



**Legal Professionalism Committee Meeting Minutes
March 1, 2016, 10:30 am, Raleigh, NC**

Commissioners attending: Catharine Arrowood, Chair
Richard Boyette
Jay Conison
Drew Erteschik
Judge Robby Hassell
Mark Merritt
Justice Bob Orr
Raymond Pierce
Matt Sawchak
Lisa Sheppard
Senator Leslie Winner

Commission staff attending: Jon Williams
Emily Portner

Issues discussed:

1. Approval of minutes

The committee unanimously approved draft minutes of its January 29 and February 2 meetings.

2. Report of subcommittee 1

This subcommittee focuses on the *supply* of law-related services and how to balance supply concerns with competence and professionalism.

Jay Conison orally summarized the subcommittee's report (attached).

3. Report of subcommittee 2

This subcommittee focuses on *how to regulate* law-related services in a period of rapid change. The issues being considered by the subcommittee include substantive regulatory measures and regulatory institutions.

Drew Erteschik orally summarized the subcommittee's report (attached).

4. Report of subcommittee 3

This subcommittee focuses on how to help *clients get access* to law-related services.

Richard Boyette gave an oral report from the subcommittee. Ideas being considered by the subcommittee include these:

- Equipping courthouses with teleconference facilities that clients could use to receive "distance lawyering" or to participate in mediations by teleconference
- Standardizing pro se forms across counties
- Expanding the range of disputes that can or must go to ADR -- e.g., custody matters
- A call center for triage of potential legal needs (as Utah has)
- Information desks at courthouses for the same type of triage (as California has)
- Training of public librarians to point clients to law-related information (as Louisiana does)
- Orientation programs for students in high schools

The subcommittee's report sparked an informal discussion with Allan Head, the executive director of the North Carolina Bar Association, about the Association's Lawyer Referral Service. The committee expressed interest in getting more detailed statistics on how many of the 70,000 annual callers to this service follow up by contacting the referees, and why they might not follow up.

5. Discussion of the committee's next steps

The committee had a wide-ranging discussion of the subcommittees' substantive recommendations to date. No recommendations were ruled in or ruled out.

The committee ultimately decided to ask each subcommittee, before the April meeting, to prepare a shorter list of concrete proposals. Each subcommittee will keep its area of focus as described above, but not rigidly. All recommendations will advance the ultimate report, which will emanate from the whole committee.

New subcommittee reports are due on March 29 at noon.

The committee will use its April and May meetings to discuss and hone its recommendations, using the subcommittee recommendations as a starting point. The committee's brief interim report to the full Commission will be due in late May or early June.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at about 2:30 pm.

/s/ Matthew W. Sawchak
Reporter