA VALLEY	Small Claims Assistance Project	Napa	Second year	The Small Claims Assistance Project (SCAP) assists unrepresented, low-income individuals prepare the legal paperwork and court filings necessary to assert and defend matters in Small Claims Court.	$25,000
17.	LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF ORANGE COUNTY	Central Justice Center Self-Help and E-Filing Project	Orange	Fifth year	LASOC staff provides information and document preparation assistance on issues related to a broad range of civil litigation issues. Individuals are referred to workshops offered by the SHC. This ongoing project will also now incorporate assistance to self-represented litigants who must now e-file all pleadings under a new Court pilot project.	$65,000
18.	LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF ORANGE COUNTY	Limited Conservatorship Clinic	Orange	Second year	Services are provided to individuals seeking assistance with limited conservatorships. One educational workshop and one follow-up clinic will be held each month. At the introductory workshop, held at the Court, a contract attorney provides a general overview of limited conservatorships and distributes and explains the necessary forms. At the second clinic, held at LASOC, staff and volunteers provide advice, counsel, and assistance with filling out the necessary court forms and completing service.	$25,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
19.	LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN DIEGO, INC.	*Conservatorship Assistance Project*	San Diego	New Project	The project will run on a facilitator-type model and assist self-represented litigants with petitions for Conservatorship of the Person. Bilingual and bicultural staff and volunteers will provide services on a walk-in "first-come first-serve" basis. The project will offer assistance through the entire process, including help in correcting defects in the petition before filing and assistance after the hearing with additional forms and paperwork. Clinic participants will be encouraged to return to the clinic to have forms reviewed before they are filed, to ask questions about the forms and process, and to seek assistance with procedural formalities.	$45,000
20.	LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN DIEGO, INC.	*Unlawful Detainer Program*	San Diego	Fifth year	The UDAP will assist low-income defendants with preparing and filing a response to a UD lawsuit, completing a Fee Waiver Application, and by serving their Answers via mail on the opposing party. The program will also assist low-income plaintiffs who are trying to evict someone from the home in which they also live. Clinic staff will assist the plaintiff with notices of eviction, the UD Complaint and a Fee Waiver Application. UDAP continues to be centered on the educational, linguistic and cultural barriers faced by their predominantly South County Latino community.	$40,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
21.	LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF SAN MATEO COUNTY	*Landlord/Tenant Clinic*	San Mateo	Fifth year	This project provides on-site services in landlord/tenant matters, including habitability issues, rent increases and security deposits. Income-eligible self-represented litigants receive assistance in preparing motions, answers, stay applications, motions to vacate default judgments and fee waiver applications or are provided with information and referrals. With Partnership Grant funding, the court hired a contract attorney to provide equivalent services to pro per landlords. All services are available in English and Spanish.	$30,000
22.	LEGAL ASSISTANCE FOR SENIORS	*Partnership to Assist Guardianship Litigants*	Alameda	Sixth year (not funded for one of these years)	Low-income and indigent litigants are given help with the procedural requirements of guardianships. Assistance is available to unrepresented parties who need help with the guardianship process. Services are provided by VLSC's pro bono attorneys on a day-of-court basis in Berkeley, and by LAS staff at the SHC in Oakland via workshops and referrals from the Clerk. Computerized programs and forms are available at the SHC site.	$40,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
23.	LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	Unlawful Detainer and Civil Harassment Mediation Project	Butte	Second year	The court refers eligible litigants to day-of-trial mediation for matters on the Civil Harassment and the Small Claims calendars (46 Civil Harassment calendars and 125 Small Claims calendars). If an agreement is reached, a settlement agreement form is completed in accordance with the litigants' stated terms, signed by the litigants and filed with the court. If the case is not resolved, the case proceeds to trial with instructions from the attorney-mediators on next procedural steps. Another proven benefit is the wide range of underlying issues the mediated agreements can address often eliminating or reducing need for additional litigation. Opposing parties have concrete understandings of their respective obligations following the mediation.	$26,000
24.	LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	Mother Lode Pro Per Project	Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Placer	Second year	The "road lawyer and paralegal" circuit ride to the clinic sites to provide one-on-one assistance in general civil, foreclosure, unlawful detainer, debt collection, small claims, family law as well as probate, guardianship and grandparent issues. Litigants are assisted in form completion, filing and preparation of orders after hearing.	$58,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
25.	LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	*Solano County Restraining Order Clinic (SCROC)*	Solano	Seventh year	This project provides 1:1 assistance with forms completion to low-income pro per litigants seeking domestic violence or civil harassment restraining orders, and assistance with elder abuse and workplace violence. Assistance includes help completing a detailed declaration of the abuse. Additional assistance in paternity, dissolution, and separation filings is provided to Vallejo residents. Spanish, Mandarin and American Sign Language translations are available.	$30,000
26.	LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN CALIFORNIA	*Consumer Assistance Project*	Yolo	Fourth year	This clinic provides assistance with forms and pleadings assistance, discovery and settlement letters. Counseling and coaching, pre-trial and trial preparation- is offered to litigants with consumer-related problems to prepare them to self-represent in court or resolve problems before trial, and to steer them toward long-term solutions. Specific areas of focus include disputed debts, credit agency errors, and identity theft. Litigants return for ongoing assistance due to complicated process required to resolve these matters. Services are available in Spanish. Monthly workshops on consumer-related topics are proposed.	$40,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
27.	LOS ANGELES CENTER FOR LAW AND JUSTICE	*Young Parent's Day*	Los Angeles	New project	One day per month will be designated as Young Parents Day at the Court. • An LACLJ attorney will conduct group presentations in English and Spanish to parents and supporting family members on basic family law, focused on creating realistic expectations for the families and providing an understanding of what the court can and cannot do in matters of custody, visitation and child support. • A Family Court Mediator will be available to conduct specialized mediations in order to draft developmentally appropriate custody orders and encourage agreement between the parties.	$25,000
28.	NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY	*Pasadena Consumer Debt Relief (CDR)*	Los Angeles	Second Year	The clinic currently offers a pre-trial answer workshop for debtors sued for consumer debt. The litigation process and different defenses are explained, including what it means to be judgment proof. One-on-one assistance follows the workshop. A weekly options workshop to educate litigants on consumer topics and financial literacy presentations provided by pro bono attorneys are also contemplated. The clinic intends to consult closely with the Court to incorporate mediation into the process.	$55,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
29.	NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY	*San Fernando Civil Harassment Project*	Los Angeles	Third year	The Civil Harassment Project provides assistance, as appropriate, to both sides in civil harassment cases. SHLAC volunteers will use the Civil Harassment HotDocs Program that has been designed specifically for this project to interview the litigant and prepare the Judicial Council forms, including a detailed declaration. The Civil Harassment attorney will create a bilingual Spanish version of the CH Program, as well as a HotDocs version for Respondents. Hearing preparation workshops will be developed in the 2nd quarter of 2013.	$45,000
30.	PRO BONO PROJECT SILICON VALLEY	*Family Court Settlement Project*	Santa Clara	Third year	This project provides mediation and negotiated collaborative settlement services to parties who have filed or responded to Orders to Show Cause in custody or visitation matters. Judicial officers select cases on the self-represented Law and Motion calendars to receive this service. If the parties agree, one attorney meets with the moving party and another with the responding party to review issues. The parties all come together in a four-way discussion to narrow the issues. If an agreement is reached, the attorneys prepare stipulated orders to be entered by the Court. Complex matters and paternity cases have begun to be mediated although this reduced the numbers of cases completed at each session.	$45,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
31.	PUBLIC LAW CENTER	*Courthouse Guardianship Clinic*	Orange	Fifth year	This clinic is a coordinated effort between PLC, the Orange County Superior Court and the Orange County Bar Association. The clinic offers self-represented parties pro bono assistance with the legal process surrounding guardianship proceedings. Both petitioners and respondents are served. Staff and volunteers provide general legal information and act as scriveners to help SRLs fill out forms and assist with the clearing of probate notes and preparation of guardianship and final orders. They also explain the process of notice of service. Plc will develop guides to the individual steps involved in securing guardianships and will create corresponding educational presentations. It will translate the sample set of completed judicial council forms into Spanish and Vietnamese.	$25,000
32.	PUBLIC LAW CENTER	*Spanish Language Self-Help Dissolution Workshops*	Orange	New project	This project will be a partnership between the Public Law Center (PLC) and the Orange County Superior Court's self-help services to provide assistance to the county's Spanish-speaking, self-represented litigants who require help completing and filing the necessary forms to obtain dissolution, legal separation, or nullity of marriage. A PLC Spanish-speaking attorney will teach dissolution workshops at the central justice center in Santa Ana. The classes will be simultaneously transmitted to the North Justice Center (NJC) in Fullerton by video remote equipment. A Spanish-speaking attorney will be present at NJC to assist individuals participating from that location.	$60,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
33.	SAN DIEGO VOLUNTEER LAWYER PROGRAM	*North County Civil Harassment Restraining Order Clinic*	San Diego	Fifth year	The CHROC provides advice and assistance for all stages of the civil harassment process from completing the petition to the hearing procedures. Assistance includes completion of all necessary documents, information and advice on consequences of the CH-TRO, trial preparation and potential resources for legal advocacy or assistance at the hearings. Staff has Spanish language capacity and materials are available in Spanish. Legal services are delivered by volunteer attorneys and law students overseen by a staff attorney and a managing attorney to supervise to the legal work.	$50,000
34.	SAN FRANCISCO BAR ASSOCIATION VOLUNTEER LEGAL SERVICES	*Family Law Assisted Self-Help Project FLASH*	San Francisco	Third year	Information and assistance is provided on family law issues (dissolution, separations, annulments, paternity, custody, visitation, support). Service delivery includes three substantive modes - mediation between self-represented litigants to assist in the resolution of custody and support issues, in-depth assessment in 1:1 appointments, and more extensive assistance for those with particularly complex matters.	$45,000
35.	SENIOR CITIZENS LEGAL SERVICES	*Conservatorship & Elder Abuse Project (CEAP)*	Santa Cruz/ San Benito	Sixth year	This project provides legal assistance, education and referral services to litigants seeking conservatorships, elder abuse restraining orders, and guardianships (especially for grandparent petitioners). Staff also assists litigants to complete required probate and local forms for conservatorships and guardianships, including renewals of lLPSconservatorships being transferred from public guardian to close relatives.	$30,000

No.	PROGRAM LEGAL NAME	PROJECT NAME	COUNTY	NEW OR RETURNING APPLICANT	DESCRIPTION	PROPOSED ALLOCATION
36.	WATSONVILLE LAW CENTER	*Language Access to the Court Project*	Santa Cruz	Fifth year	This project provides the Spanish-speaking community with access to the courts in a collaborative partnership with the court's Self-Help Center. A bilingual paralegal assists community members to obtain legal information and fill out court forms and pleadings. Areas of focus include family law, restraining orders, name changes, guardianship of the person, conservatorships, landlord/tenant, and small claims. The project also provides outreach and education to the Spanish-speaking community regarding access to the courts.	$50,000
37.	**TOTAL OF ALL GRANTS:**					**$1,624,000**

THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM
EQUAL ACCESS FUND – PARTNERSHIP GRANTS
2012 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR ALL APPLICANTS

FORM A – PROJECT ABSTRACT

1. **Project Title:** _____

2. **Program Name:** _____

   Program Contact: _____

   Phone #: _____

   E-mail: _____

3. **Amount Requested: $** _____

4. **Cooperating Court(s)*:** _____

   Address, City, Zip: _____

   Presiding Judge: _____

   Phone #: _____

   E-mail: _____

   Other Court Contact and Title: _____

   Phone #: _____

   E-mail: _____

   * If more than one court is cooperating on this project, provide additional information on a separate sheet.

5. **Current Recipient of a Partnership Grant?** ☐ Yes ☐ No

   Previous grant amounts (for this project only): 2007: _____

   2008: _____

   2009: _____

   2010: _____

   2011: _____

   Partnership Grant funds remaining as of August 1, 2011: _____

(Abstract: Partnership Grant RFP Form A, page 2)

6. Summary. Provide a description of the core aspects of your proposed project.

THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM
EQUAL ACCESS FUND – PARTNERSHIP GRANTS
2012 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR ALL APPLICANTS

FORM B – PROJECT NARRATIVE

Program Name: _____

Project Title: _____

[See pages 4 through 10 of the Request for Proposal INSTRUCTIONS for an explanation of how to complete this Project Narrative and a list of the subjects to be addressed.]

THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM
EQUAL ACCESS FUND – PARTNERSHIP GRANTS
2012 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR ALL APPLICANTS

FORM C – PROJECT ASSURANCES

Program Name: _____

Project Title: _____

Applicant assures compliance with the following:

1. Applicant agrees it will use any grant funds it receives from the Partnership Grants portion of the Equal Access Fund only for purposes allowed under the State Budget Act of 2011, upon approval thereof, and any grant agreement it enters into with the Legal Services Trust Fund Program.

2. Applicant agrees to expend any grant funds solely on civil legal assistance to indigent self-represented litigants in California courts.

3. Applicant will not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, gender, handicap, age or sexual orientation.

4. Applicant will comply with quality control procedures adopted by the State Bar.

5. Applicant will permit reasonable site visits or present additional information deemed reasonably necessary to determine compliance with the terms of a grant under the Partnership Grants portion of the Equal Access Fund.

6. Applicant will comply with fiscal management and control procedures adopted by the State Bar.

7. Applicant agrees to consult with the Legal Services Trust Fund Program concerning media coverage of any project funded by a Partnership Grant.

8. Applicant understands that any proposal submitted for a Partnership Grant, and all documents submitted pursuant to issuance of a Partnership Grant, are public documents and may be disclosed to any person.

9. Applicant assures that, to the extent this grant is being sought for an existing project, the funds will be in addition to and will not supplant current funding committed to that project. However, to the extent applicant seeks to move some of the funding already committed to the self-help center for use on other activities, then applicant will submit to the Commission an explanation of the need for the other activities, justifying moving some of the previously-committed funds from the existing self-help center.

(Assurances: Partnership Grant RFP Form C, page 2)

10. Applicant agrees it will cooperate with data collection processes or with research efforts of the Legal Services Trust Fund Program or the Administrative Office of the Courts to evaluate the Partnership Grants project.

Signed:

Executive Director Applicant Program	Chair, Board of Directors Applicant Program
Date	Date

THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM

2012 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL: EQUAL ACCESS FUND – PARTNERSHIP GRANTS

FORM D - PROJECT BUDGET

1. **Program Name:**
   Project Title:
2. **Prepared by:**
   E-mail: **Phone/Ext:**

	ACCOUNT TITLE	PROPOSED PARTNERSHIP GRANT	OTHER TRUST FUND MONIES	NON-TRUST FUND MONIES	TOTAL	IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS (IF ANY)*
Personnel						
3.	Lawyers					
4.	Paralegals					
5.	Other Staff					
6.	SUBTOTAL					
7.	Employee Benefits					
8.	TOTAL PERSONNEL					
Non-Personnel						
9.	Space					
10.	Equipment Rental & Maintenance					
11.	Supplies, Printing & Postage					
12.	Telecommunications					
13.	Travel					
14.	Training					
15.	Library					
16.	Insurance					
17.	Audit					
18.	Evaluation					
19.	Capital Additions					
20.	Contract Service to Clients					
21.	Contract Service to Organization					
22.	Other					
23.	TOTAL NON-PERSONNEL					
24.	TOTAL					
25.	Projected Carry-Over Funds					
26.	Total Amount of Funds Available					

PROJECT STAFF

	PERSONNEL	PARTNERSHIP GRANT (in FTEs)	OTHER TRUST FUND MONIES (in FTEs)	NON-TRUST FUND MONIES (in FTEs)	TOTAL TIME (in FTEs)	IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS (in hours)
1.	Total Lawyers					
a.						
b.						
c.						
2.	Total Paralegals					
a.						
b.						
3.	Total Other Staff					
a.						
b.						
4.	TOTAL PERSONNEL					

THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM
EQUAL ACCESS FUND – PARTNERSHIP GRANTS
2012 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

FOR ALL APPLICANTS

FORM E - BUDGET NARRATIVE

Program Name: _____

Project Title: _____

[See pages 11 through 13 of the Request for Proposal INSTRUCTIONS for an explanation of how to complete this Budget Narrative and for explanations of the expense categories listed on Form D.]

THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND PROGRAM
EQUAL ACCESS FUND – PARTNERSHIP GRANTS
2012 REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
FOR ALL APPLICANTS
FORM F – SUPPORT FROM COOPERATING COURT

Program Name: _____

Project Title: _____

A. Letter of Support:

Attach a Letter of Support signed by the ***Presiding Judge*** of the court(s) cooperating on the proposed project. If the project is serving one side only, the court's letter must confirm its support for such a program and clearly indicate that it understands the nature of the planned services.

Status of Letter:

☐ Signed by Presiding Judge and attached

☐ Will be sent to Trust Fund Program no later than September 2, 2011

B. Memorandum of Understanding:

All applicants must provide a copy of a formal agreement with the cooperating court setting forth the duties and responsibilities of each party as regards this project. This agreement should reflect all financial or in-kind support to be provided by each party, and all logistical and administrative matters reflected in the proposal.

New Projects: A Memorandum of Understanding with the cooperating court need not be included with the submission of a completed RFP for a ***new project***. However, successful applicants must submit a fully-executed MOU to the Trust Fund Program **no later than January 31, 2012**. Grant funds will not be disbursed without receipt of a fully-executed agreement.

Continuing Projects: For ***continuing projects***, attach a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding now in effect. Identify any changes proposed for the upcoming term of the agreement and the reasons for such changes. Revised MOU's may be submitted subsequent to the Commission's approval of a Partnership Grant, but **no later than January 31, 2012**.

Status of MOU:

☐ Fully executed and attached

☐ Enclosed draft to be executed and provided to the Trust Fund Program by _____

☐ To be drafted, executed and provided to the Trust Fund Program by _____

Attachment D:

MEMBERS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES TRUST FUND COMMISSION 2012-13
And Partnership Committee Members

David Lash, Co-Chair O'Melveny & Myers, LLP 400 South Hope Street Los Angeles, CA 90071 ph: (213) 430-8366 fx: (213) 430-6407 email: dlash@omm.com Attorney Member: 2007-2013 Judicial Council	Deborah F. Ching Principal Nonprofit Consulting Group 5416 Shenandoah Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90056 ph: (310) 748-7940 fx: (310) 568-8631 email: dfching@earthlink.net Public Member: 2008-2011, 2011-2014 Judicial Council
Jeffrey Ball, Co-Chair Friendly Hills Bank 16011 Whittier Boulevard Whittier, CA 90603 ph: (562) 947-1920 fx: (562) 947-3640 email: jball@friendlyhillsbank.com Public Member: 2009-2013 Board of Trustees	Mark R. Conrad U.S. Attorney's Office, Northern District of California 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, CA 94102 ph: (415) 436-7025 fx: (415) 436-6748 email: mark.conrad@usdoj.gov Attorney Member: 2012-2013 Board of Trustees
Adrian Dollard, Co-Vice-Chair Qatalyst Partners Three Embarcadero Center, 6th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 ph: (415) 844-7777 fx: (415) 391-3914 email: aedollard@gmail.com Attorney Member: 2008-2013 Board of Trustees	Jeanne Finberg State of **California Department of Justice** Attorney General's Office 1515 Clay Street, Suite 2100 Oakland, CA 94612 ph: (510) 622-2147 fx: (510) 622-2121 email: jeanne.finberg@doj.ca.gov Attorney Member: 2008-2013 Board of Trustees, Judicial Council
Barry J. Tucker, Co-Vice-Chair Cassidian Communications, Inc. 42505 Rio Nedo Temecula, CA 92590 ph: (619) 742-5062 email: barrytucker@san.rr.com Attorney Member: 2009-2013 Board of Trustees	Mollie Gomez 11839 Allard Street Norwalk CA 90650 ph: (562) 868-2422 fx: (714) 571-5270 email: molecue8@aol.com Public Member Client: 2010-2013 Board of Trustees
Banafsheh Akhlaghi 35 Miller Avenue #113 Mill Valley, CA 94941 ph: (925) 209-7136 email: bakhlaghi1600@gmail.com Attorney Member: 2010-2013 Board of Trustees	Emily Harpster United Way of the Bay Area 221 Main Street, Suite 300 San Francisco, CA 94105 ph: (415) 808-4333 fx: (415) 817-4655 email: eharpster@uwba.org (private) Public Member: 2012-2015 Board of Trustees

Tamara Lynn Beard Court Executive Officer Superior Court of California, County of Fresno 1100 Van Ness Avenue Fresno, CA 93724-0002 ph: (559) 457-2010 email: tbeard@fresno.courts.ca.gov Attorney Member: 2011-2014 Judicial Council	Donna Hershkowitz Assistant Director, Office of Governmental Affairs Administrative Office of the Courts 2255 N. Ontario Street Burbank, CA 91504 ph: (818) 558-3068 email: donna.hershkowitz@jud.ca.gov Attorney Member: 2005-2011, 2011-2014 Judicial Council
Richard G. Reinis Steptoe & Johnson, LLP 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2800 Los Angeles, CA 90067 ph: (310) 734-3200 fx: (310) 734-3300 email: rreinis@steptoe.com Attorney Member: 2011-2014 Judicial Council	Melissa L. White Trinity Fruit Sales Corporate Counsel 9479 North Fort Washington Road Fresno, CA 93730 ph: (559) 433-3777 fx: (559) 433-3790 email: melissaw@trinityfruit.com Attorney Member: 2011-2014 Board of Trustees
LaQuita (Mary) Robbins Soothing Visitation 5850 Reo Terrace, Unit C San Diego, CA 92139 ph: (619) 981-8649 hm/fax: (619) 470-9095 email: squirt9515@gmail.com Public Member Client: 2010-2013 Board of Trustees	Cristin M. Zeisler Manatt, Phelps & Phillips, LLP 11355 West Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064 ph: (310) 312-4194 fx: (310) 996-6996 email: czeisler@manatt.com Attorney Member: 2011-2014 Board of Trustees
Susan D. Ryan Superior Court of California, County of Riverside P.O. Box 1547 Riverside, CA 92502 ph: (951) 777-3840 fax: (951) 777-3841 email: susan.ryan@riverside.courts.ca.gov Attorney Member: 2012-2015 Judicial Council	*ADVISORS* Hon. Michael J. Convey Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles Northwest District, Department K 6230 Sylmar Avenue Van Nuys, CA 91401 ph: (818) 374-2230 email: mjconvey@lasuperiorcourt.org Judge: 2012-2015 Judicial Council
Kim Savage Law Office of Kim Savage P.O. Box 41580 Long Beach, CA 90853 ph: (562) 930-1113 fx: (562) 930-0003 email: kimsavage@verizon.net (private) Attorney Member: 2012-2015 Board of Trustees	Hon. Faye D'Opal Superior Court Judge, Marin County P.O. Box 4988 San Rafael, CA 94913-4988 cell: (415) 497-4209; (415) 444-7258 (Chambers) email: faye_dopal@marincourt.org Judge: 2011-2014 Judicial Council

Christina S. Stokholm Law Offices of Mark Pachowicz 771 East Daily Drive, Suite 230 Camarillo, CA 93010 ph: (805) 987-4975 fx: (805) 987-4980 email: christina@pachowicz.com Attorney Member: 2011-2014 Board of Trustees	Hon. Maria P. Rivera Justice, First District Court of Appeal 350 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA 94102-4712 ph: (415) 865-7240 fx: (415) 865-7309 email: maria.rivera@jud.ca.gov Judge: 1999-2001 Justice: 2002-2013 Judicial Council
Judge John A. Sutro, Jr., Retired P.O. Box 641 Kentfield, CA 94914 ph: (415) 453-5878 fx: (415) 453-4465 email: jasutro@msn.com Attorney Member: 2010-2013 Board of Trustees	

Partnership Grants Committee of the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission
2012-13

Hon. Maria Rivera, Chair (*2013*)
Tamara Beard (2014)
Mollie Gomez (*2013*)
Donna Hershkowitz (*2014*)
David Lash (*2013*)
Monica Mitchell (*2012*)
Christina Stokholm (*2014*)
Barry Tucker (*2012*)
Melissa White (*2014*)

Attachment E: Partnership Grant Committee Proposal Evaluation Form

EVALUATION FORM - PARTNERSHIP GRANTS

NAME OF APPLICANT:

COUNTY(IES):

NAME OF EVALUATOR:

DATE:

TYPE OF PROJECT (Check all that apply):

_____ GENERAL CIVIL
_____ CONSERVATORSHIP
_____ DOMESTIC VIOLENCE/CIVIL HARASSMENT/RESTRAINING ORDER
_____ ELDER LAW
_____ EXPUNGEMENT
_____ FAMILY LAW
_____ GUARDIANSHIP
_____ LANDLORD/TENANT
_____ LANGUAGE ACCESS
_____ OTHER:

BASIC REQUIREMENTS:

Yes	No	
_____	_____	Legal Services Trust Fund Program recipient.
_____	_____	Joint court/legal services project located at or near the courthouse.
_____	_____	Indigent clients/screening mechanism described.
_____	_____	Self-represented litigants (no attorney representation anticipated with these funds).
_____	_____	State court.

DISCRETIONARY CRITERIA

For the following criteria, please rank on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being inadequate, 3 being adequate, and 5 being an outstanding response. The relevant Section in applicant's Project Narrative is listed below. **Evaluate the responses based on experience and performance to date as well as plans for the future. Applicants should describe any changes they intend to make in the project, but should not include changes that would require additional Partnership Grant funds.**

____ PROGRAM'S QUALIFICATIONS (Section 1) Adequate expertise? Experience operating pro per projects? Success in this project so far?

____ NEEDS ASSESSMENT/GOALS AND OBJECTIVES (Sections 2,3) Clearly meeting an unmet client need? Services needed on an ongoing basis? Rationale for project design? Clear goals? Adequate involvement of others in goal setting?

____ TYPES OF SERVICES/RESOURCES (Section 4) Clear description of services? Proposed changes adequately explained? Resources described?

____ FINANCIAL ELIGIBILITY AND SUBJECT MATTER SCREENING (Sections 5) Adequate systems to verify income eligibility? Subject matter?

____ CONFLICT CHECKING/RELATIONSHIP WITH LITIGANT (Section 6) Clear communication about whether an attorney-client relationship is established? Adequate methods for checking conflicts? Complete explanation why limiting services to one side? Letter from Presiding Judge reflecting his/her clear understanding of the implications of serving only one side?

____ REFERRAL PROTOCOLS (Section 7) Clear description of procedures, protocols ensuring meaningful referrals? Commitments, arrangements agreed to by other entities? Conflict panel? Other info or materials provided to ineligible litigants?

____ STAFF, TRAINING AND SUPERVISION (Section 8) Adequate plans for training and supervision, especially if supervisor is not on-site?

____ SITE AND ACCESSIBLITY/TECHNOLOGY AND EQUIPMENT (Sections 9 and 10) Adequate site? Adequate equipment, including technology? Services physically accessible, culturally competent, bilingual, etc.? Plans to overcome distance barriers?

____ EVALUATION (Section 11) Clear description of evaluation systems and successful evaluations. Plans for changes and improvements as needed? Input from both the program and the court available?

____ TIMETABLE. (Section12) Proposed timetable? Quarterly plans?

____ CONTINUITY AND OTHER FUNDING AND SUPPORT. (Section 13) Complete and clear plans for and/or success in leveraging Partnership Grant funds to obtain other funding? Inclusion of program's own operating revenue or carryover from prior year? List of additional funds and amounts provided? Description of extraordinary circumstances, challenges limiting fundraising success?

____ COLLABORATIVE PLANNING WITH PARTNERS AND THE COURTS (Sections 14 and15) Adequately addresses collaboration with cooperating court as well as Self-Help Center and Family Law Facilitator staff and other offices of the court? Other local legal services providers? Ongoing coordination? Describes plans to avoid confusion for pro per users of services? Assurance of court's impartiality and independence?

____ CLEAR ABILITY TO PERFORM HIGH QUALITY WORK ON ONGOING BASIS (from overall narrative)

TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS: _____

CHECKLIST OF ISSUES ADDRESSED WITH COOPERATING COURT:

_____ Assurance of Court's impartiality and independence.
_____ Ongoing coordination.
_____ Clear distinction between parts of delivery system.
_____ Services provided, information and referrals.
_____ Security.
_____ Location/hours.
_____ Equipment/supplies.
_____ Shared space.
_____ Project continuity.
_____ Evaluation.

OVERALL COMMENTS:

SUGGESTED GRANT CONDITION(S):

MORE INFORMATION READER WOULD LIKE:

EVALUATION FORM - PARTNERSHIP GRANTS

For Staff ONLY: **CHECKLIST FOR FORMS AND ATTACHMENTS**

_____ Assurances signed
_____ Support letter submitted from presiding judge including court's understanding of all the implications presented serving one side/party.
_____ Complete budget.
_____ Budget attached for existing project, if any.
_____ Complete budget narrative, matches project narrative.
Comments:

_____ Grant level requested seems reasonable for project.
Comments: