Evaluation

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANT RECIPIENTS

Draft: June 23, 2000

Overview

Each partnership grant recipient must collect evaluative data and report both qualitative and quantitative analysis to the Commission. Projects may employ a variety of methods to collect and analyze the data requested and use whatever methods and forms are best for their individual project, provided that projects collect basic data that responds to the specific questions listed below or explains why that data is not available, and includes some outcome measurements in its evaluation plans.

The data collection and evaluation plan that each project designs for itself will be subject to approval by the Trust Fund staff. The Commission plans to engage an evaluation consultant who will be available to consult with each recipient in the development and implementation of evaluation plans, and will also help the Commission prepare the overall evaluation report.

This overall evaluation of the partnership grants will be based on an analysis of the evaluations done by individual projects. The draft of the overall evaluation will be presented to recipients at a session designed to get feedback on the overall evaluation and suggestions for future evaluative efforts.

Recipients may design the forms they use in their own projects; the Trust Fund Commission will not mandate one specific intake form. However, the forms used and the other evaluation methods combined must prepare the projects to respond to the high-priority questions described below, which are to be the basis for their evaluation. The Trust Fund Office will assist projects in the sharing of sample forms and intake sheets, best practices, and other model information.

In Summary, recipients are required to submit

1. **Status Reports**. A brief interim status report and one final report on implementation of the project, including progress toward achieving project goals, success in raising other funds, coordination with the cooperating court and other service providers, and other updates. The interim status report is due October 1, 2000, and the final report will be thirty days afer the end of

the grant period. The inclusion of anecdotal information from users of the project as well as comments of judicial personnel, pro bono lawyers, and others about the effectiveness of the project and any recommended changes is encouraged.

2. **The evaluation plan** must be submitted to the Trust Fund for approval. The **final evaluation report**, the details of which are described below, is due forty-five days following the end of the grant year, but may be submitted as part of the end-of-year report. Programs may request approval for submitting the evaluation report at a later date, if additional time is needed to complete the evaluation.

3. **End-of-year case service reports** including statistical information about the activities of the project, as described below under "service counting methods", is due thirty days following the end of the grant period.

4. **Final expenditure report** is due thirty days following the end of the grant period. The same form will be used as is used for other Trust Fund expenditure reports.

5. **Submission of copies of materials developed** for the project, or the index to lengthy manuals used by staff and volunteers.

6. **Periodic Supplemental Evaluation.** In addition to the evaluation required of each recipient, the Trust Fund may provide supplemental evaluation support for a few selected programs each year to assist them in conducting a more thorough and detailed evaluation. All programs would eventually receive this supplemental evaluation, with a few programs chosen each year. The Trust Fund Commission has postponed a decision about whether to move forward with supplemental evaluation this year until such time as the first two major goals for the consultant are achieved – helping programs launch evaluation plans, and preparing an overall statewide evaluation report on the partnership grants.

Goals for Pro Per Assistance

The following general goals for pro per assistance provide the basis for the partnership grant projects. The listing of these goals is followed by the specific questions about pro per assistance that will be the subject of evaluation during the first grant cycle.

- Pro per assistance can improve public trust and confidence in the judicial system

by providing individuals with their day in court and an opportunity to be heard.

- Pro per assistance can educate individuals so that their expectations are reasonable in light of the law and facts and then can help them achieve what they believe is appropriate from the judicial procedure.

- Pro per assistance can help increase the likelihood that cases are decided on the law and the facts, free of inappropriate influences, and that litigants are referred to legal representation where necessary.

- Pro per assistance can have an impact on the actual results of the case — in other words, can actually help self-represented litigants obtain a fairer result, based on the law and facts, than if they had not had any assistance.

High-Priority Questions as Basis of Required Evaluation

The following questions are of the utmost concern, and each project's final evaluation report must respond to each of these questions, in order. During the first grant cycle, the answers may be more subjective and may not necessarily be scientifically-valid quantitative answers because there has not yet been time for adequate evaluative planning and due to the need to balance evaluation with the provision of services. However, projects should use the combination of methods they determine will enable them to respond as well as possible this year; as to one or two of the questions, individual projects may need to respond by explaining why that question could not be answered fully or is not applicable to their project.

1. Which case types were most amenable to effective self-help assistance, and are there case types where self-help assistance is not effective?

2. Which types of assistance (introductory workshops, written and video materials, one-on-one assistance, follow-up sessions) were most effective in various legal matters?

3. Were pro pers more prepared after using a self-help center? Were forms more adequately prepared and, on balance, were cases less time-consuming for bench officers and clerks after self-help assistance?

4. Where, and for what reasons, were litigants referred for representation or more complete assistance – was the referral due to the complexity of the subject matter; due to personal reasons, such as their relative skills, language barriers, etc.; or due to other reasons?

5. To what extent did pro per litigants have reasonable expectations before they received pro per assistance, and did expectations change as a result of the assistance?

6. Were pro pers satisfied with the assistance they received from the project?

7. Were pro pers satisfied with their opportunity to make their case?

8. Were the outcomes of cases changed as a result of self-help assistance?

9. Did the representation of opposing parties interfere with the effectiveness of self-help assistance?

10. On average, did self-represented litigants achieve results more consistent with the law and facts in their case, after receiving self-help assistance?

Service Counting Methods

Recipients must report both number of individuals served by their partnership project as well as number of activities provided. Projects that provide individual counsel and advice or other brief services (such as reviewing relevant information and counseling the client on how to take action, or helping the client negotiate with the opposing party) should include the number of clients to whom such services were provided in their annual case summary report to the Trust Fund Commission. The number of clients should also be maintained separately for the Partnership Grant project and reported in an annual report for the project. To the extent that it is possible also to count the total number of contacts with those clients, that is highly desirable; otherwise an estimate of the total number of client contacts based on a reasonable sample will be satisfactory.

In addition, projects should count the quantity of services they provide that do not include individual counsel and advice or other brief legal services to clients. We are aware that this second set of reports will probably involve some duplication because one individual will take advantage of various services offered; we believe that the information about the total number of users of each service is valuable information for its own purposes. However, information on total users of the system, without any duplication, is also required; see the last report below. Quantitative reports should include the following:

a. Number of informational workshops, video presentations or legal clinics conducted and total number of individuals attending such sessions, for each area of law offered.

b. Number of one-on-one meetings to provide information to pro per litigants, for each area of law and type of assistance offered.

c. Number of information packets distributed for each area of law.

d. Number of pro bono attorneys working with the project and total number of hours of assistance they provided.

e. Number of referrals to other organizations, or to the parent legal services program, based either on an actual count or on a reasonable sample. If possible, this should include a count by organization and information about the reason for referral.

f. If possible, a count, or an estimate based either on a reasonable sample or on a client survey, of the total number of individuals served (as opposed to the number of client contacts), regardless of how many different services used by any one individual. Programs may also want to calculate the total number of persons helped by their services, including family members, etc. However, this number should be reported separately from the total number of individuals served directly.

The Trust Fund Program recognizes that these projects may be innovative and experimental. This will mean that in some cases the project will be counting things other than those described above. It may also mean that the project, and the data it should collect, will change over the course of the grant period. Please contact the Trust Fund office if your project needs to establish different service counting methods.

Outcome Measurement

During the first grant year, recipients will be asked to include some outcome measurements in their first year evaluations, as well as plan for a more thorough system for measuring and evaluating results of the projects in the event of future funding. Outcome measurements and analysis of those measurements should be included in the responses to the high-priority questions listed above. Each project's plan for measuring results, as part of an overall evaluation plan, should be approved by the Trust Fund Program, and the quality of these plans will be a factor in funding decisions. The Trust Fund will attempt to provide the assistance of an evaluation consultant to assist recipients with this effort.

Project staff should identify and define specific desired outcomes for pro per litigants who receive service, and develop a plan for measuring how frequently these results are

achieved. Outcomes to be measured may also include effects on the court, and on the legal services program itself. For example, a study of a statistical sampling of cases involving those using the self-help center could compare the following information with a baseline:

- were more judgments completed?
- were fewer defaults entered?
- was service more often completed appropriately?
- were fewer hearings continued due to procedural problems?
- were more stipulations reached?
- did the litigant's legal situation appear to improve as a result of pro per assistance?

Suggested methods for measuring outcomes include:

1. Individual interviews with judges, court clerks, private attorneys and unrepresented litigants both who were and were not users of the self-help center;

2. Focus groups with the same types of individuals;

3. Phone calls to a random sampling of users of the services;

4. Written questionnaires, including client satisfaction forms, submitted immediately upon receiving assistance as well as questionnaires mailed to users shortly after their court hearing. These questionnaires could ask for satisfaction, level of preparedness, and suggestions for improving the project;

5. Analyzing a selection of court files. An expert could look at case files and, aware of the inherent limitations of depending solely on the written case file, seek to make a determination as to the effectiveness of the pro per's self-representation.

6. The use of court watchers – possibly students or other volunteers – who view pro pers who have been assisted and note their ability to self-represent and the outcome of the hearing; court watchers could also attend hearings in

other courtrooms in similar subject matters where no assistance has been provided, for comparison purposes. Although court watchers would obviously be limited in their ability to actually evaluate the outcome of an individual case, their overall impression of the abilities of pro per litigants could be a valuable part of an evaluation plan that includes several other components.

Trust Fund Program Role in Evaluation Process

The Trust Fund Program will seek to engage a consultant to work with staff and partnership grant recipients in this evaluation process. The consultant will have two primary roles:

First, the consultant will be available to work with recipients to assist them in the development of practical and reasonable evaluation methods, which must be approved by Trust Fund staff. The consultant will then work with recipients to help implement those evaluation plans. The consultant will communicate with recipients about expectations regarding evaluations and documentation required, and other assistance as needed.

Second, the consultant will be responsible for the preparation of an overall evaluation of the partnership grants, based on the reports submitted. The draft evaluation plan will be the subject of a meeting with recipients to obtain their feedback before the plan is finalized. The Trust Fund and Judicial Council staff will work together to ensure appropriate distribution of the evaluation report to all interested parties.

In addition to the evaluation process described above, the Trust Fund may provide supplemental evaluation support for a few select programs each year to obtain more detailed information to help in the overall evaluation plan. All programs would eventually receive this supplemental evaluation, with a few programs chosen each year. The Trust Fund Commission has postponed a decision about whether to move forward with supplemental evaluations this year until such time as the first two major goals for the consultant are achieved. The primary purpose of the supplemental evaluation assistance will be to determine the effectiveness of the type of pro per assistance being provided and to collect generic evaluative information about the partnership grants; the Trust Fund Program retains the right and obligation to use the information for monitoring and oversight purposes, if appropriate.

Monroe Self-Help Legal Access Center

Evaluation Plan

Introduction

San Fernando Valley Neighborhood Legal Services (NLS) is working diligently to create a user-friendly self-help center. The Monroe Self-help Legal Access Center has been very successful and the demand for services at the Monroe Center has exceeded expectations. Given the overwhelming and positive results a systematic evaluation plan will be beneficial to both the Trust Fund Commission and NLS.

Evaluation Plan

An Evaluation Plan has been developed with several goals in mind. Staff has focused on developing a system that can identify program strengths and weaknesses and improve the project. The primary goal, however, has been to design a plan which provides access to real time data. This will enable project staff to readily identify any problems and quickly make adjustments when necessary. Moreover, the Evaluation Plan will accurately portray the work of the Monroe Center in a format that will facilitate the Trust Fund and the Judicial Council's ability to evaluate the benefits of the self-help center projects.

The Evaluation Plan has been strongly influenced by the "*Reporting Requirements and Evaluation Methodology for Partnership Grant Recipients*" authored by Mary C. Viviano and Judy Garlow. This document was used as a guide to designing the project Evaluation Plan. Similarities are intentional.

Evaluation Matrix

The attached Evaluation Matrix is an overall conceptual diagram of NLS' Evaluation Plan for the Monroe Center. The Matrix will be used by project staff to assist them to regularly and efficiently evaluate activities. Although, at first glance, the Matrix may seem complex, it is simply a list of: 1) project goals and outcomes, 2) outcome indicators and 3) the method by which data will be collected.

Detailed Description of Evaluation Matrix:

COLUMN ONE: The first column lists the six overarching goals for the project. Narrowing the focus of each of these goals, outcomes have been identified, denoting a more specific change or benefit sought to be achieved through the project.

COLUMN TWO: The second column lists the outcome indicators or measurable objectives that indicate whether project outcomes are being met. The outcome indicators are correlated to the identified outcomes. The indicators follow the "High Priority Questions" listed in the "*Reporting Requirements and Evaluation Methodology for Partnership Grant Recipients.*" The answers to these questions seemed particularly relevant to determining if outcomes, and in turn project goal were being met.

COLUMN THREE: The third column identifies which particular collection data method will be used to gather the information regarding each specific outcome indicator. The data collection methods are further discussed below.

Methods of Collecting Data

The overall goal in selecting data collection methods is to get the most useful information in the most cost-efficient manner. NLS decided to use multiple data collection methods so that the information could be obtained from a variety of perspectives. The following lists the data collection methods selected along with projected timeline for collecting the data:

A. Interviews with Key Informants. Interviews will be conducted with judges, clerks, pro bono attorneys, Monroe High school students who staff the project, project staff and guests of the Center. The goal is to interview 5 judges, 10 clerks, 20 lawyers, 19 students and 40 guests. Interviews will begin in October and will continue to the end of the funding period.

B. Focus Groups. NLS will conduct five Focus Groups with court clerks, judges, and pro bono attorneys as participants, and two groups using Center guests. Focus Groups will begin in October and will continue to the end of the funding period.

C. Random Sample Calling. Project staff will randomly call guests after they have received assistance. Ten percent of all guest served will be called randomly beginning in October and continuing to the end of the funding period.

D. Guest Satisfaction Questionnaires. Since the inception of the project, each guest is given a questionnaire regarding the services at the conclusion of receiving assistance. This method will continue to the end of the funding period.

E. Guest Post Court Survey. When each guest leaves the Center they will receive a Post Court Survey along with a stamped envelope addressed to NLS. Guest Post Court Survey will be distributed in October and will continue to be distributed until the end of the funding period.

F. Review of Documents. Project staff will review court files and center files. The goal is to review 20% of guests' files. Document Review will begin in October and will continue to the end of the funding period.

G. Assessment of Guests' understanding of legal issues pre and post assistance. Project staff will evaluate guests' understanding of their legal situation and court process prior to providing assistance. After assistance, staff will assess if guests have a better understanding of their legal circumstance. Guest Assessment will begin in October and will continue to the end of the funding period.

Service Counting Methods

NLS is establishing a sophisticated computerized database which tracks and collects all data required by the Trust Fund Commission. Each guest completes an application prior to receiving assistance which is then entered into NLS' computer database. By the end of October, when this database is fully operational, NLS will be able to generate a report which indicates the number of guests assisted, type of assistance, the number of contacts with each individual guest and the number of persons helped by a specific service, i.e. family members.

A Case Disposition form is on the back of each application which is completed by the volunteer assisting the guest. Using the Case Disposition form, NLS is able to track the number of information packets distributed for each area of law and the number and reason for referrals to other organizations.

Managing and Monitoring the Evaluation

NLS' Deputy Director, the Project Coordinator and the Site Coordinator will review ongoing results of the data collection methods every month. Staff will modify the Evaluation plan as needed in addition to adjusting project strategy to improve its effectiveness.

Evaluation Matrix

PROJECT GOALS/ OUTCOMES	OUTCOME INDICATORS	Data Collection Method (*See codes below*)						
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
COURT ACCESS **GOAL:** Improve public trust in the judicial system by providing individuals with an opportunity to be heard. **OUTCOME:** Guests are satisfied with assistance they receive from Center and with opportunity to present case in Court.	Guests satisfied with the assistance they received from the project. (Number and Percent)	X	X	X	X			
	Guests complete and file response or initiate an action. (Number and Percent)	X	X	X		X	X	
	Guests satisfied with opportunity to present their case in court. (Number and Percent)	X	X	X		X		
	What types of cases are/are not well suited to self-help assistance?	X	X	X	X			X
PRO PER EDUCATION **GOAL:** Educate Guests so expectations are reasonable in light of law and facts. **OUTCOME:** Guests understand their legal problem and feel empowered to utilize the judicial process on their own.	Guests have a better understanding of their legal situation. (Number and Percent)	X	X	X	X			X
	Guests have a better understanding of the judicial process. (Number and Percent)	X	X	X	X			X
	Most effective types of assistance for educating guests.	X	X	X				
	Guests are more prepared after using the Self-help Center. (Number and Percent)	X	X	X		X	X	
COURT PROCESS **GOAL/OUTCOME:** Increase the likelihood that cases are decided on the law and the facts, free of inappropriate influences.	Did opposing parties' representation interfere with the effectiveness of self-help?	X	X	X		X		
	Were forms more adequately prepared with self-help assistance?	X	X				X	
	Guests able to obtain Fee Waivers. (Number and Percent)			X		X	X	
	Are cases less time-consuming for court officers?	X	X					

A = Interviews with knowledgeable informants, including judges, clerks, attorneys, pro per litigants
B = Focus Groups
C = Random Sample Calling
D = Guest Satisfaction Questionnaires
E = Guest Post Court Survey
F = Review of Documents, Court Files, Center Files
G = Assessment of guest's understanding of legal issue pre and post assistance

PROJECT GOALS	OUTCOME INDICATORS	Data Collection Method (*See codes below*)						
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
APPROPRIATE REFERRALS **GOAL/OUTCOME:** Guest will be referred to legal representation and other services when appropriate.	Where Guest referred for legal representation? Why?						X	
	Was the Guest referred to other services?						X	
CASE OUTCOME **GOAL:** Self-help assistance will help "level the playing field" for pro pers. **OUTCOME:** Guests obtain a fairer result, based on the law and facts, than if they had not had any assistance.	Were the outcomes of cases changed as a result of self-help assistance?	X				X	X	
	Guests achieve results more consistent with the law and facts in their case.	X					X	
	Decision in the guest's case.					X	X	
EFFICIENT PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT **GOAL:** Project is operated efficiently. **OUTCOME:** Staff and volunteers are effectively used to help pro se litigants, enabling NLS to more efficiently utilize program resources.	Are pro bono attorney and Monroe High School student trainings effective?	X	X					
	Are pro se materials useful?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	Are clinic administrative materials effective?	X	X		X	X	X	X
	Has the project enabled NLS to utilize staff resources more effectively?	X	X					

A = Interviews with knowledgeable informants, including judges, clerks, attorneys, and pro se litigants
B = Focus Groups
C = Random Sample Calling
D = Guest Satisfaction Questionnaires
E = Guest Post Court Survey
F = Review of Documents, Court Files, Center Files
G = Assessment of guest's understanding of legal issue pre and post assistance

Why Bother with Evaluation?

Some people question whether it is worth the time, effort and funding to try to evaluate the impacts of self-help programs since (1) evaluation is so difficult and (2) anybody should know that something is better than nothing.

Here are three reasons you want to bother:

1. **Justifying funding.** It can be *very* helpful when asking for funding to be able to cite statistics such as number of people served, customer satisfaction ratings, etc. You have to be able to convince each of several groups that you're making a difference:
    - Funders will fund programs that work;
    - Judges will support programs that help people;
    - Court administrators will allocate resources to programs that have proven their effectiveness;
    - Legislators and other elected officials will put resources behind programs that reach many of their constituents.

2. **Management.** Court managers need to know where to focus their scarce resources. They need to know whether they get the "biggest bang for the buck" with pamphlets, computer programs, workshops, one-on-one sessions, etc.

3. **Institutional responsibility.** The claim of pro per assistance programs is that they help people – that they do more than simply make the litigants feel better. We need to know whether self-help is "real," or just a "feel-good" program.

There are Several Distinctive Criteria We Might Want to Assess

Question	Evaluation Criterion	Method(s)
Do customers like the program?	Customer satisfaction	• Surveys • Focus groups • Interviews
Do customers feel better able to handle their legal matters?	Self-efficacy	
Are customers better able to understand court proceedings?	Effectiveness[1] Access to justice	
Are customers more likely to feel they've had their "day in court?"	Access to justice	
Do customers do better by going through the program?	Effectiveness	• Subjective customer assessment of case outcome • Third-party assessment of case files
Are court proceedings and administration more efficient?	Efficiency	• Surveys of judges and staff asking them to compare customers with non-customers • Observation of courtroom proceedings • Analysis of case files

1 This would mean customers would be more likely to be willing and/or able to carry out or comply with court orders.

Basic Questions for an Evaluation Designer

1. What's the outcome I'm interested in measuring? Consider your audience(s) and the questions they have.

2. What kind of data will I need? You must balance two kinds of demands:
    - *Numbers* and statistics (e.g., from surveys) are important for convincing funders and others of "hard facts," but
    - *Subjective* data (e.g., from focus groups or interviews) can often tell a much better, richer story – and sometimes they are the only data you can get your hands on.

3. What's the comparison? A single measure on its own is never meaningful. You have to answer the question: compared to what? The basic choices are:
    - Before-and-after (look at historical data and trends);
    - Treatment-and-Control (compare program customers with pro per litigants who did not go through the program);
    - Benchmarking (compare your program's measures with measures from other programs.

4. What kind of evaluation resources do I have? Do you have, or can you afford, people who are accomplished in:
    - Surveys (and don't forget the data-entry!)
    - Interviews
    - Focus groups
    - Archival data collection
    - Statistical analysis

Different Groups Have Different Questions

Group	Big Question(s)	Most Satisfying Type of Data
Funders	Does this work? Is it having an impact?	• Numbers of customers served • Customer satisfaction surveys • Interviews/Testimonials • Focus groups • Outcome studies
Program Managers	Which types of program work best?	• Cross-program comparisons
Attorneys	Does this steal my business?	• Income levels of customers • Referrals
Judges and Court Administrators	Does this make my job easier?	• Testimonials • Statistical comparisons of case processing times and/or document accuracy

Surveys (Mail, telephone or face to face)

	Advantages	Disadvantages
Face to Face	- Well-suited for populations for whom there is no list, or who are not likely to respond willingly or accurately by phone or mail - Very compatible with complex questionnaires - Can increase the likelihood of participation utilizing interviewer experience (thus increasing response rate and reducing error rate)	- High Labor Cost - Expensive - Time-consuming - Requires utilizing trained staff
Telephone	- Produces results quickly - Can address problems quickly (face to face or mail would take longer) - Greater interviewer control exists - Less labor costs than face to face surveys	- Sampling error (for studies conducted with the general population—not all households have phone, or for list sample surveys—researchers may not have everyone's telephone number) - Requires experienced interviewers to explain the purpose of the survey - It's easy to collect inaccurate data since people may want to just hang up the telephone
Mail	- Require the least amount of resources and experienced staff - Can allow one to minimize sampling error at a lower cost by increasing sample size - Mail survey is more anonymous and can reduce question sensitivity and interviewer bias	- Yields the lowest response rates of all survey modes; people are less likely to respond to mail surveys - Design is important since no one is there to help respondent fill it out - Little control exists over what the respondent does with the questionnaire - Mail survey project require a lot of time

Focus Groups

Advantages	Disadvantages
The technique is a socially-oriented research method capturing real-life data in a social environment	Focus groups afford the researcher less control than individual interviews
It has flexibility	Data are difficult to analyze
It has speedy results	Moderators require special skills
It is low in cost	Difference between groups can be troublesome
	Groups are difficult to assemble
	The discussion must be conducted in a conducive environment

Factors to consider for focus groups and surveys:

	Focus Group	Surveys
Purpose	To stimulate thinking and elicit ideas on a particular subject	To determine what proportion of a predefined population has a particular attribute or opinion
Structure	Discussion of a small group of people, led by a moderator	Mail, telephone, or face-to-face questionnaire, completed by an individual respondent
Capacity to Generalize to a larger population	No	Yes
Capacity to generate ideas or hypothesis for later testing	Yes	To Some Extent
Capacity to test ideas or hypothesis	To Some Extent	Yes
Must questions and answers be formulated ahead of time?	No, but moderator must be ready to guide the discussion	Yes, except for open-ended questions

Possible Issues to Consider When Evaluating a Self-Help Center

Service delivery method

What are the best ways to provide services given the target population? These services require different levels of resources, provide different levels of assistance, and thus, evaluation criteria may be different.

One-on-one services
Groups or workshops
Computer programs to complete forms
Computer programs for legal information and research
Over-the-telephone services
Response to mailed or faxed questions or requests for assistance
Services in languages other than English
Videotapes on procedures, form information
Mediation or other ADR
Telephone helpline
Provision of forms and instructions packets
Legal information handouts regarding statutes, etc
Provision of service in the courtroom
Availability of materials (books, etc.) in self-help center
Off-site services (community center, mobile van, etc.)
Referrals to other community services
Community presentations
Use of volunteers
Information on websites
Presentations on legal issues on community television programs
Training in public speaking for self-represented litigants
Developing mentors for other self-represented litigants
Availability of quiet work areas, copy machines, public phones, stamp vending machines, etc.
Courthouse information booth to direct litigants to the service
Courthouse maps

Judicial officer and courtroom factors affecting accessibility

What are factors that judicial officers and court executive officers can consider in making the courtroom more accessible to self-represented litigants?

Support people allowed to attend court hearings
Clarity of language used by judicial officer (non-legalese)
Willingness to ask litigants questions to obtain necessary information for findings
Willingness to settle cases whenever possible
Orders prepared by courtroom staff before litigants leave the court hearing
Length of time to wait before a case is called
Length of time for court appearance to be completed
Availability of children's waiting room
Telephonic appearances
Choice of hearing times and days
Staffing of children's waiting room
Availability and proximity of public parking
Cost and time limits of public parking
Number of times litigants need to return to court due to continuances, etc.
Recognition by judicial officer of difficulty in self-representation and congratulatory/encouraging remarks where appropriate
Proximity of self-help program office to main entrance of courthouse, clerk's office
The impact of court rules and procedures on self-represented litigants is considered

Court clerk factors affecting accessibility

How can we ensure that the point of first contact at the courthouse provides effective access? How can courts evaluate the customer friendliness of their clerks' office? Here are some possible services and methods for evaluating accessibility.

Provision of information about potential required forms and procedural options
Length of line at the clerk's office
Dedicated line for court customers to use to contact the court clerk
Number of hours telephones will be answered each day
Proximity of court clerk's office to service program office
Process for receiving complaints or suggestions
Providing forms packets and informational materials

Availability of other assistance in the community

There are many types of services needed to serve self-represented litigants. How do you effectively work with your partners in the community to avoid duplication of efforts? What ways can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of these services?

Pro bono services
Legal services programs
Attorneys willing to provide unbundled services
Modest means/sliding scale panels
Legal document assistants
Mediators
Self-help section in the law library
List of books and resources in the law library or public library
Lawyer Referral Service
Bar sponsored legal information services, etc.
Law Day activities

Issues Concerning Success of Service

Once you have defined what you want to achieve, and what services you will provide to reach those goals, how will you measure the success of those services? What issues will you want to consider?

Location and physical appearance of service program office
Proximity of service program office to clerk's office, courtrooms, etc.
Diversity of staff
Demeanor of staff
Suggestion box
Frequency of repeat visits to complete just one discrete task
Length of time to wait for services
Availability of a waiting room
Method for evaluating customer comments
Availability of system for file review to help customer complete case
Method for tracking customer follow-through: did they get to the court hearing, did they receive a final judgment, etc.
Referrals from community service organizations
Referrals from other departments or offices within courthouse
Incorporation of program into the outreach efforts of judges and court staff
How is information about the service distributed?
Are there regular meetings with other stakeholders in the community assisting self-represented litigants

Family law information centers– Legislative direction for evaluation

Family Code section 15010 (k) provides that

The Judicial Council shall conduct an evaluation of the pilot project and shall report to the Legislature, no later than March 1, 2003, on the success of the pilot project.

The evaluation shall include outcome measures that address:

1) increased access to the courts for low-income litigants

and 2) any reduced burden on the courts

by having the services of the family law information center available.

The evaluation shall include an assessment of the number of people using the services of the family law information center, categorized by:

1) gender

2) type of information sought, including information regarding

a) marital dissolution, paternity or domestic violence prevention proceedings, or

b) relating to child custody, visitation, child support, or spousal support.

The evaluation shall also assess the frequency with which people seek information from the family law information center to

a) initiate an action or to respond to an action.

The pilot project shall be deemed a success if, among other things,

1) the pilot project court assists at least 100 low-income family law litigants in each year of its operation,

2) a majority of the judges surveyed in the pilot project court believe the family law information center helps to expedite family law cases with pro per litigants,

and 3) a majority of the persons using the family law information center evaluate the services of the family law information center favorably.

Family Law Facilitator Survey Sheet

Customer Intake

INTAKE INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PEOPLE SEEKING ASSISTANCE FROM THE FACILITATOR. PLEASE FILL OUT INFORMATION FOR THE PERSON WHO NEEDS THE SERVICE. Your name is not requested. This survey will only be used to determine whether we are reaching a broad range of people in the community.

Please use the No 2 pencil provided to you. Fill in the entire bubble.
Please erase any errors completely. Just fill in this side of form.

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

CORRECT: ● INCORRECT: ✓ X

1. What language do you prefer to speak? (Mark one)
   - English
   - Spanish
   - Portuguese
   - Armenian
   - Assyrian
   - Mandarin
   - Cantonese
   - Vietnamese
   - Tagalog
   - Korean
   - Cambodian
   - Hmong
   - Farsi
   - Sign
   - Other _____

2. You are:
   - Male
   - Female

3. How many children under 19 do you have?
   - none
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more
   - Parentage Contested

4. Your age group is (Optional):
   - 15-19
   - 20-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60 and over

5. Your race/ethnic group is (Optional):
   - Asian / Pacific Islander
   - Black / African
   - Hispanic (all races)
   - Native American / Eskimo / Aleut
   - White (non-Hispanic)
   - Other _____

6. Your monthly income before taxes is:
   - $ 0-$500
   - $ 501 - $1000
   - $ 1001 - $1500
   - $ 1501 - $2000
   - $ 2001 - $3000
   - $ 3001 and over

7. You are: (Mark all that apply)
   - Unemployed
   - Receiving Unemployment
   - Employed/Self-Employed
   - Retired
   - On Public Assistance
   - On Disability / Worker's Comp
   - Help from Family & Friends
   - Receiving Child/Spousal Support
   - Student

8. Highest level of school you completed:
   - 3rd Grade
   - 6th Grade
   - 8th Grade
   - 12th Grade
   - Some College
   - College Graduate
   - Post-Graduate/Professional

9. You are here regarding: (Mark all that apply)
   - Get/change Child Support
   - Get/change Spousal Support
   - Get/change Child Custody
   - Get/change Child Visitation
   - Getting a Divorce
   - Establishing Paternity
   - Responding to Papers you were served
   - Getting back your Driver's License
   - Determining Back Child Support
   - Get/change/stop a Wage Assignment
   - Physical Violence
   - Restraining Order
   - Other _____

10. You were referred by: (Mark all that apply)
    - Judge
    - Clerk's Office
    - DA Family Support
    - Bar Association
    - Attorney
    - Friend
    - Family Court Services
    - Other Facilitator
    - Newspaper
    - Facilitator Pamphlets
    - Other _____

11. How many times have you visited a Facilitator?
    - None
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4 or more

12. Is the DA involved in your Child Support case?
    - Yes
    - No

13. How many times have you had a court hearing about your family law issues?
    - None
    - 1
    - 2
    - 3
    - 4
    - 5
    - 6 or more

14. Your zip code is:

Zip Code				
0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9

Rev. 12/99

SCANTRON CUSTOM FORM NO. F-13891-JC-L © SCANTRON CORPORATION 1999 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED Scantron asks that you please RECYCLE this product M7 4799 222 54321 www.scantron.com

OFFICE USE ONLY

Service Information
FACILITATOR USE ONLY

1. Case type and current status

FLA	UPA	DVPA	DA	OTHER _____
Start	Start	Start	Start	Start
Finish	Finish	Finish	Finish	Finish
Response	Response	Response	Response	Response
Modification	Modification	Modification	Modification	Modification
Other	Other	Other	Other	Other
Petitioner	Petitioner	Petitioner	Petitioner	Petitioner
Respondent	Respondent	Respondent	Respondent	Respondent

Total # of cases

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6 or more

2. Issue
- Child Support
- Spousal Support
- Time Share Calculations
- Health Insurance
- Support Arrears
- Day Care Expenses
- Multi-Jurisdictional
- Other _____

3. No. Children
- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 or more
- Parentage contested

4. IV-D
- Y
- N

5. Gender
- M
- F

6. Staff Category
- Facilitator
- Paralegal
- Volunteer
- Staff Attorney
- Legal Assistant
- Intern
- Other _____

7. Other Child Support
- Juvenile Delinquency
- Juvenile Dependency
- Foster Care
- Guardianship
- Other _____

8. Time: 0-15 min. | 16-30 min. | 31-60 min. | 1-2 hr. | 2-3 hr. | 3-4 hr. | 4+ hr.

9. Contact Type: Workshop | Individual Appt. | Drop-In | Fax/Mail/Email

10. Assistance with:
- Document Review
- Support Calculations
- Financial Mediation
- Financial Stipulation
- Procedural Information
- Educational Literature
- Educational Videos
- Referral
- Arrearages
- Judgment Set Aside
- Other _____

11. Forms
- Fee Waiver
- Income & Expense Decl
- Petition/Complaint
- Responsive Papers
- OSC/Motion
- Ex Parte
- License Revocation Review
- Stip & Order
- OAH
- Wage Assmt/Enfcmt
- Judgment
- Other _____

12. Facilitator Document Preparation/Activities
- Prepare Pleadings
- Obtain & Review File/Minutes
- Conform & File
- Prepare Settlement Conference Stmt.
- Case Registry
- Conference with DAFSD
- Conference with other FLF
- Other Agencies
- Other _____

13. Court
- Review files for readiness
- Interview litigants
- Financial Mediations
- Support Calculation
- Prepare OAH/CLETS
- Financial Stipulations
- Procedural Information
- Educational Materials
- Special Master
- Referral
- Other _____

14. Self-Help Center
- Distribute Literature
- Distribute Forms
- Use of Guideline Support Computer
- Other Computer Use
- General Information
- Document Review
- Videos
- Library
- Referrals
- Other _____

15. Referrals
- Custody Mediation
- DA Family Support
- DA Abducted Children
- Attorney Referral
- Legal Aid
- DV Group
- Other Facilitator
- Other _____

16. Telephone Contact
- General Information
- Procedural Information
- Case Registry Information
- Case Status Information
- Support Calculation
- Referrals
- Called Back/Follow up
- Make Appt: _____

Comments: _____

17. Number of attendees at group presentations:

0	0	0
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	3	3
4	4	4
5	5	5
6	6	6
7	7	7
8	8	8
9	9	9

18.

Mon		Day		Yr	
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	2	2	2
	3	3	3	3	3
	4		4	4	4
	5		5	5	5
	6		6	6	6
	7		7	7	7
	8		8	8	8
	9		9	9	9

19.

Site ID#				
0	0	0	0	0
1	1	1	1	1
2	2	2	2	2
3	3	3	3	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	5	5	5	5
6	6	6	6	6
7	7	7	7	7
8	8	8	8	8
9	9	9	9	9

20. Customer number:

005051

OFFICE USE ONLY

DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA