



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 7

Applicant: Christopher A. Newton

Mailing Address: Vigo County Courthouse, 33 South Third Street

City: Terre Haute, IN **Zip:** 47807

Phone: 812-462-3263 **Fax:** 812-232-5183

E-mail address: judgenewton@aol.com

Judicial Appointee: Christopher A. Newton

Plan Administrator: Michelle Price

Names of Counties served: Clay, Parke, Putnam, Sullivan, Vermillion and Vigo

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
13 % 17

Please also provide pro bono participation rates by county, if available.

Number of volunteer attorneys (as defined on page 3) who provided pro bono representation for at least 50 hours during 2006: 0

Please also provide this information by county, if possible.

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): 165

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: 17 **Please also provide this information by county, if available.**

Amount of grant received for 2007: \$20,000

Amount of grant (2007 & prior years) projected to be unused as of 12/31/07: \$1,000.00

Amount requested for 2008: \$32,300

2008 PLAN SUMMARY

- 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.**

District 7 has experienced several changes in the past year. Judge Christopher Newton replaced the Honorable Phillip I. Adler as Judicial appointee in late 2006. Michelle Price also became Plan Administrator late last year. District 7's Board of Directors is also in a state of transition.

Several members who have been on the District 7 Board since its formation in 2001 resigned when their terms expired. The Board members have been replaced with younger lawyers who have brought energy and new ideas to District 7.

Changes to the Judicial Appointee and Plan Administrator have caused problems for District 7. District 7 has contracted with the local Council on Domestic Abuse (CODA) to administer the program since 2001. CODA representatives handle all client intakes, assignment of cases and monitor District 7's caseload. CODA is also responsible for all administrative and clerical tasks associated with District 7.

When Carrie McKillip resigned as CODA Director last year problems began to arise involving client intake and attorney assignments. Ms. McKillip's replacement was not aware of CODA's District 7 responsibilities and as a result client intakes and assignment of Pro Bono cases to local attorneys dropped significantly. Assigned cases also weren't monitored as they had been in the past. District 7's Board of Directors also did not meet regularly in 2006 further compounding the problem.

When Judge Newton became Judicial Appointee he and other Board members met with CODA representatives multiple times to discuss District 7's problems. Judge Newton has also conducted regular meetings since his appointment and added new Board members to replace those whose terms expired. District 7 has met monthly in 2007 to address the problems that occurred in 2006.

CODA is now regularly conducting client intakes and assigning cases to volunteer attorneys. The most pressing problem facing District 7 is to find attorneys who will handle family law cases. The problem of finding lawyers to handle family law cases has been present since District 7's formation.

District 7's Board will be conducting a family law training seminar similar to one sponsored in 2002. The free seminar will allow attorneys to receive family law training and ICLEF credit at no cost. The training session will be conducted by attorneys who have significant experience in family law and the seminar topics will include custody, visitation and child support.

Attorneys that participate in the seminar will be asked to handle a specified number of family law cases during the next year. The seminar will also be used to market District 7 and encourage attorneys who have not previously handled Pro Bono cases to become involved in District 7.

District 7 will also be scheduling a Talk to a Lawyer day. District 7 has a long client waiting list due to the problems the corporation experienced in 2006. Notices will be sent to individuals on District 7's waiting list inviting them to participate in the "Talk to a Lawyer" day. District 7 hopes that the Talk to a Lawyer day will help reduce the waiting list when advice from an attorney may be sufficient to solve the client's problem. Attorneys who participate in the program will also be encouraged to accept one or more cases from individuals that they meet with during the program.

District 7 Board members have also been calling area attorneys to assist CODA in the assignment of cases. The client waiting list will be reduced significantly through the Talk to a Lawyer day and the assignment of cases by District 7 Board members.

District 7 hosted an awards dinner earlier this year to thank Judge Adler for his service to District 7. Chief Justice Shepherd participated and presented Judge Alder with a plaque on behalf of District 7. District 7 also used the awards ceremony to encourage attorneys who had not participated in District 7 to become involved and accept one or more cases during the next year. Attorneys who have previously handled cases through District 7 were also asked to increase their case load. District 7 anticipates having another awards presentation or attorney recognition dinner in 2008.

District 7 will also continue to use a Pro Se form. The form designed by Judge Adler is used in post dissolution matters where there are no contested issues. These cases usually involve emancipation, child support modification and visitation. Attorney involvement would not be required and the client could complete the form and submit it to the court so that their case can be set and scheduled in a timely manner.

The Pro Se form will keep District 7 from assigning cases where attorney representation may not be required. The Pro Se form will also help District 7 further manager its waiting list and allow clients with issues to appear in court quickly.

The need for District 7's services has grown during the past two years. A CODA representative working part-time has handled client intakes and attorney assignments since 2001. A single part-time person cannot handle these responsibilities. It is difficult for a part-time person to conduct client intakes, assign cases, monitor files and return phone calls. The part-time person handling these responsibilities finds that more and more time is spent returning phone calls and answering questions from current clients and those on the waiting list. Time spent handling these tasks make it difficult to assign cases and monitor files.

District 7 has concluded that to adequately serve its clients that a full-time position needs to be created. A person working 40 hours a week will be able to handle all of the responsibilities associated with the administration of District 7 which includes all client and attorney contacts plus inquiries from the State Pro Bono Commission and the District 7 Board.

2006 REPORT OF VOLUNTEER ATTORNEY CASES IN DISTRICT 7

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): District 7 Pro Bono Corporation

IOLTA funding accounts for 100 % 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.

Volunteer Attorney Name	County	Number of new cases accepted/opened in 2006	Number of cases closed (but not opened) 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
Abel, Eric	Vigo	1	--	--	--	DR
" "	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
" "	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
" "	Vigo	--	1	--	0	AD
" "	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
" "	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
" "	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
" "	Vigo	--	--	1	--	DR
" "	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
" "	Vigo	--	--	1	--	DR
" "	Vigo	--	--	1	--	DR
" "	Vigo	--	--	1	--	DR
" "	Vigo	--	--	1	--	GU
Bonomo, Donald	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR

“ ”	Parke	--	1	--	0	GU
Bough, Brad	Vigo	1	--	--	--	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	1.5	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	GU
Boyll, Jeffrey	Clay	1	--	--	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
Brames, Arnold	Vigo	1	--	--	--	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	GU
Brattain, George	Vigo	--	1	--	3.5	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Britton, Louis	Vigo	--	1	--	0	AD
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	2	MI
Clary, Thomas, II	Parke	--	1	--	.5	DR
“ ”	Parke	--	--	1	--	DR
Creason, Geoffrey	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vermillion	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Sullivan	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vermillion	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Putnam	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vermillion	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Sullivan	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vermillion	--	--	1	--	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Putnam	--	--	1	--	MI
Crossen, Martha	Clay	--	1	--	0	DR
Daily, Christopher	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	1	--	--	--	DR
Drummy, William	Vigo	--	1	--	5	DR
Ellis, Kaleel, III	Vermillion	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Parke	--	1	--	0	MI
Ellis, Michael	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI

“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Followel, Doug	Sullivan	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Sullivan	--	1	--		DR
Frankel, Will	Vigo	--	1	--	6.5	DR
David Friedrich	Parke	--	--	1	--	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Sullivan	1	--	--	--	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Gambill, Christopher	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	DR
Hellman, Bob	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Ireland, Michael	Vigo	--	1	--	2.5	MI
Johnson, Jeff	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Sullivan	--	--	1	--	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	GU
“ ”	Sullivan	--	--	1	--	DR
“ ”	Sullivan	--	--	1	--	GU
Keller, John	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Kelley, Keri	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Kesler, John	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
Kesler, John II	Vigo	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
Lee, Chouli	Vigo	--	1	--	0	AD
Lewis, Libby	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Sullivan	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Clay	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Clay	--	1	--	0	MI
Lind, Jeff	Vigo	1	--	--	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	6.5	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
McKee, Craig	Clay	1	--	--	--	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
McMahan, Robert	Vigo	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	GU
Mullican, Mark	Vigo	--	1	--	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	5	DR
“ ”	Clay	--	1	--	3.5	MI
Martin, Rae	Parke	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Parke	--	1	--	0	DR

Newton, Christopher	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
Oldham, Rhonda	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
Organ, Jim	Parke	--	1	--	0	DR
Phipps, Lora	Clay	--	1	--	--	MI
Reed, Mark	Sullivan	--	1	--	0	DR
“ ”	Sullivan	--	1	--	0	DR
Sacopulos, Mike	Vigo	--	1	--	14.5	GU
Shagley, Richard	Vigo	--	1	--	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
Shema, Christopher	Vigo	--	1	--	16	AD
Skillman, Scott	Clay	1	--	--	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	DR
“ ”	Vigo	--	--	1	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	1	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	--	MI
Slagle, Mike	Clay	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	5	MI
Smith, Phillip	Sullivan	1	--	--	--	MI
“ ”	Sullivan	1	--	--	--	MI
“ ”	Vigo	1	--	--	--	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	3.5	GU
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	2	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	10	GU
Starkey, Michel	Vigo	1	--	--	--	MI
“ ”	Clay	1	--	--	--	MI
Swaim, Sam	Parke	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Putnam	--	1	--	0	GU
“ ”	Parke	--	1	--	0	MI
Wrede, Jennifer	Vigo	--	1	--	0	DR
Williams, Rowdy	Clay	1	--	--	--	DR
“ ”	Vermillion	--	1	--	10	MI
“ ”	Vigo	--	1	--	0	MI
“ ”	Clay	--	1	--	0	DR
Young, James Harvey	Putnam	--	1	--	9	DR
TOTAL:	<i>No total needed</i>	TOTAL: 15	TOTAL: 92	TOTAL: 38	TOTAL: 102.5	<i>No total needed</i>

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 – December	Judge Adler met with Board members to discuss attorney recruitment and how the local bar could be encouraged to accept Pro Bono family law cases. Judge Adler also met with Judge Newton to encourage him to become District 7's Judicial Appointee. Judge Adler and Judge Newton also met to discuss steps that need to be taken to ensure the continued success of District 7.
January	Judge Adler met with Ms. McKillip to determine how attorney involvement could be increased. Attorneys have been reluctant to accept family law cases especially those involving custody issues. Judge Adler and Ms. McKillip discussed conducting another family law training seminar where attorneys without family law experience would receive training and ICLEF credit. These attorneys would then be asked to accept Pro Bono family law cases. The training session would be free and the participating attorneys would receive ICLEF credit. The attorneys also agreed to accept family law cases following their participation in the training session.
February – May	Judge Alder and Judge Newton discussed changes to District 7's Board. Several founding Board members indicated that they would not seek reappointment at the close of their term in 2006. Judge Newton and Judge Adler began to recruit younger attorneys in the hope that their energy would increase lawyer participation.
June – August	<p>Carrie McKillip resigned as CODA's Executive Director and moved out of state. Judge Adler and Judge Newton spoke and met with CODA representatives to discuss how Ms. McKillip's resignation would effect District 7. CODA employee Amy Rollings who was responsible for client intakes and attorney assignments also resigned to accept other employment.</p> <p>Replacements for Ms. McKillip and Ms. Rollings were chosen. Ms. Rollings trained her replacement to handle client intakes, attorney assignments and use of District 7's computer system.</p>
September – December	Judge Newton succeeded Judge Adler as District 7's Judicial appointee. Michelle Price replaced Carrie McKillip as CODA's Executive Director and became District 7's Plan Administrator. Brock

Mullen became the CODA employee responsible for client intake, attorney assignments and the day to day administration of District 7.

Judge Newton also appointed David Friedrich, Sabrina Haney and Michael Wright to replace Board members whose terms were expiring. Judge Newton also began to schedule monthly meetings of District 7's Board of Directors to address problems concerning the assignment of cases and the delay in responding to client inquiries.

Judge Newton also discussed with Ms. Price whether the Kemp Software case management program should be utilized by District 7. Judge Newton and Ms. Price agreed that the Kemp's Software should be purchased and the program would be implemented in 2007.

Judge Newton, Ms. Price and Mr. Friedrich also met in December to discuss District 7's 2007 objectives. District 7's goals were to decrease the client waiting list, increase lawyer participation and determine how the District 7 program could be administered more effectively.

2006 REPORT

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.

When a client contacts the District 7 Pro Bono office an intake meeting is scheduled. Eligibility is determined during the meeting based on income, location and the legal issue involved. Qualified applicants are referred to the Bloomington office of Indiana Legal Services. Putnam County clients may be referred to the Putnam County Pro Se Help Desk or the Putnam County Family 7 Court Facilitation Project.

An application is taken from a client who requires assistance through District 7. The client is placed on a waiting list until a participating attorney is assigned. Once the assignment is made the case material is forwarded to the attorney for review. The attorney will then meet with the client to discuss the case.

The attorney will execute a case acceptance form if he/she agrees to represent the client. The District 7 office will contact the attorney periodically to check on the status of the case. The attorney will execute a closing report once the representation is concluded. The "case closing" form identifies the client's legal problem and how the case was resolved. The attorney also notes the number of hours expended as part of the representation. Judge Newton sends a letter to the attorney thanking them for their service once the case is closed.

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

The resignation of Carrie McKillip and Amy Rollings resulted in significant problems for District 7. Ms. McKillip has been the District 7's Plan Administrator since 2001. Ms. McKillip was the Director of CODA and oversaw the administration of District 7. Amy Rollings was the CODA employee who handled all intakes, client communication and attorney assignments.

Ms. McKillip resigned from CODA in 2006 when her husband was transferred out of state. Ms. Rollings resigned a short time later to accept other employment. The resignations of Ms. McKillip and Ms. Rollings also coincided with change in District 7's judicial appointee.

Judge Christopher Newton became District 7's judicial appointee in late 2006. Michelle Price replaced Carrie McKillip as CODA Director and District 7's Plan Administrator. Brock Mullen assumed Ms. Rollings District 7 responsibilities in late 2006. Ms. Rollings job was handled by another CODA employee for a short time. Mr. Mullen assumed the position when Ms. Rollings replacement left CODA.

The changes resulted in a marked increase in the client waiting list and a drop in attorney assignments. When Ms. Price assumed Ms. McKillip's duties she was unaware of the extent of CODA's responsibilities to District 7. Ms. Rollings replacement also spent a significant amount of time performing client intakes but did not assign cases to participating attorneys adding to the waiting list's backlog. When Mr. Mullen assumed responsibility for District 7 he inherited a long client waiting list and spent significant time initially handling client inquiries and performing case intakes.

When Ms. Price became aware of problems with the waiting list and attorney assignments other CODA staff were utilized to conduct client intakes and assign cases. The additional help allowed Mr. Mullen to return phone calls from clients and monitor ongoing cases. Ms. Rollings also returned to provide additional training to Mr. Mullen. The training helped Mr. Mullen to perform his District 7 job responsibilities more efficiently.

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	17,500.00	17,500.00	21,592.00	20,000.00	32,300.00
Other Income: <i>Explain source(s) and if Actual/Expected in narrative</i>					
2.					
3.					
4.					
5. Total Income (sum of lines A1 - A4)	\$ 17,500.00	\$ 17,500.00	\$ 21,592.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 32,300.00
Expense Category	2006 Actual Expenditures	2006 Budget	2007 Actual Expenditures To Date	2007 Budget	2008 Budget
B. PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES					
1. Plan Administrator	17,500.00	17,500.00	4,375.00	17,500.00	25,000.00
2. Paralegals					
3. Others - Please explain					
4. Employee benefits					
a. Insurance					
b. Retirement plans					
c. Other - Please explain					
5. Total Personnel expenditures (sum of lines B1 - B4c)	\$17,500.00	\$17,500.00	\$4,375.00	\$17,500.00	\$25,000.00
C. NON-PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES					
1. Occupancy					
2. Equipment Rental					
3. Office Supplies	250.95	400.00	85.48	400.00	400.00
4. Telephone	1,087.85	1,200.00	587.32	1,400.00	1,400.00
5. Travel		300.00			
6. Training					1,000.00
7. Library			633.50		
8. Malpractice Insurance					2,000.00
9. Dues and Fees		500.00			
10. Reserve					
11. Marketing and promotion					
12. Attorney recognition					1,000.00

13. Litigation expenditures		2,000.00		1,000.00	1,000.00
14. Property Acquisition					
15. Contract Services					
16. Grants to other pro bono providers					
17. Other - Please explain	360.73	10.00	360.73	600.00	500.00
18. Total Non-Personnel Expenditures (sum of lines C1 - C17)	\$1,699.53	\$4,410.00	\$1,667.03	\$3,400.00	\$7,300.00
D. TOTAL EXPENDITURES (sum of B5 & C18)	\$19,199.53	\$21,910.00	\$6,042.03	\$29,900.00	\$32,300.00
E. ENDING FUND BALANCE (A5 less D)	\$	\$	\$13,957.97	\$	\$ 0.00

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.

District 7 is seeking an increase in funding to \$33,400. District 7 has contracted with CODA for \$17,500 annually. CODA provides a staff person to handle client intakes, assign cases and manage the District's case load. District 7's activities are performed primarily by one part-time CODA staff member. The staff member is supervised by Ms. Price and other staff are utilized as needed. It is estimated that CODA representatives spend 20-25 hours per week on District 7 business.

A growing need has lead District 7 to seek funding to establish a full-time position to administer the program. A part-time person (20 hours) can no longer handle client intakes in a six county area, assign cases, handle communication with clients and manage the District's case load. If funding was received for a full-time position, District 7 would contract with CODA to fill this position. A CODA employee would work full-time on District 7 business but continue to work under Ms. Price's supervision.

CODA receives no benefits or mileage from District 7. CODA also allows District 7 to operate out of its Terre Haute office at no charge.

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.

District 7 will continue to operate out of CODA's office. CODA does not charge for rent or utilities which are valued at \$800 per month. CODA also donates office space to District 7 in all counties within the District and also does not charge for use of its copy or fax machine. The occupancy cost is well below market value.

Line 17 Secretary of State, accounting expense.

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 7 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:

Judicial Appointee Signature

Date

Plan Administrator Signature

Date