



# The State Bar of California

---

## Legal Services Trust Fund Commission (LSTFC) Partnership Grants Committee Teleconference

Open Session Minutes  
Thursday, April 6, 2023  
1:09 p.m.–3:26 p.m.

**Time Meeting Commenced:** The Partnership Grant Committee meeting commenced in open session at 1:09 p.m.  
**Time Meeting Adjourned:** 3:26 p.m.  
**Chair:** Eric Isken  
**Committee Coordinator:** Christal Bundang  
**Members Present:** Will Boschelli, Jason Galkin, Diana Kruze, Joseph Lee  
**Members Absent:** None  
**Advisors Present:** Hon. Victor Rodriguez, Hon. Bryant Yang  
**Advisors Absent:** None  
**Liaisons Present:** Melanie Snider (Judicial Council)  
**Liaisons Absent:** Laura Brown, Salena Copeland

### OPEN SESSION

#### 1. Call to Order

The Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Partnership Grant Committee (PG Committee) was called to order by Chair Isken.

#### 2. Roll Call

Roll call was taken and a quorum was established.

Chair Isken called for public comment, inquiring as to whether there were person(s) who wished to comment on any agenda item. There were no members of the public who wished to speak on any agenda item.

#### 3. Approval of Minutes

##### 3.1 Open Session Minutes: January 11, 2023

**RESOLVED**, that the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission Partnership Grant Committee approves the Open Session Minutes from the January 11, 2023, meeting as posted on the agenda.

*Moved by Lee, seconded by Isken.*

*Ayes – (5) Boschelli, Galkin, Kruze, Isken, Lee*

*Noes – (0)*

*Abstain – (0)*

*Absent – (0)*

*Minutes adopted.*

#### **4. Discussion and Action Items**

##### **4.1 Initial Calibration of Selected 2024 Partnership Grant Applications**

**Presenter:** Christal Bundang, Lead Program Analyst, Office of Access & Inclusion

Presentation and discussion.

Lead Program Analyst Bundang reported that 37 proposals were submitted for the 2024 grant year, seeking a total of \$5,062,000 in funding. The available funding amount for 2024 is yet to be determined, but \$2.79 million was distributed in 2023.

Bundang reviewed the scoring rubric categories and provided examples of factors to consider when allotting points. The PG Committee then proceeded with the initial calibration process for the three selected applications, which entailed discussing outlier scores and sharing reasons for individual scores. While the PG Committee aimed to reach consensus for each category, it agreed to take the average score in instances when consensus was not reached.

In discussing the merits of each application, the PG Committee discussed factors it considered when scoring a category as exceeds, meets, or below expectations.

For Court Involvement, the factors the PG Committee considered were how well integrated a project was with the court, the level of court involvement in the project's conception and planning, and the amount of time the project planned to be at the court. The PG Committee found it particularly impressive when the partner court had a high level of involvement with the project's evaluation process and substantive discussions with grantees about how to improve the project.

For Project Impact, the PG Committee evaluated the target populations' need for services and the projects' aims to meet those needs. The PG Committee considered how realistic and impactful the proposed services were for the grant period. Factors the PG Committee considered were whether the project met its goal number of services and deliverables (if a continuing project), the proposed budget relative to the proposed services, and the depth of services offered.

For Administration, the PG Committee considered an applicant's prior experience in the substantive area and whether the proposal provided a clear description of staffing and planned service days.

For Continuity Planning, the PG Committee considered a project's stated efforts to obtain other funding and whether it listed specific alternative funding sources. The PG Committee was sympathetic to fundraising challenges faced by projects in rural areas and new projects that lacked institutional history to build upon.

For Evaluation, the PG Committee considered the strength of an applicant's evaluation plan, the extent to which court personnel is engaged in process, and whether the project made any improvement or changes in response to litigant feedback. The PG Committee was particularly impressed by the use of focus groups as an additional evaluation method.

For Funding Priorities, the PG Committee aligned on a shared understanding of how to award points in this category. A project that is both new and supports unmet rural needs would receive 15 points, a project that is either new or rural receives 10 points, and a project that is neither receives 5 points.

For Innovation, the PG Committee awarded bonus points to projects developing new videos to achieve asynchronous learning and projects providing wraparound services responsive to the needs of the community (such as credit report guidance).

After the initial calibration process, Bundang confirmed the final scores for each application. PG Committee members then signed up for subsequent calibration sessions scheduled for April through May 2023 to review the remaining applications.

#### **4.2 Discuss the 2022 Partnership Grant Evaluations and Identify Key Data Points Needed for 2024 Application Review**

**Presenter:** Christal Bundang, Lead Program Analyst, Office of Access & Inclusion

Presentation and discussion.

Lead Program Analyst Bundang led a discussion of possible data points that could be extracted from the 2022 Partnership Grant Evaluations to help assist with the 2024 Partnership Grant application review process. The PG Committee decided the following data points would be most helpful:

- Project goals versus actual
- Number of services provided (both workshops and individuals served)
- Number of court/partner meetings held (plan versus actual) and any takeaways
- Number of satisfaction surveys sent and received and any takeaways

Bundang noted the requested data would be available to the PG Committee during the subsequent calibration sessions.

5. **Adjourn**

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 3:26 p.m.

DRAFT