

An Evaluation of Family Services of the Legal Services Society

Final Report

For

Legal Services Society



October 4, 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Executive Summary	v

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview of Services Involved in the Evaluation	1
2.0	Methodology	3
2.1	Survey Objectives	3
2.2	Survey Questionnaire	3
2.3	Experience and Training of Interviewers	4
2.4	Selection of sample	5
2.5	Contact Procedures and Results	7
2.6	Limitations and Strengths of the Methodology	9
3.0	Client Demographics and Originating Service	11
4.0	Resolution of Original Issue	13
5.0	Services Used by Clients	25
6.0	Reasons for Non-Resolution of Issues	33
7.0	Issues That Re-Emerge After Initial Resolution	36
8.0	New But Related Issues	43

Appendix 1: Client Questionnaire

Appendix 2: Supplementary Tables

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Time Period of Program Samples	6
Table 2:	Results of Survey Contacts	8
Table 3:	Results of Survey Contacts, by Type of LSS Service.....	10
Table 4:	Demographics of Clients.....	12
Table 5:	Service Used by Client from which He/She was Referred to Evaluation.....	12
Table 6:	Frequency of Issues.....	16
Table 7:	Types of Issues and Degree of Completion	17
Table 8:	Degree of Completion, by Demographics	18
Table 9:	Degree of Completion, by Type of Service Used.....	19
Table 10:	Satisfaction with Outcome of Issues (only for issues that were resolved)	20
Table 11:	Satisfaction with Outcome, by Demographics.....	21
Table 12:	Client Satisfaction with Outcome, by Service Type.....	22
Table 13:	Types of Issues and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved).....	23
Table 14:	Types of Services and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved).....	24
Table 15:	LSS and Other Services used by Survey Sample.....	28
Table 16:	Comparison of Total Respondent Usage of each Service with the number of Clients referred to the Evaluation from that Service	29
Table 17:	Order of Use of Services.....	30
Table 18:	Rating of Helpfulness of Service in Getting Client Closer to a Resolution.....	31
Table 19:	Whether Service Referred Client to other Legal Services	32
Table 20:	Reason Why Issues Did Not Get Resolved.....	34
Table 21:	Types of Issues, and Time for Issues to Re-emerge After Original Resolution	38
Table 22:	Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution	39
Table 23:	Types of Services Used for Issues that Start Up Again, and Comparison with Original LSS Services Used.....	40
Table 24:	Degree of Completion of Restarted Issues.....	41
Table 25:	Degree of Satisfaction with Outcome of Restarted Issues (completed cases only)....	42
Table 26:	New but Related Issues that Arise, and Comparison with Re-emerged Issues	45

Table 27: Types of Issues and Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues.....	46
Table 28: Degree of Completion of New Issues	47
Table 29: Issues Impacting Family Issues, but for which Client has been Unable to Obtain Legal Assistance	48
Table S1: Comparison of LSS populations and Survey Sample for Selected Demographics	58
Table S2: Usage of Services by LSS Program Clients (completed interviews only).....	59
Table S3: Client Rating of Helpfulness of the service in getting them closer to a resolution.....	61
Table S4: Which Services were Mentioned or Involved Referrals	62
Table S5: Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution	64
Table S6: Services Used for Cases that Start Up Again, by type of Issue Involved.....	65
Table S7: Types of Issues and Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues.....	67

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to thank David Griffiths and Sherry MacLennan of the Legal Services Society (LSS) for their helpful input in multiple revisions of the instruments for this survey, their efficiency in soliciting and assembling client lists for the overall sample, and their indefatigable and good-humoured willingness to troubleshoot issues on a regular basis.

Olga Lefort of LSS did a wonderful job of reviewing case notes and screening files for safety issues, which was essential in ensuring that it was appropriate for the evaluation interviewers to contact clients.

I also appreciate the quick turnaround of Evan Symons and Asish Singh in generating client case formats and data on demographic background of clients from the CMS and LawLine systems.

Thanks too to Peggie-Ann Kirk, the senior interviewer and case database manager for her usual dedicated and quality work, and for the other four interviewers who dealt with a complicated and demanding interview format with dedication and sensitivity: Kay Charbonneau, Elise Currie-Roberts, Heather Fox and Suzanne Murphy.

Meran Currie-Roberts managed to complete all data entry and editing mere weeks before the birth of her first child. Anthony Beks of Capital Stenographic Services word processed the report with his usual speed and upbeat humour.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This is the final report of an evaluation of service outcomes of 812 clients from nine Legal Services Society (LSS) programs that provide information, advice and/or representation services to clients with family legal issues.

Survey Objectives

The original objectives for this study as outlined by LSS were to:

- 1) Analyze the nine services in reference to the following questions:
 - What legal issue(s) did the client have?
 - What LSS family law services did the client use?
 - What services, if any, other than LSS family law services, did the client use?
 - Of the client legal issue(s) identified, which issue(s) were resolved? Was the resolution formal or informal?
 - Did the resolved legal issue(s) become a legal issue(s) again? If so, within what time period (e.g., 6 months, 1 year)? What was the reason that the legal issue(s) arose again? What steps did the client take to address the re-emerging legal issue(s)? Which of the re-emerging legal issue(s) were resolved and was there a formal or informal resolution?
 - Did new legal issues emerge for the client? If so, what were these legal issues and how were they dealt with (e.g., use of LSS family law services, other services or other)?
 - Of the client's legal issue(s) not resolved, what was the reason for non-resolution (e.g., change of circumstances, barriers to court access, and/or delays in the court process).
- 2) Determine how the nine services are working together.
- 3) Determine the types of services which appear to be most effective in achieving formal or informal resolutions to client family law issues.

Methodology

The survey was conducted by telephone between February and August 2006, using five interviewers experienced with law and/or social issues and also with telephone surveys. Because the evaluation was outcome focused, a decision was made to draw samples of clients that used each service as long ago as reasonably possible, taking into consideration the starting date of the service and the availability of client contact information. Thus in some cases the client samples were drawn from cases one year old, in others up to 3 1/2 years. The advantage of taking older cases is that they are more likely to have reached an initial conclusion and also have had time (in some cases) either to break down and be addressed again, and/or to involve new but related issues. The opportunity for these types of patterns to evolve and be defined through research was of paramount concern to LSS. The obvious disadvantage of using old cases is that many

clients are no longer able to be contacted. Part of the methodological challenge was to find the balance between these advantages and disadvantages.

The 812 interview respondents were drawn from the following services:

▪ Emergency Services Referral	207
▪ Extended Services Referral	75
▪ Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	173
▪ Family Advice Lawyer Project	102
▪ Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	64
▪ Enhanced LawLine (advice) service	73
▪ Limited Scope Supreme Court Referrals	96
▪ LawLink self-users	7
▪ Legal Information Outreach Workers	15

The first two represent referral services, the next four advice services, Limited Scope falls between representation and advice, and the last two are information services.

Overall, 2494 contact attempts resulted in 812 completed interviews (33%), 1180 cases where it was not possible at all to make a contact (47%), 266 cases (11%) where no contact could be made after 6 – 12 attempts, 138 cases which precluded calls for administrative reasons (6%), 44 cases (2%) where an interview could not be made even though a party had been reached, and 49 refusals (2%).

The primary limitation was that the age of the samples and the resulting low contact rate, combined with the differing time sequence of the samples, meant that it was not possible to obtain a representative sample of cases from each program. The strengths were that there was a much higher rate of completed cases (i.e., a low “pending” rate) than had been achieved in earlier LSS surveys, so the outcome data was more definitive. For most programs, the sample was large enough to permit useful cross-tabulations of data.

Findings

Findings in this report are presented in 29 tables in the main body of the report, plus seven supplementary tables as appendices. The key findings are:

Issue types and resolution

- Custody, access and child maintenance/support are each involved in approximately half (49-56%) of all cases.
- There is an average of 2.1 family issues per case.
- Only 17% of issues are still pending. This rate is much lower than that experienced in earlier evaluations for the LSS of duty counsel and LawLine programs, and lends support to the methodological decisions described above.
- Not including pending cases, the combined resolution rate (i.e. “completely resolved” and “resolved, but issue re-emerged”) is 85% for completed issues. Only 7% of completed issues had “no resolution.”

- 19% of all issues that are completely resolved at one point re-emerge at a later date. Access and child support had the highest rates of re-emergence (25% and 27% respectively). Issues re-emerged in aboriginal cases at a higher rate (29%) than in non-aboriginal cases (18%).
- Although for reasons explained in the body of the report, service-related completion data should be considered with caution, the Family Advice Lawyer Project has a significantly higher “completely finished” rate than the other eight services. The initial resolution rates of the Provincial Family Duty Counsel service and of LawLine are high, but they also have a higher rate (25% and 30% respectively) of re-emergence of issues than other services. Thus in terms of “completely finished” issues their rates, as well as most of Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel, are the lowest of the nine services.
- In 77% of all resolved issues, the client was “mostly” or “completely” satisfied with the outcome.
- There is a statistically significant higher rate of satisfaction among female than male clients, and among aboriginal than non-aboriginal clients.
- The Family Advice Lawyer Project and Limited Scope Referral Program had the most positive client responses concerning satisfaction with outcomes.
- 90% of resolved issues were confirmed by court order or a written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer.

Use of services

- Clients used an average of 3.3 services to resolve their family legal issue(s).
- Although all clients used LSS services, they also used non-LSS services for 23% of their overall issues.
- Analysis of the order of use of services helped clarify that services such as LawLine, Legal Aid Intake and Family Justice Counselors tend to be front-line services (i.e., used earlier on by clients). Others such as Limited Scope Supreme Court referrals and Extended Services Referral tend to be more end-point services. Other services such as printed materials, the Internet (e.g., LawLink), LIOWs, private lawyers and various community advocacy services may be used at any point in the client’s quest for resolution to his/her issue(s).
- There are frequently repeat visits of services by clients for the same problem with Emergency Services Referral, Community Advocacy Services, Family Justice Counsellors, and private lawyers.
- Clients gave high ratings of helpfulness (in terms of moving their case towards resolution) to Emergency Services Referrals, Extended Services Referrals and Legal Aid intake.
- The main “networkers” or “referrers” are Legal Aid Intake, LawLine, Family Justice Counselors, community advocacy services and (although based on very few cases) LIOWs.

Reasons for non-resolution of issues

- Although based on only 104 issues overall, the main reason for non-resolution is system barriers, with other reasons fairly evenly divided between relationship dynamics, clients' personal circumstances and "other" reasons. Systemic and relationship barriers are more prominent for clients of the two referral services (Emergency and Extended), while client personal barriers are considerably more significant for advice clients than for referral clients.

Issues that re-emerge after their initial resolution

- 189 respondents reported on 265 issues that re-emerged after initial resolution.
- Child support issues emerged on average at 7.7 months, access issues at 7.6 months and custody issues at 10.1 months.
- The two principal reasons for re-emergence of issues was refusal by one or other party to comply with an order or agreement, and the need for the individual to adapt to a changing situation.
- There was no completely reliable method of determining whether clients with re-emerged issues were able to address these issues at the same as or higher level than the original issues. However, use of a surrogate measure suggests that this is in fact the case.
- In 20% of re-emerging issues, clients did not contact a resource, despite having done so before.
- The non-resolution rate of re-emerged issues is 37%, (if pending cases are excluded) considerably higher than the 7% for original issues.
- The satisfaction rate for completed issues that have re-emerged is somewhat lower than for original issues (68% versus 77%).

New but related issues that emerge after resolution of the original issue

- Child support features as a new issue with the same regularity as it did in original issues, but new custody and access issues are less prominent. Divorce is mentioned more frequently.
- Less than half as many services are used by clients for new issues (1.4 per client) as for the original issues (3.3).
- If pending cases are excluded from the analysis, the rate of "non-resolution" of new issues (35%) is virtually the same as that for re-emerged issues (37%).

Other legal issues that have had an impact on family issues

- 10% of clients in a sub-sample of this survey reported that other legal issues had impacted resolution of their family issues.
- Of 44 issues that impacted resolution of family issues, the two primary types of matter were criminal (13) and debt (13).

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of an evaluation of service outcomes of 812 clients from nine Legal Services Society (LSS) programs that provide services to clients with family law issues.

The report presents basic client outcome data and related findings that may be useful to LSS in upcoming decisions concerning resource allocations for its family law services. It should not be considered as a needs analysis, as it did not involve persons who have legal needs but who have not used LSS, nor did the questionnaire (in Appendix 1) explore coverage or eligibility issues.

Data is presented in 29 tables, with accompanying text primarily in point form. Seven supplementary tables are also included in Appendix 2. It is important to emphasize that the data is presented in relation to client issues and services used, not cases. This is because cases typically involve more than one issue and more than one service. Outcomes and subsequent events may differ, depending on the issue and services used.

1.1 Overview of Services Involved in the Evaluation

There were nine services that were included in the evaluation. Two are representation services:

- Emergency Services Referrals, involving representation to financially eligible people where there has been violence or there is a risk of violence, and may include such services as restraining orders, supervised access orders, changes to custody or access orders, and non-removal orders. This service is available throughout the province.
- Extended Services Referrals, involving services in addition to those provided above if clients would be at greater risk if their high conflict cases were left unresolved. Extended services are available throughout the province.

Four are advice services:

- Provincial Family Duty Counsel. In this service, lawyers give legal advice to unrepresented clients with family law and child protection problems, speaking in court on simple matters such as adjournments, consent and emergency restraining orders, uncontested custody, access and support hearings. They can also help draft or review documents and negotiate issues, but do not represent clients at trial. This service is currently available in 45 provincial courts around the province.
- Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel. This service is essentially the same as the previous one, but is offered in 15 Supreme Court locations.
- Family Advice Lawyer Project, in which family lawyers provide up to three hours of legal advice to low-income parents experiencing separation or divorce, about custody, access, guardianship, child support, property, tentative settlement agreements and court procedures. A joint service with the Ministry of Attorney General's Family Justice Services Division, it is offered in six family justice counsellor offices in the province.
- Enhanced LawLine provides up to three hours of "brief services" to low income people, including legal advice, written opinions, follow-up calls to clients to check progress, phone calls on a caller's behalf to third parties, help with correspondence and documents,

or similar services that can be delivered during, or shortly after a telephone conversation. It covers family law and a range of issues such as poverty, criminal and immigration law, and is available on a 1-800 basis throughout the province.

One service falls in between full representation and advice:

- Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral, which involves low income people who are not eligible for emergency referral services but cannot avoid taking their dispute to Supreme Court, and who need more assistance than family duty counsel and advice lawyers can provide. They may be eligible for 14 hours of assistance from a lawyer in matters such as discussion of property or varying a Supreme Court order.

Two of the nine services are information-only services:

- LawLink, a website designed to help people with low incomes and their advocates find current, relevant, and easy-to-use legal information and self-help resources on the Internet. Public access terminals featuring LawLink are available in 14 communities and through government agents throughout the province. Individuals can also access the site directly from their own computer.
- Legal Information Outreach Workers (LIOWs) are LSS staff members who help people use LawLink, provide printed information and refer individuals to other LSS services. The service is available in seven centres.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

A telephone survey of clients of the nine LSS services described in Section 1.1 was conducted in the 6 1/2 month period between early February and mid-August, 2006. This section describes the survey objectives, the survey questionnaire, selection of the sample, training of the interviewers, client contact results, and strengths and limitations of the data.

2.1 Survey Objectives

The original objectives for this study as outlined by LSS were to:

- 1) Analyze the nine services in reference to the following questions:
 - What legal issue(s) did the client have?
 - What LSS family law services did the client use?
 - What services, if any, other than LSS family law services, did the client use?
 - Of the client legal issue(s) identified, which issue(s) were resolved? Was the resolution formal or informal?¹
 - Did the resolved legal issue(s) become a legal issue(s) again? If so, within what time period (e.g., 6 months, 1 year)? What was the reason that the legal issue(s) arose again? What steps did the client take to address the re-emerging legal issue(s)? Which of the re-emerging legal issue(s) were resolved and was there a formal or informal resolution?
 - Did new legal issues emerge for the client? If so, what were these legal issues and how were they dealt with (e.g., use of LSS family law services, other services or other)?
 - Of the client's legal issue(s) not resolved, what was the reason for non-resolution (e.g., change of circumstances, barriers to court access, and/or delays in the court process).²
- 2) Determine how the nine services are working together.
- 3) Determine the types of services which appear to be most effective in achieving formal or informal resolutions to client family law issues.

2.2 Survey Questionnaire

The survey questionnaire shown in Appendix I was developed in interaction with LSS staff over the course of seven drafts to address the objectives listed in Section 2.1. Although the questions closely reflect those just described, three issues in the construction of the questionnaire require mention.

¹ An informal resolution is defined as a verbal or de facto agreement about the legal issue. A formal resolution is defined as a written agreement that was based on legal advice and witnessed; or a court order.

² Non-resolution of legal issue is defined as not having an informal or formal resolution to a legal issue where conflict around the legal issue(s) still exists.

Firstly, the primary units for data collection in the questionnaire were the client “issue,” and the services used to address that issue. This approach was in recognition of the fact that when clients come to a service, they are usually addressing several related issues at once. Some issues may be addressed sooner, more satisfactorily and at different levels of formality than others. Furthermore, clients tend to use more than one service to address a problem, so it was important to understand the interconnections and sequences between services, and their differing helpfulness in moving the issues toward resolution. For this reason, data was collected in the matrix formats shown in the questionnaire.

Secondly, following the Interim Report based on 200 interviews to March 31st, a decision was taken to explore with the remaining respondents the supplementary questions shown on the final page of the questionnaire. These were intended to explore reasons for client dissatisfaction with services, why some clients did not use any services when problems re-emerged, and other legal issues that impact on the resolution of family issues. Because these questions were introduced later in the survey period, they involve a smaller number of respondents.

Thirdly, and again following the interim report, it was decided to divide the third answer under “type of resolution” on page 2 of the questionnaire into two categories. In this revised questionnaire, choice #3 is therefore omitted and replaced with choices #4 and #5. The reporting of this question in Tables 13 and 14 takes all these choices into account.

2.3 Experience and Training of Interviewers

The challenge in this survey was not the questions themselves, but in the need for the interviewers to grasp the nature of the legal issues being examined, and the combinations of almost 20 services which could be used to address them. Clients frequently do not know the names of services they use, so where multiple services were used, the interviewers had to understand the nature, location and restrictions involved for each program and to be able to help the client identify those services (including other services to which they might have been referred). Interviewer judgment was also required to determine whether an issue was resolved in the terms designated by LSS (even if a client didn’t like the outcome), and the nature of helpfulness of the service in “getting the client closer to a resolution.”

These challenges were addressed in several ways. Firstly, all five interviewers were mature individuals with at least a bachelor degree, prior experience in interviewing and in justice, government or social service settings. Secondly, a half day training session was held to explain and provide written background on each of the LSS programs to thoroughly review and discuss all questions in the questionnaire, and to explain the differing sample origins and background recording sheets that were used with each program. Thirdly, the questionnaire itself contained a number of key definitions or explanations for quick reference by the interviewer. Finally, as the survey progressed, either the interviewers or data entry clerk would bring to the attention of the director problems about recording responses to particular questions. In each of these instances, a decision was reached – often in conjunction with LSS – and that decision was distributed in writing to all of the interviewers to maintain as much uniformity of interviewing and recording procedures as possible.

2.4 Selection of sample

There were several constraints on how the sample of cases for this study could be drawn:

- *The fact that the study was focused on outcomes necessitated selection of cases from as early a time period as possible for each type of service.*

In the field of family law, cases frequently take many months or even years to achieve resolution. Furthermore, because of the dynamics that are associated with families that have broken up or are breaking up, issues may open up again after an initial resolution, and new but related issues may emerge at a later date.

If follow-up evaluation interviews are conducted too soon after the client's initial contact with the legal service, a high proportion of cases are often still unresolved and therefore very little can be said about case outcomes. For this reason, as shown in Table 1 samples of family law clients in this study are drawn from cases with initial LSS program service in 2004 or even earlier. Later time periods were only chosen if a program was new. The services are listed from most recent date of the sample to the oldest.

The advantage of drawing a sample from an older period is a high rate of completed cases and therefore an ability to provide useful long term outcome data. The disadvantage is that successful contact rates with clients are much lower than in surveys of more recent cases, and it is therefore not possible to obtain a representative sample.

- *It was not possible to pick a single, uniform time period and source of respondents for all nine programs.*

Some programs, such as Emergency Services Referrals, have a long-standing history, and it is a relatively simple matter to extract and review a sample from LSS's central management system. Other programs (e.g., Extended Services Referrals) started as pilot projects, were discontinued, and then started at a later date. Still others (e.g., Limited Scope Supreme Court Referrals) only started in May of 2005. Had all programs existed in the same (early) time period, the drawing of a representative stratified random samples might have been possible, but this was precluded in the circumstances.

- *Programs varied significantly in their capacity to provide lists of clients who had given permission to be contacted for research purposes.*

The Legal Information Outreach Worker program and LawLink do not maintain client information, so names of clients who had volunteered to participate in earlier LSS evaluation studies were the only (and very limited) source of potential respondents. Family Duty Counsel programs do not maintain centralized databases of client contact

Table 1: Time Period of Program Samples

Program	Time Period of Sample	Total # of months	Comments
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referrals	May 16, 2005 to February 6, 2006	9 months	All cases in this period were included except those flagged for client sensitivities.
Extended Services Referrals	Part 1: June 25, 2003 to March 31, 2004 Part 2: March 1 to October 31, 2005	17 months	Part 1 was a pilot project. Part 2 was from period following recommencement of project. All cases in these periods were included except those flagged for client sensitivities.
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	Part 1: November 1 to November 31, 2004. Part 2: First month of operation in 8 sites, all at different times in 2004	Part 1: 1 month Part 2: 1 month	Part 1 in 5 sites only (a predecessor project). Part 2 in 8 sites (different from Part 1 sites) for first month of service, ranging from January 2005 to September 2005 (names forwarded by Duty Counsel).
LawLink	July 2004 to February 2005	8 months	A small subset of respondents in the LawLink evaluation who used LawLink for family law issues without assistance from an LSS staff person between July 2004 and February 2005.
Legal Information Outreach Worker	July 2004 to February 2005	8 months	A small subset of respondents in the LawLink evaluation who used LIOWs for assistance in family law issues.
Family Advice Lawyer Project	September 1 to November 30, 2004	3 months	From 5 out of 6 provincial sites; lawyers who were identified in their billings as having had referrals in the sample period were asked to forward client forms to LSS.
Emergency Services Referrals	September 1 to October 31, 2004	2 months	All cases in this period except those flagged for client sensitivities.
LawLine (Enhanced Advice)	April 5 to May 19, 2004	1.5 months	Sample was limited to cases from an earlier evaluation of LawLine in 2004. Involved all cases for which client approval given.
Provincial Family Duty Counsel	Part 1: November 1, 2002 to October 31, 2003 Part 2: March 1, 2003 to December 31, 2003 Part 3: August 1, 2003 – February 28, 2004	Part 1: 13 months Part 2: 10 months (5 sites), 13 months (1 site) Part 3: 7 months	One part of the sample was drawn from respondents originally in a study of duty counsel clients in Vancouver from November 1, 2002 to October 31, 2003 (27% sample); a supplementary sample was drawn from this site to February 28, 2004. A second part was drawn from respondents in a study of duty counsel provincial sites (62% sample of cases) originally for cases from March 2003 to December 31, 2003, but extended for one site to February 28, 2004. A third sample was drawn of Duty Counsel from four Lower Mainland sites for the period August 1, 2003 to February 28, 2004. (Names forwarded to LSS by duty counsel).

information, so use of respondent names and contacts was again made possible by accessing clients who had participated in earlier studies. This base was supplemented by names forwarded by duty counsel in the field who were contacted by LSS headquarters. Duty counsel clients generally sign forms granting permission to be contacted for research purposes. Finally, the size of the LawLine sample was severely restricted by the fact that the service is offered by phone and clients therefore do not sign waivers. However, a process for obtaining permission from callers was implemented in a 2004 evaluation study of the program, and this client base was used to generate a moderate sized sample for the current study.

- *All cases required screening to avoid any cases in which the caller might be jeopardized by a contact.*

In a small number of cases, a contact by a researcher with a client could potentially cause disturbance to the client, loss of privacy or recrimination by a spouse or ex-spouse. All such cases were flagged and reviewed by LSS staff or duty counsel prior to release of the sample list to Focus Consultants for this study.

2.5 Contact Procedures and Results

Lists of potential respondents for each service were forwarded to Focus Consultants by LSS for inclusion in the sample. Certain names were dropped from the list because they were duplicates, i.e., they had already been forwarded in relation to one of the other eight programs. Up to a maximum of 12 telephone contacts were attempted with all other respondents. The results of the contacts attempts are shown in Table 2, which shows that

- The overall completion rate was 33% (812/2494).
- Only 2% (49/2494) clients refused to participate when contact was made.
- Almost half of the clients (47%, 1180/2494) could not be contacted. The primary reasons for inability to contact clients, comprising 90% of the 1180 situations, were telephone numbers which were no longer in service, wrong numbers, and numbers not recorded on original documentation. These reasons reflect the fact that the samples were of clients who had used LSS programs from two to four years prior to the attempted survey contacts. Furthermore, the fact that family cases usually involved tensions and changes in marital relationships or their sequela makes it unsurprising that a significant proportion of clients had changed domicile and/or contact information.

Table 2: Results of Survey Contacts

Contact Result		Frequency	Percentage
Interviews completed	812	812	33%
Not possible to contact at all	1180	1180	47%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ wrong number (446) ▪ not in service (499) ▪ no phone number (117) ▪ moved; no forwarding number (81) ▪ transition house/hotel, no contact possible (12) ▪ fax number only (10) ▪ incomplete phone number (6) ▪ no longer employed at work number (5) ▪ phone blocked to unknown numbers (4) 			
No contact after 6-12 attempts	266	266	11%
Contact made, but could not interview	44	44	2%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ client didn't remember service (14) ▪ client away during research period (12) ▪ client couldn't be available (10) ▪ client deceased (5) ▪ client claims he/she was refused service (3) 			
Administrative issues requiring that clients be dropped from the sample	138	138	6%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ duplicates (client used two different services, so was only phoned once) (71) ▪ child protection issues (not family issues) (45) ▪ other non-family issues (22) 			
Refusals	49	49	2%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ client declined participation (35) ▪ intermediary would not contact client (8) ▪ client declined because of cell phone charges (6) 			
Other	5	5	0%
TOTAL		2494	100%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) All 22 cases under "Administrative Issues" that were classified as "other non-family issues" were LawLine cases that had a relation to family issues, but were not strictly family matters. They included primarily passport, but also housing, wills and name change issues.

Table 3 shows the results of contact attempts, by the type of LSS service. Comparison of the completion rates with the dates of the samples in Table 1 suggests that the main driver of the completion rate is the age of the sample, that is, samples drawn from more recent time periods have higher completion rates. Four of the five services that had at least some cases from 2005 had the highest completion rates.

2.6 Limitations and Strengths of the Methodology

There were both strengths and limitations to the sample selection methodology used, and therefore of the resulting data. The principal limitations are that:

- The overall successful contact rate was too low to permit achievement of a representative sample of cases. This was primarily a factor of the age of the sample. The problem could not be remedied without inclusion of a significantly greater sample, which for some programs was not possible because they were relatively new, and for others it would have meant a higher rate of “pending” cases for which outcome data could not be gathered. Nonetheless, as pointed out below, the overall sample size was sufficient to make detailed and useful analyses of programs and issues, and on certain demographic measures the sample reflects the population of LSS cases, which lends confidence in the results.
- For the information programs (LawLink and LIOWs), the sample was too small to provide meaningful data. Nevertheless, because clients who were referred to the survey from other programs also mentioned use of these two services, there was an indirect generation of supplementary outcome data about these programs. Because neither program maintains a record of the names of clients or users, it was impossible to generate client lists to supplement the limited list available from an earlier study.
- For reasons explained above, the samples necessarily were drawn from different time periods, which means that there is no common “snapshot” period that the data can claim to represent.

The primary strengths are that:

- The strategy of selecting samples that were as “aged” as possible was successful in producing data with a low rate of “pending” cases. As shown in Table 7, the overall pending rate was only 17%, which meant that outcome data was available on 83% of cases, a significant improvement over earlier studies for LSS, in which the pending rate has ranged from 39% to 52%.³
- Although the samples were not large enough in relation to the population from which they were drawn to allow them to be considered representative, for all programs except

³ This data is from a series of reports conducted by Focus Consultants for LSS. Provincial Family Duty Counsel rate was 39% (*Evaluation of the Family Duty Counsel Project in Six Provincial Sites, Final Report*, April 27, 2004, p. 13). LawLine was 40% (*Evaluation of the LawLine Enhancement Project; Survey of Advice Callers*, October 15, 2004, p. 14). LawLink was 44% (*Evaluation of the LawLink Project, Final Report*, June 7, 2005, p. 40). Expanded Family Duty Counsel was 52% (*Evaluation of the Expanded Family Duty Counsel Project (Robson St. Court House)*, March 31, 2004, p. 17).

LawLink and Legal Information Outreach Workers, the size of the sample was large enough to permit breakdown and comparison of data between programs and in most cases between data categories within programs.

- On two of three demographic measures, there was no statistically significant difference between the demographics of referral programs in LSS's central management system database and their LawLink database when compared with the survey sample for the same programs. Specifically, in comparisons based on gender and aboriginal status, there were no statistically significant differences. A third comparison based on educational attainment revealed statistically significant differences between the LSS populations and the survey sample (these comparisons are shown in Table S1 of Appendix 2). However, as will be shown in Tables 8 and 11 there were no statistically significance differences in responses of clients with different educational attainment. These results lend some confidence that the survey samples, even if below the threshold numbers to be considered representative samples, may nonetheless reflect the makeup of the larger populations.

Table 3: Results of Survey Contacts, by Type of LSS Service

Service Type	Forms Received	Completed Interviews	Not Completed	Percentage Completed
LawLink	12	7	5	58%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	195	96	99	49%
Extended Services Referral	194	75	119	39%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	185	64	121	35%
Provincial Family Duty Counsel	548	173	375	32%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	50	15	35	30%
Emergency Services Referral	707	207	500	29%
LawLine (Enhanced Advice)	251	73	178	29%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	352	102	250	29%
Total	2494	812	1682	33%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally, but do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) See breakdown of "not completed" cases in Table 2.
- 3) Services are listed in descending order of percentage of received forms completed.

3.0 CLIENT DEMOGRAPHICS AND ORIGINATING SERVICE

Tables 4 and 5 present data on client demographics and on the service through which client names were drawn for purposes of the evaluation.

The data in Table 4 shows that users of LSS family law services in this study were predominantly female. A significant majority (76%) had high school graduation or post high school education. As noted in Section 2.6 and in Table 1 of Appendix 2, these demographic results reflect the population results drawn from LSS data for LawLine and referral clients (i.e., Emergency, Extended and Limited Scope referrals) in terms of gender and aboriginal status. However, the survey sample contains a significantly *higher* proportion of respondents with higher education attainments (i.e., “graduated with school” or “post high school”) than the CMS referral population, and a *lower* proportion of those respondents in the LawLink sample.

As discussed in Section 2.6 and shown in Table 5, there is a significant enough size effect in the samples of the three referral and four advice services to permit useful analysis and sub-division of data. However, the samples of the two information services (LawLink and LIOWs) are too small to permit comparison with the other services.

It should be emphasized that the size of the samples for each service does *not* reflect the volume of clients in those services. The sample size for each service is the product of a number of constraints discussed in the previous section, and the main concern was to attempt to develop a large enough sample for analysis and cross-tabulation within each service. For example, the monthly volume of LawLine callers on family matters is higher than the volume of clients for many of the other services, but the sample size was constrained by the difficult process of contacting callers for permission to be included in the original (2004) survey,⁴ and it was not possible to repeat that process with a larger sample for the current survey.

⁴ See footnote 3.

Table 4: Demographics of Clients

Demographic	Frequency	Percent
Gender (N=812)		
▪ Male	238	29%
▪ Female	574	71%
Ethnic Status (N=808; NR=4)		
▪ Aboriginal	69	9%
▪ Non-aboriginal	739	91%
Education (N=688; NR=124)		
▪ No high school	25	4%
▪ Some high school	140	20%
▪ Graduated high school	213	31%
▪ Post high school	310	45%

Notes:

- 1) N = number of respondents who answered the question or for whom data was available; NR = non-response, or data not available.
- 2) Percentages do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.

Table 5: Service Used by Client from which He/She was Referred to Evaluation

Service	Frequency	Percentage
Enhanced LawLine (advice)	73	9%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	175	22%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	64	8%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	99	12%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	15	2%
LawLink	7	1%
Emergency Services Referral	208	26%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	96	12%
Extended Services Referral Program	75	9%
Total	812	100%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) The volume and proportion of clients for each service in this table does *not* reflect the overall volume and proportion of clients for those services on a monthly or yearly basis. See discussion in Sections 2.4, 2.6 and 3.0.

4.0 RESOLUTION OF ORIGINAL ISSUE

Tables 6-14 describe the types of issues involved in the 812 client cases, their degree of completion, client satisfaction with the resolved issue, and the type of resolution involved.

Issues (Table 6)

- Custody, access and client maintenance/support are each involved in approximately half (49-56%) of all cases.
- The second tier issues are spousal maintenance/support, property division and divorce, featured in 11-14% of cases.
- The frequency of restraining orders to prevent violence as an issue may seem low at 5%, given that access to referral services is predicated on there being violence or a risk of violence in the relationship. Analysis of individual services shows that restraining orders to prevent violence comprised 11% (23/207) of emergency services referrals and 13% (10/75) of extended service referrals.
- There was an average of 2.1 family issues per case.
- Of the 12 “other” issues, 4 related to protection (transfer of custody) matters, and 2 each concerning passports and change of name.

Degree of completion (Table 7)

- Overall, only 17% of issues (292/1727) are still pending. This low rate suggests that despite the methodological difficulties involved in drawing samples of “old” cases, it does result in a relatively complete data set about outcomes. The footnote to Table 7 shows that it is in cases that primarily proceed through Supreme Court (property division, divorce, possession of family home) that the pending rates are highest.
- The combined resolution rate for “completely resolved” and “resolved, but issue re-emerged” is 85% (1214/1435) for completed issues. Only 7% (103/1437) of issues that were finished (i.e. on which no more action would be taken) had “no resolution.”⁵
- Possession of family home and guardianship issues achieve high levels of complete resolution responses (86% and 83% respectively). Custody and divorce issues are at the next level (both 74%). The third tier is comprised of access, child support and spousal maintenance (58 – 60%), which are all more subject to changing circumstances, and the resolutions are therefore not always as permanent (see next point).
- 19% (266/1437) of all issues that are completely resolved initially resurfaced at a later point. It is perhaps not surprising that the two issues with higher rates of re-emergence are access (25%) and child maintenance and support (27%). These issues are more subject than others to changes in family composition, residence and financial circumstances.

Degree of completion, by demographics (Table 8)

- Table 8 shows that there are no statistically significant differences on completion responses based on gender or education, but that the differences based on ethnic status are statistically significant. There is a higher rate of completely finished cases for non-

⁵ See definition of “no resolution” in footnote 2 on page 3

aboriginals (67%) than for aboriginals (54%), while issues re-emerge in aboriginal cases at a higher rate (27%) than for non-aboriginals (18%).

Degree of completion by type of service used (Table 9)

- This table presents results for degree of completion by service type. It is important to consider that the type of issue, the degree of conflict, the nature of the client and the complexity of the issue that is being brought to each service are all factors in the rate at which cases can be successfully completed. It should also be remembered that in this table other services may impact positively or negatively the completion rate for any given service (because clients use an average of 3.3 services each). With these caveats noted, the Family Advice Lawyer Project has a significantly higher “completely finished” rate than the other eight services. At the other end of the completion spectrum, the two duty counsel services and LawLine appear to get an initially high resolution (if one combines “completely finished” and “appeared to be completely finished, but issue re-emerged”), but end with lower “completely finished” ratings because the resolution became unraveled. It is also noteworthy that despite the fact that extended service referrals are intended to achieve a solution to complex issues, issues re-emerged in 23% of cases.
- Further analysis of the “no resolution” rates suggests that there is not a major difference between the two major service groupings of referral and advice programs. The combined rates for referral programs (Emergency and Extended) is 7.5% (71/941), while for advice programs (Provincial Family Duty Counsel, Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel, LawLine and Family Advice Lawyer Project) it is 6.2% (59/941), but the individual program rates ranged from 4% to 13%. The Limited Scope program is higher at 13% (16/120) while the two information programs are at 7.9% (21/265). Again, the reader is cautioned that several services contribute to the resolution of a client’s issues, so the figures reflect contributions from other services as well.

Satisfaction with outcome (Table 10)

- Note that satisfaction is only for issues that were completed, (either for better or for worse). “Satisfaction with outcome” is not the same as “satisfaction with the service,” so whether the outcome is favourable strongly colours the client’s response.
- For 77% of all resolved issues (930/1213), the client’s satisfaction with outcome rating was on the positive end of the 4 point scale (“mostly” and “completely”).
- There was little variation in satisfaction across the main issue types.

Satisfaction with outcome, by demographics (Table 11)

- Table 11 shows that there are no statistically significant differences for clients’ satisfaction with outcome based on education, but the differences based on gender and ethnic status are significant at the .05 level of confidence (i.e. the probability of these differences occurring by chance is less than 5%). There is a higher level of satisfaction among females than males (spread across all issues except spousal support and property division) and among aboriginals than non-aboriginals. However, the difference in results between aboriginals and non-aboriginals are more nuanced than the difference for gender. That is, aboriginals are more likely to say they are “completely satisfied” than non-aboriginals, but the *combined* positive response (i.e., “mostly” plus “completely”

satisfied) is slightly higher for non-aboriginals. If the negative answers (“not at all” and “only partly”) are combined, and then analyzed against the combined positive results (“many” and “completely”) there is no statistically significant differences at the .05 level of confidence.

Client satisfaction with outcome, by service type (Table 12)

- Please note that the same caveats concerning Table 9 apply to this table as well.
- As with Table 9, the Family Advice Lawyer Project received the highest positive responses, but is joined by the Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral program. The two referral services (Emergency and Extended) and duty counsel (Provincial and Supreme Court) are in the next level, together with LawLink.
- The satisfaction with outcome responses for LawLine are more positive than their degree of completion results in Table 9, while those for LIOWs are less positive.

Type of resolution (Table 13)

- The overwhelming majority of resolved issues (90%) were confirmed by a court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer. This is not surprising, in that 88% of the cases involved referral or duty counsel/advice lawyer services.
- As explained in Section 2.2, after the interim report, questions were added to the survey instrument to explore whether formal resolutions were achieved by consent or litigation. The results thus form a sub-sample consisting of approximately half the overall sample, and are also presented in Table 13.
- In this sub-sample analysis of court orders, three areas specifically involving children – custody, access and child support – tended to have higher rates of litigation (67-69%) than those issues involving the spouses directly (divorce, asset issues, and spousal maintenance, at 45-61%). It would seem unusual that client support issues should so frequently be litigated, given the existence of the client support guidelines. However, an analysis of the 88 cases, which were, litigated shows that in 52 of these cases custody was also litigated, as was access in 48 cases, and restraining orders in 8 cases. Thus in the large majority of cases, child support was litigated simply as part of an overall package of issues, rather than as a stand-alone issue.

Type of resolution by type of service (Table 14)

- The Family Advice Lawyer Project clearly has a different profile than the other services, in that only 67% of resolutions were by court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer.
- The other significant finding in this table is the high degree of consent (59%) achieved in the formal resolutions of the Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral program. All other programs achieve approximately 40% of formal resolutions by consent, except for emergency and extended services referrals (which by definition are high conflict cases), at 26% and 21% respectively.

Table 6: Frequency of Issues

Type of Issue	Number of Cases Which Involved this Issue	Percentage of Cases Which Involved this Issue (N=812)
Custody	455	56%
Access	418	52%
Child maintenance, support	399	49%
Divorce	110	14%
Property division	90	11%
Spousal maintenance, support	87	11%
Guardianship	66	8%
Restraining order to prevent violence	44	5%
Possession of family home	32	4%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	12	1%
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	6	1%
Other	12	1%

Notes:

- 1) N = Total number of respondents who answered this question.
- 2) There was more than 1 issue possible per case, therefore percentages equal more than 100%. Services are listed in descending order of percentage of cases in which they are involved.

Table 7: Types of Issues and Degree of Completion

Type of Issue	Total finished (non-pending issues)	Degree of Resolution of Finished Cases			
		No Resolution	Situation Changed	Completely resolved	Resolved, but issue re- emerged
Possession of family home	22 100%	-	1 5%	19 86%	2 9%
Guardianship	59 100%	2 3%	3 5%	49 83%	5 8%
Custody (NR=1)	389 100%	23 6%	26 7%	286 74%	54 14%
Divorce (NR=1)	74 100%	12 16%	6 8%	55 74%	1 1%
Restraining order to prevent violence	43 100%	2 5%	7 16%	31 72%	3 7%
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	6 100%	-	1 17%	4 67%	1 17%
Property division	55 100%	9 16%	5 9%	36 65%	5 9%
Access (NR=2)	357 100%	22 6%	32 9%	213 60%	90 25%
Child maintenance, support	347 100%	23 7%	23 7%	207 60%	94 27%
Spousal maintenance, support	64 100%	8 13%	9 14%	37 58%	10 16%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	12 100%	2 17%	3 25%	6 50%	1 8%
Other (NR=1)	9 100%	-	-	9 100%	-
TOTAL, All issues (NR=5)	1437 100%	103 7%	116 8%	952 66%	266 19%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages are totalled horizontally, but may not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) Services are listed in descending order of percentage “completely resolve.” The exception is for “other cases,” listed at the bottom.
- 3) NR = No response.
- 4) This table only shows the results of issues that are finished, i.e., issues that are still pending are excluded. The pending rate for all issues is 17% (289/1726). Pending rates by issues were: property division 39% (35/90); divorce 32% (35/109); possession of family home 31% (10/32); spousal maintenance/support 26% (23/87); “other” issues 18% (2/11); custody 14% (65/454); access 14% (59/416); child maintenance/support 13% (52/399); guardianship 11% (7/66); restraining order to prevent violence 2% (1/44). There were no pending cases for either restraining order to prevent removal of assets or for orders forbidding removal of child from province.

Table 8: Degree of Completion, by Demographics

Demographics	Total	Degree of Completion			
		No Resolution	Situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue	Completely finished	Appeared to be completely finished at one point, but then issue re-emerged later
<i>Gender</i>					
Male	364 100%	26 7%	24 7%	248 68%	66 18%
Female	1072 100%	77 7%	92 9%	704 66%	199 19%
<i>Education</i>					
No High School	35 100%	1 3%	3 9%	26 74%	5 14%
Some High School	215 100%	15 7%	21 10%	140 65%	39 18%
Graduated High School	400 100%	34 9%	36 9%	263 66%	67 17%
Post High school	603 100%	39 6%	41 7%	415 69%	108 18%
<i>Ethnic Status</i>					
Aboriginal	97 100%	9 9%	10 10%	52 54%	26 27%
Non-Aboriginal	1335 100%	94 7%	106 8%	898 67%	237 18%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages may exceed 100% due to rounding
- 2) There are no statistically significant differences between categories of the gender and education measures at the .05 level of confidence. The differences in response between aboriginal and non-aboriginal respondents are significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table 9: Degree of Completion, by Type of Service Used

Service Used	Total	Degree of Completion			
		No Resolution	Situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue	Completely finished	Appeared to be completely finished at one point, but then issue re-emerged later
Family Advice Lawyer Project	208 100%	8 4%	8 4%	166 80%	26 13%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	73 100%	3 4%	5 7%	51 70%	14 19%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	120 100%	16 13%	11 9%	81 68%	12 10%
LawLink	264 100%	11 4%	19 7%	173 66%	61 23%
Emergency Services Referral	648 100%	47 7%	57 9%	409 63%	135 21%
Extended Services Referral Program	293 100%	24 8%	17 6%	184 63%	68 23%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	415 100%	17 4%	27 7%	260 63%	111 27%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	126 100%	16 13%	14 11%	70 56%	26 21%
LawLine Advice	192 100%	18 9%	13 7%	103 54%	58 30%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally, but may not equal 100% due to rounding.
- 2) Services are arranged in descending order, based on the percentage in the “completed finished” column.
- 3) Since clients on average use 3.3 services when addressing their issues (see Table 15), the completion responses for any given service also reflect the contributions of other services. For example, the 184 “completely finished” issues for extended services have also likely been counted in the 409 “completely finished” responses under Emergency Services Referral.

Table 10: Satisfaction with Outcome of Issues (only for issues that were resolved)

Type of Issue	Frequency of Issue	Satisfaction with Outcome			
		Not at all	Only partly	Mostly	Completely
Divorce	56 100%	1 2%	7 13%	5 9%	43 77%
Restraining order to prevent violence	34 100%	3 9%	2 6%	3 9%	26 76%
Guardianship	54 100%	4 7%	6 11%	8 15%	36 67%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	6 100%	1 17%	1 17%	-	4 67%
Custody	339 (NR=1) 100%	32 9%	34 10%	53 16%	220 65%
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	5 100%	-	1 20%	1 20%	3 60%
Access	302 (NR=1) 100%	34 11%	40 13%	57 19%	171 57%
Possession of family home	21 100%	2 10%	6 29%	1 5%	12 57%
Property division	40 (NR=1) 100%	5 13%	6 15%	7 18%	22 55%
Spousal maintenance, support	46 100%	5 11%	9 20%	8 17%	24 52%
Child maintenance, support	301 100%	44 15%	39 13%	63 21%	155 51%
Other	9 100%	-	1 11%	-	8 89%
Total	1213 (NR=3) 100%	131 11%	152 13%	206 17%	724 60%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages are totalled horizontally, but may not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) Issues are listed in descending order of percentages in the “completely” column for satisfaction. The exception is “other” issues, which is listed at the bottom.
- 3) Percentages are not meaningful when the overall frequency is less than 20. Percentages for smaller numbers are recorded here simply for consistency.
- 4) NR = No response.

Table 11: Satisfaction with Outcome, by Demographics

Demographics	Total	Satisfaction with Outcome			
		Not at all	Only Partly	Mostly	Completely
<i>Gender (N=1213)</i>					
Male	315 100%	49 16%	46 15%	62 20%	158 50%
Female	898 100%	82 9%	106 12%	144 16%	566 63%
<i>Education (N=1061)</i>					
No High School	32 100%	2 6%	7 22%	6 19%	17 53%
Some High School	179 100%	28 16%	24 13%	26 15%	101 56%
Graduated High School	329 100%	31 9%	43 13%	61 19%	194 59%
Post high school	521 100%	47 9%	67 13%	90 17%	317 61%
<i>Ethnic Status (N=1209)</i>					
Aboriginal	77 100%	12 16%	8 10%	4 5%	53 69%
Non-Aboriginal	1132 100%	119 11%	142 13%	200 18%	671 59%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages may exceed 100% due to rounding.
- 2) There are no statistically significant differences between categories of the education measure at the .05 level of confidence. The difference in response between male & female respondents and between aboriginals and non-aboriginals is significant at the .05 level of confidence. See also the commentary in the text in regard to differences between aboriginal and non-aboriginal responses.

Table 12: Client Satisfaction with Outcome, by Service Type

Service type	Total	Satisfaction with Outcome	
		Not at all or only partially satisfied	Mostly or completely satisfied
Family Advice Lawyer Project	192 100%	36 19%	156 81%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	93 100%	19 20%	74 80%
Emergency Services Referral	540 100%	131 24%	409 76%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	371 100%	99 27%	272 73%
Extended Services Referral	250 100%	71 28%	179 72%
LawLink	234 100%	67 29%	167 71%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	96 100%	29 30%	67 70%
LawLine Advice	158 100%	54 34%	104 66%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	64 100%	25 39%	39 61%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally.
- 2) Services are arranged in descending order, based on the percentage in the “mostly or completely satisfied” column.
- 3) The original data was in four columns, but the two negative and two positive responses were combined in this table for ease of presentation.
- 4) Since clients use an average of 3.3 services when addressing their issues (see Table 15), the satisfaction responses for any given service also reflect the contributions of other services.

Table 13: Types of Issues and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved)

Type of issue	Frequency of issue	Type of Resolution			Subsample: Number and percentage of orders settled	
		Verbal or de facto	Written agreement, but not reviewed by lawyer	Court order, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by lawyer	By consent (in court or in written agreements)	After court hearing (by litigation)
Restraining order to prevent violence	34 100%	-	1 3%	33 97%	4 14%	24 86%
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	5 100%	-	-	5 100%	-	2 100%
Custody	339 100%	15 4%	20 6%	304 90%	55 33%	109 67%
Access	300 (NR=2) 100%	12 4%	17 6%	271 90%	51 33%	103 67%
Guardianship	54 100%	4 7%	8 15%	42 78%	12 43%	16 57%
Child maintenance, support	301 100%	11 4%	24 8%	266 88%	40 31%	88 69%
Spousal maintenance, support	47 100%	-	3 6%	44 94%	10 40%	15 60%
Property division	41 100%	1 2%	2 5%	38 93%	11 48%	12 52%
Possession of family home	21 100%	1 5%	-	20 95%	7 39%	11 61%
Divorce	56 100%	-	-	56 100%	18 55%	15 45%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	6 100%	-	-	6 100%	2 50%	2 50%
Other	9 100%	-	-	9 100%	5 83%	1 17%
Total	1213 (NR=3) 100%	44 4%	75 6%	1094 90%	215 42%	298 58%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages are totally horizontally, but may not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) NR = No response.
- 3) The last two columns are a subsample of approximately half the category "court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by lawyer." In the latter part of the survey, respondents were asked to differentiate between a formal resolution that was a "court order" by consent, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a "lawyer" and "a court order decided by judge, after a court hearing (i.e., litigation is involved)."

Table 14: Types of Services and Type of Resolution (only for issues that were resolved)

Service Used	Total	Type of Resolution			Subsample: Number and percentage of orders settled	
		Verbal or de facto	Written agreement, but not reviewed by lawyer	Court order, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by lawyer	By consent (in court or in written agreement)	After court hearing (by litigation)
LawLine advice	158 100%	11 7%	7 4%	140 89%	28 38%	45 62%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	371 100%	5 1%	13 4%	353 95%	60 38%	100 63%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	96 100%	1 1%	3 3%	92 96%	18 42%	25 58%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	192 100%	20 10%	44 23%	128 67%	29 41%	41 59%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	64 100%	1 2%	3 5%	60 94%	17 38%	28 62%
LawLink	233 (NR=1) 100%	17 7%	20 9%	196 84%	41 36%	74 64%
Emergency Services Referral	540 100%	6 1%	7 1%	527 98%	94 26%	272 74%
Limited Scope Supreme Court	93 100%	2 2%	1 1%	90 97%	22 59%	15 41%
Extended Services Referral	250 100%	0 0%	0 0%	250 100%	43 21%	161 79%
Total	1997 (NR=1) 100%	63 3%	98 5%	1836 92%	352 32%	761 68%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages are totally horizontally, but may not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) NR = No response.
- 3) The last two columns are a subsample of approximately half the category “court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by lawyer.” In the latter part of the survey, respondents were asked to differentiate between a formal resolution that was a “court order” by consent, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a “lawyer” and “a court order decided by judge, after a court hearing (i.e., litigation is involved).”

5.0 SERVICES USED BY CLIENTS

This section presents client feedback on the frequency and patterns of their use of services to address their issues.

Frequency of use of services (Table 15)

- This table does *not* represent how the average “person off the street” uses LSS and other services, as all clients were referred to this survey from specific services. Data for the frequency of use of services is therefore coloured by the main services from which clients have been drawn for the survey. For example, since many clients of the Emergency Services Referral and the Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel service were selected for an interview, these services will naturally show a higher frequency of use.
- 812 persons used 2692 services, or an average of 3.3 services per client.
- Although all clients used LSS services, they also used non-LSS services for 23% (617/2962) of the overall issues.

Use of services other than the survey sample service (Table 16)

- Table 16 helps to reduce the “colouring” effect alluded to in the first bullet for Table 15. As in Table 15, it shows the overall use of services for all client issues, but also shows the proportion of that use that stems from the sample interviewed. Thus there were 123 issues that were taken to LawLine advice, but 73 of those were from the interview sample for that service. Fifty clients drawn from other service samples also used LawLine, or contributed an extra 68% of total LawLine users. By comparison, only 7 LawLink issues were contributed by the LawLink sample respondents, but overall, LawLink was used by all users for 147 issues. The fact that LawLink and LIOWs were used by clients from other program samples has helped create a larger number of respondents who could offer feedback about those services.

Order of Use of Services (Table 17)

- This table permits a rough classification of service usage patterns. Services with mean order of service usage from 1.6 to approximately 2.1 can be classified as entry level services (LawLine advice 1.6, Legal Aid Intake 1.9, LawLine info 2.1, and Family Justice Counsellors 2.0). In addition, clients started with these organizations first in 50% or more of the organization’s overall client contacts. By contrast, services with higher means (e.g., Limited Scope Supreme Court Referrals 3.3, Extended Services Referrals 4.2) could be considered more as end-point services.
- Other services such as printed materials, community advocacy services, LIOWs, private lawyers, and the Internet might be used at any point throughout the client’s quest for resolution.

Rating of helpfulness of service (Table 18)

- From a service provider’s standpoint, one might view a group of services as serially moving a client’s case towards resolution, and each service as a helpful contributor to the client’s progress. By contrast, the client may praise only the service that “got them where they wanted”, and consider the others as unnecessary trials and tribulations along the

way. Interviewers found it difficult to encourage the respondents to think in terms of a service helping them to “get closer to a resolution”, rather than judge helpfulness only in terms of the service most immediately connected to the ultimate resolution. Clients also found it difficult to think of any service being helpful in moving them towards a resolution if they did not have a successful outcome.

- Overall, there is a clear pattern in the client’s perception of which services were most helpful. The mean rating on a five point scale tends to be high for LSS representation services (Extended Service Referral 4.3, Emergency Referrals 4.1 and Legal Aid Intake, the gateway to representation services, 4.2). Advice services form the next level (Family Advice Lawyer Project 3.9, Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel 3.8, Provincial Family Duty Counsel 3.7, and LawLine advice 3.5.) Limited Scope Referrals which fall in between representation and advice as a mode of service, are at 3.7. Legal information services rate lowest (LawLine information 2.9, LawLink 3.6 and Printed materials 3.5). The primary exception of this pattern is the LIOWs, with a mean rating of 4.3
- Among non-LSS services, community advocacy services, which often incorporate representational roles, are rated highly (4.0), but private lawyers (i.e., non-legal aid) are given lower rates (3.1).
- After submission of the Interim Report, it was decided to explore reasons why users of the three representation services (Emergency Services Referral, Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral and Extended Services Referral) might not consider those services helpful. Thus in the remainder of the survey, clients who rated any of these services at a “1”, “2”, or “3” level on a 5 point scale were asked why they found this service of limited helpfulness. The 68 replies included the following. (The reader is reminded that these comments represent only the negative feedback; the positive feedback comprised over 70% of the total):
 - 20 felt that the lawyer accorded the client low priority, did not communicate a great deal and moved very slowly if at all on the stated issues. It was the client’s perception in the majority of these cases that the lawyer acted in this way because the fees paid by LSS were too low.
 - 14 stated that LSS criteria for eligibility (including pay back of costs if the case was successful), criteria for coverage, and/or the maximum amount of time allocated to cases, was too restrictive to be of help in the client’s case.
 - 12 clients considered their lawyers to be rude, unsympathetic, inattentive to the client’s concerns, or lacking in their understanding of cultural factors affecting the case.
 - 8 clients felt their lawyers were either not competent or bordering on dishonesty in their handling of the case.
 - 6 stated their lawyers were not sufficiently aggressive in their pursuit of the client’s interests.
 - 4 clients complained that they had to do most of the work on the case and the lawyer just gave directives.
 - 3 felt the “whole system – judges, lawyers, etc.” was corrupt.
 - 1 complained that the lawyer said the client had no case.

- An analysis of ratings of helpfulness in relation to each of the three demographic measures showed that there is no statistically significant difference in responses based on education categories. However, there were statistically significant differences in responses based on gender and ethnic (aboriginal/non-aboriginal) status. Female clients had a higher mean rating of helpfulness than did males, as did aboriginal over non-aboriginals. These patterns are similar to those reported in Table 11 for satisfaction with outcome of the case. The table for this analysis is in Appendix 2, Table S3.

Tendency to refer (Table 19)

- The high number of “can’t remember” responses and low overall numbers make it difficult to confidently assess client responses about whether services referred them to or mentioned other services. Nonetheless, there are marked differences between the “yes” and “no” responses in several services and a sufficient size effect to allow some confidence in this data. For example, one can characterize as “networking services” those services with over 75% “yes” responses: Legal Aid intake (with its obvious connection to Emergency Service Referrals), LawLine advice, community advocacy services, LIOWs (although with a small overall number of cases), Family Justice Counsellors and LawLine information. On the other hand, Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel, Enhanced Family Duty Counsel, the three LSS referral services and private lawyers do not appear to network their clients with other services very frequently. Clients also do not appear to have gleaned referral information from the Internet (Family Law Self-Help Kit or LawLink) or from printed materials.
- A sub-analysis of referral data explored to whom referrals are made. Unfortunately the volume of overall referrals is insufficient to show strong patterns, so the analysis is presented in Table S4 of Appendix 2. The main patterns appear to be:
 - LawLine’s main connection appears to be to Family Justice Counsellors, the Provincial Family Duty Counsel Project, private lawyers, LawLink and the Family Law Self-help kit, and Legal Aid intake.
 - The most frequent recipient of referrals is Legal Aid intake, just as it is the main referral source (as per Table 19).
 - Family Justice Counsellors frequently have a close working relationship with Provincial Court family duty counsel and the Family Advice Lawyer Project, which is also reflected in this table. They also make significant referrals to Legal Aid Intake.
 - The obvious connection between Legal Aid Intake, Emergency Services Referrals and Extended Services Referrals are also shown, as well as those between Emergency Services Referrals and Extended Services Referrals.
 - The main services that link up with the two Internet services are LawLine (both advice and information) and Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel.

Table 15: LSS and Other Services used by Survey Sample

Services used by client	Number of issues for which this service was used	Percentage of cases in which this service was used (N=812)
LawLine – advice	123	15%
LawLine – information	109	13%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	227	28%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	88	11%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	107	13%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	38	5%
Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit	87	11%
Internet: LawLink	147	18%
Printed Materials	175	22%
Emergency Services Referral	303	37%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	105	13%
Extended Services Referral Program	135	17%
Legal Aid intake	431	53%
Community advocacy service or Clinic	79	10%
Pro Bono Clinic	38	5%
Family Justice Counsellor	257	32%
Private Lawyer	179	22%
Family Maintenance Enforcement Program	35	4%
Other Legal or Quasi-legal Bodies	19	2%
Diverse Social Services	10	1%
Total	2692	

Notes:

- 1) This table only represents the services used by this sample of clients, who were referred to the survey through each of the nine LSS programs. This is *not* a random sample of all LSS clients, so does not represent proportionately how overall services are used.
- 2) There were 812 persons who used the services, and 2692 services used overall, or an average of 3.3 services per client.
- 3) Percentages exceed 100% because more than one service was used by each client.
- 4) Overall, 23% of the issues (617/2692) were addressed by non-LSS services (i.e., the last seven services on the list).

Table 16: Comparison of Total Respondent Usage of each Service with the Number of Clients Referred to the Evaluation from that Service

LSS Service	Total number of respondents who used this service in the overall evaluation sample	Number of clients specifically referred from this service in the evaluation	Multipliers effect (total respondents divided by referrals from service)
LawLink	147	7	21.0
Legal Information Outreach Worker	38	15	2.53
Extended Services Referral Program	135	73	1.84
LawLine Advice	123	73	1.68
Emergency Services Referral	303	205	1.48
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	88	63	1.40
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	227	171	1.33
Limited Scope Supreme Court	105	96	1.09
Family Advice Lawyer Project	107	99	1.08

Notes:

- 1) Services are listed in descending order of multiplier effect.
- 2) An expanded version of this table is in Appendix 2 (Table S2), showing other services used by clients and how other service samples contributed to this multiplier effect.

Table 17: Order of Use of Services

Service	Total Usage	Order in which Service Used						Mean order of usage
		1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6+	
LawLine – advice	123	83 67%	18 15%	16 13%	2 2%	3 2%	1 1%	1.6
Legal Aid Intake	431 (NR=2)	222 52%	109 25%	55 13%	22 5%	15 3%	6 1%	1.9
Family Justice Counsellor	256 (NR=1)	128 50%	67 26%	27 11%	20 8%	5 2%	9 4%	2.0
LawLine – information	108 (NR=1)	55 51%	25 23%	9 8%	10 9%	5 5%	4 4%	2.1
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	226 (NR=1)	90 40%	69 31%	31 14%	19 8%	7 3%	10 4%	2.3
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	90	39 43%	19 21%	12 13%	8 9%	5 6%	7 8%	2.4
Family Advice Lawyer Project	107	27 25%	36 34%	23 21%	11 10%	5 5%	5 5%	2.6
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	78 (NR=1)	13 17%	10 13%	13 17%	6 8%	5 6%	8 10%	2.7
Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit	86 (NR=1)	15 17%	29 34%	18 21%	16 19%	4 5%	4 5%	2.8
Legal Information Outreach Worker	38	12 32%	11 29%	6 16%	2 5%	3 8%	4 11%	2.8
Emergency Services Referral	301 (NR=2)	1 0%	154 51%	76 25%	35 12%	20 7%	15 5%	2.9
Private Lawyer (non-Legal Aid)	178 (NR=1)	50 28%	32 18%	33 19%	26 15%	17 10%	20 11%	3.1
Internet: LawLink	145 (NR=2)	16 11%	39 27%	44 30%	22 15%	15 10%	9 6%	3.1
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	105	-	32 30%	34 32%	22 21%	7 7%	10 10%	3.3
Pro Bono Clinic	37 (NR=1)	10 27%	5 14%	6 16%	8 22%	3 8%	5 14%	3.3
Printed Materials	175	6 3%	51 29%	50 29%	30 17%	16 9%	20 11%	3.4
Other	63	21 33%	6 10%	7 11%	8 13%	8 13%	13 21%	3.8
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	8	1 13%	-	3 38%	-	1 13%	3 38%	4.1
Extended Services Referral Program	135 (NR=1)	-	-	61 46%	37 28%	13 10%	23 17%	4.2

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally, but do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) Services are listed in descending order of the “mean order of usage.”
- 3) NR = No response.

Table 18: Rating of Helpfulness of Service in Getting Client Closer to a Resolution

Service	Mean Rating	Rating of helpfulness of service in getting client closer to a resolution				
		Not helpful at all (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Very helpful (5)
Extended Services Referral Program (N=134; NR=1)	4.3	9 7%	5 4%	12 9%	20 15%	88 66%
Legal Information Outreach Worker (N=37; NR=1)	4.3	1 3%	1 3%	7 19%	5 14%	23 62%
Legal Aid Intake (N=425; NR=6)	4.2	42 10%	10 2%	39 9%	49 12%	285 67%
Emergency Services Referral (N=299; NR=2)	4.1	27 9%	19 6%	37 12%	43 14%	173 58%
Community advocacy service or Clinic (N=79; NR=2)	4.0	5 6%	3 4%	17 22%	16 21%	36 47%
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre (N=8)	4.0	-	2 25%	-	2 25%	4 50%
Family Advice Lawyer Project (N=107)	3.9	4 4%	9 8%	22 21%	29 27%	43 40%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel (N=89; NR=1)	3.8	10 11%	6 7%	11 12%	25 28%	37 42%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel (N=227)	3.7	26 11%	26 11%	38 17%	34 15%	103 45%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral (N=105)	3.7	15 14%	11 10%	14 13%	19 18%	46 44%
Internet: LawLink (N=147)	3.6	12 8%	15 10%	41 28%	36 24%	43 29%
LawLine – advice (N=122; NR=1)	3.5	17 14%	13 11%	26 21%	18 15%	48 39%
Printed Materials (N=175)	3.5	8 5%	17 10%	66 38%	42 24%	42 24%
Other (N=61; NR=2)	3.5	10 16%	9 15%	8 13%	6 10%	28 46%
Family Justice Counsellor (N=256; NR=1)	3.4	48 19%	30 12%	54 21%	30 12%	94 37%
Pro Bono Clinic (N=37; NR=1)	3.4	3 8%	4 11%	15 41%	5 14%	10 27%
Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit (N=87)	3.3	17 20%	11 13%	15 17%	17 20%	27 31%
Private Lawyer (N=177; NR=2)	3.1	47 27%	17 10%	35 20%	22 12%	56 32%
LawLine – info (N=108; NR=1)	2.9	23 21%	20 19%	31 29%	16 15%	18 17%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally, but do not necessarily total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) Services are listed in descending order of mean rating of helpfulness.
- 3) N = Number of responses. NR = No response.

Table 19: Whether Service Referred Client to other Legal Services

Service	Total use of service	Whether service mentioned or referred client to any other legal services	
		Yes	No
Legal Aid Intake	389 (NA=42) 100%	372 96%	17 4%
LawLine – advice	68 (NA=55) 100%	60 88%	8 12%
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	53 (NA=26) 100%	45 85%	8 15%
Family Justice Counsellor	189 (NA=68) 100%	148 78%	41 22%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	27 (NA=11) 100%	21 78%	6 22%
LawLine – information	60 (NA= 49) 100%	46 77%	14 23%
Pro Bono Clinic	20 (NA=18) 100%	13 65%	7 35%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	58 (NA=31) 100%	31 53%	27 47%
Emergency Services Referral	251 (NA=51) 100%	123 49%	128 51%
Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit	33 (NA=54) 100%	12 36%	21 64%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	51 (NA=56) 100%	17 33%	34 67%
Other	55 (NA=8) 100%	16 29%	39 71%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	129 (NA=98) 100%	35 27%	94 73%
Private Lawyer	145 (NA=34) 100%	22 15%	123 85%
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	7 (NA=1) 100%	1 14%	6 86%
Printed Materials	122 (NA=53) 100%	13 11%	109 89%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	86 (NA=19) 100%	8 9%	78 91%
Internet: LawLink	101 (NA=46) 100%	9 9%	92 91%
Extended Services Referral Program	114 (NA=21) 100%	5 4%	109 96%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally.
- 2) NA = “no answer,” because respondent could not remember.
- 3) The large number of respondents who could not remember whether services were mentioned or whether they were referred to a service make this data unreliable.
- 4) Services are listed in descending order of percentages in “Yes” column.

6.0 REASONS FOR NON-RESOLUTION OF ISSUES

As was shown in Table 7, there was no resolution for respondents with 104 issues. Table 20 describes the reasons for non-resolution of these issues. This information should be viewed as very preliminary, since it represents so few respondents. The main reason for non-resolution is systemic barriers (slightly over a third of responses), with the remaining reasons fairly evenly divided between relationship dynamics, personal circumstances or reactions, and “other” reasons.

The main “other” reasons cited were an inability to continue because the client had used up their eligible hours of lawyer-assisted service (6 cases), perceived disinterest or lack of action of the legal aid lawyer (4 cases), and advice by the lawyer to drop the case (3 cases).

In Table 9 it was shown that “no resolution” rates were broadly similar between advice and referral groups. However, analysis of the type of barriers for each of these groups shows that the nature of these barriers do differ. Systemic and relationship barriers are more prominent for clients of the two referral services (Emergency and Extended), while client personal barriers are considerably more significant for advice clients than for referral clients.

Table 20: Reason Why Issues Did Not Get Resolved

Reason Not Resolved	Type of Issue								
	All Issues	Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Guardianship	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Property division	Divorce
Systemic Barriers	68 37%		16	12	2	16	5	7	10
Client could not afford a lawyer	35		6	8	1	6	3	5	6
Client willing to represent self, but could not afford extra expenses	10		2	1	1	2	1	1	2
Client felt intimidated, confused or overwhelmed by court system.	29		7	4		7	4	2	5
Time delays made it pointless to continue	10		4	1		3		1	
Error on part of service provider	9		4	1		3			1
Relationship Dynamics	42 23%		11	8	1	8	5	3	6
Client felt worn down by opposing party	31		7	6		6	4	2	6
Client felt threatened by opposing party	22		7	4	1	3	2	2	3

Reason Not Resolved	Type of Issue								
	All Issues	Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Guardianship	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Property division	Divorce
Client Personal Circumstances or Reaction	37 20%	1	9	9	2	6	5	2	3
Client illness or other personal circumstances meant client could not continue	9		3	3			2		1
Client felt it wasn't worth the hassle to continue	28	1	6	6	2	6	3	2	2
Other	36 20%	2	8	9		7	2	5	3
Other	36	2	8	9		7	2	5	3
Total	183								

Notes:

- 1) Respondents could give more than one answer as to why their issue(s) were not resolved. The respondents had 104 issues (see "no resolution" column in Table 6), and gave 219 individual reasons for non-resolution, or 2.1 per issue.
- 2) If there were 2 or more individual answers in the same general category they were counted only once in the general category (bolded) totals. Thus the total of individual answers can exceed the category total.

7.0 ISSUES THAT RE-EMERGE AFTER INITIAL RESOLUTION

One hundred eight-nine respondents reported that 266 issues re-emerged after initial resolution. Tables 21 – 25 present data on the types of issues, processes and outcomes involved for the client in addressing these issues.

Time for issues to re-emerge (Table 21)

- Although the data set is much too small to permit conclusions for all but three issue types, this data suggests that child maintenance and access issues re-emerge sooner than custody issues. Three points deserve emphasis. Firstly, in many cases respondents were not absolutely certain about the time it took for issues to re-emerge. The data should therefore be considered with caution. Secondly, issues might still have re-emerged after the evaluation interview. The average trends for issues therefore inherently understate length for re-emergency, as they do not include cases that have taken so long to break down that they do not appear in the study. Finally, the reader is reminded that the table only deals with the 19% of overall issues that re-emerge. Therefore, while one can state that 46% of the re-emerged issues (114/249) surfaced within three months of the original resolution, this represents only 8% of the original 1437 issues.

Reasons for issues re-starting (Table 22)

- The two principal reasons for re-emergence of issues was refusal by one or other party to comply with an order or agreement, and the need to adapt to a changed situation.
- “Other” reasons usually involved court actions by the other party, or some form of dissatisfaction with and re-thinking of the initial decision, e.g., “not happy with first outcome – did not get child back,” “order unreasonable in first place. Couldn’t afford to comply,” “teenager not always wanting to stick with access arrangement. Took no action.”
- Table S5 in Appendix 2 provides a breakdown of reasons by issue type.

Types of services used for restarted issues (Table 23)

- Table 23 shows the services used when issues that were originally thought to be settled started over again. The fact that some issues re-emerged leads to the question of whether clients start at the same or a higher level of service to address these issues. While it is not possible to answer this question definitively, a surrogate measure is the extent to which clients re-use the same service as at least one of their resources (clients contacted an average of 1.7 services to address restarted issues). The data in the fourth column of the table shows that the two referral services (Emergency and Limited Scope) and Limited Scope Supreme Court referrals had a considerably higher re-usage rate than the four advice services (Provincial and Supreme Court Duty Counsel services, LawLine and Family Advice Lawyer), while the two information services (LawLink and LIOWs) had the lowest rates of re-usage. Thus it appears that clients who have a re-emerging problem do not necessarily go to the back of the line, as they are more likely to re-use a higher level service than they are a lower level one.
- At the time of the Interim Report, it was noted that in approximately a fifth of the issues the client did not use any service after an issue re-emerged. (This pattern has held

constant in these final results, at 19%, or 50/263 of all issues). In the remainder of the survey, such clients were asked why they did not seek another service. Twenty-four replies were obtained:

- Perception that an order would continue not to be enforced, whatever action was taken (6).
 - client was worn out, but would have continued, had representation been possible (5).
 - specific family circumstances unrelated to the justice system or intimidation (4).
 - Client felt he/she would proceed on his/her own (3).
 - Eligibility hours had run out (2).
 - Client too worn out to continue, even if a lawyer were available (1).
 - Time factors make continuation unfeasible (1).
 - Dissatisfaction with service (1)
 - Client feared she would get a bill from legal aid if the matter (property division) is resolved (1).
- There is no comparative data on non-contact of services when a problem first emerges. In other words, the original group of 812 respondents all had contacted one or more resources. We do not know what percentage of individuals with family legal problems do not usually contact a government or community resource. Thus it is not known whether a 19% rate at this later stage (this rate is for issues, not people) is high or low.
 - 31 of the “other” services accessed were FMELP, all for child maintenance issues. Social workers were accessed in 4 cases.
 - Table S6 in Appendix 2 provides data on the types of restarted issues that were taken by the client to each type of service.

Degree of completion of restarted issues (Table 24)

- The non-resolution rate of re-emerged issues (37%) is considerably higher than for the original issues shown in Table 7 (7%), and the pending rate is significantly higher (55% versus 17%). The higher non-resolution rate suggests that issues become more intractable as time goes on. The higher pending rate is largely due to the more recent occurrence of the re-emerged issues.

Degree of satisfaction with outcome of restarted issues (Table 25)

- Although the data set is much too small to draw firm conclusions, the satisfaction with outcomes (42/62 or 68% “mostly” or “completely” satisfied) is somewhat lower than in the original resolution (930/1213 or 77%). The difference is particularly marked for custody and access issues, but for child support issues satisfaction is slightly *higher* for outcomes in re-emerged cases than for the original cases.
- As per the footnote, a large majority of these completed issues were resolved by a court order or written agreement reviewed by a lawyer.

Table 21: Types of Issues, and Time for Issues to Re-emerge After Original Resolution

Type of Issue	Number of issues that started again after resolution	How soon issue re-emerged after original resolution (based on 249 issues)					Average time for re-start (in months)
		1-3 months	4-6 months	7-12 months	13-24 months	25+ months	
Order forbidding removal of child from province	1	1					1.0
Property division	5	3	1				2.5 (NR=1)
Spousal maintenance, support	10	6		1	1		5.5 (NR=2)
Divorce	1		1				6.0
Access	90	44	18	13	5	6	7.6 (NR=4)
Child maintenance, support	94	34	23	21	11	2	7.7 (NR=3)
Guardianship	5	2			1		8.7 (NR=2)
Custody	54	23	7	8	7	6	10.1 (NR=3)
Restraining order to prevent violence	3	1	1		1		10.3
Possession of Family Home	2			1			12.0 (NR=1)
Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	1						n/a (NR=1)
Total Issues	266						
Total Issues with time data	249 100%	114 46%	51 20%	44 18%	26 10%	14 6%	

Notes:

- 1) Respondents did not provide time data for sixteen issues.
- 2) The 266 issues described in the table were for 189 respondents (i.e., an average of 1.4 issues re-emerged for clients at a later point).
- 3) More than one re-emerged issue per case was possible. Therefore, percentages in the second column total more than 100%.

Table 22: Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution

Reason why issue restarted after original resolution	Frequency
Refusal to comply with Court Order or separation agreement	114 41%
Situation changed, need to vary order (amount or conditions)	91 33%
Arrears Order could not be enforced	15 5%
Refusal to comply with an informal agreement	6 2%
Need to make temporary order into permanent	6 2%
Mobility issue; threat of removal of child from province or region	4 1%
Other	40 14%
Total	276 100%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages do not total 100% due to rounding.

Table 23: Types of Services Used for Issues that Start Up Again, and Comparison with Original LSS Services Used

Service	Frequency and percentage of clients who used this service to deal with restarted issues	# of contacts with this service originally (nine LSS services only)	Percentage of re-contact compared with original contacts for this service
Emergency Services Referral	67 (35%)	125	54%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	6 (3%)	12	50%
Extended Services Referral Program	30 (16%)	68	44%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	26 (14%)	111	23%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	4 (2%)	26	15%
LawLine – advice	7 (4%)	58	12%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	2 (1%)	26	8%
Internet: LawLink	5 (3%)	61	8%
Legal Information Outreach Workers	0 (0%)	14	0%
Legal Aid Intake	41 (22%)	n/a	n/a
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	6 (3%)	n/a	n/a
Family Justice Counsellor	26 (14%)	n/a	n/a
Private Lawyer	40 (21%)	n/a	n/a
Internet: Family Law Self-help	1 (1%)	n/a	n/a
Printed Materials	4 (2%)	n/a	n/a
Pro Bono Clinic	4 (2%)	n/a	n/a
Other	47 (25%)	n/a	n/a
Total Contacts with services	316		
Total restarted issues	263		
Total issues where clients <u>did</u> contact a service	213 (81%)		
Total issues where clients <u>did not</u> contact any service	50 (19%)		

Notes:

- 1) 189 clients had issues that re-emerged. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a problem that had restarted, so percentages in the second column do not total 100%
- 2) 46 clients in 19% (50/263) of issues did not contact any service when an issue restarted.
- 3) The 189 clients contacted 1.7 services (316/189) each, compared to 3.3 services each for the original set of 812 clients.
- 4) Issues that did not restart are not included in this table. In two restarted issues, the client did not respond to this question.
- 5) The nine LSS services for which a comparison was made between original and restarted service contacts are listed in descending order of percentage of re-contacts.
- 6) The services contacted, by re-emerged issue type are shown in Table S6 of Appendix 2.

Table 24: Degree of Completion of Restarted Issues

Issue	Frequency of restarted issues that are finished (i.e., not pending)	Degree of completion of restarted issues that are now finished		
		No resolution	Situation changed, so no longer an issue	Completely finished
Restraining order to prevent violence	2			2
Custody	22	6	1	15
Access	39	14	5	20
Child maintenance, support	47	18	5	24
Spousal maintenance, support	4	3		1
Order forbidding removal of child from province	1			1
Guardianship	1	1		
Property division	1	1		
Divorce	1	1		
Total	118 100%	44 37%	11 9%	63 53%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally, but do not total 100% due to rounding. Because of the small number of cases, percentages are presented only for the “total” row.
- 2) The data presented in this table is only for restarted issues that had been settled at the time of the evaluation interview. There were 144 other issues that were still pending at the time of the evaluation interview, or 55% (144/262) of total re-emerged issues.

Table 25: Degree of Satisfaction with Outcome of Restarted Issues (completed cases only)

Issue	Frequency	Degree of Satisfaction			
		Not at all	Only partly	Mostly	Completely
Restraining order to prevent violence	2				2
Custody	15	4	2	4	5
Access	21	6	3	4	8
Child maintenance, support	22 (NR=2)	2	3	7	10
Order forbidding removal of child from province	1			1	
Spousal maintenance, support	1				1
Total	62 100%	12 19%	8 13%	16 26%	26 42%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages are not used in this table for individual issues because of the small number of responses.
- 2) For the 62 completed issues for which data is available, the type of resolution was a court order or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer in 55 (89%) of the cases; a written agreement was not reviewed by a lawyer in 3 (2%) of the cases; and a verbal or “de facto” agreement in 3 (2%) of the cases.
- 3) NR = No response.

8.0 NEW BUT RELATED ISSUES

There were 149 cases involving 188 issues that were new but related to the original issue, and which arose after the initial resolution.

Types of issues (Table 26)

- Table 26 shows the types of new issues that arose for clients and compares them with the re-emerged issues that were presented in Table 21. The obvious differences are that custody and access comprise a considerably smaller portion of the new issues than of re-emerged issues, and divorce a proportionately far greater proportion of the new issues. These two patterns in turn flow from the patterns shown in Table 6, where custody, access and child support exist in approximately 50% of all cases, but divorce, which is not covered as significantly by LSS, is an issue for only 14% of original cases. Thus one should expect re-emerging issues to carry more of the original pattern, while “new, but related issues” could, and do, reflect a new emphasis. Note that the evaluation question to the respondent was “Did any *new* family legal issue related to those you’ve already described arise?” but there was no assumption that these issues could necessarily be addressed successfully by LSS.

Types of services used to resolve new issues (Table 27)

- In Table 27, the frequency of service contacts for new but related issues is compared with the frequency of service contacts for re-emerged issues that were presented in Table 23. Several patterns are evident. First, the number of services contacted (1.2 services per client) is even lower than for re-emerged issues (1.7), and both are significantly lower than for the original issues of the 812 clients (3.3). The most significant differences between the “new issue” group and the “re-emerged issue” group is that the former made proportionately smaller use of Provincial Family Duty Counsel (7% vs. 14%), Emergency Services Referrals (9% vs. 35%), Extended Services Referrals (3% vs. 16%), Legal Aid intake (9% vs. 22%) and Family Justice Counselors (6% vs. 14%). However, they retain approximately the same level of use of private lawyers and (although the overall level is modest) slightly increase their use of Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel, Limited Scope Supreme Court Referrals, community advocacy clinics and the Family Law Self-Help kits. Collectively, these differences reflect the different composition of issues described in the previous bullet. That is, the increase in frequency of divorce as an issue means that Supreme Court related services are in greater demand, and, to the extent that LSS does not provide coverage, private lawyers are accessed. Some of the usage patterns concerning divorce can be seen more clearly in Table S7 in Appendix 2, which describes the services accessed according to the issue involved.
- Overall, less than half as many services were contacted for new but related problems (1.2 per client) than for the original problem (3.3 per client) and there were also fewer services contacted than for re-emerged issues (1.7 per client). This pattern could be an indicator that clients have a clearer sense of the pathways for addressing their problems, but this conclusion cannot be drawn confidently for several reasons. Firstly, the averages for services contacted in re-emerged cases and new cases included clients who did not contact any service (19% for re-emerged cases and 32% for new cases). By definition,

none of the original 812 clients contacted no services, because their names were all made available to the evaluation study through the services they had contacted. Secondly, as was seen in the discussion of Table 23, the reasons for non-use of services are usually negative rather than positive. Thirdly, fewer service options are available for clients seeking a divorce, which occurs more frequently as a client's new issue.

Degree of completion of new issues and client satisfaction with outcome (Table 28)

- The rate of "no resolution" (35%) is virtually the same in Table 28 as for re-emerged issues in Table 24 (37%), but still much higher than in Table 7 for original issues (7%). This could reflect both the fact that a large percentage of clients (32%, as per Table 27) had not contacted any service, and also that there are fewer resources to address divorce matters.
- The high "pending" rate is – like re-emerged issues – due to the greater recency of the new issue. This result confirms the importance of having drawn samples of cases with many years' duration, as discussed in Section 2.
- Because of the small number of reportable cases in which the case was "completely finished," the client's satisfaction with the outcome of the issue was summarized in a footnote to Table 28. Overall, the positive responses ("completely" or "mostly" satisfied) were 89% (47/53), considerably higher than for re-emerged issues (68%) or for the original issues (77%). The high proportion of child support and divorce matters (accounting for 37 of the 55 issues), in which a fairly clear-cut decision can be reached, may account for this highly positive response.
- As with the original cases and re-emerged cases, the vast majority (87%) of issues in new cases were completed by a court order or drafted by a lawyer.

Other legal issues that have had an impact on family issues (Table 29)

A supplementary question was inserted in the questionnaire late in the survey, to explore the impact that other legal issues have had on the resolution of family issues, but for which clients have not been able to get legal assistance. Overall, 10% of clients (32/320) responded that there had been such issues, and they cited 44 issues overall. As shown in Table 29, the main issues were debt and criminal matters. Approximately half the criminal matters concerned the former spouse rather than the client.

Table 26: New but Related Issues that Arise, and Comparison with Re-emerged Issues

Type of Issue	Frequency of New Issues (N=188)	Percentage of cases which involve this issue (N=149)	Frequency of re-emerged issues (from Table 21) (N=265)	Percentage of cases which involve this issue (N=189)
Restraining order to prevent violence	3	2%	3	2%
Custody	20	13%	54	29%
Access	23	15%	90	48%
Order forbidding removal of child from province	3	2%	1	1%
Guardianship	1	1%	5	3%
Child maintenance, support	65	44%	94	50%
Spousal maintenance, support	6	4%	10	5%
Property division	8	5%	5	3%
Possession of family home	5	3%	2	1%
Divorce	48	32%	1	1%
Other	6	4%	0	0%

Notes:

- 1) N = total number of respondents with new but related issues.
- 2) More than one new issue per case was possible. Therefore, percentages total more than 100%.
- 3) These 188 issues arose in 149 cases, or 1.26 issues per client.

Table 27: Types of Issues and Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues

	Frequency and % of clients who used this service for new problems (N=149)	Comparison with frequencies of service contacts for the restarted issues (Table 23); (N=189)
LawLine – advice	5 3%	7 4%
LawLine – info	3 2%	0 0%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	12 7%	26 14%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	4 2%	0 0%
Internet: LawLink	7 4%	5 3%
Printed Materials	2 1%	4 2%
Emergency Services Referral	17 9%	67 35%
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	7 4%	6 3%
Extended Services Referral Program	5 3%	30 16%
Legal Aid Intake	17 9%	41 22%
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	9 5%	6 3%
Family Justice Counsellor	11 6%	26 14%
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	8 4%	4 2%
Family Advice Lawyer Project	1 1%	2 1%
Internet: Family Law Self-Help Kit	4 2%	1 1%
Pro Bono Clinic	2 1%	4 2%
Private Lawyer	45 25%	40 21%
Other	24 13%	47 25%
Total contacts with services	183	316
Total new issues	188	263
Total issues where client contacted a service	128 68%	213 81%
Total issues where client did not contact a service	60 32%	50 19%
Services contacted per client	1.2 (183/149)	1.7 (316/189)

Notes:

- 1) 149 clients had new but related problems. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a new problem, so percentages do not total 100%.
- 2) Thirty-two percent (60/188) of clients did not contact any service when the new issue arose.
- 3) Seventeen of the “other” services under child maintenance are the Family Maintenance Enforcement Program (FMEP).

Table 28: Degree of Completion of New Issues

Type of Issue	Frequency of new issues that are finished (i.e., not pending)	Degree of Completion		
		No Resolution	Situation changed so no longer an issue	Completely finished
Restraining order to prevent violence	2			2
Custody	11	3	1	7
Access	12	6	2	4
Order forbidding removal of children from province	1			1
Guardianship	0			
Child maintenance, support	38	17	1	20
Spousal maintenance, support	2	2		
Property division	3	1		2
Possession of family home	0			
Divorce	21	3	1	17
Other	4	1	1	2
Total	94 100%	33 35%	6 6%	55 59%

Notes:

- 1) The data presented in this Table is only for new issues that had been settled at the time of the evaluation interview. There were 92 other new issues that were still pending at the time of the evaluation interview, or 49% of total new issues.
- 2) Because of the small number of cases, percentages are given of completion outcomes for the “total” row, not for individual issues.
- 3) Of the 55 completed issues, clients rated their satisfaction on 53 issues. Their replies were: “completely satisfied” in 39 cases (74%), “mostly satisfied” in 8 cases (15%), “only partly” in 3 cases (6%), and “not at all” in 3 cases (6%).
- 4) Of the 55 completed issues, 48 (87%) were completed by a court order or drafted by a lawyer, 5 (9%) were written agreements not reviewed by a lawyer, and 2 (4%) were de facto agreements.

Table 29: Issues Impacting Family Issues, but for which Client has been Unable to Obtain Legal Assistance

Issue	Frequency
Criminal	13
Debt	13
Other civil	5
Foreclosure	4
Housing (e.g., eviction)	3
Entitlement to benefits	3
Immigration	1
Child apprehension	1
Enforcement of maintenance with a second ex-spouse	1
Total	44

Notes:

- 1) These 44 issues were cited by 32 respondents, or 1.4 issues per respondent.

A P P E N D I X 1:

CLIENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of Client: _____

2. Identifier #: (if available) _____

4. Ethnic Status: 1. Aboriginal 2. Non-Aboriginal

5. Language:

6. Vietnamese
7. Tagalog
8. Russian
9. Other (specify _____)

6. Education:

1. no high school
2. some high school
3. graduated high school
4. post high school
5. unknown/not recorded

1. Enhanced LawLine (advice)
2. Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel
3. Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel
4. Family Advice Lawyer Project
5. Legal Information Outreach Worker
6. LawLink
7. Emergency Services Referral
8. Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral
9. Extended Services Referral Programs

9. (For referral services only) Name of Lawyer _____

10. Date of Service:

Legal Problem(s)	Outcome(s)
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.
7.	7.

CLIENT INTERVIEW

Our records show that on (date) you visited/called/used (type of service) to get help with (type(s) of problems) .

1. Is this correct? (*probe both for correct issue identification and number and type of issues*)

1. Yes

2. No (explain) _____

2. Can you tell me what happened with your problem(s)? (*or ask for confirmation of data from previous questionnaire, but make sure that you probe to see if issue re-surfaced*)

Issue Type	Degree of Completion	Satisfaction with outcome	Type of Resolution
1. Restraining order to prevent violence 2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets 3. Custody 4. Access 5. Order forbidding removal of child from province 6. Guardianship 7. Child maintenance, support, (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) 8. Spousal maintenance, support (including arrears and enforcement) 9. Property division 10. Possession of family home 11. Divorce 12. Other (specify) Notes: 1. If response is "ex parte order", ask what type of issue the order was for. 2. If response is "separation agreement", ask for what type(s) of issue(s).	1 = no resolution 2 = situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue 3 = still pending 4 = completely finished 5 = appeared to be completely finished at one point, but then issue re-emerged later Notes: 1. These choices are <u>not</u> related to satisfaction or whether client "won," but just whether issue was brought to a conclusion. 2. "No resolution" is not having either an informal or formal resolution to the issue, but conflict around the legal issue still exists.	(Only if answered #4 or #5 to previous question) Was the original outcome what you hoped to achieve, i.e. what you hoped would happen? 1 = not at all 2 = only partly 3 = mostly 4 = completely	(Only if answered #4 or #5 under "degree of completion") 1 = verbal or de facto 2 = written agreement, but not reviewed by a lawyer 4 = court order by consent, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer 5=court order decided by judge after a court hearing (i.e.litigation is involved) Notes: -"de facto" means a routine that just evolves - #2 might include an agreement drafted by the parties themselves, or an agreement developed by a family justice counselor or through mediation, but <u>not</u> formally reviewed by a lawyer.
1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.
6.	6.	6.	6.
7.	7.	7.	7.

2A. If issue(s) is/are "still pending", approximately when do you think the problem will be resolved?

1. Before August 1, 2006 (specify month _____, and ask if it is ok to call again about the outcome)

2. August 1 or later

3. Either before, at the same time, or after you visited/called/used this service did you use any other type of legal service to help you solve this/these legal problems? For example, did you use (mention services in the list below) As best as you can remember, in what order did you use these services? On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = not at all helpful and 5 = very helpful, how helpful was each service you used in terms of helping you get closer to a resolution? Did any of these services mention or refer you to one of the other services? If so, to which ones?

3.1 (Only for users of services #10, 11 and 12, where answer to helpfulness is 1,2 or 3) Why did you find this service to be of limited helpfulness? (Probe whether the client felt that the lawyer only dealt with one part of their overall problem) Record answers on p. 7.

Service	Did client use this service? 1 = no 2 = yes	Original order in which these services were used. 1 st , 2 nd , 3 rd , etc. Don't indicate repeat visits	Did you use this service more than once for this problem? 1=no 2=yes 3=can't remember	Helpfulness of this service in getting client closer to a resolution (only if used) 1 = not at all helpful 5 = very helpful	Did this service mention or refer client to any other legal service? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = Can't remember	If yes, to which service(s)? Use same number(s) as in first column
1. LawLine -advice						
2. LawLine - info						
3. Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel						
4. Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel						
5. Family Advice Lawyer Project						
6. Legal Information Outreach Worker						
7. Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit						
8. Internet: LawLink						
9. Printed Materials (brochures, booklets, info sheets)						
10. Emergency Services Referral						
11. Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral						
12. Extended Services Referral Program.						
13. Legal Aid intake						
14. Community advocacy service or Clinic						
15. Pro Bono Clinic						
16. Family Justice Counsellor						
17. Private Lawyer						
18. Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre						
19. Other (specify)						

Notes: 1) "LawLine-advice" requires financial eligibility test, & involves offering legal opinion and specific advice about best course of action (up to 3 hrs service, or 5 hrs with disability exception). "LawLine-info" - is general info about the law to help caller identify a legal issue & options to address that issue. 2) Extended service will always be preceded by emergency service. Lawyer has to write letter to LSS for permission to extend, so may have told client that he/she has used up allotted emergency service time, so will be writing a letter on their behalf to LSS. Limited scope involves cases that have to go to Supreme Court (e.g. division of property, varying Supreme Court order). Provides up to 14 hrs assistance from lawyer, but not in court (e.g. reviewing affidavits, correspondence, drafting consent orders).

4. (Ask this question if client answered "1" to any issue in question 2). You said that (issue) was not resolved. Why did this issue not get resolved?

Issue Type	Reason why not resolved (more than 1 answer possible)
1. Restraining order to prevent violence 2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets 3. Custody 4. Access 5. Order forbidding removal of child from province 6. Guardianship 7. Child maintenance, support, (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) 8. Spousal maintenance, support (including arrears and enforcement) 9. Property division 10. Possession of family home 11. Divorce 12. Other (specify)	Systemic barriers 1. Client couldn't afford lawyer 2. Client willing to represent self, but couldn't afford extra expenses (e.g. filing fees, hearing fees, reports, expert witness costs, land title fees, etc) 3. Client felt intimidated, confused, or overwhelmed by court system 4. Time delays made it pointless to continue. 5. Error on part of service provider Relationship dynamics and barriers 6. Client felt worn down by opposing party 7. Client felt threatened by opposing party Client personal circumstances or reaction 8. Client illness or other personal circumstances meant client could not continue. 9. Client felt it wasn't worth the hassle to continue Other 10. Other (specify)
1.	1.
2.	2.
3.	3.
4.	4.
5.	5.
6.	6.
7.	7.

5. (Ask this question if respondent answered "5" to question 2 for ANY of the issues). You said that (issue[s] identified in question 2) started up again after you thought that they had been resolved.
(For each issue ask):
- 5.1 How long (how many months) after you thought it had got resolved did it start up again as a legal issue?
- 5.2 Why did it become an issue again?
- 5.3 How did you try to resolve this/these issue(s)? When/what service did you go to? (If answer is "none, see 5.7)
- 5.4 Did you get this/these issue(s) resolved again?
- 5.5 (If completely resolved or finished) Was the outcome what you hoped would happen?
- 5.6 (If applicable, i.e. matter is completely finished) Type of resolution
- 5.7 (If answer to 5.3 is "none" and answer to 5.4 is "no resolution" or "still pending", ask:) Why did you not seek help from any service? (Record answer on page 7.)

Issue type	# of months later	Why an issue again (2 possible)	Service(s) Accessed	Degree of Completion	Satisfaction with outcome	Type of Resolution
1. Restraining order to prevent violence 2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets 3. Custody 4. Access 5. Order forbidding removal of child from province 6. Guardianship 7. Child maintenance, support, (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity) 8. Spousal maintenance, support (including arrears and enforcement) 9. Property division 10. Possession of family home 11. Divorce 12. Other (specify)	How long after you thought it had got resolved did the issue start up again? 1,2,3,4,5 months, etc	1. Refusal to comply with court order or separation agreement 2. Refusal to comply with informal agreement 3. Arrears order could not be enforced 4. Situation changed, need to vary order (amount or conditions) 5. Mobility issue; threat of removal of child from province or region. 6. Need to make temporary order into permanent 7. Other (specify)	1. LawLine- advice 2. LawLine - info 3. Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel 4. Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel 5. Family Advice Lawyer Project 6. Legal Information Outreach Worker 7. Internet: Family Law Self-Help Kit 8. Internet: LawLink 9. Printed materials 10. Emergency Services Referral 11. Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral 12. Extended Services Referral Program. 13. Legal Aid Intake 14. Community advocacy service or Clinic 15. Pro Bono Clinic 16. Family Justice Counselor 17. Private Lawyer 18. Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre 19. Other (specify) 20. None (ask Q. 5.7)	1 = no resolution 2 = situation changed, so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue 3 = still pending 4 = completely finished Notes: 1. These choices are <u>not</u> related to satisfaction or whether client "won," but just whether issue was brought to a conclusion. 2. "No resolution" is not having either an informal or formal resolution to the issue, but conflict around the legal issue still exists.	(Only if matter completely finished) Was this final outcome what you hoped to achieve, i.e. what you hoped would happen? 1 = not at all 2 = only partly 3 = mostly 4 = completely	(Only if matter completely finished) 1 = verbal or de facto 2 = written agreement, but not reviewed by a lawyer 3 = court order, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer Notes: - "de facto" means a routine that just evolves - #2 might include an agreement drafted by the parties themselves, or an agreement developed by a family justice counselor or through mediation, but <u>not</u> formally reviewed by a lawyer.
1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.	1.
2.	2.	2.	2.	2.	2.	2.
3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.	3.
4.	4.	4.	4.	4.	4.	4.
5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.	5.
6.	6.	6.	6.	6.	6.	6.
7.	7.	7.	7.	7.	7.	7.

6. Did any new family legal issues related to those you've already described arise? (Note: new issues must only be family issues, but are different from the original issues.)

1. No, new family issues did not arise. 2. Yes, new family issues did arise

7. (If answer to #6 is "2"). What was/were the issue(s)? Which services did you use? Did the issue get resolved? (If finished) How satisfied were you with this outcome? What type of resolution was it?

7.1 (If answer to service used is "none" and answer to degree of completion is "no resolution" or "still pending", ask:) Why did you not seek help from any service? (Record answer on page 7.)

Issues	Which Services Used? (More than 1 possible)	Overall Degree of Completion	Satisfaction with Outcome	Type of Resolution
1. Restraining order to prevent violence	1. LawLine- advice	1 = no resolution	(Only if matter is completely finished) Was the outcome to this related issue what you hoped to achieve, i.e. what you hoped would happen?	(Only if matter completely finished) 1 = verbal or de facto
2. Restraining order to prevent removal of assets	2. LawLine - info	2 = situation changed so no longer necessary; therefore dropped issue		2 = written agreement, but not reviewed by a lawyer
3. Custody	3. Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	3 = still pending		3 = court order, or written agreement drafted or reviewed by a lawyer
4. Access	4. Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	4 = completely finished		Notes:
5. Order forbidding removal of child from province	5. Family Advice Lawyer Project	Notes:		- "de facto" means a routine that just evolves
6. Guardianship	6. Legal Information Outreach Worker	1. These choices are <u>not</u> related to satisfaction or whether client "won," but just whether issue was brought to a conclusion.	1 = not at all	- #2 might include an agreement drafted by the parties themselves, or an agreement developed by a family justice counselor or through mediation, but <u>not</u> formally reviewed by a lawyer.
7. Child maintenance, support, (including arrears enforcement, expense calculation, variance, determination of paternity)	7. Internet: Family Law Self-Help Kit	2. "No resolution" is not having either an informal or formal resolution to the issue, but conflict around the legal issue still exists.	2 = only partly	
8. Spousal maintenance, support (including arrears and enforcement)	8. Internet: LawLink		3 = mostly	
9. Property division	9. Printed materials		4 = completely	
10. Possession of family home	10. Emergency Services Referral			
11. Divorce	11. Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral			
12. Other (specify)	12. Extended Services Referral Program.			
	13. Legal Aid Intake			
	14. Community advocacy service or Clinic			
	15. Pro Bono Clinic			
	16. Family Justice Counselor			
	17. Private Lawyer			
	18. Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre			
	19. Other (specify)			
	20. None (Ask Q. 7.1)			
1				
2				
3.				
4				

3.1 (Only for users of services #10, 11 and 12 where answer to "helpfulness of service was "1", "2" or "3". Why did you find this service of limited helpfulness? (Probe particularly if the lawyer only dealt with part of the overall problem, e.g. a restraining order because of violence, but where there were other family matters that could have been addressed)

5.7 (If answer to question 5.3 was "none" and answer to question 5.4 was "no resolution" or "still pending", ask: Why did you not seek help from any service? Circle answer(s) that apply. More than one answer is possible.

1. Client worn out, no more energy to pursue issue (but would if could be represented by a lawyer).
 2. Client worn out, no more energy, and wouldn't pursue even if represented by a lawyer.
 3. Client has particular family circumstances that do not relate to the justice system, nor to intimidation, fear or enforcement issues, and that make it hard to pursue the issue at this time. Client may or may not pursue in the future. (examples include family events, holidays, schedules, illnesses)
 4. Time involved in pursuing the issue would not make it worthwhile, given the possible gains (e.g. spouse always brings child back an hour later than agreed and this represents a significant inconvenience, but is too much trouble to take back to court)
 5. Client feels fear or intimidation, and doesn't feel confident about being able to protect herself
 6. Lack of enforcement (e.g. got an order, but spouse does not comply, and it is likely to be an ongoing problem that client feels won't get resolved)
 7. Other (please describe)
-
-

7.1 (If answer to "Which Services Used?" in column 2 of page 6 is "none" and answer to "Overall Degree of Completion" is "no resolution" or "still pending", ask:) Why did you not seek help from any service? Circle answer(s) that apply. More than one answer is possible.

1. Client worn out, no more energy to pursue issue (but would if could be represented by a lawyer).
 2. Client worn out, no more energy, and wouldn't pursue even if represented by a lawyer.
 3. Client has particular family circumstances that do not relate to the justice system, nor to intimidation, fear or enforcement issues, and that make it hard to pursue the issue at this time. Client may or may not pursue in the future. (examples include family events, holidays, schedules, illnesses)
 4. Time involved in pursuing the issue would not make it worthwhile, given the possible gains (e.g. spouse always brings child back an hour later than agreed and this represents a significant inconvenience, but is too much trouble to take back to court)
 5. Client feels fear or intimidation, and doesn't feel confident about being able to protect herself
 6. Lack of enforcement (e.g. got an order, but spouse does not comply, and it is likely to be an ongoing problem that client feels won't get resolved)
 7. Other (please describe)
-
-

8. Are there other legal issues that have had an impact on your family issues, but for which you have not been able to get legal assistance?

1. Yes 2. No

8.1. (If yes) What type of legal issues? (record, but do not prompt the following)

1. Debt
2. Foreclosure
3. Housing (e.g. eviction)
4. Entitlement to benefits (pension or social assistance)
5. Immigration proceedings
6. Other legal issues (specify _____)

8.2 Please explain the type of impact they are having on your family issues.

9. *****Remember to confirm accuracy of response to ethnic status on page 1, and correct if necessary. Also gather language and education data if not originally recorded.

A P P E N D I X 2:

S U P P L E M E N T A R Y T A B L E S

Table S1: Comparison of LSS populations and Survey Sample for Selected Demographics

Comparison with LawLine Data

Demographic	LawLine Advice Fiscal 2005/06	Survey Sample	Significance
Male Female	1224 (26%) 3418 (74%)	16 (22%) 57 (78%)	Not significant at .05 level of confidence
Aboriginal Non-Aboriginal	293 (6%) 4368 (94%)	6 (8%) 67 (92%)	Not significant at .05 level of confidence
No or some High School Graduated High School Post High school	59 (3%) 903 (48%) 936 (49%)	14 (25%) 14 (25%) 28 (50%)	Significant at .05 level of confidence

Comparison with CMS Data for Emergency, Extended and Limited Scope Referrals

Demographic	CMS Fiscal 2005/06	Survey Sample	Significance
Male Female	1062 (23%) 3541 (77%)	85 (22%) 293 (78%)	Not significant at .05 level of confidence
Aboriginal Non-Aboriginal	666 (14%) 3937 (86%)	47 (13%) 329 (88%)	Not significant at .05 level of confidence
No High School Some High School Graduated High School Post High School	113 (3%) 1379 (40%) 1075 (31%) 916 (26%)	13 (4%) 95 (28%) 124 (36%) 112 (33%)	Significant at .05 level of confidence

Notes:

- 1) Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
- 2) LawLine data did not differentiate between “no high school” and “some high school.”

Table S2: Usage of Services by LSS Program Clients (completed interviews only)

Overall Services Used	Total # of Users	Number of users of service among clients of LSS programs									Overall Users Divided by Sample Group Clients
		Enhanced LawLine	Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	Family Advice Lawyer Project	LIOW	LawLink	Emergency Services Referral	Limited Scope Referral	Extended Services Referral	
LawLine – advice	123	73	17	10	5	2	-	6	4	6	1.68
LawLine – information	109	-	8	8	10	4	2	36	26	15	na
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	227	10	171	-	10	4	2	21	1	8	1.33
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	88	2	1	63	-	-	-	3	17	2	1.40
Family Advice Lawyer Project	107	-	-	2	99	-	1	3	-	2	1.08
Legal Information Outreach Worker	38	1	3	1	1	15	2	7	2	6	2.53
Internet: Family Law Self-Help Kit	87	11	13	18	2	-	1	14	13	15	na
Internet: LawLink	147	25	17	18	24	15	7	17	13	11	21.00
Printed Materials	175	16	21	15	38	2	2	37	26	18	na
Emergency Services Referral	303	9	11	2	-	-	1	205	1	74	1.48
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	105	2	-	5	-	-	-	1	96	1	1.09
Extended Services Referral Program	135	1	7	-	-	-	1	52	1	73	1.84
Legal Aid Intake	431	13	23	14	5	1	1	203	96	75	na
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	79	4	10	1	10	-	1	29	11	13	na
Pro Bono Clinic	38	2	4	3	11	-	-	13	4	1	na

Overall Services Used	Total # of Users	Number of users of service among clients of LSS programs									Overall Users Divided by Sample Group Clients
		Enhanced LawLine	Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	Family Advice Lawyer Project	LIOW	LawLink	Emergency Services Referral	Limited Scope Referral	Extended Services Referral	
Family Justice Counsellor	257	15	84	14	65	1	2	37	14	25	na
Private (non-legal aid) Lawyer	179	27	49	11	30	5	4	9	24	20	na
Supreme Court Self-help Info Centre	8	1	-	6	-	-	-	1	-	-	na
Other	63	5	3	2	5	1	1	24	7	15	na

Notes:

- 1) The last column shows how much greater the number of overall users in the nine LSS services is compared to the number of clients in that service's sample group. For example, LawLine Advice was used by 123 users, only 73 of whom were the clients of the service used for the original survey contacts. This means that another 50 clients of other services also used the LawLine Advice Service. The ratio is $123/73 = 1.68$. The numbers used in each calculation are in bold on each line.
- 2) The survey interviewers made the distinction between "LawLine advice" and "LawLine information," based on questions asked of the respondent concerning length of time of service and service activities. While Focus Consultants believes that the distinction between these two services was accurate in the vast majority of cases, it should be emphasized that the assessment was subjective and subject to error in the client's recall.

Table S3: Client Rating of Helpfulness of the service in getting them closer to a resolution

Demographics	Total	Mean rating	Client rating of helpfulness of service in getting them closer to a resolution				
			Not at all helpful 1	2	3	4	Very helpful 5
<i>Gender</i>							
Male	723 100%	3.64	87 12%	62 9%	167 23%	113 16%	294 41%
Female	1955 100%	3.76	237 12%	166 8%	321 16%	321 16%	910 47%
<i>Gender</i>							
No High School	67 100%	3.76	6 9%	8 12%	13 19%	9 13%	31 46%
Some High School	455 100%	3.87	40 9%	36 8%	81 18%	86 19%	212 47%
Graduated High School	726 100%	3.70	98 13%	61 8%	130 18%	112 15%	325 45%
Post High School	1021 100%	3.76	108 11%	94 9%	198 19%	156 15%	465 46%
<i>Gender</i>							
Aboriginal	246 100%	3.92	28 11%	9 4%	40 16%	45 18%	124 50%
Non-Aboriginal	2416 100%	3.71	296 12%	219 9%	447 19%	386 16%	1068 44%

Notes:

- 1) Percentages total horizontally. They may exceed 100% due to rounding.
- 2) There are no statistically significant differences between categories of the education measure at the .05 level of confidence. The differences in responses between male and female respondents, and between aboriginals and non-aboriginals is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Table S4: Which Services were Mentioned or Involved Referrals

Service that mentions or refers to another service	Number of clients who say they were referred from this service	Service to whom client is referred or mentioned (more than 1 possible). Percentages are based on the number of <u>people</u> who answered the question																
		LawLine advice	LawLine Info	Family Justice Counsellor	Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	Private Lawyer	Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	Other	Family Advice Lawyer Project	Legal Information Outreach Worker	Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit	Internet: LawLink	Printed Materials	Emergency Services Referral	Limited Scope Referral	Extended Services Referral	Legal Aid Intake	Pro Bono
LawLine – advice	62			13 21%	10 16%	12 19%	4 6%	3 5%	2 3%		17 27%	22 35%			1 2%		8 13%	2 3%
LawLine – information	48	2 4%		6 13%		2 4%	5 10%	1 2%		1 2%	7 15%	8 17%			2 4%		28 58%	1 2%
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	33			8 24%		10 30%				2 6%			1 3%				14 42%	
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	31	1 3%		2 6%		2 6%		1 3%			12 39%	10 32%	5 16%		5 16%		9 29%	
Family Advice Lawyer Project	17			2 12%	3 18%	3 18%	1 6%	3 18%				3 18%					2 12%	1 6%
Legal Information Outreach Worker	21	1 5%		1 5%	2 10%			1 5%	1 5%			12 57%	2 10%				6 29%	1 5%
Emergency Services Referral	123			4 3%	6 5%	5 4%		9 7%				1 1%	1 1%			100 81%	6 5%	
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	8		1 13%			4 50%	2 25%	1 13%				1 13%						
Extended Services Referral Program	5			1 20%	2 40%			1 20%							2 40%			
Legal Aid Intake	375		5 1%	7 2%	5 1%	2 1%	6 2%		1 0%		6 2%	5 1%	8 2%	262 70%	90 24%	8 2%		1 0%
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	45	1 2%	2 4%	2 4%	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%	1 2%	2 4%		1 2%				3 7%		33 73%	2 4%
Pro Bono Clinic	13			1 8%	3 23%	1 8%			1 8%					1 8%			7 54%	
Family Justice Counsellor	153	4 3%	3 2%		40 26%	2 1%	13 8%	3 2%	51 33%		7 5%	4 3%	7 5%	6 4%		1 1%	44 29%	

Service that mentions or refers to another service	Number of clients who say they were referred from this service	Service to whom client is referred or mentioned (more than 1 possible). Percentages are based on the number of <u>people</u> who answered the question																
		LawLine advice	LawLine Info	Family Justice Counsellor	Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	Private Lawyer	Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	Other	Family Advice Lawyer Project	Legal Information Outreach Worker	Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit	Internet: LawLink	Printed Materials	Emergency Services Referral	Limited Scope Referral	Extended Services Referral	Legal Aid Intake	Pro Bono
Private Lawyer	22	2 9%		4 18%	2 9%				1 5%			1 5%		4 18%	3 14%		7 32%	
Internet: Family Law Self-help Kit	11				3 27%	1 9%											7 64%	
Internet: LawLink	8				1 13%	1 13%							1 13%				5 63%	
Printed Materials	13	1 8%	1 8%		3 23%	1 8%		1 8%			1 8%	1 8%		2 15%		2 15%	7 54%	
Other	17	1 6%		2 12%	2 12%	1 6%	1 6%	1 6%		1 6%							11 65%	
Total	1005	13 6%	12 1%	52 5%	86 9%	49 5%	34 3%	26 3%	59 6%	4 4%	51 5%	68 7%	25 2%	275 27%	106 11%	109 11%	194 19%	8 1%

Notes:

- 1) Since a service could refer an individual to several other services, the total number of referrals (1171) exceeds the number of persons referred (1005). Percentages are based on the number of persons referred (1005) and therefore exceed 100%

Table S5: Reasons Why Issue Restarted after Original Resolution

Reason why issue restarted after original resolution	Frequency (more than 1 reason possible)	Type of issue										
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Retraining order to prevent removal of assets	Custody	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Access	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Divorce	Guardianship	Division of Property	Possession of family home
Refusal to comply with Court Order or separation agreement	114 41%	1	1	16	1	42	39	8		2	3	1
Situation changed, need to vary order (amount or conditions)	91 33%			21		26	35	3		3	2	1
Arrears Order could not be enforced	15 5%						15					
Refusal to comply with an informal agreement	6 2%	1		2		2	1					
Need to make temporary order into permanent	6 2%	1		1		3	1					
Mobility issue; threat of removal of child from province or region	4 1%			2		2						
Other	40 14%			12		17	10		1			
Total Reasons	276 100%	3	1	54	1	92	101	11	1	5	5	2

Table S6: Services Used for Cases that Start Up Again, by type of Issue Involved

Service	Frequency & percentage of clients who used this service to deal with restarted issues	Type of issue									
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Access	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Divorce	Guardianship	Property division	Possession of family home
LawLine – advice	7 (14%)		2		2	3					
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	26 (14%)		7		10	8			1		
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	4 (2%)		1		1	1	1				
Emergency Services Referral	67 (35%)	1	17		32	10	3		2	1	1
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	6 (3%)		2		1	2	1				
Extended Services Referral Program	30 (16%)	2	7		13	4	3		1		
Legal Aid Intake	41 (22%)		11		20	7	1			1	1
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	6 (3%)		1		4	1					
Family Justice Counsellor	26 (14%)		8		6	10	2				
Private Lawyer	40 (21%)		11	1	18	9				1	
Internet: Family Law Self-help	1 (1%)					1					
Legal Information Outreach Worker	0 (0%)										
Internet: LawLink	5 (3%)		1		2	2					
Printed Materials	4 (2%)		1		2	1					
Pro Bono Clinic	4 (2%)		1		2	1					
Family Advice Lawyer Project	2 (1%)					2					
Other	47 (25%)		3		5	37	2				

Service	Frequency & percentage of clients who used this service to deal with restarted issues	Type of issue									
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Access	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Divorce	Guardianship	Property division	Possession of family home
Total Contacts with services	316	3	73	1	118	99	13	0	4	3	2
Total restarted issues	263	3	53	1	90	94	10	1	4	5	2
Total issues where clients <u>did</u> contact a service	213	2	46	1	75	71	9	0	4	3	2
Total issues where clients <u>did not</u> contact any service	50	1	7	0	15	23	1	1	0	2	0

Notes:

- 1) 189 client had issues that re-emerged. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a problem that had restarted, so percentages do not total 100%
- 2) Clients in 19% (50/263) of issues did not contact any service when an issue restarted.
- 3) The clients in 213 issues who did contact a service for their problem contacted 1.48 services (316/213) per issue.
- 4) Issues that did not restart are not included in this table. In two restarted issues, the client did not respond to this question.

Table S7: Types of Issues and Services Used to Deal with New but Related Issues

	Frequency and % of clients who used this service	New Issues										
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Guardianship	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Property division	Possession of family home	Divorce	Other
LawLine – advice	5 3%			1	1		2					1
LawLine – info	3 2%			1			1	1				
Provincial Court Family Duty Counsel	12 7%			1	1		4		1	1	3	1
Legal Information Outreach Worker	4 2%			1			2				1	
Internet: LawLink	7 4%		1	1			1				4	
Printed Materials	2 1%						1				1	
Emergency Services Referral	17 9%		3	3			8			1	2	
Limited Scope Supreme Court Referral	7 4%		1	1		1	2				2	
Extended Services Referral Program	5 3%	1	1				1				2	
Legal Aid Intake	17 9%		4	3		1	7		1		1	
Community Advocacy Service or Clinic	9 5%	1	1	2					1	1	3	
Family Justice Counsellor	11 6%		4	2			5					

	Frequency and % of clients who used this service	New Issues										
		Restraining order to prevent violence	Custody	Access	Order forbidding removal of child from province	Guardianship	Child maintenance, support	Spousal maintenance, support	Property division	Possession of family home	Divorce	Other
Supreme Court Family Duty Counsel	8 4%		1				2		1		4	
Family Advice Lawyer Project	1 1%		1									
Internet: Family Law Self-Help Kit	4 2%		1				1				2	
Pro Bono Clinic	2 1%										2	
Private Lawyer	45 25%		4	3	1		5	4	4	3	21	
Other	24 13%	1					20				3	
Total Services Used	183	3	22	19	3	2	62	5	8	6	51	2
Total Clients	188	3	20	23	3	1	65	6	8	5	48	6
Total Clients who did Contact a Service	128	3	12	12	2	1	44	4	6	5	37	2
Total Clients who did <u>not</u> Contact a Service	60	0	8	11	1	0	21	2	2	0	11	4

Notes:

- 1) 149 clients had new but related problems. Clients may have contacted more than one service to resolve a new problem, so percentages do not total 100%.
- 2) Thirty-two percent (60/188) of clients did not contact any service when the new issue arose.
- 3) Overall, the 149 clients contacted 1.2 services (183/149) each.
- 4) Seventeen of the "other" services under child maintenance are the Family Maintenance Enforcement Program (FMEP)