



Indiana Pro Bono Commission
One Indiana Square, Suite 530
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Indiana Bar Foundation
230 East Ohio Street, 4th Floor
Indianapolis, IN 46204

COMBINED 2006 DISTRICT REPORT, 2008 PRO BONO GRANT APPLICATION, AND 2008 PLAN

Pro Bono District Eleven

Applicant: Legal Aid- District Eleven, Inc.

Mailing Address: 1531 13th Street, Suite G 330

City: Columbus, IN **Zip:** 47201

Phone: (812) 372-8933 **Fax:** (812) 372-3948

E-mail address: lade@iquest.net

Judicial Appointee: Magistrate Joseph W. Meek

Plan Administrator: Tammara Jo Sparks

Names of Counties served: Bartholomew, Brown, Decatur, Jackson and Jennings

Number and Percentage of volunteer attorneys (as defined on page 3) who rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or who accepted a pro bono case in 2006 per registered attorneys in district, i.e. the district's pro bono participation rate:

197 registered with Supreme Court, 85 took case(s) in 2006 – 43%
Bartholomew – 102 registered with Supreme Court, 47 took case(s) in 2006 - 46%
Brown – 17 registered with Supreme Court, 8 took case(s) in 2006 - 47%
Decatur – 21 registered with Supreme Court, 8 took case(s) in 2006 - 38%
Jackson – 40 registered with Supreme Court, 10 took case(s) in 2006 - 25%
Jennings – 17 registered with Supreme Court, 12 took case(s) in 2006 - 70%

Number of volunteer attorneys (as defined on page 3) who provided pro bono representation for at least 50 hours during 2006: 11 (eleven) – 9 from Bartholomew County, 1 from Brown County, and 1 from Jackson County

Number of potential clients requesting help in 2006 (limit this to actual intake done or sessions in which plan administrator or his/her delegate provided more than minimal assistance): 1,130

Number of potential clients who were actually provided with legal services (through volunteer attorney referral or assistance organized by the plan administrator) as a result of their request:

179 were still pending at the end of 2006, 191 were referred to pro bono attorneys, 40 were represented by Legal Aid's Client Counseling Program Director, 57 were represented by Legal Aid's domestic violence victim's attorney, 5 were represented by the Plan Administrator, 255 were provided legal information and/or advice, 72 were assisted in filing court documents pro se, and 331 were deemed eligible and were receiving assistance but were withdrawn from the program after failing to follow through with requests for information or failure to attend a scheduled appointment.

Of the 191 referred to pro bono attorneys, 133 were Bartholomew County cases, 7 were Brown County cases, 15 were Decatur County cases, 15 were Jackson County cases, and 21 were Jennings County cases.

Amount of grant received for 2007: \$42,055.00

Amount of grant (2007 & prior years) projected to be unused as of 12/31/07: \$0.00

Amount requested for 2008: \$83,871.00

- 1. Please write a brief summary of the 2008 grant request. Please include information regarding your district's planned activities including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion. The grant request should cover needs to be addressed, methods, target audience, anticipated outcomes, and how past difficulties will be addressed.**

Summary of Grant Request - Legal Aid is requesting a grant of \$83,871.00 for 2008. This represents 24% of Legal Aid's 2008 total agency budget (see supplement).

With this money Legal Aid will fund a portion two employee's salaries, benefits, and payroll taxes. A portion of Legal Aid's cost of rent, phone, postage, supplies, professional fees, insurance, membership dues, and printing/publications. This money will cover 100% of the cost of pro bono attorney expenses and 100% of the cost of the annual appreciation banquets.

Planned Activities:

Committee Meetings – Legal Aid plans on having one committee meeting per quarter. Every effort will be made to make this committee a working committee that is committed to increasing pro bono participation in the counties, assisting the plan administrator with hosting CLE's in each county, and assisting the plan administrator with marketing and promotion.

Training – Legal Aid intends to provide at least one family law CLE training in each county by the end of December 2008. It is our intent to collaborate with each county bar association on this project. The training will be free as long as the attorney signs an agreement to take a family law case in the next year; otherwise, there will be a fee for attendance.

Legal Aid also intends on providing a live webcast of the TTALT CLE in November of 2008 in at least Bartholomew County and hopefully in every county.

Attorney Recognition – Legal Aid intends to host appreciation banquets in each county, provide CLE as part of each banquet, recognize the pro bono attorneys of the year (given to the volunteer attorney in each county that reports the most closing hours for the year), and provide a token of appreciation to every attorney that accepted a case.

Marketing and Promotion - The plan administrator intends for the Pro Bono Committee to assist in developing a marketing and promotion plan for District Eleven.

Newspaper or Magazine Articles – The plan administrator intends for the Pro Bono Committee to assist in finding something newsworthy at least once per quarter. These press releases will then be sent to all newspapers in the five county area.

Focus for 2008: Increase participation by the Pro Bono committee. The plan administrator needs assistance in carrying out the goals of Legal Aid's pro bono plan. Without an active committee, it will be difficult for the plan administrator to realize all of the goals of the plan.

2006 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY CASES IN DISTRICT ELEVEN

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 3A.

Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each pro bono case for that attorney. The information provided in this chart, and the charts immediately following, should be for the calendar year 2006 and not the fiscal year.

Definitions

Case: A legal matter referred to and accepted by a pro bono attorney volunteer. This includes mediation and GAL services.

Volunteer Attorney: An attorney who has rendered pro bono service to at least one low-income client during the year or accepted a pro bono referral from the identified program. This does not include attorneys who are on the list of pro bono volunteers but who have never taken a case. The case numbers do not include cases screened, only cases actually referred to a pro bono attorney. This also includes an attorney who has worked solely on a pending pro bono case that was neither opened nor closed during the reporting year. Volunteer attorneys for modest means programs may be counted, as long as they are separately identified as such.

Case Type: Please use the abbreviations listed in Indiana Supreme Court Administrative Rule 8(B)(3) or any other defined abbreviation.

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): **Legal Aid - District Eleven, Inc.**

In 2006, IOLTA funding accounted for 41% of total pro bono provider budget. Please state the percentage of volunteers and cases which are attributable to IOLTA funding 100%. If this percentage is substantially more than the percentage of IOLTA funding, please explain.

In 2006, the cost of running the pro bono program was approximately \$60,000. Legal Aid received \$25,000.00 from IOLTA to run the program. The remaining cost of running the program was derived from Legal Aid's other funding sources. In 2007, the cost of running the pro bono program was approximately \$60,689.00. Legal Aid received \$42,055 (69%) from IOLTA to run the program. Again, the remaining cost of running the program was derived from Legal Aid's other funding sources. In 2008, the cost of running the pro bono program is estimated at \$83,871.00 and Legal Aid is requesting 100% of the cost from IOLTA.

<i>Volunteer Attorney Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006</i>	<i>Number of cases closed in 2006</i>	<i>Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006</i>	<i>Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)</i>	<i>Case Type *see last page for key</i>
Lisa Anderson	Bartholomew	2	2	0	12.75	32
					2.8	31
Scott Andrews	Bartholomew	3	4	0	0	62
					2.8	9
					0	69
					3.6	61
Gerald Angermeier	Bartholomew	0	1	0	10.88	31

<i>Volunteer Attorney Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006</i>	<i>Number of cases closed in 2006</i>	<i>Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006</i>	<i>Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)</i>	<i>Case Type *see last page for key</i>
Gene Arnholt	Bartholomew	9	10	0	16	31
					0	32
					45.3	32
					32.3	32
					16.5	32
					24.1	32
					9.2	32
					6.3	38
					0	32
					27.1	31
Jeffrey Beck	Bartholomew	0	1	0	57.3	32
Cynthia Boll	Bartholomew	3	6	0	4.3	32
					0	32
					2	32
					0	32
					1.5	31
					4.9	32
Kirsten Bouthier	Bartholomew	1	0	0		
David Brinley	Bartholomew	1	1	0	5.9	69
Alaina Byers	Bartholomew	2	1	0	9.7	31
Millie Corbin-Beverly	Bartholomew	1	1	0	3	32
Kathleen Coriden	Bartholomew	4	7	0	38.08	39
					25.84	32
					49.61	31
					13.6	32
					4	31
					9	32
					9.37	32
Terrence Coriden	Bartholomew	4	10	1	4	33
					0	32
					4	31
					10	38
					10	31
					0	32
					4	69
					0	32
					5	31
					8.1	32

<i>Volunteer Attorney Name</i>	<i>County</i>	<i>Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006</i>	<i>Number of cases closed in 2006</i>	<i>Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006</i>	<i>Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)</i>	<i>Case Type *see last page for key</i>
Timothy Coriden	Bartholomew	4	3	2	17.4	31
					4	32
					4	32
Jefferson Crump	Bartholomew	3	2	3	0.5	69
					0	32
Robert Dalmbert	Bartholomew	0	1	0	4.75	31
Aaron Edwards	Bartholomew	0	1	0	5	32
William Garber	Bartholomew	6	8	0	5	32
					4	32
					5	32
					4.5	32
					3	32
					5	32
					4	33
					15	32
Dominic Glover	Bartholomew	5	2	2	10	32
					0	42
Jason Guthrie	Bartholomew	7	7	0	0	32
					0	31
					123.8	33
					2	32
					18.75	32
					0	99
					27.2	32
Landyn Harmon	Bartholomew	2	5	1	0	32
					20	31
					10	31
					5	99
					3	32
Patrick Harrison	Bartholomew	2	1	1	4	9
Eric Hayes	Bartholomew	3	3	1	0	32
					8	32
					3.3	32
James Holland	Bartholomew	6	2	1	6.6	32
					0	32
David Hooper	Bartholomew	4	6	0	2	32
					22.75	32
					10	32
					4	32
					6	32
					32	33
Jeffrey Jackson	Bartholomew	1	1	1	1	38

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006	Number of cases closed in 2006	Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006	Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)	Case Type *see last page for key
Michael Kummerer	Bartholomew	4	3	3	3	32
					12	38
					4	32
Ben Loheide	Bartholomew	4	2	0	0	32
					40	31
C. Richard Marshall	Bartholomew	3	1	2	4.5	31
Michael McIver	Bartholomew	2	1	0	0	32
Kathy Molewyk	Bartholomew	6	7	0	2	32
					0	32
					12.3	32
					8.4	32
					0	32
					0	33
					0	31
Thomas Mote	Bartholomew	1	2	0	3.7	32
					9	32
David Nowak	Bartholomew	5	6	0	0	32
					11.7	32
					7.2	31
					9.6	32
					43.5	42
					16.9	32
Jerry Prall	Bartholomew	4	3	0	17.33	32
					5.6	31
					31.5	32
Jeffrey Rocker	Bartholomew	1	2	0	10	69
					6	30
Heidi Sage	Bartholomew	3	1	0	5.3	32
Daniel Schuetz	Bartholomew	1	0	0		
Otto Schug	Bartholomew	3	1	0	4	33
James Shoaf	Bartholomew	3	3	2	7	32
					6	31
					3	31
Dennis Stark	Bartholomew	5	7	0	4	32
					4	32
					5	3
					2	31
					1	31
					0	31
					1	31

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006	Number of cases closed in 2006	Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006	Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)	Case Type *see last page for key
John Stroh	Bartholomew	7	7	1	40	32
					10	31
					5.1	36
					1	31
					2	31
					44.9	31
					4.6	63
Joyce Thayer-Sword	Bartholomew	0	0	1		
Michael Thomasson	Bartholomew	3	3	0	0	32
					3	32
					9.63	32
Sean Thomasson	Bartholomew	1	0	0		
J. Grant Tucker	Bartholomew	4	3	2	5	32
					4.9	32
					0	32
Timothy Vrana	Bartholomew	8	5	1	4.2	29
					14.73	51
					1	74
					15.87	51
					17.7	74
Jeffrey Washburn	Bartholomew	2	0	0		
Alan Whitted	Bartholomew	6	7	1	0	31
					4.16	32
					9	31
					3.5	32
					7.5	32
					5	31
					1.5	31
Thomas Barr	Brown	0	1	0	15	32
Jay Charon	Brown	1	2	0	0	42
					4	32
David Grupenhoff	Brown	0	2	0	10	32
					150	31
Amy Huffman Oliver	Brown	1	0	0		
Heather Mollo	Brown	1	1	0	11.5	31
Cynthia Rose	Brown	1	2	0	40	31
					0.6	32
Sharon Wildey	Brown	0	1	0	1	31
Kurt Young	Brown	4	1	1	0	99
Timothy Day	Decatur	1	1	0	10	32

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006	Number of cases closed in 2006	Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006	Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)	Case Type *see last page for key
Frank Hamilton	Decatur	3	4	0	5.5	32
					4.5	32
					5	33
					3	32
William Robbins	Decatur	0	1	0	10	32
Scott Simmonds	Decatur	0	1	0	40.1	99
Stephen Taylor	Decatur	2	1	0	0	32
Christopher Tebbe	Decatur	3	2	0	10	32
					20	32
Steven Teverbaugh	Decatur	3	3	0	5.4	31
					8.4	31
					4.2	32
Karl Walker	Decatur	3	1	0	0	32
Rodney Farrow	Jackson	2	3	0	7.4	38
					14	32
					7.4	31
Amanda Goecker	Jackson	3	1	1	5	31
Thomas Lantz	Jackson	3	0	0		
Bruce MacTavish	Jackson	1	1	0	4	33
Joseph Markel	Jackson	0	1	0	10	3
Stephanie Mellenbruch	Jackson	3	4	0	1	32
					24.9	32
					10.4	32
					11.8	32
Ryan Redmon	Jackson	2	2	0	42.1	32
					11.7	32
Joseph Robertson	Jackson	2	1	0	0	32
Susan Sparks	Jackson	1	1	1	1	32
Travis Thompson	Jackson	2	3	0	0	32
					3	31
					6.5	32
Brian Belding	Jennings	3	3	1	4	32
					4	36
					7	32
Robert Brown	Jennings	3	7	0	4	32
					4	32
					4	32
					4	31
					4	32
					4.75	31
					4	32
Mark Dove	Jennings	2	2	0	0	32

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006	Number of cases closed in 2006	Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006	Number of hours for cases closed in 2006 (column 4)	Case Type *see last page for key
Brad Johnson	Jennings	1	0	0		
Bradley Kage	Jennings	3	3	1	4	32
					5	32
					3	32
Alan Marshall	Jennings	0	1	0	10	32
Jason Pattison	Jennings	0	1	0	20	31
John Roche	Jennings	7	6	0	30	31
					4.5	31
					2	31
					0	32
					3.5	32
					1	99
John Rothring	Jennings	1	1	0	6	63
Ann Schwartz	Jennings	1	0	0		
Stephen Voelker	Jennings	0	0	1		
Charles Waggoner	Jennings	6	4	0	3.8	33
					4	32
					0	32
					0	31
TOTALS		218	219	32	2072.15	
		Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006	Number of cases closed in 2006	Number of cases pending in 2006 that were neither opened nor closed in 2006	Number of hours for cases closed in 2006	

**2006 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY LIMITED
INFORMATION ACTIVITY IN DISTRICT ELEVEN**

This limited legal information chart can include activities such as pro se clinics and call-in or walk-in informational services.

Please attach additional pages for each pro bono provider that receives IOLTA funding, whether directly or indirectly, in your district. See the sample additional pro bono provider page 4A.

Please list each attorney only once in the volunteer attorney column but complete one line for each type of legal information activity for that attorney.

Name of Pro Bono Provider (includes legal service provider, court, plan administrator, bar association, and other organizations): **Legal Aid - District Eleven, Inc.**

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Type of Activity	Number of Hours
Cynthia Boll	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Alaina Byers	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Kathleen Coriden	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Richard Eynon	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
William Garber	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Jason Guthrie	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Angel Marks	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	4
C. Richard Marshall	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Michael McIver	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Kathy Molewyk	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Dennis Stark	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Marcy Wenzler	Bartholomew	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Mark Brennan	Brown	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Landyn Harmon	Brown	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Beth Kirk	Brown	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
Kurt Young	Brown	Talk To A Lawyer Today	2
TOTAL: 16			TOTAL:34
OVERALL VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY TOTAL: 16			OVERALL HOURS TOTAL: 34

2006 REPORT

Please list your District's 2006 activities--including committee meetings, training, attorney recognition, newspaper or magazine articles, marketing and promotion--in chronological order.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>
January	Referred 20 cases to pro bono attorneys Hosted first annual Talk To A Lawyer Today (TTALT) Event in Bartholomew and Brown counties. Newspaper articles appeared in both counties local papers. Plan Administrator did local radio spot promoting TTALT.
February	Referred 19 cases to pro bono attorneys
March	Referred 18 cases to pro bono attorneys Article appeared in supplement to the Indiana Lawyer
April	Referred 9 cases to pro bono attorneys
May	Referred 39 cases to pro bono attorneys Annual Meeting and Volunteer Appreciation Banquet
June	Referred 11 cases to pro bono attorneys Contacted all pro bono committee members regarding interest in remaining on committee Plan Administrator attended retreat at Indiana State Bar Association
July	Referred 19 cases to pro bono attorneys
August	Referred 16 cases to pro bono attorneys
September	Referred 22 cases to pro bono attorneys Held District Eleven Pro Bono Committee meeting
October	Referred 16 cases to pro bono attorneys Plan Administrator attended retreat in conjunction with annual meeting of the Indiana State Bar Association
November	Referred 31 cases to pro bono attorneys Held District Eleven Pro Bon Committee meeting Live webcast of "Incredibly Interesting and Useful CLE for Attorneys with a Heart" held in Bartholomew County
December	Referred 8 cases to pro bono attorneys Video replay of "Incredibly Interesting and Useful CLE for Attorneys with a Heart" held in Brown County

Please provide a short summary of how the provision of pro bono service is coordinated in your district, including the intake process, the relationships of pro bono providers in the district, how referrals are made, and how reporting is done.

There are two civil legal service providers in District 11, Legal Aid - District Eleven, Inc. (Legal Aid) and Legal Services of Indiana, Bloomington office (BLSO). Legal Aid is the only provider of pro bono services and is the only one to receive IOLTA funds. Both Legal Aid and BLSO provide intake for District 11 and both have toll free intake numbers. When BLSO has a District 11 case that needs a pro bono referral, Myrta Hudson, Paralegal/Office Manager calls and advises Legal Aid that they have a case for referral. She then faxes us the applicant's information. If Legal Aid needs more information prior to making the referral, Legal Aid contacts the client directly. Because Legal Aid and BLSO offer direct representation by staff attorneys for certain types of cases and because Legal Aid offers pro se assistance, referrals to pro bono attorneys are only made if there is no other way to resolve the applicant's legal problem.

Referrals are made by Legal Aid's Lawyer Referral Program Director, John Pushor. John makes referrals by calling attorneys that have agreed to participate. John speaks directly to the attorney or a member of his or her staff and describes the case to be referred. If the attorney agrees to accept the case, all relevant documentation collected by Legal Aid is faxed or mailed to the attorney, a letter is mailed to the applicant notifying them of the referral, and a referral file is generated at Legal Aid. In the letter sent to the applicant, it notifies them that they must contact the referral attorney within two weeks to schedule an appointment. Therefore, all referrals are tickled for two weeks to check on their status. If the client has not contacted the attorney, Legal Aid makes every effort to contact the client to find out why they failed to contact the referral attorney and to attempt to connect the two. Once the client has contacted the referral attorney, the client's file is then tickled for quarterly reviews to check the status of the case.

Once a case is completed, the pro bono attorney is asked to submit a closing form. The information contained in the closing form, i.e. time spent, expenses, donated fee, outcome, etc. is used to close the file at Legal Aid. If the attorney fails to complete a closing form, Sandy Wilson, Program Assistant, calls the referral attorney's office for closing details. Sandy will continue to call weekly until she gets the closing information. All of the client's information is collected using Kemp's Caseworks software – Clients 2000. A paper file for each referral is also maintained.

Please describe any special circumstances, including difficulties encountered, affecting your District's 2006 implementation of its plan.

The biggest barrier to implementation of the 2006 plan was the lack of a "working" committee. The District 11 Committee met twice in 2006 (prior to 2006, the committee had not met since 2002). The first meeting was held on September 21, 2006. Five of the ten members attended. Discussion was held on recruiting committee members from Jackson and Jennings counties and members were appointed to make contact with potential candidates in those counties. Discussion was held regarding assignment of an attorney (liaisons) in each county to speak with attorneys in their county who are not currently accepting pro bono cases. The goal was to determine why they do not participate and to remove any barriers to their participation. It was determined that another meeting should be held prior to December to finalize plans for TTALT, check the status of finding members from Jackson and Jennings, and to assign liaisons for Bartholomew, Brown, Jackson and Jennings counties. Members were informed that meeting by conference call was available and acceptable. At the second meeting on November 16, 2006, two of the ten members attended. The meeting was adjourned and no action was taken.

The plan administrator needs assistance in carrying out the goals of Legal Aid's pro bono plan. Without an active committee, it will be difficult for the plan administrator to realize all of the goals of the plan.

BUDGETS for 2006, 2007 and 2008

Income Category	2006 Actual Income	2006 Budget	2007 Actual Income To Date	2007 Budget	2008 Budget
A. INCOME					
1. IOLTA Grant Amount	25,000	25,000	42,055	42,055	83,871
Other Income:					
2. United Way	-	-	3,927	17,854	0
3. Brown County Community Foundation	-	-	0	780	0
4.	-	-	-	-	0
5. Total Income (sum of lines A1 – A4)	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$45,982	\$60,689	\$83,871
Expense Category	2006 Actual Expenditures	2006 Budget	2007 Actual Expenditures To Date	2007 Budget	2008 Budget
B. PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES					
1. Plan Administrator	7,100	7,100	10,000	20,000	32,600
2. Paralegals	0	0	3,424	6,848	0
3. Others – Program Assistant	8,840	8,840	4,680	9,360	16,380
4. Employee benefits					
a. Insurance	0	0	1,967	3,935	5,087
b. Retirement plans	0	0	0	0	0
c. Other – Payroll Taxes	0	0	1,874	3,748	3,653
5. Total Personnel expenditures	\$15,940	\$15,940	\$21,945	\$43,891	\$57,720
C. NON-PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES					
1. Occupancy	0	0	851	1,703	1,981
2. Equipment Rental	0	0	0	0	0
3. Office Supplies	0	0	655	1,310	3,310
4. Telephone	210	210	525	1,050	1,140
5. Travel	0	0	135	800	0
6. Training	0	0	0	1,000	0
7. Library	0	0	0	0	0
8. Malpractice Insurance	150	150	630	630	1,400
9. Dues and Fees	0	0	300	300	788
10. Reserve	0	0	0	0	0
11. Marketing and promotion	0	0	0	1,000	840
12. Attorney recognition	1,200	1,200	4,873	2,000	7,500
13. Litigation expenditures	7,500	7,500	2,826	6,800	6,000
14. Property Acquisition	0	0	0	0	0
15. Contract Services	0	0	205	205	3,192
16. Grants to other pro bono providers	0	0	0	0	0
17. Other - Please explain	0	0	0	0	0
18. Total Non-Personnel Expenditures (sum of lines C1 - C17)	\$ 9,060	\$ 9,060	\$11,000	\$16,798	\$26,151
D. TOTAL EXPENDITURES (sum of B5&18)	\$25,000	\$25,000	\$32,945	\$60,689	\$83,871
E. ENDING FUND BALANCE (A5 less D)	\$0	\$0	\$13,037	\$ 0	\$ 0

Budget Narrative

Please provide descriptions of the following line items in the foregoing budget chart, by item number, in the space provided. Please explain any other budget entries that are not self-explanatory, including other sources of income. Lines (B)(1), (2), (3), (4) Please indicate the number of hours per week for each personnel position, rate of pay, and all employee benefits.

For 2008

Line (B) (1) - 72% of the Plan Administrator's (PA) salary of \$45,000.00. The PA is full-time. The other 28% is funded through other funding sources. (*see supplement: Total Agency Budget)

Line (B) (3) - 87% of the Intake Specialist/Program Assistant's (ISPA) wages. This amount represents a pay rate of \$9.00 per hour at 40 hours per week. The remaining 13% is funded through other funding sources.

Line (B) (4) (a) - 66% of the cost of health insurance benefits for the PA and 87% of the cost of health insurance for the ISPA. The remaining balance is funded through other funding sources.

Line (B) (4) (c) - 66% of the cost of the employer's share of payroll taxes for the PA and 87% of the cost of the employer's share of payroll taxes for the ISPA. The remaining balance is funded through other funding sources.

Line (C)(1) Please describe the occupancy cost in terms of square footage, utilities or other amenities and indicate whether the occupancy cost is above or below the market rate for that space.

Legal Aid pays \$420 per month rent for 1,704 square feet. All utilities are included. This is approximately twenty-four cents per square foot per month. This cost is well below the market rate.

One supplemental, explanatory page may be added to the end of this report and plan.

ANNUAL TIMETABLE FOR SUBMISSION OF FORMS AND CHECKS:

January 1:	Checks distributed
July 2:	Annual report, plan and grant application due to IPBC
November:	Notification of awards
December 1:	IBF grant agreement due and revised budget due

PRO BONO DISTRICT NUMBER 11 LETTER OF REPRESENTATION

The following representations, made to the best of our knowledge and belief, are being provided to the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation in anticipation of their review and evaluation of our funding request and our commitment and value to our Pro Bono District.

Operation under Rule 6.6

In submitting this application for funding, this district is representing itself as having a Pro Bono Plan, which is pursuant to **Rule 6.6** of the Indiana Rules of Professional Conduct. The plan enables attorneys in our district to discharge their professional responsibilities to provide civil legal pro bono services; improves the overall delivery of civil legal services to persons of limited means by facilitating the integration and coordination of services provided by pro bono organizations and other legal assistance organizations in our district; and ensures access to high quality and timely pro bono civil legal services for persons of limited means by (1) fostering the development of new civil legal pro bono programs where needed and (2) supporting and improving the quality of existing civil legal pro bono programs. The plan also fosters the growth of a public service culture within the district which values civil legal pro bono publico service and promotes the ongoing development of financial and other resources for civil legal pro bono organizations.

We have adhered to **Rule 6.6** (f) by having a district pro bono committee composed of:

- A. the judge designated by the Supreme Court to preside;
- B. to the extent feasible, one or more representatives from each voluntary bar association in the district, one representative from each pro bono and legal assistance provider in the district, and one representative from each law school in the district; and
- C. at least two (2) community-at-large representatives, one of whom shall be a present or past recipient of pro bono publico legal services.

We have determined the governance of our district pro bono committee as well as the terms of service of our members. Replacement and succession members are appointed by the judge designated by the Supreme Court.

Pursuant to **Rule 6.6** (g) to ensure an active and effective district pro bono program, we:

- A. prepare in written form, on an annual basis, a district pro bono plan, including any county sub-plans if appropriate, after evaluating the needs of the district and making a determination of presently available pro bono services;
- B. select and employ a plan administrator to provide the necessary coordination and administrative support for the district pro bono committee;
- C. implement the district pro bono plan and monitor its results; and
- D. submit an annual report to the Commission.

Commitment to Pro Bono Program Excellence

We also understand that ultimately the measure of success for a civil legal services program, whether a staffed or volunteer attorney program, is the outcomes achieved for clients, and the relationship of these outcomes to clients' most critical legal needs. We agree to strive for the following hallmarks which are characteristics enhancing a pro bono program's ability to succeed in providing effective services addressing clients' critical needs.

- 1. Participation by the local bar associations and attorneys.** The associations and attorneys believe the program is necessary and beneficial.
- 2. Centrality of client needs.** The mission of the program is to provide high quality free civil legal services to low-income persons through volunteer attorneys. Client needs drive the program, balanced by the nature and quantity of resources available.
- 3. Program priorities.** The program engages in a priority-setting process, which determines what types of problems the program will address. Resources are allocated to matters of greatest impact on the client and are susceptible to civil legal resolution. The program calls on civil legal providers and other programs serving low-income people to assist in this process.
- 4. Direct representation component.** The core of the program is direct representation in which volunteer attorneys engage in advocacy on behalf of low-income persons. Adjunct programs such as advice clinics, pro se clinics and paralegal assistance are dictated by client needs and support the core program.
- 5. Coordination with state and local civil legal providers and bar associations.** The programs work cooperatively with the local civil legal providers. The partnerships between the civil legal providers and the local bar association results in a variety of benefits including sharing of expertise, coordination of services, and creative solutions to problems faced by the client community.
- 6. Accountability.** The program has mechanisms for evaluating the quality of service it provides. It expects and obtains reporting from participating attorneys concerning the progress/outcome of referred cases. It has the capability to demonstrate compliance with requirements imposed by its funding source(s), and it has a grievance procedure for the internal resolution of disputes between attorneys and clients.
- 7. Continuity.** The program has a form of governance, which ensures the program will survive changes in bar leadership, and has operational guidelines, which enable the program to survive a change in staff. Programs should have written job descriptions, policies and procedures to ensure continuity. Every pro bono program which receives IOLTA funding from the Indiana Pro Bono Commission and Indiana Bar Foundation must be incorporated and have obtained or applied for federal tax-exempt status by July 1, 2007.
- 8. Cost-effectiveness.** The program maximizes the level of high quality civil legal services it provides in relationship to the total amount of funding received.

9. Minimization of barriers. The program addresses in a deliberate manner linguistic, sensory, physical and cultural barriers to clients' ability to receive services from the program. The program does not create undue administrative barriers to client access.

10. Understanding of ethical considerations. The program operates in a way which is consistent with the Rules of Professional Conduct; client confidentiality is assured and conflicts of interest are avoided. The staff and volunteers are respectful of clients and sensitive to their needs.

11. ABA Standards. The program is designed to be as consistent with the ABA Standards for Programs Providing Civil Pro Bono Legal Services to Persons of Limited Means as possible.

No events, shortages or irregularities have occurred and no facts have been discovered which would make the financial statements provided to you materially inaccurate or misleading. To our knowledge there is nothing reflecting unfavorably upon the honesty or integrity of members of our organization. We have accounted for all known or anticipated operating revenue and expense in preparing our funding request.

We agree to provide human-interest stories promoting Pro Bono activities in a timely manner upon request of the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission. We further agree to make ourselves available to meet with the Pro Bono Commission and/or the Indiana Bar Foundation to answer any questions or provide any material requested which serves as verification/source documentation for the submitted information.

Explanation of items stricken from the above Letter of Representation:

It is understood that this Letter does not replace the Grant Agreement or other documents required by the Indiana Bar Foundation or Indiana Pro Bono Commission.

Signatures:

Joseph W. Meek
Judicial Appointee Signature

6-29-07
Date

Tammara Jo Sparks
Plan Administrator Signature

6-29-07
Date