

State Bar Board Committee Structure 2001 – 2012

In response to outside urging by the Supreme Court and the State Auditor, in August 2001 the then Board of Governors engaged in a two-day Board Governance and Strategic Planning retreat to (1) set a new course for the future direction of the State Bar of California and (2) structure itself to effectively fulfill its Board role.

The Board's governance consultant initially recommended a four-committee governing structure, three Board Committees, each responsible for discharge of a specific Board responsibility and a Governance Committee accountable for the Board's effective functioning:

[1] . . . Governance Committee, chaired by the board president and consisting of the chairs of the . . . functional standing committees and the CEO . . . basically responsible for the effective functioning of the board and for the maintenance and development of the board-CEO working relationship.

[2] Planning and Program Development Committee . . . accountable for developing and leading the board's participation in all planning, including annual budget preparation.

[3] Operational Oversight Committee . . . accountable for overseeing operational and financial performance.

[4] External Relations/Volunteer Involvement Committee . . . responsible for maintaining effective relationships with the various constituencies and for ensuring that volunteer involvement is highly productive . . .”

Driven by a perceived need to provide a leadership opportunity for each third-year lawyer member of the Board by chairing a committee and thereby positioning themselves for election as president of the Board, the final recommendation submitted by the consultant led to the creation of six Board Committees:

1. Board Operations (BOPS)
2. Planning, Program Development, and Budget Committee (PPDB)
3. Regulation, Admission and Discipline Oversight Committee (RAD)
4. Member Oversight Committee (MOC)
5. Stakeholder Relations Committee (SRC)
6. Volunteer Involvement Committee (VIC)

This six-committee governance structure was adopted in 2001 with the understanding that the Board could and would refine the structure in the future as experience and need required.

In September 2004 the Board opted to combine the Stakeholder Relations Committee and Volunteer Involvement Committee to create the Communications and Bar Relations Committee (“COMBAR”), and maintain the Planning Program Development and Budget Committee, Regulation, Admissions and Discipline Committee, Member Oversight Committee, and the Board Operations Committee. In October of 2004 the Board appointed the “Audit Committee” and in July 2005, adopted its charge.

Also in July 2005, the Board revived the six committee structure adopted by the Board in December 2001 which is comprised of the Member Oversight Committee, Planning, Program Development, and Budget Committee, Board Committee on Regulation, Admissions, and Discipline, Stakeholder Relations Committee, Volunteer Involvement Committee, and Board Operations Committees, and continued the Sections Task Force not as a Board Committee, but as a separate entity with the President as its Chair.

In July 2009, the Board adopted a seven committee structure that split the Regulation, Admissions Committee and Discipline Committee into two committees – Regulation and Admissions (“RAC”) and Discipline Oversight Committee (“DOC”); changed the Stakeholders Relations Committee to a Legal Services, Pro Bono and Equal Access Committee; combined the Member Oversight Committee and Volunteer Involvement Committee into a Member Involvement, Relations and Services Committee (“MIRS”) and maintained the Audit, Board Operations, Planning Committees, and the Sections Task Force.

During the 2010 – 2011 Board year, the Board returned to the six-committee structure originally adopted in 2001, maintaining the Task Force on Sections and the Audit Committee.

In 2011-2012, the Board changed the name of the Volunteer Involvement Committee (“VIC”) to Nominations and Appointment Committee (“NAC”) to clarify the jurisdictional boundaries between various working groups during the 2011-12 Board year and because in recent years, the central mission of the VIC -- and the bulk of its work -- had been nominations and appointments. The Board also created a new Task Force on Discipline Metrics and Monitoring to focus on improving the quality of reporting information that is available to Board members in the area of discipline and an Ad Hoc Legislative Affairs Committee to provide a structural tool within the Board from which to draw upon the experience and expertise of Board members.