

NANAIMO FAMILY JUSTICE SERVICES CENTRE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT



**100 Viaduct Ave W
Victoria, BC V9E 1J3
Tel: (250) 479-2962
Fax: (250) 479-2961
Email: focus99@shaw.ca**

September 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The consultant would like to thank Rochelle Appleby, Acting Manager, Policy, Corinne de Bruin, Manager, Policy (both of the British Columbia Legal Services Society), and the other members of the Evaluation Advisory Committee (Cathy Tait, Dan Vandersluis and Tony Frances – Family Justice Services Division) for their assistance with the planning and implementation of the evaluation.

Thank you also to all the staff at the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre for their involvement in data collection and to all the clients, staff, key justice partners and administrators who participated in the evaluation interviews.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This document presents the findings of an evaluation of the implementation of the pilot phase of the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre (the Centre). The Centre provides a comprehensive range of family justice services, resources and information, including access to dispute resolution, Legal Aid Intake, legal advice, legal information and resources and information about child support. The Centre is co-managed and funded by the BC Attorney General and the Legal Services Society.

The recommendation to develop pilot centres or “hubs” as entry points for families with family legal problems grew out of the report *A New Justice System for Families and Children* (May 2005) authored by the Family Justice Reform Working Group. One of the main recommendations arising from the report was the development of a centralized access point for family justice services and information.

The Centre began to deliver expanded services in mid-April 2007. This report covers the implementation phase from mid-April until the end of December, 2007.

The objective of the evaluation was to determine the degree to which implementation, service delivery and outcome objectives were met. Evaluation objectives, measurement indicators and methodologies were defined in the Evaluation Framework and Plan.

Evaluation Design

The Evaluation Framework and Plan was developed in consultation with an Evaluation Advisory Committee and was finalized in March 2007. Eight methodologies were included in the evaluation plan. These included the compilation of data on the number and type of client visits (Front Desk Records), the collection of data on client use of the Resource Room, a Client Survey, an examination of the use of internal Centre services by clients (Collaborative Model Analysis), a Key Justice Partner survey and staff and administration interviews. Three visits to the site and meetings with the on-site staff were also held as part of the evaluation.

It was originally intended that some data from the Screening and Assessment Tool be incorporated into the evaluation to provide a baseline for client service needs. While rated as helpful by both clients and staff, an analysis determined that the results from the Tool were likely to have limited applicability to the evaluation. Substitute data was used from the Client Survey, where feasible.

There was a commitment to and focus on data collection on the part of all staff at the Centre throughout the evaluation. Minor problems arose in the interpretation of some of the data entered on the Front Desk Records.

There was no consistent method of collecting Child Support Officer data. This position was not fully functional during the implementation phase, consequently, this data is not reported in this report.

A small set of data, collected and reported throughout the study, was later identified as not meeting the criteria of being a core Centre service. Because this data had already been collected and was embedded in the findings, it continued to be reported in a small number of tables. Where this occurred it was noted in the text.

The data presented in this report reflects the activities that took place during the implementation phase of the Centre (mid-April to December 31, 2007). Information on subsequent changes to the Centre's structure, services, funding, policies or staffing is not included.

Physical Site, Location and Resources for the Centre

Overall there was a positive assessment of the physical site and location of the Centre by respondents. Staff identified several issues including a lack of signage at the front door, inconvenient location of washrooms (outside the office area) and the children's play area, and the lack of visibility of the Resource Room from the waiting room. Clients were positive about the location of the Centre and its proximity to the Courthouse.

A baby's change area was suggested as being important for parents visiting with babies and toddlers. The size and convenience of staff offices was rated positively by staff but there were concerns expressed (in December 2007), that the site was close to reaching capacity.

Staff suggested extending the hours of the Centre on some days to meet the needs of working parents who are unable to visit during the day.

Data collected from the Front Desk Records indicated that 9 – 11% of the clients who visited the Centre brought their children with them. Fifteen percent of those participating in the Client Survey said that they had taken their children with them on at least one visit.

Sixty-seven percent of the parents who took their children with them on a visit said that the Centre was well equipped and welcoming, 20% gave the Centre a moderate rating and 13% a low rating. Clients suggested that services could be improved at the Centre for children by establishing a clearly designated play area in a distinctive room, with more toys and books and some limited child-minding for parents with very young children.

Referrals to and Within the Centre

The Centre showed a consistent growth in the number of clients who visited the Centre during the implementation phase. There were 1180 individual clients recorded as having visited the Nanaimo Centre between mid-April and December 2007. First visits ranged from a low of 73 in December to a high of 163 in August. Forty-three percent of the clients made more than one visit to the Centre. In total, 2140 separate visits were made by clients during the implementation phase.

The average number of visits per month was 237 or about 60 per week. There was a growth of 32% in the number of visits by clients between the first and third quarters.

Almost every client who visited the Centre was appropriately referred. This finding suggests that referral sources in the community have a high degree of understanding of the mandate of the Centre.

Family Justice Services Division staff provide a significant level of brief services and brief counselling to clients, frequently by telephone. Family Justice Services Division (FJSD) FIS data indicated that 1828 brief services or brief counselling services were provided between April and December. Although no data was available from Legal Aid Intake staff related to this issue, it is our understanding that information provided by telephone can be extensive.

Data provided by the BC Legal Services Society indicates that 440 clients were referred to Legal Aid Intake during the implementation phase, and of these, 79% were eligible for Legal Aid. Of the 29% identified as not being eligible for Legal Aid, 14% were referred to external services. This includes referrals to external agencies or to services within the Centre.

Client Use of Services

Several methods were used to track the service use patterns of clients. The Collaborative Model Face Sheet analyzed the internal service patterns and external referrals provided to clients. This data was compiled and coordinated by Family Justice Counsellors (FJs). This data used FJs as the information source point and did not examine internal referrals arising from Legal Aid Intake or Advice Lawyers.

Service use among a sample of 104 mothers and 105 fathers was tracked on the Face Sheet. An analysis of the service use patterns of clients indicated that:

- More mothers than fathers made a second visit to the Centre;
- Mothers were provided with more services than fathers at the first visit;
- The front end assessment process and application of the Screening and Assessment Tool was being applied to the majority of clients, with debriefing occurring regularly;
- Fathers appeared to require more settlement readiness counselling than mothers;
- Few referrals were made (at any visit) of clients to the Child Support Officer (this position was not fully functional during the implementation phase due to staff training and turnover);
- There were few discussions with other (external) agencies of client needs;
- There were very few referrals of clients to court recorded on the Face Sheet.

Sixty percent (60/100) of the clients participating in the Client Survey remembered receiving a referral to another agency from staff at the Centre. This data indicates a much higher rate of referrals than was indicated in the Front Desk Record. The highest level of referrals was to Parenting After Separation (PAS) followed by lawyers (provided through Legal Aid). Few clients recalled receiving referrals to community service agencies.

The highest levels of follow-up to referrals (where numbers were significantly high), were to the Court Registry and to lawyers in private practice who receive a referral from Legal Aid Intake staff.

Some respondents from community service agencies who participated in the Key Justice Partner Survey expressed concern about what they perceived to be a low rate of referrals to their organizations from the Centre.

Resource Room Use and Client Satisfaction

The Resource Room at the Centre was staffed by 3, .5 FTE who also did Legal Aid Intake. An additional staff member was hired to work in the Resource Room in December 2007, at the end of the evaluation phase. The impact of the new staff person could not be assessed.

Several data collection methods were used to determine the level and type of client use of the Resource Room and satisfaction levels. The main method was the Client Feedback Form which was provided to clients who visited the Resource Room by staff. Sixty-four clients completed this form during the implementation phase. These clients made a total of 94 visits.

It is not clear to what degree the number of completed Client Feedback Forms indicated the level of client visits or use at the Resource Room. Since the Resource Room was not fully staffed until December 2007 this may have affected the degree to which forms were distributed.

Clients completing the Client Feedback Form indicated a high degree of satisfaction with the services they received at the Resource Room. Eighty-six percent reported finding some or all of the legal information they required. Success at finding information was statistically associated with receiving staff assistance.

Three other methodologies provided indications of client use of the Resource Room. Eighteen percent of the clients participating in the Client Survey said that they had used the Resource Room. In most cases this use consisted of picking up pamphlets or publications. Over 30% of these respondents said they received the information that they required. Clients in the Client Survey gave all aspects of the Resource Room, such as the availability and helpfulness of staff, very high ratings. The main reason cited by clients for not using or visiting the Resource Room was that they didn't realize it was available. About a quarter of these respondents said that they did not need to use the Resource Room because they didn't require any legal information.

An analysis from the Front Desk Records indicated that few clients were directed to the Resource Room from the front desk at the Centre. Data from the Collaborative Model Face Sheet also indicated that there were few internal client referrals to the Resource Room.

Response to the Centre by Key Justice Partners

Twenty three respondents participated in the Key Justice Partner Survey component of the evaluation. These included community agency representatives, Court Registry staff, government agencies, Advice Counsel and the Judiciary.

Seventy percent of the key justice partners said that 80 – 100% of their clients had family legal problems. Fifty-six percent said that referrals from their organization(s) to the Centre had been regular or frequent.

According to key justice partners, the expanded services at the Centre had been well promoted to key justice partners; 83% said they had received direct information about the expanded services. There was a high level of understanding among key partners of all key service components. However, about half of the

key partners had additional specific questions about services or service delivery at the Centre. Eighty-two percent of the key justice partners were satisfied with their level of client referrals to the Centre.

The majority of key justice partners felt that services at the Centre were not well known to the public, even to their own clientele. A number of suggestions were made to expand this outreach, including providing more services off-site and engaging in targeted publicity campaigns. An additional staff person to support the Resource Room was hired in December 2007 to address some of these concerns.

All the key justice partners interviewed for the evaluation had had contact with staff at the Centre and 90% had had direct contact with the Local Manager, again suggesting that the staff are highly visible and have developed collaborative relationships in the community. Seventy-six percent of the key justice partners were highly satisfied with their working relationship with staff; 24% were moderately satisfied.

Over 80% of the key justice partners said that the establishment of the Centre had increased the level of communication and collaboration between key justice partners to a significant degree. Sixty percent were highly satisfied with the services their clients had received (although 40% said that they were moderately satisfied, many said that they lacked the information to fully comment in this area). Some concerns were expressed by a few respondents about the accuracy of some of the legal documents being completed by staff and more staff training in this area was suggested.

Eighty-five percent of the key justice partners said that the centralized services were very beneficial to clients. There was strong consensus among key justice partners that the service had also been beneficial to agencies and the court system in terms of providing a “one-stop shopping model,” a resource for agencies that is collaborative, and a free out-of-court service that supports the empowerment of clients.

Findings Related to the Aboriginal Community

Nineteen percent of those participating in the Client Survey described themselves as having Aboriginal or Metis background. This is a higher rate of involvement than has been indicated in comparable studies. Since the Client Survey was not a statistically significant selection of clients (it represented 14% of those who visited the Centre), it is not known whether this data can be applied to the population of clients visiting the Centre. However, these results suggest a significant use of services by the Aboriginal/Metis population.

Several respondents participating in the Key Justice Partner Survey said that they would like to see an increased visibility of the Centre within the Aboriginal community. One respondent indicated that Aboriginal clients had greater needs to resolve poverty law rather than family law issues (a poverty law component is now being initiated at the Centre). The degree to which these views reflect the Aboriginal community as a whole could not be established.

Concerns were raised in the staff interviews that Aboriginal groups had not been significantly informed about the Centre or that specific outreach to this community had not been prioritized. It was difficult to accurately assess the degree of specific outreach as no data on specific outreach activities was available.

Several suggestions were made to further engage this community including providing services off-site, expanding PLEI, offering family justice information through existing programs and maintaining Aboriginal PAS even if attendance is low.

Screening and Assessment Tool

A three-part Screening and Assessment Tool was developed to assess client characteristics and needs in order to plan the most effective delivery of services. It was designed as a case management tool for the Centre after a development and pilot phase.

Staff were positive about the design and function of the Screening and Assessment Tool, although at one point in the evaluation concerns were raised about the Tool not fully meeting the data needs of LSS. Some later modifications were made to adapt the form to meet LSS data needs.

Almost 90% of the clients involved in the Client Survey remembered completing Part 1 of the Assessment and Screening form. Twenty-five percent said that they received assistance in completing the form.

Most clients said they had a positive assessment of the form, 95% said they were given sufficient time to complete it and found the questions clear and understandable. Eighty-four percent remembered discussing the results of the assessment with a staff member and 80% of these found these discussions to be helpful. Only four respondents raised minor concerns about the form.

Characteristics of Clients Visiting the Centre

One hundred clients, randomly selected from clients who had first visited the Centre between May and September were included in the Client Survey. Fifty-two percent (52/100) of the respondents were mothers, 42% (42/100) were fathers, 5% (5/100) were grandmothers and one was an aunt. Among those who were in a relationship, 47% had been married, 41% had been living in a common-law relationship and 12% had been in a dating relationship. Over 50% of the women and 67% of the parent substitutes (e.g. grandmothers) were in very low income categories.

Half of the clients visited the Centre in order to develop a new agreement but almost a third wanted to vary their agreements; 2% wanted to obtain a divorce.

Sixty-five percent of the clients said that they had met with a Family Justice Counsellor, 30% had met with a Legal Aid Intake Worker. Sixty-two percent of clients said that they had used more than one service at the Centre; 12% had used three or more.

Thirty-six percent of the clients in the Client Survey said that they had attempted to previously resolve a family justice problem. Court-related methods (e.g. Legal Aid, private lawyers (non-Legal Aid) or going to Court) had been used as the primary methods to solve these problems. In 80% of these situations relationship issues rather than service delivery issues appeared to be the major barrier to resolving previous family legal problems.

Client Assessment of Service Quality and Benefits

Clients were very positive about the friendly/welcoming attitude of the staff at the Centre and the Centre's proximity to the courthouse. The time required to wait before appointments was given a lower rating. Data from the staff interviews also suggested that wait times have increased although a detailed analysis on this issue was not undertaken.

Almost 40% of the clients said that they were able to solve most or all of their family justice problems through services provided at the Centre. 29% said that they were able to solve some of their problems and 23% said that they were not able to solve any of their family legal problems. In 43% of the cases where respondents reported not being able to resolve any of their family legal problems, relationship issues were described as the main barrier.

Eighty-six percent of the clients found the integration of services in one location at the Centre to be very helpful.

Thirty-nine percent of the clients had made at least one visit to court during or after receiving services at the Centre (in most cases for a court appearance). There did not seem to be any statistical relationships between the services clients used at the Centre and whether they eventually went to court. Although clients who saw an FJC were less likely to proceed to Court than those who saw the Legal Aid Intake Worker or who consulted an Advice Lawyer, this difference was not statistically significant.

Fifty-three percent of the clients made suggestions on ways services could be improved at the Centre. Decreasing the wait times for appointments, advertising and promoting the services more widely in the community and adding more staff to decrease wait times were the most frequently made recommendations. There was no strong consensus on these recommendations.

Response of Staff and Administrators

Nineteen administrative, supervisory and local onsite staff involved in the Nanaimo Centre were interviewed as part of the evaluation. Ten staff working directly at the Centre as well as some respondents at the administrative levels of the Legal Services Society and the Family Justice Services Division were included. Staff were very positive about the working relationships and management at the Centre. There was a strong consensus among respondents that the major objectives of the Centre had been achieved.

Staff and administrators were highly positive about the quality of management at the site describing the Local Manager as supportive and encouraging to staff and as being collaborative and using a team-building approach. He was described as being highly communicative and responsive and having a very good reputation in the community. Some concerns were raised about the level of specific direction taken around some policy-related issues. There was concern raised by some respondents that the management structure of the Centre was complex, especially for LSS staff, however, these issues were described as being resolved through partner collaboration.

There was a strong consensus among all staff and administrative respondents that the major objective of the Centre, to act as a "front door" for clients to access a range of family justice services had been achieved. All respondents described the model as a partially integrated or co-housing model. There were

some concerns expressed that some key justice partners were not yet involved in the delivery of services at the centre and that some of the differences between the two key partners had not yet been resolved.

Some issues or areas of improvement were also identified in the staff interviews.

Seventy percent of the staff felt that the definition of their mandate, tasks and training received had not fully equipped them for their roles at the Centre. More up-front training on specific management and legal issues and “less on the job” training was recommended.

There was a general consensus among staff and administrators that early planning for staffing may not have sufficiently taken into account the potential growth of clientele demands on staff or potential staff changes. This had resulted in pressures on staff and an increase in wait times for clients. A number of these issues were evident in the last quarter of the implementation phase. Some of these issues were being addressed as the evaluation period ended.

The issue of handling client confidentiality and safety issues was identified as one of the major issues arising during the implementation. While this has been handled on a temporary basis by changing the intake process, the concern was that this be fully resolved on a policy and practice level. This issue reflected some of the management, cultural, legal, staffing and organizational differences between the two partner organizations. A majority of respondents felt that these differences should have been better identified, discussed or resolved in the project planning phase.

Although staff and administrators were generally positive about the level and type of promotion of the Centre to the public and other agencies there were some concerns that specific strategies had not been developed for specific groups such as the Aboriginal or ethno-cultural minority population, low income clients or young parents.

Lessons Learned

Staff and administrators were specifically asked to comment on the “lessons learned” during the implementation phase that might be applied to similar projects in the future. The “lessons learned” that were most frequently cited were:

- 1) To clearly designate a component of the pre-planning process that would identify cultural, structural, organizational, data management and policy differences between key partners and define methods to address them from a policy and practice perspective.
- 2) To increase the degree of up-front staff training in specific areas for specific staff (e.g. increased training in the areas of those working at the front desk, office management and in relation to family justice information including the completion of basic legal documents).
- 3) To specifically plan for staff requirements in advance of their being required and review these plans on a regular basis.
- 4) To provide an increased capacity at the Centre to address Supreme Court matters.

- 5) To develop clear lines of authority and simplified management structure to include all staff at the Centre. This involves the clarification of the authority of the on-site manager.
- 6) To develop and support the development of an oversight Committee that would consist of representatives of both key partners (FJSD and LSS), to identify service delivery issues, support buy-in (at all levels) to the project and to troubleshoot emerging issues on a timely basis. The structure should be considered in relation to the present Steering Committee and governance model for the Centre that is set out in an MOU signed by both LSS and MAG.
- 7) To ensure that all staff who are hired and trained for the positions at the centre are provided with an overview of the broader vision and goals of the Centre.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	i
Executive Summary.....	ii
Table of Contents	x
List of Tables	xiii
1.0 Introduction & Description of this Report	1
2.0 Description of the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre	2
2.1 Background and Overview of Services	2
2.2 Collaboration of Key Partners	3
3.0 Evaluation Design, Methodologies and Research Considerations	4
3.1 Development of the Evaluation Plan	4
3.2 Issues Addressed in the Evaluation	4
3.3 Description of the Methodologies Used in the Evaluation	5
3.4 Previous Evaluation Reports	8
3.5 Research Considerations.....	8
3.5.1 Data Quality and Comprehensiveness	8
3.5.2 Front Desk Record Data	8
3.5.3 Resource Room Client Feedback Form.....	9
3.5.4 Screening and Assessment Tool	9
3.6 Reporting of Data	9
3.7 Role of the Evaluation Advisory Committee	10
4.0 Number and Characteristics of Clients Visiting the Centre	12
4.1 Description of the Data.....	12
4.2 Number and Gender of Clients Visiting the Centre	12
4.3 Month of First Visit to the Family Justice Services Centre	12
4.4 Total Number of Visits by Month	13
4.5 Level of Client Visits.....	14
4.6 Percentage of Clients Meeting the Mandate of the Centre.....	14
4.7 Previous Telephone Contact with the Centre	14
4.8 Client Involvement in Brief Services and Brief Counselling	15
4.9 Number of Clients Attending with Children.....	15
4.10 Referral Sources for First Time Visitors	16
4.11 Internal Referral Patterns	19
4.11.1 General Patterns	19
4.11.2 Specific Patterns of Referral.....	20
4.12 Legal Aid Intake and Advice Lawyer Referral Data	20
5.0 Client Use and Assessment of the Resource Room	22
5.1 Description of the Resource Room	22
5.2 Description of the Client Feedback Form	22
5.3 Number of Visitors and Visits to the Resource Room	22
5.4 Duration of Visit.....	23

5.5	Finding Information at the Resource Room.....	23
5.6	Suggestions for Improving the Resource Room.....	25
6.0	Assessment of the Collaborative Service Model (Face Sheet)	26
6.1	Description	26
6.1.1	Questions Addressed by the Client Face Sheet	26
6.1.2	Description of the Face Sheet	26
6.2	Level of Services Provided to Clients	27
6.3	Types of Internal (Centre) and External Services and Referrals	28
7.0	Findings From the Survey of Key Justice Partners	31
7.1	Introduction	31
7.2	Characteristics of Key Justice Partners Participating in the Survey	31
7.3	Description of Clients and Referral Levels by Key Justice Partners	32
7.4	Referrals Made by Key Justice Partners to the Centre	32
7.5	Level of Key Justice Partner Awareness of Services Provided at the Centre.....	33
7.6	Level of Awareness of the Centre in the Broader Community	35
7.7	Level of Referrals from the Centre to Community Organizations	36
7.8	Level and Type of Contact Between Key Justice Partners and Staff at the Centre	37
7.8.1	Level of Contact.....	37
7.8.2	Type of Contact	38
7.8.3	Key Justice Partner Assessment of the Working Relationship with Centre Staff	38
7.8.4	Impact of the Expanded Services on Communication Between Key Partners	39
7.9	Satisfaction of Key Partners with the Quality of Services Clients Receive at the Centre	40
7.10	Assessment of Service Quality by Key Justice Partners	41
7.11	Helpfulness of Centralized Services.....	42
8.0	Client Survey Results	45
8.1	Description of Client Survey	45
8.1.1	General Description.....	45
8.1.2	Respondent Selection Method.....	45
8.2	Client Description	45
8.3	Client Service Profile Data	48
8.4	Referrals, Service Needs and Service Use Data.....	49
8.4.1	Original Referral Source	49
8.4.2	Initial Reason for Visit.....	50
8.4.3	Specific Service Needs of Clients Related to Agreements	51
8.4.4	Services at the Centre that Clients Wanted to Access.....	52
8.4.5	Services Accessed by Clients.....	52
8.5	Client Response to Previous Family Justice Problems	53
8.5.1	Frequency of Problems	53
8.5.2	Barriers to the Previous Resolution of Family Justice Problems.....	54
8.6	Client Assessment of the Screening and Assessment Tool	54
8.6.1	Description of the Screening and Assessment Tool	54
8.6.2	Completion Levels and Assistance Received	55
8.6.3	Assessment of Other Aspects of the Tool.....	55
8.6.4	Overall Assessment of the Screening and Assessment Tool	55
8.7	Client Satisfaction with Resources at the Centre for Children	56
8.8	Client Satisfaction with the Resource Room	56
8.8.1	Overview	56

8.8.2	Level of Resource Room Use.....	56
8.8.3	Use of Services at the Resource Room.....	57
8.8.4	Level of Staff Assistance Received at the Resource Room and Outcome of Visit.....	58
8.9	Referrals Provided to Clients Visiting the Centre and Satisfaction with Referrals	59
8.10	Client Satisfaction with the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre	61
8.10.1	Service Quality Assessment.....	61
8.10.2	Client Assessment of the Degree to Which They Were Able to Resolve Their Family Justice Problems	61
8.10.3	Client Assessment of the Value of Integrated Services	63
8.11	Court Visits Made by Clients	63
8.11.1	Visits to Court During or After Receiving Services at the Centre	63
8.12	Suggestions Made by Clients for Improving Services at the Centre.....	64
9.0	Results of Staff Interviews	66
9.1	Introduction and Description of Respondents.....	66
9.2	Staffing Levels at the Centre	66
9.3	Staff Training.....	67
9.4	Staff Assessment of the Physical Site	67
9.5	Assessment of the Resource Room.....	68
9.6	Staff Assessment of the Client Intake and Internal Service Referral Process	68
9.6.1	Intake and Internal Referral Process	68
9.6.2	Use and Assessment of the Screening and Assessment Tool	69
9.7	Data Management.....	69
9.8	Promotion of the Centre and Level of Referrals	69
9.9	Assessment of the On-site Management at the Centre.....	70
9.10	Degree to Which the Centre's Organizational Objectives have been Achieved and Benefits of the Service	71
9.11	Effectiveness of the Model	71
9.12	"Lessons Learned"	72
10.0	Summary of Key Findings.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Methodologies Used in the Evaluation	6
Table 2.	Gender of Centre Clients.....	12
Table 3.	Month of First Visit to Centre	13
Table 4.	Month of First Visit to Centre	13
Table 5.	Number of Visits Made to the Centre by Unique Clients	14
Table 6.	Previous Telephone Contact with Centre by First Time Visitors.....	14
Table 7.	Brief Services and Brief Counselling Services Provided at the Nanaimo Centre (April – December 2007)	15
Table 8.	Proportion of Clients Visiting the Centre with Children	16
Table 9.	External Referral Source for First Time Visitors	16
Table 10.	Community Organizations that Made Referrals to the Centre	17
Table 11.	Source of Referrals Made to the Centre: Quarterly Results	18
Table 12.	Client Referral Patterns by Quarter	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Table 13.	Referrals to Legal Aid Intake: Clients Referred and Outcomes of the Referral.....	20
Table 14.	Referrals of Cases Not Eligible for Legal Aid.....	21
Table 15.	Number of Clients Referred to Advice Lawyers.....	21
Table 16.	Number of Visits to the Resource Room	23
Table 17.	Duration of Client Visits to the Resource Room	23
Table 18.	Methods for Finding Information at the Resource Room	24
Table 19.	Level of Resource Room Information Found by Visitors	24
Table 20.	Association Between the Type of Assistance Required and Level of Information Found	25
Table 21.	Number of Services Provided to Mothers by Visit	27
Table 22.	Number of Services Provided to Fathers by Visit	28
Table 23.	Types of Services Provided to Mothers by Visit	29
Table 24.	Types of Services Provided to Fathers by Visit	30
Table 25.	Description of Key Justice Partner Organizational Affiliations	32
Table 26.	Level of Clients with Family Justice Problems.....	32
Table 27.	Approximate Number of Client Referrals Made by Key Justice Partners.....	33
Table 28.	Ways that Key Justice Partners Learned About the Expansion of Services	34
Table 29.	Key Justice Partner Awareness of Specific Services at the Centre	35
Table 30.	Level of Client Referrals Made from the Centre to Community Organizations	37
Table 31.	Key Justice Partner Contacts with Types of Staff at the Centre	38
Table 32.	Level of Key Justice Partner Satisfaction with the Working Relationship	38
Table 33.	Degree to Which Communication and Collaboration has Increased as a Result of the Expansion of Services.....	39

Table 34.	Level of Key Partner Satisfaction with the Current Level of Communication and Collaboration	39
Table 35.	Respondent Rating of the Quality of Services Received by their Clients at the Centre	40
Table 36.	Assessment of the Quality of Services	41
Table 37.	Key Justice Partner Recommendations for Service Improvement.....	42
Table 38.	Helpfulness of Centralized Services to Clients	42
Table 39.	Main Benefits of the Centre to Clients, Agencies and the Family Justice System	43
Table 40.	Respondent Income Before Taxes	46
Table 41.	Living Arrangements of Children	47
Table 42.	Length of Relationships of Married and Common-Law Respondents.....	48
Table 43.	Length of Time Respondents Separated.....	48
Table 44.	Profile of Client (Data from the Running Record)	49
Table 45.	Client Survey: Referral Source	50
Table 46.	Reasons Client Visited the Family Justice Services Centre	51
Table 47.	Client Service Needs.....	51
Table 48.	Services Clients Wanted to Access at the Centre	52
Table 49.	Services Used by Clients at the Centre.....	52
Table 50.	Services Clients Used to Address Previous Family Justice Problems.....	53
Table 51.	Barriers to Solving Legal Problems in the Past	54
Table 52.	Helpfulness of Discussions Arising from the Screening and Assessment Tool	55
Table 53.	Client Assessment of Centre for Children	56
Table 54.	Reasons for Not Using the Resource Room.....	57
Table 55.	Services Used by Clients at the Resource Room.....	58
Table 56.	Level of Staff Assistance Provided at the Resource Room	58
Table 57.	Degree to Which Clients Found the Information they Needed.....	59
Table 58.	Assessment of Different Aspects of the Resource Room	59
Table 59.	Referrals Provided to Clients.....	60
Table 60.	Client Assessments of Service Quality	61
Table 61.	Client Assessment of the Degree of Resolution of Family Justice Problems at the Centre	62
Table 62.	Issues Related to Non-Resolution of Family Legal Problems.....	62
Table 63.	Client Assessment of Helpfulness of Comprehensive Services	63
Table 64.	Analysis of Services Received in Relation to Whether Clients Went to Court	64
Table 65.	Client Recommendations for Improvements in Services	65

1.0 INTRODUCTION & DESCRIPTION OF THIS REPORT

This document presents the findings of an evaluation of the implementation of the pilot phase of the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre (the Centre).¹ The Centre was established in mid-April, 2007 and was an expansion and enhancement of services provided at the existing Nanaimo Family Justice Centre. The Centre provides an expanded range of family justice services, resources and information including access to Legal Aid Intake, to Advice Lawyers and to a Resource Room of family legal information. The Centre receives funding through the BC Ministry of Attorney General (Family Justice Services Division) and the Legal Services Society. The two partners co-manage the Centre.

The evaluation examined delivery issues and outcomes (including staff and client satisfaction) during the first nine months of the implementation phase of the Centre (mid-April – December, 2007). Evaluation questions and methods were defined in an extensive consultation process that included both key partners and related staff. The evaluation planning process culminated in the development of an Evaluation Framework and Plan that was finalized in March 2007.

This report includes background information about the Centre, the services offered, the model of service delivery, a description of the evaluation design, client use data, Resource Room use, client and key partner use and satisfaction, an assessment of the integration of services, and staff and administrative perspectives on the implementation phase. Data on each of the components of the evaluation are reported separately.

¹ Also referred to as the Justice Access Centre.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE NANAIMO FAMILY JUSTICE SERVICES CENTRE

2.1 Background and Overview of Services

The recommendation to develop pilot centres or “hubs” as entry points for families with family justice legal needs grew out of the report *A New Justice System for Families and Children* (May 2005), authored by the Family Justice Reform Working Group (FJRWG). One of the most important recommendations arising from the report was the development of a centralized access point for family justice services and information.

The key to our proposal is a Family Justice Information Hub. This is where families across the province would know they could turn for access to an array of information and services. Just as everybody knows to dial 411 for directory assistance, British Columbians would come to know this HUB as the place to go when they need help or information about a family law issue (BC Justice Review Task Force, 2005: 23).

On April 2, 2007, the BC Ministry of Attorney General, in partnership with the Legal Services Society, piloted the development of the first Family Justice Services Centre in Nanaimo, BC. The Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre built on existing services, resources and information available at the existing Family Justice Centre but added a number of significant service enhancements, primarily provided through the Legal Services Society. Major services provided at the Centre are identified below (service expansions are noted by an asterisk):

- *Formal Case assessment (Screening and Assessment Tool) to determine client issues and service needs;
- Settlement readiness counselling;
- Brief services information counselling;
- Dispute resolution services;
- Information sessions and courses (e.g. *Parenting after Separation* and *Separated with Children – Dealing with Finances*);
- *Legal Aid Intake;
- *Legal advice provided through legal advice lawyers;
- *Assistance with child support matters (e.g. getting or changing a child support order or agreement);
- *Access to legal information through a print and computer based resource room;
- *Legal information outreach.

The Centre is a Rule 5 site. Parties to most Family Relations Act cases are required to meet with a Family Justice Counsellor and consider if mediation might be appropriate for their case instead of proceeding directly to Court.

Several other services exist at the Centre but were not considered to be part of core services (e.g. Notice to Mediate, Custody Access Report). Some data related to these services was collected and has been reported in previous quarterly reports. This data is included in this report to maintain data integrity but is identified as being outside of the framework of core services.

2.2 Collaboration of Key Partners

One of the most significant aspects of the pilot phase Family Justice Services Centre has been the development of the partnership between the Family Justice Services Division (FJSD) and the Legal Services Society (LSS). Expanded services provided through LSS include access to legal advice through Legal Advice Lawyers, access to Legal Aid Intake on the site and the establishment of a Resource Room of computer-assisted and print materials that can be utilized by both staff and clients. In December, 2007 an additional staff person was hired to support client use of the Resource Room.

3.0 EVALUATION DESIGN, METHODOLOGIES AND RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Development of the Evaluation Plan

The research questions, evaluation framework and plan were developed between January and April 2007 with the assistance of an Evaluation Advisory Committee made up of staff from the Family Justice Services Division, Legal Services Society and related stakeholders. The Evaluation Framework and Plan was finalized in March 2007 to guide the implementation of the evaluation. The framework included *input* (implementation), *output* (service) and *outcome* (results and effectiveness) objectives, measurement indicators and the evaluation methodologies.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee met once during the evaluation phase to discuss the use of client data entered on the Assessment and Screening Tool. The evaluator communicated and met regularly with on-site staff and communicated with representatives from FJSD and LSS.

3.2 Issues Addressed in the Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation was to determine the degree to which the implementation, service delivery and outcome objectives defined in the evaluation framework were identified as barriers that affected the implementation. The general questions and issues addressed in the evaluation and discussed in this report include the following:

- How well organized, appropriate and serviceable is the size, layout and organization of the site?
- How well equipped do staff feel in terms of training, planning and their defined mandate?
- How well is the model of integration working for staff and in terms of the Centre's stated objectives?
- How many clients have visited the Centre? What is their pattern of service use?
- How do clients assess the effectiveness, efficiency and outcomes of services they receive?
- How do key partners assess the benefits and/or limitations of the service?
- What is the profile of the Centre in the community? What types of promotion have been used and are there gaps in awareness of the Centre among certain groups?
- To what degree is the Screening and Assessment Tool being used and how is it assessed by key staff and clients?
- To what degree is the Resource Room being used and how do clients assess its effectiveness?
- To what degree are clients satisfied with the services they have received at the Centre?
- To what degree have clients accessed or used a network or "hub" of family justice services?
- How effectively has the integrated model worked? What are its benefits for clients and for key justice partners?
- What issues have arisen in the implementation phase and how effectively have these been addressed?
- What are the "lessons learned" arising from the implementation phase that could be applied to other projects of this type?

3.3 Description of the Methodologies Used in the Evaluation

The evaluation included clients, staff, management and key justice partners.

Eight major methodologies were used in the evaluation of the pilot project, as well as a data quality review component and the addition of supplementary data. These are described in Table 1.

Table 1. Methodologies Used in the Evaluation

Methodology		Description	Scope of Application
1	Site visits/staff meetings	This component involved meetings with staff and management to review and discuss service implementation and evaluation issues.	Four meetings were held between May 2007 and January 2008
2	Program policy and document review	<p>Program and policy documents related to the Centre were reviewed including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background reports such as “<i>A New Justice System for Families and Children</i>,” ▪ Case flow, intake and assessment policies; ▪ Screening and assessment documents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The review of documents continued throughout the evaluation ▪ Policy and planning documents such as the MOU between LSS and FJSD, proposals for new screening/intake policies (LSS)
3	Front Desk Record	<p>This data collection form tracked:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The number of client visits to the Centre; ▪ The number of cases with previous telephone contact; ▪ The source of the initial referral; ▪ Whether the referral was mandatory or voluntary; ▪ The date of the visit; ▪ Whether the visit was a repeat or first time visit; ▪ Whether the visitor was accompanied by children; ▪ Referrals made. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data was aggregated and analyzed by quarter. Reports were completed for the first quarter (April-June), second quarter (July-September) and the third quarter (October-December)
4	Resource Room Client Feedback Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Resource Room Client Feedback Form was used to collect client feedback on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of clients using the Resource Room; - The time, duration and frequency of visits; - Source of assistance used; - Outcomes of the visit; - General satisfaction with the services; - Information gaps. ▪ The form was handed out and collected by Resource Room Staff. 	Records were analyzed and aggregated from April – December, 2007
5	Assessment of Collaborative Model (Service Delivery Face Sheet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The level of collaboration and communication between key partners at the Centre and the number of referrals made was assessed by examining the referral patterns of clients with closed or open FJSD files; ▪ The Service Delivery Face Sheet collected data on the number and type of service contacts and cross referrals made; ▪ Family Justice Counsellors coordinated the data collection. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All FJSD files opened or still active between April and October, 2007 were analyzed ▪ Data on 118 cases was aggregated and analyzed

Methodology		Description	Scope of Application
6	Client Satisfaction Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Client Satisfaction Survey included clients who consented to be involved in the research. The Client Satisfaction Survey assessed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The level of satisfaction of clients with the site (convenience, access); - Satisfaction with the timeliness and efficiency of service; - Satisfaction with internal and external referrals; - Ease of site use by parents, satisfaction with level of staffing; - Perceived benefits of the services; - Whether clients felt that their ability to address family justice problems had increased as a result of the integrated model. ▪ The survey was conducted by telephone. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One hundred clients who had received a range of services were randomly selected and included in the survey ▪ Interviews were scheduled to allow for at least three months of follow-up services
7	Key Justice Partner Survey	<p>This component of the survey addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The degree of understanding among key partners of the mandate of the Centre, services provided and referral protocols; ▪ Respondent views of the benefits of the Centre to clients, agencies and the Family Justice system; ▪ The level and appropriateness of referrals made to and from the Centre; ▪ The satisfaction of respondents with the Centre in terms of working relationships between key partners, understanding of the diverse roles and the effectiveness of information exchange. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key justice partners included court registry staff, advice lawyers, community organizations and government ministry staff ▪ Twenty-three key partners were included in the survey
8	Staff and administrator interviews	<p>Staff and administrators related to the Centre were interviewed individually or in a group. The interviews explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Satisfaction with the physical site; ▪ Satisfaction with staffing levels and working relationships; ▪ The functioning and benefits of the Centre model; ▪ The benefits of the Screening and Assessment Tool and other evaluation components; ▪ Issues arising from the implementation. 	<p>Twenty staff were included in the interviews. They included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 11 on-site staff ▪ 9 administrative staff
9	Data quality review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An internal review of data quality and the level of data completion was carried out throughout the evaluation. ▪ A specific review and report was made of the Screening and Assessment Tool to determine whether data could be transferred to the Client Satisfaction Survey. Several changes were also made to the Front Desk Record as a result of this review to improve data quality. 	Continued throughout the evaluation

Methodology		Description	Scope of Application
10	Supplementary data	<p>Some supplementary data is also included in the report. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Data from the Legal Services Society showing Legal Aid Intake levels from April-December; ▪ Level of Brief Services/Brief Counselling provided by the Centre (FJSD records). 	Data covered the period April – December, 2007

3.4 Previous Evaluation Reports

Two quarterly reports were developed and submitted in July and October 2007. These reports summarized Front Desk Intake, Resource Room, Legal Aid Intake and Brief Services/Brief Counselling data. An analysis of data collected by the Screening and Assessment Tool was completed in September, 2007.

Additional quarterly data was aggregated and presented in January and May, 2008.

3.5 Research Considerations

A number of issues arose during the evaluation that affected data collection, analysis or reporting. These are summarized below.

3.5.1 Data Quality and Comprehensiveness

Centre staff had an important role in the collection of data for the evaluation. There was a strong commitment and focus from all the staff in seeing that the data was collected and submitted in a timely way. There was a significant time commitment involved in collecting Front Desk Record and the Collaborative Model Face Sheet data.

The quality and comprehensiveness of the data collected for the evaluation varied depending on the type of service involved. Issues related to the major methodologies are discussed below.

3.5.2 Front Desk Record Data

There were minor data entry problems that affected the quality of the Front Desk Record data to some degree. These included wording problems related to the early structure of the form, difficulty in interpreting client names, difficult-to-read entries, confusion about previous or first time visitors and a lack of clarity about referral sources in the early stage of data collection. The gender of visitors could not always be determined from the client's name. Problems also sometimes resulted when new or temporary staff took over the data entry. Despite these issues, staff managing these data were highly focused, committed to data collection and provided the data in a timely and efficient manner. Front desk staff were also helpful in training new staff to enter the data consistently and accurately.

3.5.3 Resource Room Client Feedback Form

A Client Feedback Form was developed as an evaluation method in consultation with the Evaluation Advisory Committee. The form measured the number of visits to the Resource Room and the purpose and outcomes of the visit. Sixty-four Client Feedback Forms were submitted during the evaluation.

Although the forms were made available for pick-up at the Resource Room, in most cases completion of the forms was dependent on staff distribution and collection. The Resource Room had limited staffing until December 2007 when further staff were hired. The limited staff presence in the Resource Room may have affected the level of form completion. Only two forms were submitted in December 2007. In addition, there was also a lack of clarity on the methods and process required to collect the forms later in the implementation phase.

3.5.4 Screening and Assessment Tool

The evaluation framework recommended incorporating data from the Screening and Assessment Tool as a way of determining initial client characteristics and service needs. A review of 301 Part 1, 67 Part 2 and 29 Part 3 forms determined that the completeness and consistency of data from these forms was insufficient for evaluation purposes. This determination was made in consultation with the Evaluation Advisory Committee. Aspects of the Client Survey were adapted to meet these data requirements.

3.6 Reporting of Data

A small set of data (relating mainly to external or internal referrals), was later identified as not meeting the criteria for core services at the Centre. This data is retained in the report, where applicable, to maintain the overall integrity of the data, but is clearly identified.

Attempts were made to collect client use data related to the Child Support Officer position and this data was reported in the Second Quarterly Report. However, because this position was not fully functional during the implementation phase, client service data related to this position was not included in the document. The Centre includes three major services provided and coordinated through the Legal Services Society: 1) access by clients to Advice Lawyers through appointments at the Centre, 2) Intake Assessment for Legal Aid and 3) access to a Resource Room that includes print materials and access to computer-based legal information and assistance.

The Legal Services Society provided aggregate data on the number of clients assessed by Legal Aid Intake staff or directed to other services. This data is included in this report.

The evaluation design was complex and consisted of eight discrete methodologies. In some cases, methodologies explored the same types of questions but from different perspectives. Where feasible the results of the evaluation are reported by theme. However, because of the uniqueness of the data instruments and their approach to questions, results are primarily also reported in relation to specific methodologies.

In some cases findings resulting from the use of different methodologies may appear to be contradictory. However, in all cases this reflects a different perspective to a similar question. Where possible these differences are explained in the text.

Broad qualitative questions (e.g. client recommendations for improving an aspect of a service) may elicit a wide range of reasonable suggestions even though a consensus is not evident. In these cases all answers are reported and the level of reporting is described.

3.7 Role of the Evaluation Advisory Committee

The development of the Evaluation Framework and Plan was funded by the Family Justice Services Division and was coordinated by an Evaluation Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from both the Legal Services Society and the Ministry of Attorney General. There was a change to the funding and coordination of the evaluation in the early implementation phase from MAG to LSS.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee met once (by teleconference) during the implementation phase to discuss issues related to data use arising from the Screening and Assessment Tool. The reduced role of the committee affected communication and some decision-making related to aspects of the evaluation.

NANAIMO FAMILY JUSTICE SERVICES CENTRE IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION REPORT

FINDINGS

4.0 NUMBER AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CLIENTS VISITING THE CENTRE

4.1 Description of the Data

Most of the data in this section is derived from the Front Desk Record which recorded basic client data from the client's first and subsequent visits. Front Desk Records were completed by staff at the front desk at the Centre. The data collected in the Front Desk Record included the name of the client, number of visits, referral sources and referrals² made and whether they were accompanied by children.

Supplementary data on the number of Brief Services and Brief Counselling provided at the Nanaimo Centre is also presented in this section as is aggregated data on Legal Aid Intake and referrals. Intake data was previously reported by quarter. A fourth quarter report (January – March, 2008) has been published separately.

4.2 Number and Gender of Clients Visiting the Centre

There were 1180 individual clients recorded as having visited the Centre in the first three quarters of the pilot phase (mid-April – December, 2007). Half of the clients were women. The gender of some visitors could not be determined by the names indicated on the Front Desk Records.

Table 2. Gender of Centre Clients

Gender	Number and Percentage of Clients
Male	485 (41%)
Female	595 (50%)
Gender could not be identified by name	100 (8%)
TOTAL	1180 (99%)

4.3 Month of First Visit to the Family Justice Services Centre

First visits by clients ranged from a low of 73 in December to a high 163 in August. The average number of visits per month was 118. June, August and October were the busiest months in terms of first time visitors to the Centre.

² The term "referrals" applies both to the external services that originally referred clients to the Centre and to referrals that are made within or between services at the Centre. These can also be described as services to which clients are directed by staff.

Table 3. Month of First Visit to Centre

Month of Visit	Number and Percentage of Individual Clients
April*	120 (10%)
May	131 (11%)
June	142 (12%)
July	129 (11%)
August	164 (14%)
September	131 (11%)
October	152 (13%)
November	138 (12%)
December	73 (6%)
TOTAL	1180 (100%)

*The Centre opened in mid-April 2007

4.4 Total Number of Visits by Month

There was a steady growth in the number of visitors to the Centre between mid-April and December 2007. There were 2140 separate visits made by the 1180 clients during this period. Most clients made one to two visits. Table 4 provides the breakdown of the number of visits by month. August and October showed the highest number of visits recorded on the Front Desk records. The average number of visits per month was 237 clients or about sixty clients per week. There was a growth in the number of visits between the first and third quarter of 32%.

Table 4. Month of First Visit to Centre

Month of Visit	Number of Visits
April	146 (7%)
May	194 (9%)
June	245 (11%)
July	227 (11%)
August	308 (14%)
September	248 (12%)
October	323 (15%)
November	274 (13%)
December	175 (8%)
TOTAL	2140 (100%)

4.5 Level of Client Visits

Clients visited the centre during the pilot implementation period (April – December) between one and thirteen times. Eighty percent of those visiting the Centre visited once or twice. Two percent of the clients could be considered extensive users (6 or more visits) of services at the Centre.

Table 5. Number of Visits Made to the Centre by Unique Clients

Number of Visits	Number and Percentage of Clients
One visit	667 (56%)
Two visits	284 (24%)
Three visits	112 (9%)
Four – five visits	94 (8%)
Six – seven visits	17 (1%)
Eight or more visits	6 (1%)
TOTAL	1180 (99%)

4.6 Percentage of Clients Meeting the Mandate of the Centre

Front Desk Records indicated that almost every referral to the Centre met the mandate of the Centre. This suggests that information distributed to key justice partners and the public about the mandate of the Centre has been accurate. Data from the first two quarters of the pilot phase indicated that 99% (625/632) of the visitors were referred to the Centre appropriately by other agencies and referral sources. Because of the high level of positive results, this data was not collected in the third quarter.

4.7 Previous Telephone Contact with the Centre

Results indicate that 81% (958/1180) of the clients described themselves as first time visitors at their first visit while 18% (211/1180) said they had visited the Centre previously, in 1% (11/1180) of the cases there was no data recorded.

Of those who described themselves as first time visitors, almost two thirds said that they had had previous telephone contact with staff at the Centre before visiting in person.

Table 6. Previous Telephone Contact with Centre by First Time Visitors

Previous Telephone Contact	Number and Percentage of Clients
Previous telephone contact with staff	611 (64%)
No previous telephone contact	293 (31%)
No data/could not determine	54 (6%)
TOTAL	958 (101%)

No data was available on early contact with Legal Aid Intake or Resource Room staff by telephone. Interview data suggests that a significant number of enquires are received by telephone by Legal Aid Intake staff.

4.8 Client Involvement in Brief Services and Brief Counselling

Additional data was aggregated on the level of Brief Services and Brief Counselling provided by FJSD staff (e.g. by the Family Interviewer or FJC) at the Centre. This data was extracted from the FIS data management system and was provided by the Family Justice Services Division. The majority of these services were provided by telephone.

Table 7 indicates that there were 1826 Brief Services or Brief Counselling services provided to clients at the Nanaimo Centre between mid-April and December 2007. Most were Brief Services provided to clients without case numbers. This data provides another indicator of service demand apart from that indicated on Front Desk Records.

Table 7. Brief Services and Brief Counselling Services Provided at the Nanaimo Centre (April – December 2007)

Date	BS With Case Number	BS Without Case Number	BC With Case Number	BC Without Case Number	Total
April	10	136	1	17	164 (9%)
May	23	200	4	28	255 (14%)
June	26	173	2	37	238 (13%)
July	22	115	12	49	198 (11%)
August	14	150	6	53	223 (12%)
September	22	128	6	22	178 (10%)
October	18	173	9	55	255 (14%)
November	13	119	3	34	169 (9%)
December	6	82	7	51	146 (8%)
TOTALS	154	1276	50	346	1826 (100%)

Source: Family Justice Services Division (FIS)

4.9 Number of Clients Attending with Children

Front Desk Record data indicated that, at their first visit to the Centre, 11% (130/1180) of the clients said that they visited with children. Seventy-five percent (90/120) of those attending with children (where the gender of the client was known) were mothers. The rate of clients attending with children at subsequent visits remained stable, varying between 8 – 10%, depending on the visit being considered.

Table 8. Proportion of Clients Visiting the Centre with Children

Status	First Visit	Second Visit	Third Visit	Fourth Visit	Fifth Visit
Attended with children	130 (11%)	46 (9%)	24 (10%)	10 (8%)	5 (10%)
Did not attend with children	1028 (87%)	459 (89%)	201 (88%)	105 (90%)	43 (86%)
No data	22 (2%)	9 (2%)	4 (2%)	2 (2%)	2 (4%)
TOTAL	1180 (100%)	514 (100%)	229 (100%)	117 (100%)	50 (100%)

4.10 Referral Sources for First Time Visitors

Data was collected on the external referral source at the first visit for first time visitors. There was some confusion in the early stage of the evaluation about what constituted a referral source and in some cases, the referral source was identified as an internal rather than an external service. Only external data sources were included in Table 9.

Word of mouth accounted for approximately a third of the referrals to the Centre, followed by Legal Services. Court Registry (Rule 5) accounted for 10% of the referrals. Social worker, child welfare and MCFD referrals accounted for 2/3 (30/39) of the Ministry referrals; VIHA accounted for 5% (2/39) and Mental Health 8% (3/39%).

Table 9. External Referral Source for First Time Visitors

Referral Source	Number and Percentage of Clients
Word of mouth/self/friend/other parent/family	239 (32%)
Legal Services Society	122 (16%)
Court Registry (not Rule 5)	111 (15%)
Court Registry (Rule 5)	73 (10%)
Community Services	62 (8%)
Government Ministries	39 (5%)
Private Bar	38 (5%)
FMEP	20 (3%)
Internet/web resource	18 (2%)
PAS or FAS course(s)	10 (1%)
Phone book	7 (1%)
Pamphlet/brochure/newspaper	7 (1%)
Custody & Access Writer Program	3 (0%)
Probation	3 (0%)
School	2 (0%)
Native Court Worker	2 (0%)
Courthouse Librarian	1 (0%)
TOTAL*	757 (99%)

*In total, there were 958 visitors who visited the Centre for the first time. Referral data on the additional 201 cases indicated an internal referral source and so was not presented in this table.

Eight percent of the referrals of first time clients were made by community services. Over twenty community services or agencies referred clients but most only referred one client. Haven House, a transition house, which is a component of the Haven Society's range of services, made the highest number of client referrals to the Centre.

Table 10. Community Organizations that Made Referrals to the Centre

Community Resource		Number and Percentage of Clients
1	Haven House	20 (32%)
2	Victim Services	7 (11%)
3	Men's Resource Centre	5 (8%)
4	Family Life	4 (6%)
5	Transition House*	3 (5%)
6	RCMP	3 (5%)
7	Nanaimo Citizen's Advocacy	3 (5%)
8	Tillicum House	2 (3%)
9	Dad's Make a Difference	1 (2%)
10	Parksville SOS	1 (2%)
11	Alcohol and Drug Centre	1 (2%)
12	Alcohol Course	1 (2%)
13	Family Services	1 (2%)
14	Counselling Service (not identified)	1 (2%)
15	Vancouver Francophone Society	1 (2%)
16	BC Families in Transition	1 (2%)
17	Courtenay Access Centre	1 (2%)
18	Makala Housing Authority	1 (2%)
19	Nanaimo General Hospital	1 (2%)
20	Women's Centre	1 (2%)
21	Children at Play	1 (2%)
22	Nanaimo Area Resource Services for Families	1 (2%)
23	Partners in Parenting	1 (2%)
TOTAL		62 (105%)

*Unclear whether these were also referrals made from the Haven Society's Transition House.

Table 11 shows the changes in the general pattern of external referrals in the first three quarters of the implementation. This table does not include internal referrals or cases where there was no data. Results from this analysis indicate that:

- In the first and third quarters word of mouth referrals accounted for over one third of all referrals but this proportion dropped significantly in the second quarter;
- There has been a steady decrease in the number and percentage of Rule 5 referrals to the Centre. It was suggested by some respondents that Rule 5 is being by-passed by some clients whose lawyers introduce a Notice of Motion in the Court. This issue was noted in the staff interviews;
- There appear to have been few referrals from PAS or FAS to the Centre;
- The proportion of referrals from Community Services has remained relatively stable from 6 – 10% of all referrals in each of the quarters;
- Few clients are referred through written information or from internet or web resources;
- Referrals through Legal Aid increased dramatically in the second quarter. It is assumed this means from the Legal Aid Intake office in Nanaimo. There is no obvious explanation for this trend;
- Court Registry referrals also increased in the second quarter but dropped in the third quarter.

Table 11. Source of Referrals Made to the Centre: Quarterly Results

Referral Source	First Quarter	Second Quarter	Third Quarter	Total
Word of mouth (self, friends, family)	95 (36%)	42 (19%)	102 (37%)	239 (32%)
Legal Aid	38 (14%)	51 (24%)	33 (12%)	122 (16%)
Court Registry (Rule 5)	40 (15%)	16 (7%)	17 (6%)	73 (10%)
Court Registry (not Rule 5)	28 (11%)	50 (23%)	33 (12%)	111 (15%)
PAS or FAS courses	4 (1%)	1 (0%)	5 (2%)	10 (1%)
Community service agencies	17 (6%)	22 (10%)	23 (8%)	62 (8%)
Government Ministries	11 (4%)	10 (5%)	18 (6%)	39 (5%)
Internet/Web resource	5 (2%)	5 (2%)	8 (3%)	18 (2%)
Private Bar	13 (5%)	9 (4%)	16 (6%)	38 (5%)
Phone book	4 (1%)	1 (0%)	2 (1%)	7 (1%)
Custody and Access Writer Program	2 (1%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (0%)
FMEP	5 (2%)	6 (3%)	9 (3%)	20 (3%)
School	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	2 (0%)
Pamphlet/brochure/newspaper	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	5 (2%)	7 (1%)
Probation	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (1%)	3 (0%)
Native Court Worker	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)	2 (0%)
Courthouse Librarian	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (0%)
TOTAL	265 (98%)	216 (97%)	276 (99%)	757 (99%)

4.11 Internal Referral Patterns

4.11.1 General Patterns

Table 12 describes the patterns of internal referrals provided to clients visiting the Centre at their first to fifth visits. This data was derived from the Front Desk Record and could not be independently verified. Most of the data involves referrals to services inside the Centre.

Data from the Front Desk Records indicates that:

- Most clients are referred or directed to one internal service at each visit.
- There were few referrals of clients to external agencies or organizations at any visit³.
- At the first visit clients were equally likely to be directed towards the Family Interviewer, Family Justice Counsellors or to Legal Aid Intake. Legal Aid Intake and the Advice Lawyer Service constitute a third of the first visit referrals.
- The proportion of referrals to the Family Justice Counsellor and to the Advice Lawyer Service grew from the first to third visits, suggesting that the need for these services intensifies at later visits for many clients. The proportion of visitors referred to the Child Support Officer also increased and was greatest at the fifth visit.
- Referrals to the Resource Room from the Front Desk were limited.

Table 12. Client Referral Patterns by Quarter

Referrals Made	First Visit	Second Visit	Third Visit	Fourth Visit	Fifth Visit
Within the Centre					
Family Interviewer	314 (27%)	57 (11%)	21 (9%)	10 (8%)	5 (18%)
Family Justice Counsellor	307 (26%)	187 (36%)	102 (44%)	38 (32%)	19 (38%)
Resource Room	23 (2%)	13 (2%)	6 (3%)	4 (3%)	2 (4%)
LSS Intake	252 (21%)	97 (19%)	31 (13%)	22 (19%)	6 (12%)
LSS Advice Lawyer	139 (12%)	90 (17%)	43 (19%)	21 (18%)	6 (12%)
Child Support Officer	167 (14%)	74 (14%)	29 (13%)	19 (16%)	13 (26%)
Custody/Access Writer Program ⁴	6 (0%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
External to the Centre					
Government Ministries	2 (0%)	2 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
External Community Services	3 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
Court	4 (0%)	1 (0%)	2 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No data	16 (1%)	7 (1%)	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	0 (0%)
Number of Clients Reporting	1175	514	229	117	50
Average Number of Referrals per visit	1.05	1.02	1.02	1.01	1.06

³ It is most likely that referrals to external agencies or organizations would be made by FJCs or the LSS staff. External referrals made by the FJC are reported in Tables 22 & 23.

⁴ Not considered a core service.

4.11.2 Specific Patterns of Referral

A further analysis of internal service referrals recorded on the Front Desk Record was carried out looking at the data in cases where the first referral was from Legal Aid Intake, the Family Interviewer or the Family Justice Counsellor.

This data indicates that:

- When the first time visitor's first referral was to Legal Aid Intake, 31% (72/231) of these received a second internal service referral and 11% (12/72) received a third referral. The second internal referral was made to Legal Aid Intake in 38% (28/72) of the cases and in 29% (21/72) to the FJC. The average number of subsequent visits for clients initially referred to LSS Intake was 1.5.
- When the first referral was made to the Family Interviewer, 54% (156/290) received a second referral and 24% (69/290) received a third. Forty-five percent of the second referrals were to Legal Aid Intake or to Legal Advice Lawyers. The average number of visits for clients referred initially to the Family interviewer was 2.0.
- If clients were referred to the Family Justice Counsellor initially, 43% (87/200) were likely to be referred a second time and 17% a third time. These clients made an average of 1.7 visits. These clients tended to be referred back to the FJC for subsequent visits.

None of these referral patterns were statistically significant.

4.12 Legal Aid Intake and Advice Lawyer Referral Data

Table 13 provides data on the number and type of referrals made to Legal Aid Intake and the Advice Lawyer at the Nanaimo Centre between April and December 2007, the period covered by the evaluation. This data was aggregated and provided by the Legal Services Society.

The data indicates that there was an 11% decrease in the number of clients assessed by Legal Aid Intake between the first and third quarters. Seventy-nine percent of the clients were eligible for Legal Aid while 21% were recorded as not being eligible.

Table 13. Referrals to Legal Aid Intake: Clients Referred and Outcomes of the Referral

Month (2007)	Referral	Eligible for Legal Aid	Not Eligible for Legal Aid
April	38	28 (74%)	10 (26%)
May	67	49 (73%)	18 (27%)
June	58	45 (78%)	13 (22%)
July	42	34 (81%)	8 (19%)
August	56	44 (79%)	12 (21%)
September	34	32 (94%)	2 (6%)
October	56	44 (79%)	12 (21%)
November	44	37 (84%)	7 (16%)
December	45	36 (80%)	9 (20%)
TOTAL	440 (100%)	349 (79%)	91 (21%)

A further assessment of this data indicates that for those clients ineligible for Legal Aid 14% were referred to external agencies including services provided at the Nanaimo Centre. The outcomes of some of these cases (e.g. those waiting for information) are unknown.

Table 14. Referrals of Cases Not Eligible for Legal Aid

Month (2007)	Total Number of Ineligible Clients	Waiting for Information	Provided with Self-Help for PLEI	Given Advice Assistance	Referral not Specified	Referral to External Agencies Including to the Centre
April	10	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
May	18	3 (17%)	4 (22%)	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	9 (50%)
June	13	9 (69%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)
July	8	5 (63%)	2 (25%)	1 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
August	12	8 (67%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	1 (8%)
September	2	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
October	12	10 (83%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)
November	7	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)	0 (0%)
December	9	3 (33%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
TOTAL	91 (100%)	47 (52%)	22 (24%)	1 (1%)	8 (9%)	13 (14%)

Table 15 describes the number of clients referred to Advice Lawyers at the Centre between August and December 2007. The original source of these referrals (e.g. whether they came through Legal Aid Intake or through the front desk) is unknown.

Table 15. Number of Clients Referred to Advice Lawyers

Month (2007)	Number of Clients Referred
August*	57
September	66
October	67
November	43
December	73
TOTAL	306

*Data was not available prior to August 2007.

5.0 CLIENT USE AND ASSESSMENT OF THE RESOURCE ROOM

5.1 Description of the Resource Room

The Resource Room is a stand-alone service at the Centre that provides access to printed family documents, legal information, brochures and forms, as well as computer access to legal and LawLine information. Although the Resource Room is an open room at the Centre most clients use the resources with staff assistance. Few referrals by non-LSS staff appear to have been made to the Resource Room during the implementation phase.

A lack of consistent staffing at the Resource Room was identified by staff in the implementation phase as a barrier to service use. A part time staff member was added to the Resource Room in December 2007 to address this issue. The impact of this staff increase is not addressed in this report.

5.2 Description of the Client Feedback Form

A Client Feedback Form was used to collect feedback from clients on their use of the service, duration and outcomes of the visit and level of staff assistance needed. The degree to which this form was distributed to Resource Room users could not be verified. For this reason the level at which the Resource Room was used may be under-reported.

5.3 Number of Visitors and Visits to the Resource Room

According to the data aggregated from the Client Feedback Form, sixty-four unique clients used the services at the Resource Room from April to December, 2007. These clients made a total of 94 visits or an average of approximately nine visits per month.

The highest volume of visits recorded at the Resource Room were in September and November.

The majority of visitors visited the Resource Room once or twice. It was not possible to track the number of visits made with precision because most of the forms completed by clients did not include identifying information.

Eleven percent (10/94) of the visitors said that their children had accompanied them during the visit to the Resource Room.

Table 16. Number of Visits to the Resource Room

Month	Number and Percentage of Visits
April	7 (7%)
May	1 (1%)
June	6 (6%)
July	10 (11%)
August	14 (15%)
September	20 (21%)
October	16 (17%)
November	18 (19%)
December	2 (2%)
TOTAL	94 (99%)

5.4 Duration of Visit

Eighty-five percent (80/94) of the clients who visited the Resource Room described the duration of their visit. Visits ranged from 5 minutes to five hours; the average length of a visit was just over 50 minutes.

Table 17. Duration of Client Visits to the Resource Room

Length of Visit	Number and Percentage of Visits
Twenty minutes or less	14 (17%)
20 to 60 under minutes	52 (65%)
Over 1 hour to 2 hours	11 (14%)
Over 2 hours	3 (4%)
TOTAL	80 (100%)

5.5 Finding Information at the Resource Room

The Resource Room is not specifically organized as a self-help centre although information and computers are available in the room for use. The findings indicate that almost 80% of the users of the Resource Room said that they required staff⁵ help to find the information they needed. Only 4% of the users said that they looked for material and information on their own.

⁵ Prior to December 2007 staff coverage at the Resource Room was limited. In December 2007 an additional staff person was hired to support clients.

Table 18. Methods for Finding Information at the Resource Room

Method of Finding Information	Number and Percentage of Visits
Staff assisted visit	74 (79%)
Visitor looked for information by self	4 (4%)
Both methods (staff and self)	11 (12%)
No data	5 (5%)
TOTAL	94 (100%)

The level of client satisfaction with the information received at the Resource Room was high. Eighty-six percent of the visits resulted in visitors finding most or all of the information that they needed; 14% said that they found only some or none of the information they required.

Table 19. Level of Resource Room Information Found by Visitors

Level of Information Found	Number and Percentage of Visits
All legal information required was found	56 (64%)
Most of the legal information required was found	20 (23%)
Some of the legal information required was found	11 (12%)
None of the legal information required was found	1 (1%)
TOTAL	88 (100%)

Table 20 looks at the association between the type of assistance visitors received and the degree to which clients found the information that they required. Although the cell numbers in this table are small, the results from the Client Feedback Form indicate that visitors achieved more success at the Resource Room when they received some level of staff assistance. This association was statistically significant at $p=0.0016$.

Table 20. Association Between the Type of Assistance Required and Level of Information Found

Level of Information Found	Type of Assistance Used		
	Staff	Self	Both Staff and Self
Visitors found all of the information needed	51 (72%)	1 (25%)	3 (30%)
Visitors found most of the information needed	12 (17%)	1 (25%)	6 (60%)
Visitors found some of the information needed	8 (11%)	2 (50%)	0 (0%)
Visitors didn't find any of the information needed	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)
TOTAL REPLY*	71 (100%)	4 (100%)	10 (100%)

*Cases where there was no response were not included

5.6 Suggestions for Improving the Resource Room

Visitors were asked about improvements that could be made to the Resource Room and how materials in the Resource Room could be enhanced.

Thirteen visitors made suggestions about ways services at the Resource Room could be improved. The suggestions were to:

- Increase staffing to provide timely services to clients (6/13);
- Increase the number and quality of computers (3/13);
- Promote the Resource Room more in the community (1/13);
- Place a clock in the Resource Room (1/13);
- Provide more privacy in the Resource Room (1/13);
- Improve client access to parking at the Centre (1/13).

There were seven suggestions from visitors about adding to the materials at the Resource Room. These included providing:

- More information about Supreme Court applications, specifically change of custody orders;
- Access to copies of the Family Relations Act;
- More information about the court process;
- More information about complicated legal matters;
- Access to information about postal codes;
- More information on the rights of grandparents;
- More information on the CPP and credit splitting.

6.0 ASSESSMENT OF THE COLLABORATIVE SERVICE MODEL (FACE SHEET)

6.1 Description

6.1.1 Questions Addressed by the Client Face Sheet

One of the key objectives of the Centre is to provide a central point of access to comprehensive services for clients who want to resolve their family justice problems. The Evaluation Framework plan identified several descriptors or indicators related to the achievement of this over-all goal.

- 1) Clients are able to access the range, scope and number of family justice services they require;
- 2) Services are streamlined, non-duplicative and managed in a collaborative manner at the Centre;
- 3) The services available and provided to clients are comprehensive;
- 4) Service needs are determined through a consistent intake and screening process.

It was originally hoped that links could be made between service needs (as specified by clients on the Screening and Assessment Tool), and the services used at the Centre. The Screening and Assessment Tool was designed to collect information on client characteristics and service needs in order to plan the delivery of services more effectively. The data collected on the Screening and Assessment Tool was incomplete in some cases in relation to the requirements of the evaluation. Additions were made to the Client Survey questionnaire to collect some of the client needs data.

6.1.2 Description of the Face Sheet

The Face Sheet was used to collect detailed data on the types of services used by a randomly selected group of clients who had visited the Centre. The results from the Face Sheet indicated the degree to which the service needs of clients were addressed, and the scope, number and type of services received.

Data collection for the Face Sheet was triggered when an FIS file number was assigned at the point when a Family Justice Services Division file was opened at the Centre. Face Sheet data was compiled by Family Justice Counsellors.⁶

Records were drawn from FJSD files which were closed between mid-April and October, 2007. The minimum follow-up period in which clients received services was 3 – 4 months. This analysis looked only at the number and type of services provided, not at the length of time the service was provided.

Data was collected on the services provided and referrals made to 104 mothers and 105 fathers. Most of the data collected on the form described internal services which clients were directed to within the Centre. Parents had both joint and individual visits but referrals to services were analyzed by client. This data may not completely reflect some of the services received by clients as the records were dependent on all services at the Centre notifying the FJC when services had been provided. The degree to which this took place could not be verified. The Face Sheet data provides a more detailed view of services provided to clients than do the Front Desk Records.

⁶ The evaluation used the FJC as the point of entry to services and was not necessarily able to assess the validity and comprehensiveness of data relating to the use of legal services at the Centre.

6.2 Level of Services Provided to Clients

Data from Tables 21 and 22 indicates the number of services provided to mothers and fathers at their first and subsequent visits. Eighty-one percent of the mothers returned for a second visit to the Centre, a slightly higher percentage than fathers. Fifty-five percent of the mothers and fathers made three or more visits.

Clients received most of their service referrals at their first visit to the FJC. At the first visit mothers received an average of four service referrals. Over a quarter received five or more referrals. Fathers were referred to an average of three services at the first visit, fewer than the mothers. Nineteen percent of the fathers were referred to five or more services at the first visit.

Table 21. Number of Services Provided to Mothers by Visit

Number of Services Provided	First Visit	Second Visit	Third Visit	Fourth Visit	Fifth Visit	Sixth Visit	Seventh Visit	Eighth Visit
1	10 (10%)	59 (70%)	43 (75%)	29 (71%)	15 (56%)	10 (63%)	10 (91%)	4 (57%)
2	8 (8%)	18 (21%)	11 (19%)	9 (22%)	9 (33%)	5 (31%)	1 (9%)	2 (29%)
3	32 (31%)	6 (7%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	3 (11%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)
4	27 (26%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
5	20 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6	6 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Average number of services provided at this visit	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	2
TOTAL	104	84	57	41	27	16	11	7

Table 22. Number of Services Provided to Fathers by Visit

Number of Services Provided	First Visit	Second Visit	Third Visit	Fourth Visit	Fifth Visit	Sixth Visit	Seventh Visit	Eighth Visit
1	15 (14%)	56 (75%)	33 (57%)	32 (78%)	14 (61%)	10 (71%)	9 (69%)	4 (44%)
2	11 (10%)	9 (12%)	13 (22%)	5 (12%)	7 (30%)	3 (21%)	2 (15%)	4 (44%)
3	25 (24%)	4 (5%)	11 (19%)	2 (5%)	2 (9%)	1 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (11%)
4	34 (32%)	4 (5%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
5	14 (13%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6	5 (5%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
7	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
8	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Average number of services provided for this visit	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	2
TOTAL	105	75	58	41	23	14	13	9

6.3 Types of Internal (Centre) and External Services and Referrals

Tables 23 and 24 describe the types of internal and external services and referrals⁷ provided to both fathers and mothers. The data from these tables suggest that:

- 83% of the mothers and 76% of the fathers were engaged in a discussion of Part 2 of the assessment tool at their first visit to the FJC. Over 80% of the respondents were also involved in a discussion or clarification of family justice issues that needed to be addressed. This data suggests that there is a strong front-end planning process that takes place with most clients at their first visit with the FJC;
- Most referrals to Legal Aid Intake are made at the first visit to the Centre;
- There is consistent debriefing at most subsequent visits;
- Fathers appear to receive more settlement readiness counselling for longer periods of time than do mothers;
- Discussion of individual dispute resolution issues carries on for some time, again suggesting the emphasis on dispute resolution preparation;
- Screening issues for fathers appear to be discussed in later visits than for mothers;
- Most referrals to external agencies happen at the first visit but there is some level of referrals at subsequent visits;
- The data indicates few referrals to the Child Support Officer (this service was not fully functional throughout the implementation phase);
- There is almost no referral of fathers or mothers to the Resource Room by services at the Centre (the Resource Room was not fully staffed during this time);
- Specific counselling related to children's needs appears to be provided primarily at the first visit.

⁷ Most of this data refers to referrals to other services within the Centre, although referrals to outside agencies or services are also included. Internal referrals may be informal, as in staff directing or suggesting clients use services.

- There are few discussions with other agencies about client needs – this likely relates to confidentiality provisions;
- There are almost no referrals made to Court at any visit.

Table 23. Types of Services Provided to Mothers by Visit

Type of Service	First Visit	Second Visit	Third Visit	Fourth Visit	Fifth Visit	Sixth Visit	Seventh Visit	Eighth Visit
Brief contact or brief follow-up	17 (16%)	43 (51%)	36 (63%)	21 (51%)	13 (48%)	12 (75%)	4 (36%)	5 (71%)
Discussion of Part 2 screening results/ development of case plan	86 (83%)	4 (5%)	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	3 (11%)	1 (69%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion/clarification of issues – settlement readiness counselling	88 (85%)	8 (10%)	5 (9%)	2 (5%)	3 (11%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	2 (29%)
Assistance with documentation/ completion of forms	27 (26%)	3 (4%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (14%)
Specific counselling related to children's needs	35 (34%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Assistance with court appearance	12 (12%)	1 (1%)	2 (4%)	3 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to LSS Advice Counsel	11 (11%)	7 (8%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to LSS Intake Worker	17 (16%)	5 (6%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to Child Support Officer	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to Resource Room	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to other services on site	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to financial workshops	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to PAS	43 (41%)	1 (1%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to external services/agencies	22 (21%)	4 (5%)	1 (2%)	4 (10%)	2 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)
Follow-up on referrals	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to court	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion with LSS intake worker about client needs	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion with Child Support Officer	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion with other agencies/services about client needs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	2 (5%)	2 (7%)	2 (13%)	1 (9%)	0 (0%)
Engaging both parents in dispute resolution – joint meeting	0 (0%)	16 (19%)	11 (19%)	4 (10%)	3 (11%)	2 (13%)	2 (18%)	2 (29%)
Discussion of dispute resolution issues with individual parents – in person or by phone	3 (3%)	13 (15%)	5 (9%)	11 (27%)	8 (30%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)	0 (0%)
Finalize agreement	1 (1%)	5 (6%)	0 (0%)	5 (12%)	5 (19%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	1 (14%)
TOTAL VISITS	104	84	57	41	27	16	11	7

Table 24. Types of Services Provided to Fathers by Visit

Type of Service	First Visit	Second Visit	Third Visit	Fourth Visit	Fifth Visit	Sixth Visit	Seventh Visit	Eighth Visit
Brief contact or brief follow-up	22 (21%)	42 (55%)	29 (50%)	16 (39%)	16 (70%)	11 (79%)	7 (58%)	4 (44%)
Discussion of Part 2 screening results/development of case plan	80 (76%)	7 (9%)	9 (16%)	3 (7%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion/clarification of issues – settlement readiness counselling	85 (81%)	8 (11%)	12 (21%)	5 (12%)	4 (17%)	2 (14%)	2 (17%)	2 (22%)
Assistance with documentation/completion of forms	22 (21%)	5 (7%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (17%)	2 (22%)
Specific counselling related to children's needs	38 (36%)	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Assistance with court appearance	7 (7%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Referral to LSS Advice Counsel	7 (7%)	1 (1%)	3 (5%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Referral to LSS Intake Worker	13 (12%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to Child Support Officer	4 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to Resource Room	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Referral to other services on site	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to PAS	47 (45%)	5 (7%)	3 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Referral to external services/agencies	20 (19%)	6 (8%)	4 (7%)	4 (10%)	2 (0%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Referral to court	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
Discussion with LSS Advice counsel about client needs	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion with LSS intake worker about client needs	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion with Child Support Officer	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Discussion with other agencies/services about client needs	0 (0%)	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Engaging both parents in dispute resolution – joint meeting	0 (0%)	15 (20%)	11 (19%)	9 (22%)	2 (9%)	1 (7%)	1 (8%)	2 (22%)
Discussion of dispute resolution issues with individual parents – in person or by phone	4 (4%)	15 (20%)	7 (12%)	9 (22%)	5 (22%)	1 (7%)	2 (17%)	1 (11%)
Finalize agreement	0 (0%)	3 (4%)	5 (9%)	6 (15%)	2 (9%)	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	0 (0%)
Other services	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TOTAL VISITS	105	76	58	41	23	14	12	9

7.0 FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY OF KEY JUSTICE PARTNERS

7.1 Introduction

A survey of key family justice partners working in relation to the Nanaimo Centre was completed as part of the evaluation. Key Justice partners included Advice Counsel, representatives of community services or agencies, Court Registry staff and the Judiciary. The survey explored the following question and issues:

- The level of understanding by key justice partners of the services provided at the Centre and the Centre's mandate and referral protocols;
- The level of key justice partner contact with the services and staff at the Centre;
- Key justice partner satisfaction with the quality of services at the Centre;
- Key justice partner satisfaction with the level of referrals from the Centre to community agencies;
- The effectiveness of methods to publicize the Centre's activities;
- Suggestions on the ways that the delivery of services provided at the Centre be improved to meet the needs of clients and key justice partners.

Because only one member of the judiciary was involved in the Key Justice Partner Survey, the question of whether self-litigants had become more effective in court as a result of services received at the Centre was not explored.

7.2 Characteristics of Key Justice Partners Participating in the Survey

Twenty-eight key justice partners were identified by members of the Evaluation Advisory Committee as potential respondents for the survey. Interviews were successfully completed with 82% (23/28) of these respondents.

Table 25 provides a description of the agencies and services represented by the respondents. Thirty-nine percent represented local community services or agencies. Only one member of the judiciary was included in the Survey.

Table 25. Description of Key Justice Partner Organizational Affiliations

Organization or Agency	Number and Percentage
Community services or agencies	9 (39%)
Advice Counsel	4 (17%)
Judiciary	1 (4%)
MCFD	1 (4%)
Court Registry staff	4 (17%)
FMEP	2 (9%)
VIHA	1 (4%)
PAS/FAS	1 (4%)
TOTAL	23 (98%)

7.3 Description of Clients and Referral Levels by Key Justice Partners

Key justice partners described a high level of family legal problems among their clientele. Seventy percent said that 80 – 100% of the clients served by their organizations had family legal problems. Among the community service organizations represented in the survey 67% (6/9) said that the majority of their clients had family legal problems.

Table 26. Level of Clients with Family Justice Problems

Level of Clients with Family Justice Problems	Number of Respondents Reporting
80% – 100%	16 (70%)
50% – 79%	3 (13%)
25% – 49%	1 (4%)
Under 25%	3 (13%)
TOTAL	23 (100%)

7.4 Referrals Made by Key Justice Partners to the Centre

All of the Key Justice Partner respondents said that they referred clients to the Centre. Over half of the respondents said that these referrals had been consistent and regular since April 2007 when the Centre opened. Thirty percent of the key partners said that they referred clients to the Centre on a frequent basis (Table 27).

The Judiciary and Advice Counsel described making the highest level of referrals, 2/9 of the community services said that they had made only a few. Court Registry staff were unable to estimate the level of client referrals made.

Table 27. Approximate Number of Client Referrals Made by Key Justice Partners

Level of Client Referrals	Number and Percentage of Responses
Very few (1 or 2 every few months)	2 (8%)
A few (about one or two clients every month)	5 (22%)
Regular (approximately one or two clients every week)	6 (26%)
Frequent (three or more clients per week)	7 (30%)
Unable to estimate	3 (13%)
TOTAL	23 (99%)

The majority (82% or 18/22) of key justice partners said that they were satisfied with the level of referrals they or their organizations were making to the Centre, only 10% (2/22) said they would like to see an increase (two other respondents could not comment).

The two organizations that would like to see an increase in referrals to the Centre were an Aboriginal and men's resource agency. Their suggestions for increasing use of the Centre by their clients were:

- To expand the mandate of the Centre to include issues related to child protection and poverty law (not within the scope of services at the time of the evaluation);
- To have more of a physical presence on the site of Aboriginal services in the community;
- To simplify the intake process at the Centre (the respondent suggested that clients who require only one brief service may not require the complete assessment process. No further details were provided).

7.5 Level of Key Justice Partner Awareness of Services Provided at the Centre

Expanded family justice services have been offered at the Centre since mid-April 2007. Eighty-three percent (19/23) of the key justice partners said that they were directly informed about the expansion of services, suggesting that the expansion of services was effectively promoted in the community.

There were a variety of methods used to promote the Centre. Almost 40% of the respondents recalled receiving information about the expanded services directly from the Local Manager of the Centre.

Table 28. Ways that Key Justice Partners Learned About the Expansion of Services

N=18

Method	Number and Percentage
Open House	1 (6%)
Phone or email information about Centre	6 (17%)
Local Manager informed directly	7 (39%)
Was asked to participate in opening	1 (6%)
Agency meeting attended by Local Manager	3 (17%)
Met with staff	1 (6%)
Learned from supervisor	3 (17%)
Informed by Legal Services	2 (11%)
Luncheon	5 (5%)

Table 29 describes the major services provided at the Centre and the degree to which key justice partners were aware of them.

There was a very high level of understanding among key justice partners of the mandate of and main services provided at the Centre. For example, ninety-one percent (21/23) of the respondents were aware that the services at the Centre were directed primarily towards low income clients and were free.

Table 29. Key Justice Partner Awareness of Specific Services at the Centre

N=23

Services Provided	Justice Partners are Aware	Justice Partners are Not Aware
Formal assessment of client needs (Screening and Assessment)	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
General information about family legal issues	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Access to legal advice (through advice lawyers)	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
Processing of Legal Aid applications	21 (91%)	2 (9%)
Assistance with developing agreements or handling disputes through dispute resolution	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Assistance with developing agreements so that people can avoid going to court	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Assistance with understanding or completing legal or court documents	22 (96%)	1 (4%)
Assistance with resolving problems related to child support or maintenance	23 (100%)	0 (0%)
Access to the Resource Room and computer so clients can look for legal information on their own or with staff assistance	22 (96%)	1 (4%)

Despite key justice respondents having a high degree of understanding of the mandate of and services available at the Centre about half the respondents (48% or 11/23) said that there was a variety of additional information about the services or the Centre that they would find useful. These included:

- Whether people who live in other adjacent communities are eligible for services;
- Whether Supreme Court issues are addressed by the Child Support Officer;
- How Rule 5 cases of the Provincial (Family) Court work;
- What the Centre's general practice related to FRA custody and child protection consists of;
- Whether the Centre is willing and able to accept clients with addiction problems;
- What is covered by Legal Aid;
- Whether Legal Aid is part of the Centre;
- Whether child mediation or child advocacy takes place at the Centre;
- How high risk cases are handled;
- How screening for violence is carried out and the safety of women protected;
- Whether new services have been recently added;
- Whether all clients have to go through a formal assessment at the Centre.

7.6 Level of Awareness of the Centre in the Broader Community

Only 30% (3/20) of the key justice partners felt that the expanded services at the Centre were well known to the public (sometimes this included their own clientele).

A number of suggestions were made by the respondents to improve the visibility of the services provided at the Centre to the public at large. There was no clear consensus on best strategies and the feasibility of these recommendations was not addressed. The following suggestions were made by 1 – 3 respondents. The suggestions were to:

- Expand outreach to local Aboriginal organizations;
- Provide outreach services or access to services within other communities;
- Send materials to other services;
- Use local television announcements;
- Do selected community mail-outs on a regular basis.
- Increase advertising in the local paper
- Target brochures and posters to specific locations (e.g. doctor's and lawyer's offices);
- Set up booths at community events;
- Hold open houses on regular basis;
- Speak to college classes;
- Provide flyers at the downtown Legal Services Legal Aid Intake office;
- Staff family court on a regular basis;
- Do presentations at high schools;
- Provide mini-workshops at women-serving organizations.

Eighty percent (16/20) of the key justice partners said that they displayed or distributed information about the Centre at their organizations. In three cases where respondents had no displayed information, it was because the office was “too small” to display material such as brochures. Although there is an informative poster available describing the Centre, not all respondents were aware of it.

7.7 Level of Referrals from the Centre to Community Organizations

According to some key justice partners there appears to be a somewhat low level of regular referrals from the Centre to organizations or agencies in the community. Only a third of the key justice partners said that they received referrals originating from the Centre on a regular basis. This was particularly an area of concern to community services and agencies⁸.

⁸ Face Sheet data indicated a higher level of referrals to external resources and agencies at the client's first visit. However, data from the Client Survey showed a relatively low level of referrals to community services (except for PAS) and a limited degree of follow-up.

Table 30. Level of Client Referrals Made from the Centre to Community Organizations

Level of Referrals	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting
Referrals made on a regular basis	7 (30%)
Occasional referrals	6 (26%)
Rare referrals	1 (4%)
No referrals	2 (9%)
Does not apply	4 (17%)
Unknown/no answer	3 (13%)
TOTAL	23 (99%)

In some cases referrals back to agencies from the Centre may not be necessary. Clients may arrive at the Centre via community organizations and may not need to return after receiving services from the Centre.

The organizations that would like to see more referrals coming from the Centre include:

- Haven House
- Victim Services
- Men's Resource Centre
- Native Friendship Centre

Respondents noted that, in most cases, the referrals made from the Centre to their organizations were appropriate and met the mandates of their organization(s).

7.8 Level and Type of Contact Between Key Justice Partners and Staff at the Centre

7.8.1 Level of Contact

All of the key justice partners said that they had had direct dealings with staff working at the Nanaimo Centre. Eighty-seven percent said that they had had direct dealings with the Local Manager suggesting that he is strongly visible and accessible to other organizations and agencies. Contact levels were lowest with Advice Lawyers. This is likely because appointments with Advice Lawyers are primarily for clients and arranged by Legal Aid Intake staff at the Centre. About half of the key justice partners had had contact with the Family Interviewer.

Table 31. Key Justice Partner Contacts with Types of Staff at the Centre

N=23

Staff	Number and Percentage
Director	20 (87%)
Legal Aid Intake Worker	13 (57%)
Advice Lawyer	2 (9%)
Family Interviewer/Intake Worker	11 (48%)
FJCs/Mediators	15 (65%)
Child Support Officer	9 (39%)
Staff at the Resource Centre	6 (26%)

Sixty-five percent (15/23) of the key justice partner respondents had direct contact with three or more staff at the Centre.

7.8.2 Type of Contact

There were four broad areas around which communication between Centre staff and key justice partners occurred. The most common area of communication was related to how to network better, make client referrals and collaborate in terms of service delivery. A second major area involved discussions about completion of paperwork and documentation related to clients. This involved the clarification of documentation requirements or the accurate completion of forms. Respondents also noted the need to discuss services, service mandate and philosophy. Most communication involved the exchange of information about the services at the Centre and enhancing service use by clients.

7.8.3 Key Justice Partner Assessment of the Working Relationship with Centre Staff

Over 75% of the key justice partners were very satisfied with their working relationship with staff at the Centre, giving an average rating of 6.3/7.0. A quarter of the respondents assessed their level of satisfaction as moderate. No one gave working relationships a low rating.

Table 32. Level of Key Justice Partner Satisfaction with the Working Relationship

Level of Satisfaction with the Working Relationship	Number and Percentage of Participants
Low	0 (0%)
Moderate	5 (24%)
High	16 (76%)
TOTAL	21 (100%)

In two of the five cases where there was less satisfaction this was because of concerns about the inconsistency of information provided to clients.

We have had feedback from clients that their areas were not handled appropriately and that they got incorrect information.

In one case this comment was made by Court Registry staff.

Another respondent noted that Centre staff workload had affected the working relationship. In another there was concern expressed that safety issues of clients might not be fully discussed or addressed.

7.8.4 Impact of the Expanded Services on Communication Between Key Partners

One of the identified benefits of the Centre was that the expanded services have led to an increase in collaboration and communication between the Centre and key partners. Over 80% of the respondents said that communication and collaboration has increased to some or a significant degree.

Table 33. Degree to Which Communication and Collaboration has Increased as a Result of the Expansion of Services

Degree to which Communication and Collaboration has Increased	Number and Percentage
Increased to a significant degree	10 (45%)
Increased to some degree	8 (36%)
No change	4 (18%)
TOTAL	22 (99%)

Eighty-six percent of the key justice respondents were quite or very satisfied with the level of communication and collaboration between their organization and the Centre; 14% said that they were only “somewhat satisfied” but no respondent reported a low level of satisfaction.

Table 34. Level of Key Partner Satisfaction with the Current Level of Communication and Collaboration

Level of Satisfaction	Number and Percentage
Very satisfied	11 (50%)
Quite satisfied	8 (36%)
Somewhat satisfied	3 (14%)
Not satisfied	0 (0%)
TOTAL	22 (100%)

All of the key justice partner respondents were asked to identify ways in which collaboration and communication between their organization and the Centre could be improved. Twenty respondents made suggestions.

The most frequently made suggestion was to hold face-to-face training or meetings between the Centre and key justice partners on a regular basis.

(The Centre should have) more regular open houses, every three to four months especially when staff changes.

Meetings between specific key partners, for example the Bar and Court Registry were also suggested.

Bar Association and key personnel at the Centre should have more meetings. More information about mediation would be helpful to the Bar.

7.9 Satisfaction of Key Partners with the Quality of Services Clients Receive at the Centre

Fifteen respondents rated the quality of services that they felt their clients had received at the Centre (eight respondents felt that they were unable to comment on this question due to a lack of information). The majority of respondents gave this a high rating; 40% percent gave this a moderate rating.

Table 35. Respondent Rating of the Quality of Services Received by their Clients at the Centre

Quality of Service Rating	Number and Percentage of Respondents
Low rating	0 (0%)
Moderate rating	6 (40%)
High rating	9 (60%)
TOTAL	15 (100%)

Key partners were asked to describe aspects of the Centre that were most and least beneficial to their clients. Access to mediation services and the fact that many family justice services are gathered in a central place were noted as the main benefits for clients.

Nine key justice partners had concerns about the services provided to clients.

Several respondents raised concerns about the accuracy related to documentation being compiled by Centre staff. This was mentioned by Court Registry respondents.

Two key partner respondents raised concerns about what they perceived as the uneven quality of staff at the Centre. Two staff felt that there was insufficient training or bias in relation to women with safety issues or to men involved with family justice problems. Finally, one respondent said that Aboriginal clients have a greater need for poverty law services than for family law.

7.10 Assessment of Service Quality by Key Justice Partners

Key justice partners were asked to assess seven aspects of service quality at the Centre. The proximity of the Centre to the Court House and the convenience of the Centre hours were given the highest ratings. The lowest ratings were given to the accessibility and visibility of the Centre in the community and the level of staffing at the Centre.

Table 36. Assessment of the Quality of Services

Aspects of the Centre	Number Reporting	Low rating (1-3)	Moderate Rating (4-5)	High Rating (6-7)	Average Rating
Accessibility/visibility of the Centre in the community	20 (100%)	2 (10%)	10 (50%)	8 (40%)	5.3
Proximity of Centre to the Court House	21 (100%)	1 (5%)	5 (24%)	15 (71%)	6.3
Convenience of the Centre hours	12 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (33%)	8 (67%)	6.3
Knowledge and experience of staff	16 (101%)	0 (0%)	6 (38%)	10 (63%)	5.9
Timeliness of services (in meeting client needs)	11 (100%)	0 (0%)	3 (27%)	8 (73%)	6.0
Availability of legal information and materials at the Centre	14 (100%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	12 (86%)	6.2
Level of staffing at the Centre	12 (100%)	1 (8%)	5 (42%)	6 (50%)	5.4

Eighteen key justice partners made suggestions about how services or service delivery at the Centre could be improved. Twelve suggestions were made by 1 – 4 respondents. There was no clear consensus on these suggestions.

One of the most frequent recommendations was to improve staff training in the completion of some court forms through involvement and collaboration with Court Registry staff. Putting signage about the Centre outside the office building was also suggested as a priority. Several key justice partners suggested that staff at the Centre could occasionally deliver services in other community locations. Others recommended including other key justice services at the Centre. The complete list of recommendations is provided in Table 37.

Table 37. Key Justice Partner Recommendations for Service Improvement

N=18

Recommendations for Service Improvements*	Number and Percentage of Respondents Reporting
Increase staff training on correct completion of some court forms	4 (22%)
Place signage about Centre on outside of building	3 (17%)
Increase the sensitivity to women's safety issues and power imbalances	2 (11%)
Increase services in community – be available in more locations (e.g. branch offices, Family Court)	2 (11%)
Increase the presence of other family justice services at the Centre	2 (11%)
Increase staffing (workload is too heavy)	1 (6%)
Develop consistent staff training	1 (6%)
Provide access to free parking for clients	1 (6%)
Expand mandate to address poverty law	1 (6%)
Increase public outreach	1 (6%)
Increase number of Advice Lawyers	1 (6%)
Make the service more accessible and welcoming to men	1 (6%)

*Two respondents suggested the need to complete custody and access reports faster. This was not defined as a core service, and these results are not included in the table.

7.11 Helpfulness of Centralized Services

There was a strong consensus among key justice partners that the provision of a centralized location at which to access family justice services was very helpful to clients.

Table 38. Helpfulness of Centralized Services to Clients

Level of Helpfulness	Number and Percentage
Very helpful	17 (85%)
Quite helpful	2 (10%)
Somewhat helpful	1 (5%)
Not helpful	0 (0%)
TOTAL	20 (100%)

Most key justice partners also felt that the expanded service had been highly beneficial in helping clients *resolve* their family justice problems. Sixty-five percent (13/20) said the expanded service had been very helpful, 25% (5/20) said that it had been quite helpful and 10% (2/20) said that the expanded service had been somewhat or not very helpful in this regard.

Table 39 describes the most important benefits to clients, agencies and court system identified by key justice partners. Benefits that were identified by at least three respondents are listed.

Table 39. Main Benefits of the Centre to Clients, Agencies and the Family Justice System

Benefits to Clients (N=25)	Benefits to Agencies or Organizations (N=20)	Benefits to the Family Justice System (N=23)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Centre provides “one stop shopping” for clients. A great variety of services are now available in an accessible downtown location. ▪ The Centre provides access to free legal advice and materials. ▪ The Centre provides an opportunity to resolve conflict through dispute resolution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Centre provides local agencies with a place to refer clients where they will receive high quality services. ▪ It is helpful to have collaborative relationships with staff working in the family justice area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The alternative process helps keep people out of the court reducing costs and the burden on the court system. ▪ The services at the Centre are free and easy to access. ▪ The services have increased the knowledge and empowerment of the clients.

There was a strong consensus among respondents on the major benefits of the Centre to clients, agencies and the family justice system. Benefits were described as the expansion of resources and services in the community, the consolidation of services and the perceived lessening of the burden on the Court.

Nine key justice partners identified some drawbacks or concerns they had about expanded services at the Centre. There was no clear consensus on this issue. The most frequent comment was that individual clients might be more visible or identifiable when visiting the Centre. This could affect their sense of privacy. Several raised questions about the Centre duplicating services that some agencies in the community were already providing, however, this question was not explored in detail.

There were several other comments about services at the Centre. One respondent felt strongly that poverty law services were a much greater need in the Aboriginal community than family law services.

Several respondents reiterated issues that had arisen among the staff related to the incorrect completion of legal forms. Another respondent mentioned concerns related to the interpretation and implementation of Rule 5⁹. One key justice partner noted,

I would like to see the Centre, the Judiciary, Court Registry and the Bar on the same page (in terms of Rule 5). Some cases are slipping through even though they are required (because of Rule 5) to go to the Centre. We need more clarity on how Rule 5 is implemented.

⁹ Rule 5 is a Provincial Court (Family) Rule.

A more detailed examination of issues related to Rule 5 was not undertaken in this evaluation. However, it is our understanding that some Rule 5 cases are being diverted from the Court. Data indicates that there was a drop in Rule 5 referrals between the first and third quarters.

8.0 CLIENT SURVEY RESULTS

8.1 Description of Client Survey

8.1.1 General Description

A survey was conducted with clients who had first contacted the Nanaimo Centre for services between May and September 2007.

One hundred clients, randomly selected from this five month period were included in the survey. The survey examined:

- Referral sources for clients and their main reason(s) for visiting the Centre;
- The services clients used at the Centre;
- Previous attempts by clients to handle their family justice problems;
- The degree to which services were used by clients to solve their family justice problems;
- Client response to and satisfaction with services;
- Client assessment of the helpfulness of services;
- Client suggestions for improving service delivery.

8.1.2 Respondent Selection Method

One hundred clients were selected from a random sample of clients who had signed consent forms agreeing to be involved in the evaluation at a first visit between May and September 2007. The Client Survey was conducted 5 – 6 months after this visit to allow for most service outcomes to be achieved. Clients interviewed in the Client Survey represented approximately 14% (100/697) of all clients who made their first visit to the Centre during this period. This did not comprise a statistically significant representative sample of all visitors to the Centre during this time period.

Clients were paid \$25.00 as a token of thanks for their participation in the telephone interview.

8.2 Client Description

Eighty-nine percent (89/100) of the clients were parents of children; five respondents had no children and six respondents were acting in place of parents.

Fifty-two percent (52/100) of the respondents were mothers, 42% (42/100) were fathers, 5% (5/100) were grandmothers and one was an aunt. Only clients who were involved in a family justice issue were included in the survey.

Among the parents with children, 44% (39/89) had one child, 45% (40/89) had two and 11% (10/89) had three or more. Fifty-five percent (49/89) of the parents has at least one child under six years of age.

In 86% (86/100) of the cases the respondent was the service contact initiator. In 38% (33/86) of the cases respondents said that they had visited the Centre alone (without the other party seeking help). It is not known whether the other parent visited the Centre in the future.

Twenty percent (20/100) of the respondents said that they planned to handle their case in Court without having a lawyer (i.e. as self-litigants).

i. Background

Nineteen percent (19/100) of the clients in the survey indicated an Aboriginal or Metis background. This is a much higher rate than shown in other family justice survey studies and is dramatically higher than the provincial average.

No firm conclusions can be drawn from this data as the Client Survey did not involve a statistically representative sample. Despite this limitation, however, these results suggest a significant use of services by the Aboriginal population and a trend that would be worth confirming in future studies of this type.

The results from the Client Survey seem to contradict a finding from the staff interviews which identified a lack of outreach to the Aboriginal community as a major area of concern in the implementation phase. This finding appeared to be more related to perceptions about the visibility of the Centre in the Aboriginal community and within Aboriginal organizations as well as to the low attendance for programs such as Aboriginal PAS.

ii Income Data

Half of the clients who participated in the Client Survey had very low incomes – under \$20,000 per year. Among those with low incomes, non-parent respondents (primarily grandmothers) were concentrated in the lowest income categories. While this sample is small, the data suggests that a significant number of non-parent family members who became involved in family justice issues may have significant income challenges.

Table 40. Respondent Income Before Taxes

Income Level	Mothers	Fathers	Associate Respondents	Total
Under \$12,000 per year	15 (29%)	7 (17%)	4 (67%)	26 (26%)
From \$12,000 to under \$20,000 per year	16 (31%)	7 (17%)	0 (0%)	23 (23%)
From \$20,000 to under \$30,000 per year	11 (21%)	9 (21%)	0 (0%)	20 (20%)
From \$30,000 to under \$60,000 per year	6 (11%)	14 (33%)	1 (17%)	21 (21%)
From \$60,000 to under \$80,000 per year	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)
Over 80,000 per year	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (1%)
No data	1 (2%)	3 (7%)	1 (17%)	5 (5%)
TOTAL	52 (100%)	42 (99%)	6 (101%)	100 (100%)

iii. Educational Level of Respondents

Data from clients indicates that 19% (19/100) of the clients did not graduate from high school, 20% (20/100) graduated, 12% (12/100) attended vocational college, 34% (34/100) attended some college or university and 15% (15/100) graduated or attended post-graduate studies.

iv. Custody and Living Arrangements

In terms of the custody arrangements of children 35% (31/89) of the parents said that they had sole custody, in 8% (7/89) of the cases the other parent had sole custody, in 28% (26/89) the parents had joint custody, in 2% (2/89) another party had custody and in 26% (23/89) of the cases the custody was undetermined. Sixty-six percent of the parents and surrogate parents reported that their children lived primarily with them.

Table 41. Living Arrangements of Children

Living Arrangement of Children	Number and Percentage
Children living primarily with this respondent	63 (66%)
Children living with the other party	12 (13%)
Children living with parties on an equal basis	8 (8%)
Children living with parents – parents still living together	6 (6%)
No stable living arrangements	1 (1%)
Children live with other relatives	3 (3%)
Children in care of Ministry	1 (1%)
Children live on their own	1 (1%)
TOTAL	95 (99%)

v. Respondent Relationship Data

Among the respondents in the relationship who had been (or were still) involved in a relationship, 47% (44/94) said this was a marital relationship, 41% (39/94) said that they had been in a common-law relationship and 12% (11/94) said they had been in a dating relationship (grandmothers and aunts were excluded from this question).

Among the respondents who where married or had lived common-law 60% had had relationships lasting six years or more.

Table 42. Length of Relationships of Married and Common-Law Respondents

Length of Relationship	Number and Percentage
Under 1 year	3 (4%)
From 1 to under 3 years	14 (17%)
From 3 to under 6 years	16 (19%)
From 6 to under 10 years	27 (32%)
From 10 to under 15 years	14 (17%)
More than 15 years	9 (11%)
TOTAL	83 (100%)

Six percent of the married or common-law respondents had not yet separated from the other party, however, most (71%) had been separated for at least a year.

Table 43. Length of Time Respondents Separated

Separation Time	Number and Percentage
Not yet separated	5 (6%)
Under 3 months ago	2 (2%)
From 3 months to under 1 year ago	17 (20%)
From 1 year to under 3 years ago	22 (27%)
From 3 years to under 5 years ago	16 (19%)
From 5 years to under 10 years ago	10 (12%)
More than 10 years ago	11 (13%)
TOTAL	83 (99%)

Considering all the respondents who were involved in a relationship, 37% (35/94) had been involved in a previous marital or common-law relationship. In most cases (89% or 31/35) this involved only one previous relationship; in 11% (4/35) it involved two.

8.3 Client Service Profile Data

Although clients themselves were asked about the services they required and used at the Centre, a profile was developed from the running record case notes on the services received and the outcomes of any dispute resolution clients were involved in. The running record is a narrative description of the case compiled by FJSD staff at the Centre. It describes clients, identifies their needs and tracks service requests, services provided and outcomes of services. Data from the running record reflects the complexities of each case and can vary in detail and consistency.

By examining this data, we were able to establish a broad service profile. However, because the numbers of clients in the survey are not a statistically representative sample, it is not possible to generalize these findings to all clients who visited the Centre. This data indicates that a majority of the clients involved in the Client Survey engaged in brief services or brief counselling, 33% engaged in dispute resolution and 40% received legal services.

Table 44. Profile of Client (Data from the Running Record)

Service Received by Clients	Number and Percentage
Dispute resolution	33 (33%)
Brief services only	40 (40%)
Brief counselling only	20 (20%)
Brief services and brief counselling	3 (3%)
Settlement readiness or pre-mediation	4 (4%)
TOTAL	100 (100%)
Clients who Received Legal Services	40 (40%)

In the cases where dispute resolution was attempted, 64% (21/33) of the records indicated that an agreement had been reached.

8.4 Referrals, Service Needs and Service Use Data

8.4.1 Original Referral Source

Among those participating in the Client Survey, 25% had been initially referred to the Centre by a friend, family or coworker; 6% were Rule 5 clients and 12% were referred from the Court Registry (non-Rule 5). This data approximates some of the results of the data from the Front Desk Record analysis.

Table 45. Client Survey: Referral Source

N=100

Referral Source	Number and Percentage
Friend, family, co-worker (including other parent)	26 (26%)
Court Registry (non-Rule 5)	12 (12%)
Court Registry (Rule 5)	6 (6%)
Internet/web resource	6 (6%)
FMEP	6 (6%)
Legal Aid	6 (6%)
Private Bar	5 (5%)
Community organization*	4 (4%)
Government ministry**	4 (4%)
Other Family Justice Centre	3 (3%)
Police	3 (3%)
Duty Counsel (Court house)	2 (2%)
PAS or FAS	2 (2%)
University/college	1 (1%)
Saw brochure, newspaper article, TV	1 (1%)
Victim Services	1 (1%)
Health professional	1 (1%)
Native Court Worker	1 (1%)

*Haven House (3 referrals); Tillicum House Friendship Centre (1 referral)

**MCFD (3 referrals); Attorney-General (1 referral)

8.4.2 Initial Reason for Visit

Respondents were asked to describe the main reason they decided to visit the Family Justice Centre. Child support, custody and access were the most frequent reasons given by clients.

Table 46. Reasons Client Visited the Family Justice Services Centre

N=100

Reason(s) Why Client Visited the Family Justice Services Centre	Number and Percentage
Required help with a child support issue	52 (52%)
Required help with a custody issue	52 (52%)
Required help with child access/visits	49 (49%)
Required help with a guardianship issue	35 (35%)
Required information on legal rights after separation	13 (13%)
Required help with a restraining or no contact order	6 (6%)
Required help with a spousal support issue	4 (4%)
Had concerns with personal or child safety	4 (4%)
Wanted to finalize a divorce	3 (3%)
Required general information about separation or divorce	2 (2%)
Wanted counselling related to the needs of children	2 (2%)
Wanted to get Legal Aid	1 (1%)
Wanted court preparation	1 (1%)
Required information about changing child's name	1 (1%)
Required information about resources for grandchildren	1 (1%)
Required help with a paternity issue	1 (1%)
Wanted legal advice before signing court order	1 (1%)

8.4.3 Specific Service Needs of Clients Related to Agreements

While most (50%) of the respondents wanted to develop an agreement on a family justice issue, 31% were interested in varying an existing order or agreement.

Table 47. Client Service Needs

Service Needs	Number and Percentage
Client wanted to develop an agreement on a family justice issue	49 (49%)
Client wanted to vary an existing order or agreement	31 (31%)
Client wanted to finalize a divorce	2 (2%)
Other need	18 (18%)
TOTAL	100 (100%)

Among the clients who wanted to develop an agreement, 16% (8/49) of the agreements were related to the Supreme Court, 69% (34/49) to the Provincial Court and (7/49) of the respondents were not able to identify the court level that was involved.

Thirty-one clients wanted to vary an existing order or agreement; in 52% (16/31) of these cases the variation was at the Supreme Court level, in 48% (15/31) it was at the Provincial Court.

8.4.4 Services at the Centre that Clients Wanted to Access

When asked what services they specifically wanted to access at the Family Justice Centre, 56% said that they wanted to meet with a Family Justice Counsellor to explore or engage in dispute resolution.

Table 48. Services Clients Wanted to Access at the Centre

N=100

Services Client Wanted to Access	Number and Percentage
Wanted to apply for Legal Aid	23 (23%)
Legal Assistance (e.g. through Advice Counsel or Clinic)	23 (23%)
Wanted to explore or become involved in dispute resolution with a Family Justice Counsellor	56 (56%)
Wanted to get general counselling/information about a family justice issue	21 (21%)
Wanted to see the Child Support Officer	12 (12%)
Wanted help to complete court or legal documents	5 (5%)

8.4.5 Services Accessed by Clients

When asked who they had met with at the Centre 65% (65/100) of the respondents said that they had met with a Family Justice Counsellor, while 30% had met with a Legal Aid Intake worker. Less than half remembered meeting with the Family Interviewer. Most clients (62% or 62/100) used more than one service at the Centre. Seventeen percent (17/100) used three or more services.

Table 49. Service Used by Clients at the Centre

N=100

Service Client Used at the Family Justice Services Centre	Number and Percentage
Family Justice Counsellor	65 (65%)
Family Interviewer	45 (45%)
Legal Intake Worker	30 (30%)
Advice Lawyer/Advice Clinic	24 (24%)
Child Support Officer	17 (17%)

8.5 Client Response to Previous Family Justice Problems

8.5.1 Frequency of Problems

Clients were asked whether, in the two years prior to the opening of the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre, they had attempted to resolve a previous family justice problem. Thirty-six percent (36/100) said that they had a previous family justice problem that they had attempted to resolve in the past.

Table 50 describes the resources and services chosen by clients to attempt to solve their previous family justice problems. Half the clients (18/36) used one method and 50% (18/36) used two or more methods.

Court-related methods, such as contact with Legal Aid, private lawyers or going to court were the methods used by the majority of the clients with previous legal problems (78% or 28/36). Few had previously tried to visit the Family Justice Centre, or use web-based or other self-help methods.

Table 50. Services Clients Used to Address Previous Family Justice Problems

N=36

Methods Used	Number and Percentage
Contacted Family Justice Counsellor (at the Nanaimo or another Family Justice Centre)	3 (8%)
Contacted family counsellor (general)	2 (6%)
Contacted private/professional mediator	2 (6%)
Used Legal Aid	9 (25%)
Contacted Duty Counsel at courthouse	2 (6%)
Contacted private lawyer	15 (42%)
Used Internet or web-based resource	0 (0%)
Went to court	17 (47%)
Visited a Law Clinic	1 (3%)
Contacted LawLine	0 (0%)
Used self-help legal information	2 (6%)
Contacted other agencies (e.g. RCMP)	2 (6%)

The most common method previously used by clients to solve a family legal issue was going to court. In 47% (8/17) of these cases, clients said they had made one or two court appearances. In 53% (9/17) of the cases clients had made three or more court appearances. In 53% (9/17) of the cases all the court appearances were attended by a lawyer. Other aspects of the court appearances were not explored in detail.

This data suggests that the majority of clients had used court related methods to solve their previous family legal problems.

8.5.2 Barriers to the Previous Resolution of Family Justice Problems.

Respondents were asked to identify the factors that had been barriers to resolving their previous legal problems. Twenty-three respondents identified barriers. In almost 80% of the cases relationship issues were major barriers to resolving the problem, whatever the methods used. Respondents described the other party as being unwilling to compromise, or being uncooperative, unstable, or arguing about income levels and the division of assets. Of the eighteen people who identified relationship issues as a major barrier, 67% (12/18) said they had used legal services or the private bar, 17% (3/18) had used mediation.

This data suggests that relationship barriers rather than the availability or effectiveness of resources is a major barrier to resolving family justice issues.

Table 51. Barriers to Solving Legal Problems in the Past

N=23

Barriers to Previously Resolving Family Legal Problems	Number and Percentage
One or both parents uncommunicative, uncooperative	18 (78%)
Respondent couldn't afford a lawyer	5 (22%)
Violence in relationship	1 (4%)
Didn't qualify for Legal Aid	1 (4%)
Private lawyer not effective	2 (9%)
Tried but could not resolve the problem by myself	2 (9%)

8.6 Client Assessment of the Screening and Assessment Tool

8.6.1 Description of the Screening and Assessment Tool

A three-part Screening and Assessment Tool was developed and used at the Nanaimo Centre to collect baseline information on the characteristics of clients visiting the centre and to help determine client service needs. The Screening and Assessment Tool was specifically developed for use at the Nanaimo Centre after a development and pilot test phase.

The Screening and Assessment Tool has three parts. Part 1 collects basic demographic and background characteristics (e.g. client names and birthdates) and is completed by clients themselves, sometimes with staff assistance. Part 2 looks at client background issues and needs in more detail. The purpose of Part 2 is to provide information about the client's service needs. Part 3 compiles the data arising from the needs assessment for the purpose of guiding the FJCs approach with individual clients. Part 2 is typically completed with assistance from an FJC and Part 3, a summary of information, is completed by the FJC.

8.6.2 Completion Levels and Assistance Received

Most of the clients (89% or 89/100) remembered completing Part 1 of the Assessment and Screening Tool, (11% or 11/100) said that they had no recollection of completing the Tool. Twenty-five percent (22/89) of the clients said that they received assistance in completing the Tool.

Most of the clients who did not receive assistance said that they were very happy to complete the Tool by themselves. Eighty-eight percent (59/67) said that they didn't want or need any assistance; 6% (4/67) said some assistance might have been helpful but was not necessary.

Seventy-six percent (68/89) of the clients said that they remembered receiving information on the ways that their personal information on the Tool was going to be protected, only one respondent said that this had not been explored. Twenty-two percent (20/89) could not remember whether this had occurred.

8.6.3 Assessment of Other Aspects of the Tool

Clients were positive about the process of completing the Tool. Almost all the respondents who remembered the Screening and Assessment Tool (95% or 85/89) felt that they were given sufficient time to complete the Tool – only one respondent said s/he was rushed (three respondents couldn't remember). Ninety-five percent (85/89) said that the questions on the Tool were very or quite "clear and understandable." No respondent described the questions on the Tool as being difficult to answer (four couldn't remember the questions sufficiently to comment).

Eighty-four percent (75/89) of the respondents who remembered completing the Assessment and Screening Tool said that they remembered discussing aspects of their family situation in more detail with a staff member at the Centre; and 10% (9/89) said they did not. Six percent (5/89) did not remember. Most of the clients (80%) found these discussions to be very helpful.

Table 52. Helpfulness of Discussions Arising from the Screening and Assessment Tool

Assessment of Discussion	Number and Percentage
Very helpful	60 (80%)
Helpful	9 (12%)
Ambivalent – neither helpful or unhelpful	4 (5%)
Very unhelpful	2 (3%)
TOTAL	75 (100%)

8.6.4 Overall Assessment of the Screening and Assessment Tool

Most respondents appeared to be very satisfied with the content and delivery of the Screening and Assessment Tool. Only four respondents raised general concerns about the Tool and there was no agreement about the most important concerns. Concerns raised by these respondents were that:

- One respondent would have liked to provide more detailed answers to some questions;

- One respondent felt that the questions appeared to be weighted towards mothers and excluded fathers;
- One respondent felt that some of the questions about domestic abuse were embarrassing;
- A question on the first page was felt to be contradictory/confusing (the respondent couldn't remember the question).

8.7 Client Satisfaction with Resources at the Centre for Children

Data collected from the Front Desk Records indicated that 9 – 11% of the clients who visited the Centre brought their children with them.

Among the clients interviewed in the Client Survey, 56% (56/100) said that they had children under ten. Of these, 27% (15/56) had taken their children with them on at least one visit to the Centre. Eighty percent (12/15) of these clients said that these children were six years or under. Sixty-seven percent of the parents who took their children said that the Centre was well equipped and welcoming.

Table 53. Client Assessment of Centre for Children

Rating	Number and Percentage
Low Rating	2 (13%)
Moderate rating	3 (20%)
High rating	10 (67%)
TOTAL	15 (100%)

For those parents who gave this question a moderate or low rating, suggestions for improving the Centre included the following:

- Create a clearly designated area for children (the play area is located in the hallway);
- Add more toys and books;
- Provide some kind of sound barrier for the children's play area;
- Provide some level of limited child-minding for younger children.

8.8 Client Satisfaction with the Resource Room

8.8.1 Overview

The Client Survey also asked clients if they had used the Resource Room. Questions addressed the overall use of the room, services used and the helpfulness of services.

8.8.2 Level of Resource Room Use

Eighteen percent (18/100) of the respondents who visited the Centre said they used the Resource Room or had picked up material there. Five respondents could not remember who directed them to the Resource

Room but among the others, the Centre receptionist was the main source of referral, followed by Legal Aid Intake, Advice Lawyers, and the Child Support Officer. Only one client had been referred to the Resource Room by a Family Justice Counsellor.

Eighty-nine percent (16/18) of the Resource Room visitors visited only once; 11% (2/18) visited multiple times. Eighty-two percent of the respondents did not use the Resource Room when they visited the Centre. In the majority of cases this was because respondents did not realize that the Resource Room existed or was available for use and had not been referred by staff to it. The Resource Room is not clearly visible from the reception area.

A minority of respondents (23%) said that they did not need to use the Resource Room because they didn't require legal information.

Table 54. Reasons for Not Using the Resource Room

N=82

Reason	Number and Percentage
Didn't realize the Resource Room was there	60 (73%)
Didn't know the public could use the Resource Room	2 (2%)
Didn't require legal information	19 (23%)
Didn't know what was available in the Resource Room	1 (1%)
Had no time to visit the Resource Room	5 (6%)
Didn't know how to use the computer in the Resource Room	1 (1%)
Disability problems prevented use of room	1 (1%)
Other	1 (1%)

8.8.3 Use of Services at the Resource Room

Clients who visited the Resource Room were asked to identify the services or documents they used. In most cases respondents reported picking up publications or pamphlets; five respondents said that they used the computer. Only one respondent said s/he had linked with LawLine.

Table 55. Services Used by Clients at the Resource Room

N=18

Services	Number and Percentage
Computer	5 (28%)
LawLine	1 (6%)
Printer	3 (17%)
Photocopier	1 (6%)
Picked up pamphlets	9 (50%)
Picked up publications	4 (22%)
Telephone	1 (6%)

8.8.4 Level of Staff Assistance Received at the Resource Room and Outcome of Visit

Over forty percent of the respondents who visited the Resource Room said that they did not receive any staff assistance, while half said that they received staff assistance for all their visits.

Table 56. Level of Staff Assistance Provided at the Resource Room

Level of Assistance Received	Number and Percentage
Received staff assistance for all visits	9 (50%)
Received staff assistance for some visits	1 (6%)
Received no staff assistance at any visit	8 (44%)
TOTAL	18 (100%)

Over 80% of the respondents said that they received all the family legal information that they needed at the Resource Room. A further analysis indicated that there was no association between the type of assistance received and the result of the visit.

These findings differ to some degree from those compiled from the Client Feedback Forms distributed at the Resource Room, which showed a statistical association between finding information and staff assistance.

Table 57. Degree to Which Clients Found the Information they Needed

Degree to Which Clients Found Information Needed	Total	Type of Assistance		
		Staff	Some Staff	No Staff
Client found all of the information they needed	15 (83%)	8 (89%)	1 (100%)	6 (75%)
Clients found most of the information they needed	1 (6%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Clients found some of the information they needed	2 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (25%)
Clients were unable to find any of the information they needed	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TOTAL	18 (100%)	9 (100%)	1 (100%)	8 (100%)

Clients who used the Resource Room were asked to rate specific aspects of the Resource Room such as the availability and helpfulness of staff. Respondent ratings of the Resource Room were high, averaging between 6.5 – 7.0 out of 7.0. These results suggest that the quality of services received and equipment provided at the Resource Room is rated very positively and that clients find the Resource Room helpful. Equipment availability and hours of access and comprehensiveness of information were given the highest ratings.

Table 58. Assessment of Different Aspects of the Resource Room

Aspect Rated	Number of Respondents Reporting	Low Rating	Medium Rating	High Rating	Average Rating
Availability of staff to assist	10	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (100%)	6.8
Helpfulness of staff	10	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	6.5
Hours of availability	14	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	14 (100%)	6.9
Availability of computers	5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	7.0
Ease of access to computer or information	5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	5 (100%)	6.9
Availability of telephone	2	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (100%)	7.0
Comprehensiveness of legal materials available	17	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	17 (100%)	6.9

8.9 Referrals Provided to Clients Visiting the Centre and Satisfaction with Referrals

Sixty percent (60/100) of the clients participating in the Client Survey remembered receiving an external service referral from staff at the Centre. The evaluation analyzed the level of referrals made by type of referrals, the number of referrals followed up on and the client's assessment of these referrals on a 1 (not helpful) to 7 (very helpful) scale.

Referrals to specific services were highly variable with two services (PAS)¹⁰ and Legal Aid Lawyers (through Legal Aid) receiving the highest number of referrals. Most of the services received a small number of referrals (5% or under).

The level that clients followed up on these referrals varied. The highest level of follow-up (where numbers involved at least ten referrals), were to the Court Registry (the reasons for these referrals were not defined) and to Legal Aid Lawyers. Only one in five clients followed up a referral made to family counseling.

The lowest ratings, given by clients for the helpfulness of the referral, where there were a significant number of referrals was to Legal Aid Lawyers and PAS. The reasons for these ratings were not explored.

Table 59. Referrals Provided to Clients

N=60

Referral Agency	Number and Percentage of Clients Who Received Referrals	Number and Percentage of Clients Who Followed Up On Referrals	Average Assessment of Helpfulness of Referrals
Duty Counsel	9 (15%)	4 (44%)	6.0
Court Registry	10 (17%)	9 (90%)	6.7
FMEP	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	no data
Lawline	2 (3%)	1 (50%)	7.0
PAS	25 (42%)	15 (60%)	5.6
FAS	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	no data
Family counselling	5 (8%)	1 (20%)	5.0
Child counselling	4 (7%)	1 (25%)	no data
Haven House	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	7.0
Men's Resource Centre	3 (5%)	2 (67%)	5.5
RCMP	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	7.0
Legal Aid Lawyer	16 (27%)	13 (81%)	5.2
Lawyer Referral Service	6 (10%)	4 (67%)	5.5
Counselling for fathers	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	no data
Parents Together	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	no data
Aboriginal counselling	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	7.0
Aboriginal support group	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0
Rainbows	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0
Private lawyer	1 (2%)	1 (100%)	1.0

¹⁰ Attending PAS is a mandatory requirement of the Provincial Court in Nanaimo before most parties to Family Relations Act cases can proceed to a first hearing.

8.10 Client Satisfaction with the Nanaimo Family Justice Services Centre

8.10.1 Service Quality Assessment

Respondents were asked to assess six specific characteristics of the Centre. Characteristics such as the knowledge and experience of staff and timeliness of the service were rated.

Respondents were most positive about the friendly/welcoming attitude of the staff at the Centre and the Centre's proximity to the courthouse. The time required to wait before an appointment and the comfort of the waiting room were given lower ratings.

The waiting time prior to an appointment was also identified in staff interviews and in the Key Justice Partner Survey. Many staff stated that staff changes and insufficient staffing in some areas have increased wait times for some clients, particularly those wanting to see a Family Justice Counsellor.

Table 60. Client Assessments of Service Quality

Aspect Rated	Number of Respondents Reporting	Low Rating	Medium Rating	High Rating	Average Rating
Proximity to the courthouse	77 (100%)	0 (0%)	6 (8%)	71 (92%)	6.7
Knowledge and experience of staff	100 (100%)	0 (0%)	4 (4%)	96 (96%)	6.7
Ability of staff to clearly explain legal issues	90 (99%)	2 (2%)	12 (13%)	76 (84%)	6.3
Convenience of the hours of the Centre	100 (100%)	6 (6%)	16 (16%)	78 (78%)	6.2
Comfort of waiting room	100 (100%)	2 (2%)	32 (32%)	66 (66%)	5.9
Time waited before appointment	98 (99%)	12 (12%)	21 (21%)	65 (66%)	5.8

8.10.2 Client Assessment of the Degree to Which They Were Able to Resolve Their Family Justice Problems

The main objective of the Centre is to provide a range of comprehensive, interrelated services to enable clients to resolve their family justice issues. Clients were asked to describe the degree to which this had occurred through their use of services at the Centre.

Almost 40% of the respondents said that they were able to solve most or all of their family justice problems through services provided at the Centre; 29% said that they were able to solve some of their problems and 23% said that they had not been able to solve any of their family justice problems.

Table 61. Client Assessment of the Degree of Resolution of Family Justice Problems at the Centre

Degree of Resolution of Problems	Number and Percentage
Respondents able to resolve all problems	16 (16%)
Respondents able to resolve most problems	22 (22%)
Respondents able to resolve some problems	29 (29%)
Respondents not able to resolve any problems	23 (23%)
Issue in progress	10 (10%)
TOTAL	100 (100%)

A further analysis was done of the cases where clients said that services provided at the Centre had not helped them solve any of their family justice problems. In 43% of these cases the reason given was related to problems in the client's relationship, particularly the other party's unwillingness to engage in the resolution of the problem. This finding confirms the importance of relationship issues rather than the services available or provided as the main barrier to resolving family legal problems. All of the barriers to the resolution of problems are presented in Table 62.

Table 62. Issues Related to Non-Resolution of Family Legal Problems

Issues Involved in Non-Resolution of Problems	Number
Partner(s) are unwilling to mediate, uncooperative or uncommunicative	10 (43%)
Family situation has changed or has become more complex	2 (9%)
The problem was a maintenance issue	2 (9%)
Violence was involved	3 (13%)
Case involved a child protection issue	1 (4%)
The case is out of the jurisdiction	1 (4%)
Client is unable to pay for a lawyer	1 (4%)
Lawyer is ineffective	1 (4%)
No information	2 (9%)
TOTAL	23 (99%)

8.10.3 Client Assessment of the Value of Integrated Services

There was a strong level of agreement among the clients that the integration of services in one central place was very beneficial. Eighty-six percent of the respondents gave this aspect of the Centre a very high rating.

Table 63. Client Assessment of Helpfulness of Comprehensive Services

Assessment	Number and Percentage
Very helpful	86 (86%)
Quite helpful	8 (8%)
Somewhat helpful	4 (4%)
Not helpful at all	2 (2%)
TOTAL	100 (100%)

Clients were asked to identify the most helpful and least helpful services if they received more than one service at the Centre. Results were limited because many clients said that all services were helpful. It was also difficult to establish the level and type of contact clients had with each service. General results indicate that 38% (14/37) of the clients identified mediation services as being most helpful, 27% (10/37) identified Legal Aid, 19% (7/37) identified the Advice Lawyer and 14% (5/37) identified the Child Support Officer service. These results should be interpreted with caution.

The same limitations hold true when clients were asked to define the “least helpful service.” There were three key comments made by at least 2 – 5 respondents.

- Mediation was sometimes perceived as least helpful not because of aspects of the service but because it didn’t work for the parties or one party did not want to be involved;
- Several respondents raised concerns about the accuracy of the advice provided by the Child Support Officer. This issue was not explored in detail;
- Several respondents were concerned about the experience and knowledge provided by the Advice Lawyer they consulted. This issue was not explored in detail.

8.11 Court Visits Made by Clients

8.11.1 Visits to Court During or After Receiving Services at the Centre

Thirty-nine percent 39% (39/100) of the clients said that they had visited court during or shortly after receiving services at the Centre. Although the reasons for these visits were not assessed in detail, in 85% (33/39) of these cases clients said that their visits were related to a court appearance, in 2% (3/39) it was to get information from the court registry or court clerk or to drop off consent forms and in 8% (3/39) it was to finalize an agreement.

Thirty-three percent of these respondents (11/33) made one appearance, 36% (12/33) made two and 30% (10/33) made three or more.

There did not appear to be a statistical relationship between the services clients used at the Centre and the likelihood of their going to court. Although clients who saw an FJC were less likely to proceed to court than those who saw the Legal Intake Worker or who consulted an Advice Lawyer, this association was not statistically significant.

An analysis of the services delivered, as compiled in the Running Record was also used to look at whether the types of services noted in the clients case records were associated with whether they went to court. This analysis looked at whether clients had been engaged in dispute resolution, brief services or brief counselling or had received Legal Aid services. Data on involvement with Legal Aid services could not be cross verified with Legal Aid Intake data due to issues of client confidentiality. In terms of the data that was available, no association could be established with the types of services received and whether clients ended up ultimately in court.

Table 64. Analysis of Services Received in Relation to Whether Clients Went to Court

Services Received	Client Did Not Go to Court	Client Went to Court
Engaged in dispute resolution	21 (64%)	12 (36%)
Received brief services only	26 (65%)	14 (35%)
Received brief counselling only	10 (50%)	10 (50%)
Received brief services and brief counselling	1 (33%)	2 (67%)
Received pre-settlement readiness counselling	3 (75%)	1 (25%)
Received legal services	22 (55%)	18 (45%)

*These data were extracted from the FIS running record (FJSD)

The type of issues clients wanted to resolve was also analyzed in relation to whether they ultimately went to court. Clients who attended the Centre to learn about legal rights after separation were most likely to go to court, while those with child support issues were least likely but none of these associations were statistically significant.

Whether clients went to court to solve a family justice issue previously was not statistically associated with going to court during or after visiting the Centre.

8.12 Suggestions Made by Clients for Improving Services at the Centre

Fifty-three percent of the clients made suggestions for improvements at the Centre. All the suggestions are listed in Table 65. Decreasing wait times for some appointments, promoting the servicers more actively in the community and adding staff were the most frequently made suggestions. There was no consensus on these suggestions and the feasibility of implementing these recommendations was not assessed.

Because of the qualitative nature of the questions and the broad range of answers, all answers are shown in Table 65. Some services (Child Support Officer) were not fully functional during the implementation phase.

Table 65. Client Recommendations for Improvements in Services

N=53

Recommendations	Number and Percentage
Decrease wait time for appointments	12 (23%)
Increase the advertising and promotion of the Centre	8 (15%)
Add additional staff	7 (13%)
Make the Centre more visible from the street	5 (9%)
Provide more understanding and resources for men	4 (8%)
Notify clients about the availability of the Resource Room	4 (8%)
Increase the frequency of appointment times available to see lawyer	3 (6%)
Explain that there are a range of services available at the centre	2 (4%)
Provide babysitting for mediation sessions	2 (4%)
Allow clients to have more than three sessions with the Advice Lawyer	2 (4%)
Simplify the Assessment and Screening Tool	1 (2%)
Assist with uncontested divorces	1 (2%)
Have a printout of steps to resolve family issues	1 (2%)
Increase the number of men on staff	1 (2%)
Provide more training for the Family Interviewer to avoid misinformation	1 (2%)
Contact clients who have been waiting longer than two weeks for an appointment	1 (2%)
Provide workshops for clients contemplating mediation	1 (2%)
Extend services to other communities	1 (2%)
*Assist the Child Support Officer to become more aware of self-employment issues	1 (2%)
Provide information on how to proceed with varying an order if person does not believe that income reported by other partner is accurate	1 (2%)
Increase seating in the waiting room	1 (2%)
Make it possible to call in for an appointment	1 (2%)
Develop a booklet providing information to women in abusive situations	1 (2%)
*Child Support Officer needs to show more interest in client	1 (2%)
Provide more legal training for staff	1 (2%)
Provide more follow-up when clients referred to Legal Aid	1 (2%)
Provide separate waiting areas for different services	1 (2%)
Provide more assistance for those with disabilities	1 (2%)
Make waiting room more child friendly	1 (2%)
Allow teenagers to be involved in meetings	1 (2%)
Ensure that clients realize Legal Aid Intake is available at the Centre	1 (2%)
Follow-up with clients who have not received help	1 (2%)
Have someone attend court with clients	1 (2%)
Recommend an Advice Lawyer if mediation is not an option	1 (2%)
Act as a liaison with FMEP in simple matters	1 (2%)
Add an extra computer in the Resource Room	1 (2%)
Ensure mediators are knowledgeable about the law and are neutral	1 (2%)
Ensure adequate follow-up with clients	1 (2%)

*This service was not fully functional during the implementation phase.

9.0 RESULTS OF STAFF INTERVIEWS

9.1 Introduction and Description of Respondents

Nineteen administrative/supervisory and local staff involved in the Nanaimo Centre were interviewed as part of the evaluation. Ten staff working directly at the Centre were included in the interviews as well as nine respondents from the administrative levels of the Legal Services Society (LSS) and the Family Justice Services Division (FJSD).

The interviews were highly qualitative in nature (although some rating questions were included for Centre staff) and questions varied according to the role and involvement of the respondent. Most of the Legal Services administrative level respondents were interviewed in a group (at their request). The findings in this section are reported primarily by theme.

The interviews explored the opinions of respondents on the effectiveness of the implementation process in the areas of staff training, promotion of the Centre, facility/site issues, adequacy of staffing, effectiveness of the services, policies and model, and the “lessons learned” during the implementation phase.

9.2 Staffing Levels at the Centre

There was general consensus among the staff who addressed this question that the current level of staffing (at the end of 2007 and early 2008) was insufficient to meet existing client levels and needs. Staffing issues were cited as being most acute in relation to front desk and Family Interviewer staff, Family Justice Counsellors, and gaps related to the availability of a Child Support Officer (not a fully functioning position during the implementation phase). The lack of consistent staffing at the Resource Room was also identified as a problem during the first nine months of the expanded service but was being addressed through additional hiring in December 2007.¹¹

One of the implementation issues identified by staff was the importance of planning 6 – 8 months in advance for expected increases in the volume of clients. Pre-planning should also take into account potential staff changes and the time needed to train staff adequately.

On-site staff perceived that staffing issues had resulted in an increase in the wait times for clients, especially those waiting to see a Family Justice Counsellor and the difficulty front desk sometimes have had in contacting clients within 24 hours to arrange appointments. Some staff said that wait times had doubled for some groups of clients. There were concerns expressed by some staff that a small number of clients might be discouraged from using services due to the lack of a timely response. Whether this had occurred could not be assessed.

¹¹ It is our understanding that many of these staff issues were being addressed in early 2008. However, the evaluation was unable to assess changes after the data collection was completed.

9.3 Staff Training

Seventy percent of the staff working at the Centre felt that the definition of the mandate and tasks and training did not fully equip them for their role(s) at the expanded Centre. The following broad areas of concern were identified:

- Front desk staff were not always sure of their role. More specific “upfront” training related to specific tasks such as the handling of the FIS is required for all new staff. There was a significant amount of “on the job” training taking place for both LSS and front desk staff;
- Front desk staff frequently felt they would have been better able to do their job if they had had more training in the family justice area (e.g. a basic understanding of the family court process, what happens when people go to court, or how to complete court documents);
- There was a need for more training taking into account the complexity of referrals arriving at the centre;
- Certain positions (e.g. the Child Support Officer) lacked clear parameters and specific training (This position was not fully functional during the implementation phase);
- Positions such as the Legal Aid Intake Worker involved new expectations associated with new roles (e.g. issues related to cross referrals required for those working in a multi-service agency). It was felt that these expectations had not always been clearly defined.

9.4 Staff Assessment of the Physical Site

In general, the staff at the Centre were very positive about the location of the Centre and the physical characteristics of the site. Staff felt that location of the Centre, in relation to the Provincial Court, was good, as were the size of staff offices. Some problem areas were identified. These included:

- The street “visibility” of the Centre – this was considered to be somewhat compromised due to the 3rd floor placement of the office and lack of signage at street level;
- The location of the washrooms. Although in place prior to the development of the Centre, it was felt their location (outside the main office) was somewhat problematic;
- Concern that exiting the Centre in an emergency may be somewhat problematic for staff at some offices;
- The lack of visibility of the Resource Room from the public waiting room;
- The lack of space as client uptake continues to increase. For example, Advice Lawyers on contract to LSS are sometimes required to use the Board Room for client consultations if an office is unavailable;
- Difficulty accessing the Centre by disabled persons because the front door to the office building is too heavy.

There were concerns expressed by a small number of staff that the waiting room was “on the verge” of being overcrowded and that a water jug would be helpful for clients who had long waits. The arrangement of the waiting room (with all clients looking directly at the front desk) was felt to affect the privacy of front desk staff to some degree. Half the staff suggested that an expansion of service hours could benefit working parents.

Concerns also were raised about the placement of the play area (in the corridor) and the lack of a baby’s change table in the washrooms.

9.5 Assessment of the Resource Room

The Resource Room was not consistently staffed during the implementation phase (further staffing was added in December 2007). Most of the staff described themselves as never or rarely using the Resource Room to access material and referring clients infrequently. However, when specific aspects of the Resource Room were rated such as availability of staff or the comprehensiveness of materials available, the Resource Room received consistently positive ratings.

Lack of trained staff during the implementation phase, inadequate signage at the Centre and insufficient promotion and a room set-up that discouraged a self-help approach were considered major barriers to Resource Room use during the implementation phase.

9.6 Staff Assessment of the Client Intake and Internal Service Referral Process

9.6.1 Intake and Internal Referral Process

Staff were evenly divided on whether there was an “accurate, up-to-date written policy” that was accessible to staff that described the client intake and internal referral process. There was, however, general agreement that the process was functioning “quite” or “somewhat” effectively.

Managing client confidentiality issues was defined as a major problem by both on-site staff and administrative respondents. Client confidentiality is framed and interpreted in two distinctive ways by the Legal Services Society (where client-solicitor confidentiality is a core and legal operating principal), and the Family Justice Services Division, which has a requirement to report issues that may affect child safety.

A central question arose around whether the LSS provision should be applied to all clients who seek services at the Centre. The LSS provision means that potential child safety issues identified throughout the Legal Aid Intake process cannot be shared with FJSD staff. Some staff felt that this had limited the potential for collaboration in some cases.

It is our understanding that this issue has not yet been completely resolved but that modifications have been made in the early referral process to “stream” clients into LSS and FJSD components with appropriate measures to address confidentiality issues. In general, staff said that these procedures were working fairly well on a case by case basis although there was a general consensus that this issue needed to be resolved by both parties at a policy level. There was an agreement among the on-site staff that this issue had not affected the delivery of services to clients and that, despite the issue, staff had retained positive personal working relationships.

Several other issues were noted at the intake and referral phase. There were concerns that the intake process was being “overloaded” by an increasing volume of clients which was also being exacerbated by the weight of telephone contacts made to the Centre. There were also concerns raised that not all cases are initially going through the front desk and that some Legal Aid Intake or LawLine enquiries may come directly to Legal Aid Intake staff.

9.6.2 Use and Assessment of the Screening and Assessment Tool

Staff respondents felt that the Assessment and Screening Tool was being administered effectively with most clients.

Most of the respondents who addressed this question said that the Screening and Assessment Tool had been quite or very effective in determining client service needs or accurately assessing issues of power, violence or control in the relationships of clients.

It was noted by some staff that a very small number of clients appear to be reluctant to complete the Assessment and Screening Tool or have problems understanding some of the terms. Several respondents noted that the form was not originally designed with all the information needs of Legal Aid Intake. It is our understanding that modifications were made to address these concerns. One concern is that valuable data on the Screening Tool is not captured in the FIS.

9.7 Data Management

Aspects of data collection and data management at the Centre were assessed by some of the on-site staff. Respondents described several issues related to data collection including front desk data collection as being time consuming and that it was difficult to determine referral sources due to the acronyms used. One comment was that data collection appeared to revolve more around FJSD services than LSS (LSS client confidentiality provisions limit access to specific client data).

Over 80% of the respondents had read the previous quarterly evaluation reports. One respondent had not found the reports useful while most found the reports moderately or highly useful. The most valued aspects of these reports were the statistics on how many clients had used the Centre.

9.8 Promotion of the Centre and Level of Referrals

The Centre used a variety of promotional and outreach methods to attract client referrals to the Centre. These included public “launches,” “meet and greets,” tours, talking directly to agencies, development of a website, brochures and open houses. Direct contact with agencies in the Nanaimo community who were most likely to refer clients was a major focus of promotional activities.

Respondents were generally very satisfied with the level of education and promotion that had been carried out by the Centre. However, most of the staff felt that there had been insufficient outreach and promotion to specific groups and organizations in the community. These included groups serving the Aboriginal, low-income, disabled and ethnic minority communities. Other groups defined as needing more outreach were social workers working in the mental health or family system, teens and young parents.

It was impossible to verify the exact degree of outreach to specific groups as no record or log of outreach activities was kept during the implementation phase.

One outreach strategy planned prior to the opening of the Centre was the development of a Community Advisory Group that would include representation from community organizations in Nanaimo. This strategy was not implemented. Instead the Centre’s Local Manager participated regularly in pre-existing local committees that addressed needs and issues related to family justice.

On-site staff respondents made a number of suggestions on ways to improve outreach and promotion to specific groups who may require family justice services. These included:

- The placement of information about the Centre in the local phone book (this was considered to be a priority);
- Developing a recognizable logo for the Centre to be placed on all promotional materials;
- Improving signage at the street level for the Centre;
- Describing the specific services provided and what they consist of in all promotional materials;
- Meeting with Aboriginal leaders in the Nanaimo area to discuss best approaches to promoting the Centre;
- Providing services within other programs off-site to attract specific client groups (current premises were described as being too “government” looking for some clients);
- Using more PLEI to increase outreach and interest;¹²
- Developing an electronic newsletter to distribute to agencies;
- Maintaining Aboriginal PAS even when attendance is low;
- Offering family justice information through existing programs such as “Build Better Babies”;
- Doing more in-person outreach at the Courthouse.

9.9 Assessment of the On-site Management at the Centre

All of the staff/administration respondents assessed the on-site management at the Centre as being very or quite effective. There was a strong consensus among respondents that the on-site manager was positive, encouraging, easy to approach, open to new ideas, communicative and enthusiastic. He was also described as collaborative, a team-builder and problem-solver, as having a good reputation in the community and being a good ambassador for the Centre. Respondents highlighted the sense of caring and interest the Local Manager conveyed to staff, and his ability to obtain resources and problem solve immediate office-related problems. Regular meetings were held for staff to discuss issues and share information.

Some respondents also identified areas of the on-site management that were somewhat problematic. One issue involved problems with on-site management as a whole rather than issues related to the Local Manager. It was somewhat unclear about how the Local Manager fitted into the management of LSS on-site staff considering the complex managerial/reporting system of LSS. Some respondents were concerned that the Local Manager did not have a clear role in supervising all staff at the site in all areas.

There was a concern raised by many respondents that, at the management level, staffing needs had not been anticipated or planned sufficiently in advance. This had led to pressures on staff and problems with client wait times. Other comments included management sometimes having difficulty in taking forceful direction in cases where this was required or following through on specific details of policies.¹³

¹² An additional staff person was hired to assist with outreach in December 2007. The impact of this position was not addressed in the evaluation.

¹³ The on-site management did not have the authority to address all policy and practice issues that arose during the implementation phase.

In terms of resolving these issues, it was suggested that the Local Manager be given more time to manage these issues, that team building meetings be continued and enhanced, and that specific reporting and management structures be clarified.

9.10 Degree to Which the Centre's Organizational Objectives have been Achieved and Benefits of the Service

One of the most significant goals of the Nanaimo Centre is to provide a centralized access point for clients who require family justice services and information. Staff and administration respondents were asked whether they felt that the Centre had advanced the objective of being a "front door" to the family justice system for clients in the community. Eighty percent of the staff and administrators who addressed this question felt that this objective had been achieved. There was a strong consensus on the part of respondents that the major benefit of the Centre – as an efficient, convenient, helpful, relevant centralized, one-stop shopping place for clients to access a range of comprehensive and consistent services – had been achieved.

The benefits of the Centre to other agencies were described as providing enhanced services and resources to agencies that are both consistent and focused. Respondents also believed the services provided at the Centre reduced the costs and burden on the court system, although this benefit has not been specifically measured

Three factors were described by staff limiting the implementation objectives of the Centre to some degree. These were that:

- Some relevant key partners had not yet been directly involved in delivering services at or in relation to the Centre;
- The current staffing levels in some areas had made it difficult (in the last phase of the implementation), to meet client needs in a timely way;
- Although staff felt their working relationships were good there was still a concern that because the client/case confidentiality issue had not been resolved, some intake, file management and collaborative processes had been affected.

9.11 Effectiveness of the Model

One of the most innovative aspects of the Centre has been the bringing together of two key partners (LSS and FJSD) to develop, implement, resource and manage the Centre. Over 80% of the respondents described this partnership model as a co-location or partially integrated model. Most respondents said that the model had had a high or moderate level of effectiveness.

With the exception of the sharing of case and client information (which received lower ratings), on-site staff rated aspects such as general information sharing, team-work and case flow very positively. The major challenges related to the implementation of the model were described by staff and administrators as the following:

- Many key respondents felt that there had been a lack of sufficient attention in the planning phase to the operational, management and policy differences between the two key partners. Differences were seen

to exist in a number of areas including the handling of client files, core operating principles related to confidentiality, information sharing, staffing and data management. It was felt that these differences or their impacts on service delivery had not been clearly identified or discussed in the planning phase.

- Some respondents suggested that there was a lack of common cultural understanding between the two partners on what the ultimate objective or vision of the Centre was, and how this should be conveyed to all staff or how it should be incorporated in staff hiring and training policies.

9.12 “Lessons Learned”

Staff and administrators were specifically asked to identify the “lessons learned” from the implementation phase of the Centre that could be considered in the implementation of similar projects. In some cases, these “lessons learned” are noted elsewhere in this report, however, in response to this specific question respondents suggested that the following be considered.

- 1) Clearly designating a component of a pre-planning process that would identify cultural, structural, data management, organizational and policy differences between partners and define methods to address them from a policy, legislation or practice perspective.
- 2) Increasing the degree of upfront staff training required in specific areas including office management and related to an understanding of family justice/court procedures and documents, (where required).
- 3) Anticipating and planning for staff requirements in advance of their being required and reviewing these plans on a regular basis.
- 4) Providing an increased capacity at the Centre to address Supreme Court matters.
- 5) Developing a clear line of authority and simplified management structure to meet the needs of the Centre, all staff and partners.
- 6) Developing and supporting the development of an on-going oversight committee that would include all key partner representatives to identify service and evaluation issues, support buy-in (at all levels) to the project and troubleshoot emerging problems on a timely basis.
- 7) Developing and implementing hiring and training policies for staff that support the overall vision and goals of the Centre.

10.0 SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

Section 10.0 provides a summary of the key findings arising from the evaluation presented by theme.

1) **Growth in the Number of Visitors to the Centre**

There was a strong and consistent growth in the number of visitors to the Centre during the implementation phase. Data indicates that there was a 32% growth in the number of visits to the Centre from the first to third quarters. In the first nine months, 1,180 (unique) clients visited the Centre and made 2,140 visits. 1828 brief counselling and brief services (frequently delivered by telephone) were provided to clients during this period.

Data provided by the Legal Services Society indicates that 440 clients were referred to Legal Aid Intake from April-December 2007. Seventy-nine percent of these were deemed eligible for Legal Aid. Of those not eligible, 14% were referred to external services including services at the Centre.

2) **Benefits of the Integrated Model**

Eighty-five percent of the key justice partners felt that the centralized or “hub” service model had been very beneficial for clients. The “one-stop shopping” model was considered to be the most important outcome of the expanded Centre. Key justice partners also felt that the Centre provided local agencies with a place to refer clients as well as encouraging a collaborative approach to solving family legal issues.

There was also a very strong consensus among Centre staff and administrators that this central objective had been achieved and was beneficial for clients. Benefits to the family justice system as a whole were also identified, including reductions in the use of court time.

There was a strong level of agreement among clients participating in the Client Survey that the integration of family justice services within a central location had been very beneficial. Eighty-six percent of the respondents gave this outcome a high rating.

Thirty-eight percent of the clients in the Client Survey said that they were able to resolve most or all of their family legal problems through services provided at the Centre. Twenty-three percent were not able to resolve any of their family justice problems. This was primarily due to relationship issues between parents rather than any aspect of the service. Relationship problems were also identified as the major barrier to solving previous family justice problems.

3) **Assessment of the Physical Site, Location and Hours of Service of the Centre**

The proximity of the Centre to the Courthouse and most of the characteristics of the Centre were given high ratings by key justice partners, staff and clients. However, feedback provided in January/February 2008 suggests that the Centre may be close to physical capacity in terms of staff and client use. A lack of signage at the street level was identified as an issue. Staff suggested that the hours of the Centre be expanded to accommodate working parents although clients included in the Client Survey gave the hours of availability a positive rating.

4) **Key Justice Partner Awareness and Assessment of Services at the Centre**

Eighty-three percent of key justice partners said that they were specifically informed about the expanded services at the Centre and had a high level of understanding of the mandate and main services being provided. Almost half said they had specific questions that they would like further information about. These included the degree to which Supreme Court issues were being addressed at the Centre and whether clients from other communities were eligible to receive help.

Most key justice partners had regular and frequent contact with staff at the Centre and seventy-six percent of the key justice partners assessed the working relationship between themselves and staff at the Centre as very positive.

Eighty-six percent of the respondents were quite or very satisfied with the level of communication and collaboration between their organizations and the Centre.

Some key justice partners identified the level of staffing and the visibility of the Centre in the community as issues. The proximity of the Centre to the Courthouse and the convenience of the hours at the Centre were very positively assessed. Improvements to signage and increased training for some staff in family legal matters (especially completing court documents) was suggested by some key justice partners.

Clients gave the “knowledge and experience” of staff very high ratings and wait times for appointments lower ratings.

5) **Effectiveness of the On-Site Management**

On-site management at the Centre was considered to be very effective. The Local Manager was described by staff as responsive, collaborative, supportive and a team builder. Staff suggested that the positive reputation of the Local Manager in the community had raised the profile of the Centre, especially with community services and agencies. Some problems were identified in relation to the coordinating authority of the site manager in relation to all staff positions. There was consensus among the staff that these issues had usually been resolved informally.

6) **Referrals and Promotion of the Centre**

Data from the Front Desk Records indicated that word of mouth accounted for approximately a third of the referrals to the Centre. Eight percent of the first time referrals of clients to the Centre were from community service agencies. Rule 5 referrals to the Centre decreased throughout the implementation phase. Few clients appeared to visit the Centre as a result of web-related information.

Fifty-six percent of the respondents participating in the Key Justice Partner Survey said that they made frequent referrals to the Centre. Eighty-two percent of the key justice partners said they were satisfied with the level of referrals being made.

The Centre uses a variety of methods to inform the community about the Centre including official launches, open houses and direct contact by staff with key justice agencies. Eighty-three percent of the key justice partners said that they had been directly informed about the expanded services by staff at the Centre (usually the Local Manager). Results suggest that the service mandate of the Centre is well known in the community.

Both key justice partners and staff/administrators described the Aboriginal community as one where more outreach was required (this was despite 19% of the clients in the Client Survey identifying themselves as Aboriginal or Metis). Suggestions for increasing the involvement of the Aboriginal community included building direct contact with the community, maintaining the Aboriginal PAS (despite limited attendance), delivering some services within Aboriginal organizations and providing more legal assistance to address poverty law matters.

7) **Use and Assessment of the Resource Room**

There was limited staffing of the Resource Room until December 2007. An additional staff person was hired in December 2007 to assist clients. Data collected on the Resource Room Client Feedback Form indicated that sixty-four clients used the Resource Room during the implementation phase.

Eighteen percent of the clients participating in the Client Survey said that they used the Resource Room, primarily to pick up pamphlets and brochures.

Eighty-eight percent of the clients who completed the Resource Room Client Feedback Form said that they had received most or all of the information they required at the Resource Room and the rate of satisfaction was equally high for clients participating in the Client Survey.

Data from the Resource Room Client Feedback Form indicated that there was a statistical association between clients finding the legal information they required and whether they received staff assistance.

8) **Assessment of the Centre by Clients with Children**

About 10% of clients bring children with them to the Centre. Sixty-seven percent of the parents with young children thought the Centre was very well equipped and welcoming to children. Parents made several suggestions for improving the facilities in relation to children. Suggestions included developing a more clearly designated play area at the Centre, adding a sound barrier between the play space and meeting offices and the addition of more toys and books. Staff felt a baby's change table would be helpful in the washrooms.

9) **Use of Services Within the Centre**

A comprehensive assessment of service use and internal referrals was completed in the evaluation. Internal service referral data was tracked by Family Justice Counsellors. Findings from an analysis of this data indicated that:

- Mothers appear to use more services than fathers and receive more referrals at the first visit;
- Client needs are systematically reviewed with 80% of the clients and debriefing occurs on a regular basis;
- Fathers appear to receive more settlement readiness consulting than mothers;
- Most referrals to Legal Aid Intake occur at the first visit;
- Specific counselling related to children's needs occurs only at the first visit;
- There are few referrals of clients to the Resource Room made by non LSS services at the Centre.

10) **Impact of the Centre on Helping Clients Resolve their Family Justice Problems**

Almost 40% of the clients participating in the Client Survey said that they were able to solve most or all of their family justice problems through services provided at the Centre.

Twenty-three percent of the clients said that they were not able to resolve their current family legal problems through services provided at the Centre. In 43% of these, relationship issues were again cited as the main barrier. This finding confirms the importance of relationship issues rather than the services available or provided as the main barrier to resolving family legal problems.

11) **Issues Arising in the Implementation Phase**

There were several issues identified in the staff and administrative interviews as affecting the implementation phase.

There were concerns that staffing was insufficient in some areas late in the implementation phase as the volume of clients continued to grow. A number of staff suggested that, in future projects of this type, staff requirements need to be planned and plans updated on a regular basis.

Some important cultural, organizational, structural and related differences between the two key partners were not fully identified, discussed and resolved during the planning or pre-implementation phases. Key differences in terms of handling client confidentiality issues arose in the implementation phase. The use of an on-going oversight committee to address emerging issues or those arising from the evaluation was suggested.

There was a general agreement that a fully integrated model has not been completely achieved but that the partially integrated model works well at the client level and that real benefits for clients, key justice partners and the family justice system have been achieved. Staff value the working relationships in place at the Centre although there was a sense that an overall collective vision for the Centre is sometimes lacking.

Staffing at the Resource Room was limited in the implementation phase and affected use of this resource by clients and Centre staff. A recent addition of staffing should assist with this problem.

There are two administrative streams operating at the Centre and this has affected the clarity of the role of the Local Manager to some degree. In contrast to FJSD, the LSS management structure involves at least five reporting authorities for specific staff at the Centre. Although the

relationships have worked well and problems have been resolved on an informal basis, there were concerns expressed in some of the staff interviews that authority of the Local Manager needs to be clarified and lines of authority simplified, wherever this is feasible and appropriate.