



IS YOUR PROGRAM EFFECTIVE?: AN ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

*By Jan Allen May, Executive Director¹
AARP Legal Counsel for the Elderly*

I can think of no question more central to the leadership and management of a legal services program than: Is your program effective? Below is an attempt to design a framework for addressing this question.

PEOPLE: People who need people

It should come as no surprise that the most important element of an effective program is the people who staff it. The place to start is with the executive director.



An effective program needs an effective director. As circular as that sounds, this article explains what areas the executive director must address well in order for the program as a whole to be an effective one and for her to be an effective director. The director must walk the talk and do so

visibly, consistently and frequently. Regular feedback to the executive director, including an annual performance review by the board or a committee of the board with input from staff, is perhaps a good way to ensure that this is happening.

The next piece of the personnel puzzle is the hiring of competent legal workers. One former legal services director of an amazingly effective program said that his job was to “hire good people and create an environment in which they want to stay.” That, of course, is a good deal easier said than done. Part of this task is to ensure that you have good systems in place to recruit, screen and select high quality diverse personnel, and then provide the appropriate orientation, training, supervision and recognition systems once they are on board. But more on this a little later.

Other key members of your staff are the middle managers who should be full participants in the program’s leadership team and ensure that the people they supervise “get today’s work done today.” It is important that these individuals share with the director a common understanding of the mission and purpose

of the organization. Many a dysfunctional organization arises as a result of the director and some middle managers having different visions of what the organization is or should be about. Middle managers are the people who help set the tone and visibly embody the culture of the organization. They play a vital role in ensuring that the “informal culture” of the program is closely aligned with the “formal culture” of the program. They ensure that the mission of the organization is carried out in its day to day work in a high quality manner resulting in favorable outcomes for clients.

Another group of key staff are the administrators who accurately track resources, ensure compliance with personnel laws and who understand and support the programs operations. A program that does not husband its resources fastidiously is not an effective program or will not be one for long.

And of course there is the board itself. Ideally the board is a diverse group of individuals, passionate about the mission, who bring special expertise and resources to the overall operation of the program. An effective board is fully cognizant and compliant with their fiduciary responsibilities. An effective board member is one who can quickly get to the “unshakable facts” of a situation and make timely, wise and often difficult decisions about the overall direction of the organization. An effective board plays a key role in fundraising, by both making a “stretch” donation each year as well as actively participating in efforts to attract additional funds and funding sources. Especially where

I can think of no question more central to the leadership and management of a legal services program than: Is your program effective?

© IS YOUR PROGRAM EFFECTIVE?

Continued from page 3

a board is not functioning optimally, board training should be encouraged.

Finally, and significantly, are volunteers. The name of the game is leverage—leveraging a relatively small number of staff by maximizing the use of volunteers in multiple aspects of the program—case work, administrative work, fundraising, community speaking and various other roles to augment staff. It is worthwhile to consider how each of the projects within your organization can maximize the effective use of volunteers to enhance the quality and quantity of services the program provides.

PEOPLE II: On-going development of effective staff

Perhaps you know of “managers” who take the view that their jobs consist of hiring proven performers and then writing a glowing performance appraisal once a year (if that). In my experience, good performers are made and developed, not born. The lion’s share of a good manager’s job is to develop expectations of what each staff member under their purview needs to do (reviewed at least annually), when they need to do it, and measures for the quality by which it is done. This requires check-ins on a regular basis, guidance and coaching as needed, and case reviews, strategy sessions and quick consultations as appropriate. While different management styles and the intensity of the supervision will vary widely depending on the experience level and past performance of the employee, a manager

How is our work changing the lives of the people we serve and how should their lives be changing? This is the crux of the matter.

An effective organization is clear about its mission, has a staff that owns the mission and a public that is regularly reminded of what that mission is, together with examples of how it has advanced toward that goal.

nonetheless has responsibilities to all her/his employees along these lines, at the very least to maintain open, honest and on-going, regular conversations about their work.

It is important that a program and its leadership challenge staff to take on more challenging assignments for the professional development of staff as well as the growth of the program and the betterment of the client community. Leadership is not a course for executive directors but a concept that should be built into the fabric of the organization so that leaders emerge in multiple areas within the program.

As for the personnel development piece, while I firmly believe that the employee herself or himself must “own” their own professional development, the manager should facilitate that process and provide feedback to the employee concerning areas that need improvement/development as well as providing opportunities for professional development in line with the program’s goals and objectives. Providing feedback that is timely, accurate, and descriptive and ensuring that the employee actually “hears” it, is an art that all managers should develop. Likewise, it is important to recognize superior performance in a manner consistent with your program’s culture. A key element is the need to pay salaries and benefits that will attract and retain high quality staff and avoid excessive turnover and low morale.

MISSION: What business are we in and what business should we be in?

This Peter Drucker question may be overused, but is a tremendously useful tool in determining strategic direction of any organization. Of course, answering the question can be difficult, but how you answer may determine whether your organization survives as a viable and effective entity. There is the age-old story of the buggy whip manufacturer who, at the end of the nineteenth century, needed to determine what business he should be in. If he decided that he was in the buggy whip business, he went out of business in a few years. If he decided he was in the travel business, his organization may well be thriving today.

Once you have addressed this question, it becomes easier to fashion a mission statement ensuring that staff, volunteers and the world at large understand what you are really about. This gives focus, meaning and inspiration to your overall operation. For example, the mission statement of California Rural Legal Assistance is: “To fight for justice and individual rights alongside the most exploited communities in our society.” From

An Effective Organization: An Analytical Framework

People	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Has an effective director ■ Good system for recruiting, hiring, orienting, training, supervising, and recognizing superior performance ■ Middle managers who own the mission and manage day-to-day work ■ Skilled administrators who carefully track resources ■ Committed, knowledgeable board who understand their fiduciary duties ■ Trained volunteers who assist in myriad ways
People II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Staff who have clear, measurable, appropriate, stretch goals ■ Supervision appropriate to skill level and performance ■ Appropriate on-going professional development ■ All provided with ongoing, timely, accurate constructive feedback
Mission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ What business are we in and what business should we be in? ■ Crafting a mission statement ■ Developing strategic and ambitious goals in line with mission ■ How is your program changing client lives for the better?
Metrics & Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Are your delivery models working? ■ Are they delivering the desired results and outcomes? ■ How do you know? What measurements are you using and are they the right ones? ■ The importance of partnerships with other entities ■ The importance of empowering clients and the client community
Money	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The importance of developing reserve funds ■ Aggressive, ongoing and systematized fund-raising ■ Development of a five-year financial plan ■ Need for effective fiscal controls; timely, accurate financial reports ■ Effective board oversight ■ Clean audits
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Responsive to the current needs of clients ■ On-going development of new approaches, new issues, new systems ■ How can we do it better? ■ Using technology to best meet program needs ■ Willingness to experiment, make mistakes and learn from them
Reputation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Effective on-going publicity campaign ■ Testimony in a variety of venues about the difference your program is making in clients' lives ■ Development of strong relations with leaders, the media and funders ■ Administering money and property well; complying with the law ■ Treating employees fairly

such a statement, one might then craft a series of strategic and ambitious goals focusing on the specific activities of the organization which will result in the lives of your clients being changed for the better. The central question is: How is our work changing the lives of the people we serve and how should their lives be changing? This is the crux of the matter. An effective organization is clear about its mission, has a staff that owns

the mission and a public that is regularly reminded of what that mission is, together with examples of how it has advanced toward that goal.

The mission issue is especially important in the context of fundraising. In an effective program, mission drives fundraising and not the reverse. Mission drift is an affliction of too many cash-strapped non-profits. I recently noticed an organization so desperate for funds

© IS YOUR PROGRAM EFFECTIVE?

Continued from page 5

that they are seeking grant funds laughably outside their mission. If they don't get the money (which they shouldn't), the grantor will no doubt have recognized that the proposed activities are well outside their areas of expertise and overall mission. If they do get the money, it will significantly contort the mission of their organization and perhaps result in the delivery of services that could have been delivered by another organization with the requisite expertise in a much more effective manner. An ancillary consideration in this regard is ensuring that you do not "low-ball" bids on a contract (say for handling a specific type of case) to win the contract, only to find that to complete the work you will have to subsidize it through the use of the organization's valuable unrestricted funds. This, in effect, is not raising funds but squandering them. Consider filtering every request for proposals through the screen of your program's mission, expertise and the unique role your organization plays in the community. It will ensure that your organization stays on track and save you from much misery down the road.

Too often legal services directors or managers view cutting back on training and support as a viable means of saving program resources during lean times. In reality this is pennywise and pound foolish. Spending money on essential training and support for those activities that lead directly to the desired outcomes of the program should always be a high priority. Preserving such training in hard financial times also sends a message to staff that the organization places a high priority on enhancing their skills and reinforcing their professionalism which can solidify their commitment to the program.

METRICS: What are we accomplishing and are we accomplishing it in the best way possible?

Ancillary to the mission question, but central to the overall effectiveness question, is what delivery model(s) you are using to deliver on your mission. Does it focus on what the program does best? Does it achieve the desired outcomes? How do you know? How do we measure whether you have achieved these outcomes? Do you have too many metrics, too few metrics, or not the right metrics? Does the model make the best uses of the resources the program has available?

And we need partners to do it right. Just as John Donne wrote so long ago "no man (sic) is an island, entire unto itself" so too no organization exists in a

vacuum. Think of the most lasting achievements of your program. In all probability they were accomplished in conjunction and collaboration with other organizations, firms, coalitions and entities. There is strength in numbers and greater strength in collaborative efforts which effectively tap skills and resources necessary to tackle the bigger issues. Strategic coalition-building is an indispensable step in achieving lasting change for your client community. Community lawyering is not just a phrase but a proven effective means of achieving lasting systemic change in a community through immersion of staff into the lives of our clients.

In a similar vein, much of our work needs to direct itself toward the empowerment of communities and giving clients the tools they need to act for themselves. An effective program continuously asks itself: Are we empowering our clients with the knowledge and skills they need and increasing their problem-solving capacity as much as possible? Are there community groups we can assist, train, and add value to which squarely fit into our mission? Further, are we serving the entire service area or just the geographic areas near our offices?

During the economic downturn we heard a lot about business entities that were "too big to fail." Unfortunately, there are at least some legal services entities that are "too small to succeed." By that I mean that some programs are so small that they cannot effectively achieve their mission. These are often programs with only a very few staff members who are all performing multiple disparate tasks. Such entities should seriously consider partnering with larger entities so that certain "back-room" functions (such as accounting, fundraising, etc.) might be done more effectively and efficiently by the larger entity, and, for the sake of the client community, have a much better chance of succeeding in their mission.

MONEY: Follow the money and carefully

As every director knows, raising money, saving money and spending money wisely is key to the viability of your operation. An effective program raises enough money to create a surplus. A rainy day fund is essential in an effective legal services program because it often seems like we exist in a veritable tropical rain forest. Extra money in the bank (an amount of three to six months of expenses is often suggested) can ease your program out of many a tough situation and is crucial to weathering storms, which sooner or later, every program experiences.

To do so requires an aggressive ongoing and

systematized effort to raise funds from a variety of sources, including a private fundraising effort. Just as with personal investing, effective programs have diversified funding streams, with special attention to those streams that provide “unrestricted” funds to shore up any short-term funding shortfalls in other areas.

A useful strategy in this regard used by many successful programs is the development of a five-year financial plan laying out what the likely sources of revenue are, conservatively estimated, and then planning your program expenditures with those careful and conservative projections in mind. This helps to minimize surprises and allows you to take steps now to shore up your core operations in the event of lean times ahead.

It is important to remember that a dollar saved is as important as a dollar raised. The director, in conjunction with the chief financial officer, needs to have a systematized way to review expenses, ensure that the expenses are accurate, justifiable and timely paid. An effective organization has appropriate fiscal controls, receives and reviews timely financial reports, and ensures adequate board oversight of the organization’s financial management. The chief financial officer especially should be on the look-out for irregularities as well as savings and ensure that grant monies are being drawn down accurately, timely, and appropriately. You should strive for consistently clean audits.

CHANGE: Innovate, be flexible to changing needs and respond appropriately

A common problem afflicting a mediocre program is the problem of “hardening of the categories.” That is, a situation where a program and most especially the staff decide that the program focus should be on certain specific substantive areas, regardless of the changing needs of the clientele. This is often based on staff interest as opposed to client need. One seasoned legal services director quips that his worst fear is waking up one day to find that his program has become irrelevant to the lives of its clients. Over time, the group of clients most in need of your services changes, the substantive areas of law change, there are new issues to be addressed, different, more effective approaches to be used, and, with each passing year, a heightened need to utilize technology in a way that best delivers desired outcomes for your clients. An effective program is nimble, flexible, creative, innovative, and courageous. It learns from its mistakes which it embraces as part of the overall learning process. This is a tall order and requires questioning about what your program is doing

and whether there are ways that it could be doing it better. You, as a leader, should be asking these questions on an on-going basis.

REPUTATION: A good reputation in the community and the larger world

Assuming that your organization is staffed with capable people, that your mission is a clear and shared one, the strategies you have developed are ones that you have carefully designed and in fact deliver measureable results that positively change the lives of the clients you serve, your remaining essential task is to ensure that your reputation in the community is a positive one. This means an effective on-going publicity campaign to advertise your successes, testimony in various venues concerning the difference your program is making, development of strong relationships with community and political leaders, the media and of course funders. It means properly administering money and property, complying with the law, regulations, grant conditions and contract provisions. And, finally, it means treating your employees fairly and in accordance with the law. This is the stuff upon which good reputations are made and maintained.

While, as with many things, the devil is in the details, following these general principles I think will result in a program that is truly effective in making the world a better place for clients and the client community.

- 1 Jan Allen May is the Executive Director of AARP Legal Counsel for the Elderly (LCE) in Washington, D.C. He is also Chair of the Management Information Exchange *Journal* Committee and serves on the MIE Board of Directors. LCE is a full-service legal services program providing full representation of low and moderate income D.C. residents in a wide variety of civil legal areas. He has developed many innovative legal services programs, most recently in the area of systemic reform utilizing the pro bono resources of larger law firms. He has conducted training in substantive legal areas and management issues nationally for over thirty-five years and written extensively on these issues. Jan may be reached at jmay@aar.org.

This article was peer reviewed prior to publication. The author wishes to thank peer reviewers John Tobin, Patricia Pap, John Arango and Stephanie Edelstein for their comments and suggestions.



THE SIDLEY AUSTIN ANNUAL VINCENT F. PRADA PRO BONO AWARDS CEREMONY, REMARKS BY RONALD FLAGG, JULY 10, 2015¹

Note from the Journal Committee: This summer, the Washington, D.C. law office of Sidley Austin held its annual Vincent F. Prada Pro Bono Awards Ceremony at which it honors those lawyers and staff who devoted at least sixty hours to pro bono the prior year. The keynote speaker was Ron Flagg, a former partner at Sidley and currently General Counsel to the Legal Services Corporation and Vice President for Legal Affairs. Ron is AARP Legal Counsel for the Elderly's former Board Chair and currently serves on its Advisory Committee. I attended the Prada Award ceremony and asked Ron if we could publish his speech. His remarks follow. —J. May, Chair

Thank you. It's always a pleasure to return to Sidley, my longtime professional home and the source of many of my best friends and many of my fondest memories. And, it's great to see so many of those friends here today. It is an honor to be invited on this occasion when the Firm recognizes those lawyers who have devoted their time to the service of others in our community, around the country and around the world. It is particularly fitting that Sidley's recognition of your pro bono work bears the name of Vince Prada, a dear friend of mine, who, as Mark Hopson described, devoted thousands of hours to pro bono work over his all-too-short career here at Sidley.

I would like to put into context and highlight today the profound significance of the pro bono work you

Approximately 50% of all those who seek legal assistance from LSC grantees are turned away because of lack of adequate resources. This requires legal aid programs to make stark, hard choices.

do. Access to justice is a core national value, articulated as early as the Mayflower Compact, stated profoundly in our Constitution and above the entrance to the Supreme Court, and repeated daily in our Pledge of Allegiance — justice for all. Unfortunately, America's follow-through has not matched the grandeur of our pledge. For millions of Americans who cannot afford a lawyer, justice for all remains an unfulfilled promise. Unmet civil legal needs in the country are at an all-time high, while the resources we make available to address those needs have dwindled in recent years.

Roughly one in three Americans—around 100 million people — qualified for Legal Services Corporation (LSC)-funded services last year. These people had annual incomes below 125% of the federal poverty line: this is NOT a substantial sum, just over \$14,000 for an individual; and just over \$29,000 for a family of four. The number of people eligible for civil legal aid from LSC-funded programs is up over 20% since the start of the recession in 2008.

While the number of Americans eligible for civil legal assistance has steadily increased, funding for civil legal services has been declining. Funding for the legal aid programs supported by LSC is down over fifteen percent since 2010. If LSC's funding had merely kept pace with inflation since 1995, LSC's 2015 appropriation would be more than \$620 million. Instead, in 2015, LSC's appropriation is \$375 million, about 40% less than inflation adjusted funding for 1995. With rising numbers of people in need, and declining funding, federal funding per eligible client has dropped to an all-time low. Let me put the \$375 million the federal government appropriates for LSC into context: Americans spend \$350 million annually for Halloween costumes — for their PETS!! As, I said, our follow through on the pledge of justice for all has not been good.

With fewer resources available to them, LSC-funded recipients have to turn away thousands of low-income Americans seeking civil legal assistance.

© RONALD FLAGG—PRADA AWARD REMARKS
Continued from page 19

Approximately 50% of all those who seek legal assistance from LSC grantees are turned away because of lack of adequate resources. This requires legal aid programs to make stark, hard choices. For example, in recent years

- over one-third of LSC's grantees reduced family law cases, for example, eliminating specific types of cases such as contested divorces or custody cases.
 - over one-quarter reduced services to victims of domestic violence, for example, restricting services to cases where the victim had children. In other words, if you were subject to domestic violence some of our funding recipients do not have the resources to represent you unless you also had a child. If you're childless, you're on your own.
 - over 20% of our grantees reduced representation in housing matters, for example, evictions and foreclosures.
 - over 20% reduced services in consumer cases, for example, bankruptcy, predatory lending, or consumer debt.
-

First, we must raise public awareness about the crisis in access to civil justice. ...

Second, we must summon the political will to transform justice for all from promise to reality, by increasing the funds available to address currently unmet legal needs. ...

Third, we must better leverage civil legal aid resources, including by means of technology and by increasing the amount of pro bono work done by lawyers around the country....

Fourth, we must change our legal aid delivery systems. Finally, we need to examine potential changes to our courts and justice system.

In the District of Columbia, more than 90% of tenants are unrepresented in landlord/tenant court. In New York City, 91% of petitioners and 92% of respondents do not have lawyers in child support matters in family court, and 99% of tenants are unrepresented in eviction proceedings. 80% of litigants in family law cases are unrepresented in California and Massachusetts. These enormous volumes of unrepresented litigants in our Nation's courts fundamentally undermine the justice available to those litigants as well as to other parties whose cases are delayed because of the time required to fairly address cases involving unrepresented parties.

This justice deficit will not be closed by simply following the path our country has already treaded. It will require a host of new approaches and strategies. First, we must raise public awareness about the crisis in access to civil justice. Most Americans do not realize that you can lose custody of your child without a lawyer. That you can lose your home without a lawyer. That you can be denied veterans benefits without a lawyer. That you can be forced to face an abusive spouse or partner without a lawyer. Many Americans assume that this cannot be the case because every week in the television show *Law and Order*, people are told they have a right to a lawyer. I submit that any significant public policy debate that is largely informed by episodes of *Law and Order* is not off to a promising start. I believe it is the responsibility of the legal profession, including our judiciary, to raise public awareness of this critical issue.

Second, we must summon the political will to transform justice for all from promise to reality, by increasing the funds available to address currently unmet legal needs. While additional funding alone will not close the enormous justice gap we face, that gap will not be bridged without additional resources. Simply stated, we need to fund legal aid with amounts greater than we spend for our pets' costumes on Halloween.

Third, we must better leverage civil legal aid resources, including by means of technology and by increasing the amount of pro bono work done by lawyers around the country.

Fourth, we must change our legal aid delivery systems. Such changes could potentially take a multitude of forms, such as limited-scope representation by lawyers or provision of services by non-lawyers. Given enormous and growing demands and resource constraints, we must be creative and innovative in considering potential changes. In late 2013, LSC released a report urging that we "explore the potential

of technology to move the United States toward the goal of providing some form of effective assistance to 100 percent of persons otherwise unable to afford an attorney for dealing with essential legal needs.” In considering this proposal, it must be underscored that, in many cases, full representation by a lawyer is required if justice is to be realized. Nonetheless, the goal and vision set forth in the report “represents a much-needed rethinking of the traditional service-delivery model and points to a future where no one will get nothing, which is what happens all too often today.”

Finally, we need to examine potential changes to our courts and justice system. Our system was largely designed by lawyers, for lawyers and on the assumption that litigants would be represented by lawyers. That assumption is all too often false, and given that fact, we should examine what changes in our system could be made to make it more accessible to the millions of Americans who go to court each year without a lawyer.

These steps will require change. And change requires leadership, including from our legal profession and from our country’s leading law firms. As an alumnus of this Firm, I cannot tell you how proud I am that, as it enters its 150th year, Sidley is known for its leadership in public service. For example, the Firm has lent to this great cause, John Levi, the current board chair of the Legal Services Corporation and a tireless warrior in seeking to raise public awareness of and funding for access to justice. Sidley has been generous in making direct financial contributions to legal aid programs. Apart from many other charitable contributions, Sidley contributed \$2.1 million to legal aid organizations in 2014. Tellingly, when *The American Lawyer* recently asked 20 large, profitable firms to share data regarding such contributions, Sidley was one of only four firms to provide such data.

And of course, I have left for last mention of Sidley’s most significant contribution to bridging the justice gap, the Firm’s pro bono program. Included within the broad and deep volumes of Sidley’s pro bono work are four firmwide projects: the Capital Litigation Project, the Political Asylum and Immigration Rights Project, the Veterans Legal Services Project, and the Africa & Asia Agricultural Enterprise Program. I mentioned the need for leadership and these projects exemplify leadership. Each of them was initiated by a different group of Firm lawyers who took the lead in designing and proposing the project. The Firm’s management expeditiously approved each of these projects and did so knowing that collectively they involve commitment of thousands of pro bono hours

annually and hundreds of thousands of dollars of out-of-pocket expenses.

While all of these projects and all of the Firm’s pro bono work speak volumes about Sidley, more importantly they make an enormous difference in the lives of the Firm’s pro bono clients. At any given moment, you represent clients in capital cases, asylum cases, child custody cases, domestic violence cases, veterans’ benefits cases and scores of other matters, which are literally “bet the company” cases for those clients.

The statistics I cited about the justice gap are sobering. The prospect of bridging that gap in the aggregate is, at best, daunting. But, for the moment, I would ask you to share a more intimate view of the justice gap, the view from the perspective of an individual client. For the status of justice in America is depicted not only by numbers in the aggregate, but by an examination of the processes and resources available to each and every individual American.

From the perspective of an individual or a family, the prospect of losing custody of a child, losing a home, losing disability benefits, or facing domestic violence without a lawyer is bewildering, frustrating and enormously frightening. But viewing the justice gap from the perspective of unrepresented individuals or families does offer one potential silver lining — hope. Hope that a lawyer can be found to help one individual or one family.

The Prada Award honors you for helping to bridge the justice gap for each of your clients. When you helped dozens of veterans who served in Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan receive tens of thousands of dollars of benefits for combat-related disabilities, the justice gap was bridged. When, after five years of work, you secured permanent U.S. residence status for a Tanzanian woman who was the victim of severe abuse by her former husband, the justice gap was bridged. You helped bridge the justice gap when, after seven years of work, you won withholding of removal for a couple who had been subject to imprisonment and torture in Yemen. When eight of you worked for seven years to free David Housler from multiple lifetime sentences in Tennessee and succeeded in obtaining dismissal of his four felony murder convictions, the justice gap, at least for a moment, closed.

When you did this work, when you helped to bridge or narrow the justice gap faced by your individual clients, you may have been reminded of the reasons you went to law school in the first place. For me, Atticus Finch, the central character in *To Kill a Mockingbird*,

Continued on page 54

© RONALD FLAGG—PRADA AWARD REMARKS
Continued from page 21

was an inspiration to attend law school. You probably remember Atticus, a solo practitioner in a small town in Alabama, drafted by the town justice of the peace to defend a black man, Tom Robinson, accused of raping a white woman. Atticus Finch inspired me, and I suspect scores of others, to become a lawyer. Atticus Finch remains for me a vivid —albeit fictional— embodiment of the duty and opportunity of an individual lawyer to address injustice, one client at a time.

In representing Rodney Parker, Vince Prada was the true-life embodiment of that duty and opportunity to serve. Vince continues to stand as an example of the best our profession, not just this Firm, our profession has to offer. I am certain that Vince would be honored to have his name recalled each year as Sidley honors you, who have lived up to this standard.

Thank you for your work in helping to bridge the justice gap. Please continue to do that work and to step forward to help lead Sidley, our profession and our country to make good on our promise of justice for all. Thank you for permitting me to share this moment in honoring you.

1 Ronald Flagg is General Counsel and Vice President for Legal Affairs of the Legal Services Corporation, appointed effective June 3, 2013. He previously practiced commercial and administrative litigation at Sidley Austin LLP for thirty-one years, twenty-seven years as a partner. He chaired the firm's Committee on Pro Bono and Public Interest Law for more than a decade.

Flagg served as president of the District of Columbia Bar in 2010–2011 and on the Bar's Board of Governors in 2007–2009. He currently chairs the board of the National Veterans Legal Services Program. He has also served as chair of the District of Columbia Bar Pro Bono Committee, chair of the Governing Board of the AARP Legal Counsel for the Elderly, as a member of the American Bar Association's House of Delegates, on LSC's Pro Bono Task Force, and as a member of the board of the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights and Urban Affairs. Flagg graduated with honors from the University of Chicago and cum laude from Harvard Law School. He began his career as a law clerk to Judge Myron L. Gordon, U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Wisconsin and as attorney-advisor in the United States Department of Justice, Office of Intelligence Policy. Ron may be reached at flaggr@lsc.gov.