

Civil Legal Aid Coordinated Intake and Referral Governance

To ensure the ongoing success and continuous improvement of Coordinated Intake and Referral in Minnesota's Civil Legal Aid system following implementation of all of the actions the Coordinated Infrastructure Working Group (CIWG) has committed to take through its work over the last four years, the CIWG has adopted the following governance structure.

Implementation and Timing

This Governance Structure goes into effect once statewide coordinated intake is implemented in each of the four hub regions. For the first six months after full implementation, each participating organization will be on the Governance Committee in accordance with Model A. After 6 months, the Governance Committee will transition to Model B.

Scope

A Coordinated Infrastructure Committee (the Committee) shall oversee the supporting governance and technological infrastructure required to achieve the goals outlined in the 2017 Analysis of the Civil Legal Aid Intake Infrastructure in Minnesota (commonly referred to as the "Tull Report"), and the evolved perspectives on those goals that have emerged through Minnesota civil legal aid providers' critical, collaborative work to advance the goals since 2017. While housed at individual organizations, coordinated intake is a shared resource of all participating organizations. The scope of the Committee includes:

- Coordinated Phone Intake policies.
- Policies and procedures governing the coordinated aspects of LegalServer (e.g., e-transfers, case triage, case distribution, questions asked on intake).
- Goal and priority setting for the coordinated intake system.
- Coordinated intake quality control.
- Legal Organizations Online Network (LOON).
- LawHelpMN Guide and Online Intake.
- Any other infrastructure the Committee decides is required to support the goals of the Tull Report.

Membership

The Coordinated Infrastructure Committee (the Committee) will consist of one of these models:

Model A:

The Coordinated Infrastructure Committee (the Committee) will consist of one representative from each of the CIWG members:

- Central Minnesota Legal Services (CMLS)
- Legal Aid of Dakota County (LADC)
- Legal Assistance of Olmsted County (LAOC)

- Legal Aid Service of Northeastern Minnesota (LASNEM)
- Legal Services of Northwest Minnesota (LSNM)
- Mid-Minnesota Legal Aid (MMLA)
- Southern Minnesota Regional Legal Services (SMRLS)
- Volunteer Lawyers Network (VLN)

Model B:

The Coordinated Infrastructure Committee (the Committee) will consist of five members as detailed below:

- Two members from hub organizations
- Two members from receiving organizations
- One member not affiliated with a participating organization

Each member shall serve a term of 2 years.

Structure and Procedures

Meeting Frequency

The full Committee shall meet quarterly.

Sub-Committees

The Committee shall create standing Coordinated Intake Hub Sub-Committees (the Hub Sub-Committees) for each coordinated intake hub serving primary poverty law service regions throughout Minnesota. Additionally, the Committee may create other standing and ad hoc sub-committees and working groups, as deemed necessary.

The Hub Sub-Committees will meet monthly for at least the first year during which coordinated phone intake is fully implemented in the hub's region. After the first year, each Hub Sub-Committee shall decide how frequently to meet.

Other Sub-Committees may decide how frequently they will meet.

State Support Role in Facilitating Committee and Sub-Committees

State Support will facilitate and staff Committee and Sub-Committee meetings by:

- scheduling meetings, and associated in-person and virtual meeting logistics;
- creating agendas with input from Committee and Sub-Committee members;
- preparing reports and recommendations, both at the direction of Committee members and upon its own initiative;
- providing written meeting recaps to Committee members;
- performing general project management duties; and

- carrying out other tasks as needed.

Coordinated Infrastructure Quality Control

State Support is charged with ensuring that the policies, procedures, and systems of coordinated infrastructure projects lead to a high-quality client experience. To perform this duty, State Support shall:

- Create an annual workplan for targeted examination of coordinated infrastructure elements. This annual workplan shall prioritize aspects of coordinated infrastructure that have the most significant impact on the client experience and quality of client service.
- Conduct strategic, compliance, reputational, operational, information technology, and other targeted examinations of coordinated intake projects. After completing each examination, State Support shall draft a report with key findings and recommendations. The organization(s) involved in the aspect of coordinated intake under examination shall provide a written response with a plan for any items identified as needing corrective action.
- State Support staff shall not conduct any examination where the staff member has had direct operational *authority* over any of the activities examined. State Support staff shall not conduct any examination if within the preceding year the staff member has had direct operational *responsibility* over any of the activities examined.
- Conduct an annual examination of coordinated phone intake, including but not limited to:
 - calls to the 1-888 number:
 - call volumes
 - wait times
 - abandonment rate
 - call outcomes, broken down by regional hub:
 - number of callers who receive no service and no coordinated intake referral, with associated rejection code and case type
 - number of callers who receive service from a hub organization, with level of service and detailed case type
 - number of callers who receive a coordinated intake warm referral, with level of service, detailed case type, and where relevant, rejection code
 - direct intake calls received by non-hub coordinated intake organizations, with level of service, detailed case type, and where relevant, rejection code
- Conduct an annual examination of LOON listings to determine if legal topics and eligibility criteria are in alignment with cases accepted by the relevant organization.
- Conduct an annual examination of online intakes, including but not limited to, case acceptance rates, rejection codes, and case types served.

- Upon approval of the Committee, conduct special examinations, at the request of coordinated infrastructure stakeholders.
- Establish follow-up procedures to monitor previous findings and recommendations that required corrective action and communicate to the Committee the effectiveness of organizations' implementation of corrective actions taken.

Decision-Making and Grievance Policy

Policy and Project Decisions

The Committee shall vote on any decisions impacting the core goals of the project, such as changing technology vendors or creating or modifying policies governing coordinated intake or changes to intake procedures. Each member shall have one vote for any decisions that come to a vote before the Committee. Votes on actions and policies shall be determined by a simple majority.

Exemptions to actions or policies shall be granted in any case where an organization demonstrates that adherence to an action or policy would result in non-compliance with the organization's contractual, ethical, regulatory, or other legal obligations. To the extent possible, such potential outcomes of particular actions or policies should be presented to the Committee for consideration in advance of voting on the actions or policies.

Quality Control Findings and Recommendations

The Committee shall review examination reports prepared by State Support and vote whether to "receive and file" such reports. A vote in favor of receiving and filing an examination report indicates that the Committee agrees the examination methodology was sound and the findings in the report are supported by evidence from the examination. A vote in favor of receiving and filing an examination report does not mean that the Committee agrees with the recommendations in the report.

Out of Scope Decisions

Organizations retain the autonomy over staff supervision and day-to-day decisions, as long as they comply with any statewide policies, procedures, and the goals of the statewide coordinated intake process. State Support retains the autonomy to make decisions about the day-to-day operation of technology that it manages.

Grievance Policy

If Committee members are unable to resolve a disagreement about statewide case referrals or other aspects of coordinated intake, any organization may request that State Support conduct an examination and prepare a report with findings and recommendations for resolving the issue. The issue will be referred to the full Committee for consideration at the next quarterly Committee meeting. State Support will present its report and recommendations, and impacted Committee members will have the opportunity to state their case. The full Committee will then vote on how to resolve the issue, with a majority vote considered to be binding.

If Hub Sub-Committee members are unable to resolve a disagreement about case referrals or other aspects of coordinated intake, any organization may request that State Support conduct an examination and prepare a report with findings and recommendations for resolving the issue.

State Support shall present the report and recommendations at a Hub Sub-Committee meeting, and impacted Hub Sub-Committee members will have the opportunity to state their case. The Hub Sub-Committee shall then vote on a resolution to the issue. The issue shall be resolved if the Hub Sub-Committee unanimously votes on a resolution to the issue.

If the issue is not resolved at the Hub Sub-Committee meeting, the issue will be referred to the full Committee. At the full Committee meeting, State Support will present its report and recommendations, and impacted Committee members will have the opportunity to state their case. The full Committee will then vote on how to resolve the issue, with a majority vote considered to be binding.