APPENDIX D
METHODOLOGY

I. Legislative Charge

In 1999 the California Legislature created the Equal Access Fund (EAF) "to improve equal access and the fair administration of justice."[1] The initial allocation of ten million dollars has been renewed in each subsequent year. The fund is distributed to non-profit legal aid providers by the Legal Services Trust Fund Commission of the State Bar of California, overseen by the Judicial Council. The State Budget Act of 2001 requires the Judicial Council to send a report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by March 1, 2005, on the efficiency and effectiveness of the operations of projects funded from the EAF, including an assessment of the fund's success in meeting the unmet needs of unrepresented litigants and recommended changes to the program to increase efficiency and effectiveness.

II. Background to Research Design

This evaluation was designed and carried out by staff from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC), Center for Families, Children & the Courts (CFCC) in conjunction with the staff and commission of the State Bar of California Legal Services Trust Fund Program (LSTFP). Given the collaborative nature of the grant administration and the diversity of the 164 projects supported by the EAF, the involvement of EAF grantees and other legal aid experts was a high priority in constructing the evaluation. The initial design was developed by consultants from the Resource for Great Programs (RGP) in 2002 and 2003. RGP conducted a series of conference calls, focus groups, and meetings that included directors from 50 non-profit legal aid providers. An assessment of the available and potentially available data was completed, an approach for conducting the evaluation was developed, and preliminary data from budget proposals and year-end reports were collected and analyzed.

One of the primary outcomes of the collaborative design process was the determination that non-profit legal aid providers in California have developed diverse responses to the needs of their client communities. The 164 projects situated within 99 legal aid providers use a variety of service models, with some providers focusing on direct representation; others on brief advice and counsel to clients; and others on legal education in the community, partnerships with the courts,

[1] Stats. 1999, ch. 50, § 2, item No. 0250-101-0001, sched. (hx), prov. 2; SB 160.

or capacity building for other organizations. EAF grantees also vary by size, the amount of EAF funding they receive, and the proportion of the project that is funded by EAF and the proportion funded by other sources.

These varied service models made the development of a traditional evaluation model with standardized outcome measures impossible. Instead, the consultants, legal aid provider staff, AOC staff, and LSTF staff designed a series of indicators that could be collected across all provider types and that would address the Legislature's charge of reporting on the efficiency and effectiveness of the projects and on the success of meeting the unmet needs of self-represented litigants. These indicators follow:

1. Report on clients: *What are the unmet needs of low-income Californians, including unrepresented litigants?*

    a. Who were the clients served by the projects supported by the EAF during the 2003–2004 funding cycle?
    b. What were the legal needs of people served by the EAF during the 2003–2004 funding cycle?
    c. What special populations were served (such as non-English speakers or the elderly)?

2. Report on services: *What is the efficiency and effectiveness of funded projects? What is the EAF's success at meeting unmet needs?*

    a. What was the range of legal services supported by EAF during the 2003–2004 funding cycle?
    b. What legal education was provided to clients and community members?
    c. What collaborations and partnerships were conducted by EAF grantees?

3. Report on funding: *How have the EAF funds been used to meet the needs of unrepresented litigants and other low-income people?*

    a. How were EAF resources used across all funded projects?
    b. How were additional resources employed?

In addition, the evaluation team provided resources and technical assistance to build project capacity to design and carry out their own outcomes-based evaluation. The results of these self-evaluations are used throughout the report to provide information on the effectiveness of individual projects.

III. Research Methods

1. Participants

The participants in this study are 99 non-profit legal aid providers that received a grant from the Equal Access Fund (EAF) during the 2003–2004 grant year. Since most of these providers received EAF money continuously since the fund's inception in 1999, they provide a reasonable overview of how the majority of the money has been spent over time. While the specific projects, activities, and staff costs covered by the grants have varied more over the years than the amount of money each provider has received, in most cases these too have remained substantially the same. As a result, data from this single grant year provides an accurate cross-sectional look at how the money was used.

In accordance with the legislative requirements,[2] there are two types of legal aid providers that received grants from the fund. The first and most numerous type, nonprofit legal aid providers, offers an array of legal and law-related services directly to eligible clients. These providers are further divided into two subtypes: independent organizations and law school clinics (attached to law schools), both of which provide free legal services to indigent people.[3] The second type of provider, support centers, primarily provides free legal training, technical assistance, or advocacy support to the legal aid providers mentioned above.[4]

2. Summary of Data Sources and Reporting Periods

Different time periods are covered in this report, depending on the type of project (EAF grantee or EAF partnership grantee), and the nature of the data reported. For EAF grantees, some data is taken from proposed budgets for FY 2003–2004, which ran from October 1, 2003, through September 30, 2004. Other data was taken from interim final reports covering October 1, 2003 through March 31, 2004. Data is also reported from those projects that conducted self-evaluations, covering various time periods between October 1, 2003 and July 31, 2004. All data used to describe and evaluate EAF partnership grantees came from calendar year 2003 (which is also the fiscal year for those projects).

EAF Grantees: In August 2003 EAF grantees submitted to LSTF project descriptions and proposed budgets for grant year 2003–2004. The evaluation team developed a coding system to abstract standardized information from these project descriptions and reports, including descriptive data on clients served, services provided, and the manner in which EAF funds were incorporated into provider budgets (see attachment 1).

Beginning with grant year 2003–2004, providers were also asked to report outcome data on each EAF-funded project they ran. Outcome data included the number and type of direct legal

[2] CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 6213 (a), (b) (Deering 2003).
[3] CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 6213 (a) (Deering 2003).
[4] CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE § 6213 (b) (Deering 2003).

services provided to individual clients, and the number and type of legal education and other services provided to individuals or community organizations. Those results covered the period from October 1, 2003, through March 31, 2004 (see attachment 3).

The providers that engaged in self-evaluation of individual projects also submitted reports on the evaluations. Those reports covered a variety of time periods between October 1, 2003, and July 31, 2004.

EAF Partnership Grantees: Partnership grantees operate on a calendar year funding cycle and had slightly different reporting requirements. The reports on their activities in 2003 were submitted to LSTF in early 2004. These year-end reports serve as the primary source of information about the partnership projects. The reports included descriptive and outcome data similar to that reported by the EAF grantees, but tailored to the work of the self-help centers. They also included answers to evaluation questions that were given to the projects at the beginning of 2003 (see attachment 4). A coding system was developed to capture descriptive, outcome, and evaluation information (see attachment 2).

Partnership grant proposals for 2003 also served as a source of descriptive information about those projects. In addition, some projects submitted extensive year-end reports that went beyond the requirements of their EAF grants. Data from both those sources is incorporated in this report.

3. Sources of Data

Most of the data in this report comes from three sources: (1) annual budget proposals submitted by providers prior to the start of each grant year; (2) annual reports, including standard Legal Services Corporation case and matters closing statistics, that cover what a project has accomplished; and (3) reports on self-evaluation efforts, submitted in conjunction with the annual reports, including data showing whether goals and objectives were met. The data was gathered by the EAF grantees, reported to LSTF staff, and forwarded to AOC staff for analysis. Detailed descriptions of each source are set out below.

Budget Proposals for non-partnership grants. In August of each year, budget proposals for each project are submitted to LSTF staff and reviewed. Beginning with the 2002—2003 grant year and continuing with the 2003-2004 grant year, a coding system was developed to capture important information from these proposals (see attachment 1). Data used in this report comes from the 2003-2004 budget proposals.

a. Who submitted the data. Each provider that received EAF funding for grant year 2003–2004 had to complete a proposed budget and submit it to LSTF. The grant year for these projects began October 1, and proposed budgets were due in August 2003.
b. Who collected the data. The data to complete the budgets was initially collected by the legal aid providers receiving EAF grants. The budget proposals are currently held by LSTF in paper format and AOC has copies of these.

c. How the data was collected. Quantitative data was collected using the in-house case-tracking or record-keeping systems employed by the individual providers. These vary widely from paper and pencil systems to sophisticated computer-based systems. Qualitative data consists of narratives written by provider personnel in response to questions posed by LSTF.
d. Period of time covered by the data. This data covers October 1, 2003, to September 30, 2004, and is a prospective description of what will be done, based on current needs.
e. Who coded and analyzed the data. These budget proposals were coded by LSTF staff. Reliability coding was done by AOC staff.
f. Method of data analysis. The data was abstracted using a standardized coding system. Once coded, the data was entered into a social science statistical analysis program and descriptive analyses were produced using frequencies and cross-tabs.

Annual Report for non-partnership grants, grant year 2003–2004. An interim, six-month report was submitted by legal aid providers with projects funded by the EAF, with a separate report submitted for each project. Each report covered three basic areas: (1) narrative reports of project goals, implementation, and outcomes; (2) case closing and "matters" reporting spreadsheets detailing the outcomes of cases closed and services provided by grantees; and (3) data from self-evaluations regarding project services and accomplishments. This preliminary version of the annual report (covering the first six months of the grant period) is the first phase of what will become an annual reporting requirement.

a. Who submitted the data. Each provider that received EAF funding for grant year 2003–2004 was required to complete an interim version of the annual report.
b. Who collected the data. The data was initially collected by the legal aid providers receiving EAF grants. The results of the data collection were reported in the interim annual report and any self-evaluation reports that were attached to it. LSTF collected these reports in electronic format, transferred the summary statistics into a database, and forwarded them to the AOC.
c. How the data was collected. Quantitative data was collected using the in-house case-tracking or record-keeping systems employed by the individual providers. These vary widely from paper and pencil systems to sophisticated computer-based systems. Qualitative data in the form of interview or focus group write-ups was also collected by the individual providers. Summaries and excerpts of these were transmitted to LSTF in electronic format. Finally, data in the form of narrative answers to annual report questions were collected by LSTF from provider representatives. All data collected by LSTF was transmitted to AOC for further analyses.
d. Period of time covered by the data. This data covers October 1, 2003, to March 31, 2004, and is a retrospective report of the outcomes of project strategies and services. The data from the case closing and matters reporting spreadsheets covers a uniform time period for all projects, October 1, 2003, through March 31, 2004. Data from self-evaluation efforts covers varying periods of time from October 1, 2003 through July 31, 2004, depending on the type of evaluation performed.

e. Who coded and analyzed the data. Narrative portions of this data were coded by AOC staff. Quantitative portions of the data from the case closing and matters spreadsheets were analyzed by AOC staff. Data from self-evaluations was processed by the providers that collected it, and results in the form of a brief report were sent to LSTF.
f. Method of data analysis. Three methods were used to analyze the data from these reports, based on the type of data collected. A random sample of approximately 25 percent of the narrative reports of progress, along with narrative examples of services provided and objectives achieved, was analyzed qualitatively. The data was read one or more times and grouped into categories based on similar strategies, development, and experiences. The reports were summarized within these categories, and specific, illustrative examples were quoted.

   A coding system was also developed that captured evaluation strategies and progress made in developing effective evaluations. Once coded, the data was analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques.

   Case and matters closing data was analyzed quantitatively using descriptive techniques.

Annual Report for partnership grants, grant year 2003.

a. Who submitted the data. Each legal aid provider that received EAF funding for grant year 2003 was required to complete an annual report.
b. Who collected the data. The data was initially collected by the legal aid providers receiving EAF partnership grants. The results of the data collection were reported in the annual report and answers to self-evaluation questions that were attached to it. LSTF collected these reports in paper format, entered the summary statistics into a database, and forwarded them to the AOC. In addition, data submitted by partnership grantees was coded into a database by LSTF staff and sent to AOC staff for analysis (see Attachment 2 for coding system).
c. How the data was collected. Quantitative data was collected using the in-house case-tracking or record-keeping systems employed by the individual partnership projects. These vary widely from paper and pencil systems to sophisticated computer-based systems. Qualitative data in the form of interview or focus group write-ups was also collected by the individual partnership projects. Summaries and excerpts of these were transmitted to LSTF in electronic format. Finally, data in the form of narrative answers to annual report questions were collected by LSTF from project representatives. All data collected by LSTF was transmitted to AOC for further analyses.
d. Period of time covered by the data. This data covers January 1, 2003, to December 31, 2003, and is a retrospective report of the outcomes of project strategies and services.
e. Who coded and analyzed the data. Narrative portions of this data were coded by LSTF staff and further analyzed by AOC staff. Quantitative portions of the data from the case closing and matters spreadsheets were analyzed by AOC staff. Data from self-evaluations was processed by the projects that collected it, and results in the form of a brief report were sent to LSTF.

f. Method of data analysis. Two methods were used to analyze the data from these reports, based on the type of data collected. The reports were read one or more times and grouped into categories based on similar strategies, development, and experiences. The reports were summarized within these categories, and specific, illustrative examples were quoted. Case and matters closing data was analyzed quantitatively using descriptive techniques.

APPENDIX D—ATTACHMENT 1

CODING SYSTEM FOR DESCRIBING NONPARTNERSHIP GRANTEES USING PROPOSED BUDGETS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003–2004

Reviewer:
Provider number:
Provider name:
Project title:
Comments, follow-up:

1. Areas of legal need addressed (check all that apply):

- ☐ Consumer/finance
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Employment: Job discrimination; Wage claims; Other
- ☐ Family: Adoption; Custody and visitation; Dissolution; Guardianship; Name change; Parental rights termination; Paternity; Domestic violence; Child support; Other
- ☐ Juvenile: Delinquency; Dependency; Other
- ☐ Health: Medicaid; Medicare; Access to mental health services; Other
- ☐ Housing: Public housing rights; Home ownership; Landlord/tenant; Other
- ☐ Income maintenance: TANF/ CalWORKs; Food stamps; Social security; SSI; Unemployment compensation; Veterans benefits; Workers compensation; General relief; Earned income tax credit; Other
- ☐ Individual rights: Immigration; Mental health; Prisoner's rights; Disability rights; Other
- ☐ All (no special issues targeted)
- ☐ Other

2. General issues addressed (check all that apply, if any):

- ☐ Welfare to work
- ☐ Housing and homelessness
- ☐ Equal access to justice—assistance for unrepresented litigants
- ☐ Community economic development
- ☐ Underserved groups based on geography (isolated rural, underserved urban)
- ☐ Underserved groups based on characteristics (e.g., language, ethnicity, age, disability)
- ☐ Domestic violence
- ☐ Access to health care, including efforts to prevent illness or injury
- ☐ Training and access to technology for service providers
- ☐ Wraparound or "holistic" services
- ☐ Income support for low-wage workers
- ☐ Other

3. Services provided by project (check all that apply):

- ☐ Advice or brief service
- ☐ Referrals

☐ Self-represented litigant assistance
☐ Administrative representation
☐ Full legal services, including court representation
☐ Litigation support/co-counseling
☐ Nonlitigation advocacy and project development, including CED
☐ Community legal education, outreach, and other community work
☐ Production of advocacy training or resource materials
☐ Direct training and support for advocates and other provider staff
☐ Watchdog: investigation and enforcement
☐ Interpreter service
☐ Administrative support only (administrative support positions not otherwise included under others).
☐ Legislative/administrative advocacy
☐ Other

4. Services provided with EAF funding, only if different from the answer to C:

5. Method of client contact and service delivery:
☐ Call-in
☐ In person, largely one-on-one
☐ Group meeting or class
☐ Mass advertising or distribution of flyers or brochures
☐ Web-based services
☐ Other

6. Services in languages other than English?
Yes ___ No ___ Unknown ___

7. Results sought (classify according to primary result sought—enter "1" for primary outcome identified by grantee; if project seeks a mix of outcomes, enter "2," "3," etc., to indicate relative emphasis as reflected in budget materials):
___ Information and education: people informed about legal rights and responsibilities
___ Brief assistance: relatively simple solutions to uncomplicated legal problems and/or partial solutions to more complex problems
___ Extended representation: solutions to more complex legal problems
___ Collaborative mixed-model: solutions to complex problems having legal and nonlegal dimensions (e.g., holistic projects, community economic development)
___ Systemic change: change in rules, practices, systems affecting large segments of low-income population (e.g., impact litigation, legislative/admin. advocacy)
___ Support: more efficient and effective legal aid delivery (e.g., training and technical assistance for advocates, task force coordination)
___ Other:

8. Measures of success (check all that apply; do not include methods covered in "quality control" questions):

- ☐ Quantitative measures of services
- ☐ Client/customer satisfaction surveys
- ☐ Client/customer follow-up surveys
- ☐ Focus groups
- ☐ Advocate-recorded outcomes
- ☐ Community partner surveys
- ☐ Court observation/file review
- ☐ Peer review
- ☐ Other

9. First year the project was funded with EAF money:

10. Does EAF replace money lost from other sources (only if it's possible to tell from this year's budget)?
Yes ___ No ___ Unknown ___

11. Is EAF matching funds for another grant (only if it's possible to tell from this year's budget)?
Yes ___ No ___ Unknown ___

12. Client population served by project (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Legal aid providers and advocates
- ☐ General income eligible
- ☐ Children
- ☐ Mentally or physically disabled
- ☐ Facilities residents
- ☐ Families
- ☐ Homeless
- ☐ Non-English/limited English
- ☐ Low-wage workers
- ☐ Rural residents
- ☐ Seniors
- ☐ Immigrants
- ☐ Migrant and other farm workers
- ☐ Other

13. Partners (check all that apply):

- ☐ Courts
- ☐ Other legal services providers
- ☐ Other organizations
- ☐ Volunteers

14. Quality assurance systems in place (check all that apply)**:**

- ☐ Performance evaluations
- ☐ Reviews of legal work

☐ Oversight of system

15. Staffing, expenditures, and revenue

Total funding: $_____ EAF funds: $_____

Total funding includes allocated overhead? Yes___ No___ Unknown___

Total attorneys FTE: _____ EAF attorneys FTE: _____

Total paralegals FTE: _____ EAF paralegals FTE: _____

Total others FTE: _____ EAF others FTE: _____

16. Sources of other funding (check all that apply):

☐ IOLTA
☐ LSC
☐ Other government
☐ Foundations
☐ Contributions
☐ General operating support
☐ Other

17. Geographic coverage:

Statewide ____ Regional ____ County ____ Other

18. Underserved client group(s):

APPENDIX D—ATTACHMENT 2

CODING SYSTEM FOR PARTNERSHIP GRANT FINAL REPORTS, 2003

Reviewer:
Provider number:
Provider name:
Project title:
Comments, follow-up:

1. Type of service (check all that apply):

- ☐ Information and advertising (e.g., distributing brochures and fact sheets, participating in community fairs and other public events, participating on boards and advisory councils)
- ☐ Pro per packets
- ☐ Individual forms
- ☐ One-on-one nonlegal advice
- ☐ One-on-one legal advice
- ☐ Preparation of forms ready to sign
- ☐ Community workshops for clients
- ☐ Training staff of social service agencies
- ☐ Referral to other agency, provider, or assistance
- ☐ Other _____ (describe)

2. Primary legal issues or needs addressed (check all that apply; if indicated, enter a "1" if it is a primary focus of the service, enter a "2" if it is only an occasional or secondary service—otherwise code everything as "1"):

____Bankruptcy
____Debt collection
____Domestic violence—assistance with restraining orders
____Domestic violence—assistance with victim and witness assistance petitions
____Civil harassment
____Employment
____Family law—dissolution of marriage
____Family law—paternity
____Family law—child custody
____Family law—child support
____Guardianship
____Housing—landlord/tenant; unlawful detainer (*tenant evictions*)
____Housing—other (non–landlord/tenant issues such as mortgage assistance, foreclosures, etc.)
____Personal injury
____Probate (wills, estates, and other issues pertaining to passing wealth from one generation to the next)
____Other _____ (describe)

3. Language of service (check all that apply):

- ☐ English
- ☐ Spanish
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ Other _____ (describe)

4. Client populations served:

- ☐ General income eligible
- ☐ Other _____ (describe—"other" would have to be based on personal characteristics such as sex, language ability, disability status, age, or the like; it would not be based on the type of problem the client has, such as domestic violence or eviction; those qualities will be picked up in other sections)

5. Hours of operation:

Average hours per week center is open to the public. _____ (you may have to calculate this, especially if the center's hours changed over the year)

Was there a significant change (more than 10%) in the center's hours during the year?

- ☐ Yes, increased
- ☐ Yes, decreased
- ☐ No
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unclear, unknown, or missing

6. Evaluation instruments used (check all that apply):

- ☐ None listed or described
- ☐ Informal evaluation (unstructured discussions or other collection of information about service without a plan for getting a representative sample or key informants; may include reflections of provider personnel or director)
- ☐ Administrative data analysis (counts of clients served, client characteristics, type or number of services provided, number of service hours, etc.)
- ☐ Case file review—court cases
- ☐ Focus groups (structured or semistructured discussions with groups of clients, judicial officers, court personnel, community partners, or others based on some kind of representative sample, cross-section, or key informants)
- ☐ Individual interviews (structured or semistructured interviews of clients, judicial officers, court personnel, community partners, or others based on some kind of representative sample, cross-section, or key informants)
- ☐ Observations—courtroom
- ☐ Outcomes (client outcomes recorded by provider personnel at case closing or service completion)
- ☐ Survey—client exit (conducted immediately after completion of service; may include forms given to client on completion of service but mailed in at a later date; generally used to determine such things as how client felt about service and treatment, whether client understood and could make use of advice, or what client plans to do next)
- ☐ Survey—client follow-up (conducted at some point after service has been completed to determine such things as whether client used information, followed up on advice given, or generally what happened next—along with client's opinions about service; may use follow-up phone calls, mail; or other means of contacting client)
- ☐ Survey—partner (includes community organizations and other legal service providers, judicial officers, court personnel, or other nonclient sources)

☐ Other _____ (describe)

7. Legal problem types most amenable to effective self-help assistance (check all that apply):

☐ None mentioned
☐ Uncontested dissolutions of marriage with few or no assets
☐ Responses to dissolution of marriage complaints
☐ Initial filings in paternity/custody actions
☐ Requests for temporary orders through the filing of orders to show cause
☐ Responses to orders to show cause
☐ Counsel and advice on debtor-creditor matters
☐ Domestic violence restraining orders
☐ Unlawful detainer—first responsive pleading
☐ Other _____ (describe)

8. Legal problem types for which self-help assistance is not effective (check all that apply):

☐ None mentioned
☐ Custody disputes that are seriously contested
☐ Complicated asset/debt situations
☐ Complex legal issue cases
☐ Complex factual issue cases
☐ Other _____ (describe)

9. Types of assistance that are most effective (check all that apply) (check only those listed as being particularly helpful; for example, statements that written materials may be helpful to some people, but one-on-one plus workshop assistance is generally what is called for, should only be coded one-on-one and workshop):

☐ Introductory workshops
☐ Written materials
☐ Videos
☐ One-on-one assistance
☐ Follow-up sessions
☐ Other _____ (describe)

10. Were self-represented litigants more prepared after using the services by having more complete forms?

☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
☐ Mixed
☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

11. Were cases less time-consuming for bench officers and clerks?

☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
☐ Mixed
☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

12. Where were litigants referred for representation or more complete assistance? (check all that apply):

- ☐ Housing agencies
- ☐ State or federal welfare services (CalWORKs, food stamps, SSI)
- ☐ Counseling/shelter services
- ☐ Treatment programs
- ☐ Other social service agencies or community-based organizations
- ☐ Pro bono private attorneys
- ☐ Legal services providers
- ☐ Family law facilitator
- ☐ Lawyer referral service
- ☐ District attorney
- ☐ Other _____ (describe)

13. For what reasons were litigants referred? (check all that apply):

- ☐ Client requested referral
- ☐ Complexity of subject matter
- ☐ Relative skills/special needs (e.g., low functioning, disabled, or elderly clients)
- ☐ Language barriers
- ☐ Needs outside of or beyond services provided by project
- ☐ Other _____ (describe)

14. Were self-represented litigants' expectations reasonable before receiving assistance?

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

15. Did self-represented litigants' expectations change following assistance?

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)—Better understanding of the legal process
- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)—Better understanding of how the facts of their particular case might result in a positive or negative result for them
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unknown

16. Were self-represented litigants satisfied with the assistance they received from the project?

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

17. Were self-represented litigants satisfied with their opportunity to make their case?

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed depending on judge
- ☐ Mixed depending on how early in the process they came for help
- ☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

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

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

19. Did the representation of opposing parties affect the effectiveness of self-help assistance?

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

20. Did self-represented litigants achieve results more consistent with the law and facts in their case as a result of receiving assistance?

- ☐ Yes (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ No (all, generally, mostly so)
- ☐ Mixed
- ☐ Unknown (explicitly stated or inferred from lack of comment)

APPENDIX D -- ATTACHMENT 3

NON-PARTNERSHIP GRANTEE REPORT FOR PERIOD FROM 10/1/2003 TO 3/31/2004

[*NOTE*: A slightly different form was used for Support Centers]

General Instructions

Please complete a report package for your Grantee Report for the period from [Date] to [Date]. Please feel free to contact the Legal Services Trust Fund staff to discuss any questions you have while you are in the process of completing the report package.

The forms are due by e-mail by 5:00 p.m., _____, _____ to trustfundprogram@calbar.ca.gov. No hard copy is required at this time.

The forms, once completed, will give a clear description of how your organization spent the grant funds, as well as a report on the results of the grant. Trust Fund Commission members will use your report, along with the summary project description that was part of your EAF budget submission, to describe your project's goals and results to the legislature, the private bar, the judiciary and the general public.

There are five forms to complete. Two of them are "packaged" in a single word-processor (MS Word or Word Perfect) file, called the "Narrative" package:

Narrative Package

Form A: Narrative Report on Project Results

Form B: Examples Illustrating Major Results Achieved

The other three forms are provided in spreadsheet (MS Excel) format. For single-project grantees, they are packaged in a single Excel "Workbook":

Data Package for Single-Project Grantees

Form C: Financial and Staffing Report

Form D: Case Services Report

Form E: Report on Legal Services Other than Cases ("Matters")

Form A: Narrative Report on Results.

Complete a separate Form A for each Equal Access Fund project. If you completed a "program-owned" evaluation of the project, attach a report of the evaluation and do not answer question (e).

Form B: Examples Illustrating Results.

Complete a separate Form B for each Equal Access Fund project. Provide descriptions of **two** specific examples of the project's services. The examples can fall under any of the three questions and should total only two for each project.

Form C: Project Staffing, Expenditures and Revenue.

Complete a separate Form C worksheet for each Equal Access Fund project. You may use estimates for the amounts of non-EAF funds used for the project.

Definitions for Form C

PERSONNEL

Lawyers: Salaries and wages paid to attorney employees, whether full-time, part-time or temporary. On Form C, state the number of full-time equivalents positions.

Paralegals: Salaries and wages paid to paralegal employees (including law graduates, legal assistants and law students), whether full-time, part-time or temporary. Paralegals are persons working under the supervision and control of an attorney, whose duties consist primarily of such activities as intake interviewing, case investigations, checking court records, legal research, client representation at administrative hearings and outreach and community work. On Form C, state the number of positions, their full-time equivalents, and the percentage of salaries that will be paid with this grant allocation.

Other Staff: Salaries and wages paid to all other staff, whether administrative/clerical or others, and whether full-time, part-time or temporary. On Form C, indicate the number of positions, their full-time equivalents and the percentage of salaries that will be paid with this grant allocation, and specifically identify those positions.

Employee Benefits: Fringe benefits and payroll taxes paid on behalf of employees, such as retirement, FICA, health and life insurance, workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, and other payroll-related costs.

NON-PERSONNEL

Contract Payments to private attorneys, consultants or organizations who

Services to Clients: provide professional services to clients specifically with regard to the project(s) funded by the Equal Access Fund Grant.

Other: All expenses specifically with regard to the project(s) funded by the Equal Access Fund grant, and not included in contract services to clients.

Form D: Case Services Report.

Complete a separate form D worksheet for each Equal Access Fund project. Use the following definitions to categorize the data for this report.

Closed Case is a case in which there is a resolution of the client's problems or in which the client's problem is not resolved but it is determined that no further action will be taken on the case.

Major Reason Case Closed describes the circumstances or event causing the program to determine that no further action is to be taken on the case. If the case is closed for more than one reason, select the single major reason that best describes why the case was closed. The following are brief descriptions of the major reason cases are closed:

Counsel and Advice refers to preparing and providing advice to the client, e.g., reviewing relevant information and counseling the client on how to take action to address a legal problem.

Brief Service Other than Counsel and Advice refers to action taken at or soon after intake on behalf of a client that resolves a case, e.g., preparing short letters, making a telephone call.

Referred after Legal Assessment refers to circumstances in which, *during the course of providing assistanc***e**, a client is referred outside the program because new intake information or developments in the case indicate that the program should not handle the case, or that the client would be better served by a referral outside the program. *This category does not include referrals made at the time of intake.*

Insufficient Merit to Proceed applies to situations where it is determined that there are no legal grounds upon which to pursue the issue because of new facts or circumstances even though the applicant was initially accepted as a client.

Client Withdrew or Did Not Return includes cases in which the client failed to return to the program during the course of the case and could not be contacted by the program. It also includes all cases in which the client decided not to proceed with the case, e.g., client in an eviction case decided to move out instead of proceeding with legal action.

Negotiated Settlement Without Litigation applies to those cases that are resolved through negotiation prior to the initiation of a court or administrative action.

Negotiated Settlement With Litigation applies to those cases that are resolved through negotiation after initiation of a court or administrative action, e.g., resolution of a dispute after suit has been filed.

Administrative Agency Decision applies to all cases that are resolved as a result of action by an administrative agency or body, e.g., a welfare department.

Court Decision applies to all cases that are resolved as a result of action by a court.

Change in Eligibility Status refers to cases in which an applicant whom has been accepted as a client is found no longer eligible for services because of failure to meet the "indigent person definition" as expressed in the statute due to new circumstances, e.g., employment or income changes.

Other refers to cases that do not fit any of the preceding ten CSR case closure categories. Cases in which there is no opposing party, but in which the services provided are too extensive to fit the brief service category, such as the preparation of a complex contract or a complex medical power of attorney, may be closed in this category. Cases which fit two or more CSR categories may not be closed in this category, but should be closed in the category which best reflects the level of service provided.

Form E: Report on Legal Services Other Than Cases ("Matters").

Complete a separate Form E worksheet for each Equal Access Fund project. Do not include on this form any services in which an attorney-client relationship has been established; report those using Form D.

You do not need to include on this form services that do not represent a significant part of the project's work. In other words, if distributing legal education materials is an important feature of your project, include the numbers here. If you simply provide an educational packet to an occasional client, however, you do not need to keep track of that.

Form A: Narrative Report on Project Results

You must complete ONE narrative for EACH "project" funded in whole or in part with your organization's EAF grant.

1. Executive Summary

Please provide one short paragraph for items "a" through "c" below. You may use more space for "e," but the total for this Executive Summary should not exceed three pages.

a. Description of the project *(including population served)*:

b. Needs of the low income population addressed by this project:

c. Strategy used to address the needs:

d. Did your organization carry out a "program-owned" evaluation of this project during this reporting period?
   (1) ___ No -- *Please go on to "e."*
   (2) ___Yes -- *Please provide a copy of the evaluation report. You do not have to complete item "e."*

e. Major results achieved from the strategy outlined in "c:"

   (1) Most significant results achieved for clients *(use quantitative as well as qualitative information, if available)*

   (2) Other major achievements

   (3) Relationship between these results and the goals expressed in your budget submission for this grant year. *Referring to the approved budget narrative for this project, please briefly assess the extent to which the results outlined in "e.(1)" and "e.(2)" met the goals expressed in the approved budget. Indicate what action or steps have been taken either to address gaps or grasp opportunities indicated by this assessment.*

   (4) Impact of EAF funding on the results achieved
   Describe if applicable: increase in access to and level of services due to EAF funding and/or how NOT having EAF funding would have affected results achieved.

   (5) Contribution of partners to these results
   Check below all that are applicable and describe role of each.
   (a) Courts – indicate which, if any, courts are involved and their roles they will play:
   (b) Other legal services providers -- indicate which, if any, organizations are involved and their roles they will play:
   (c) Other -- indicate which, if any, others are involved and their roles they will play:
   (d) Volunteers – indicate if pro bono lawyers or other volunteers are involved and their roles they will play:

2. Attachments

Please check all of the following that are being submitted with this report:

a. ____Self-evaluation report (if your organization performed an evaluation of this project)
b. ____Project brochure or other promotional materials
c. ____Press clippings about results achieved by the project

Form B: Examples Illustrating Major Results Achieved

Please use this form to provide two (2) vignettes (brief narrative examples, or snapshots) of typical results achieved by this project. These vignettes should be suitable for use in reports and other materials describing the work of EAF grantees to legislators, private bar members, the judiciary and the general public. You may choose to submit vignettes illustrating any of the following types of work that are applicable to your project. Leave the items that do not apply, or which you decide not to use, blank.

- Direct legal services to low income people (item "1");
- "Impact" cases, class actions or other "impact" work (item "2");
- Other services such as community legal education, self-represented litigant assistance, technology based services (e.g., web-based) or training of other legal services advocates (item "3").

1. Examples of Direct Legal Services to Low Income People

Please provide not more than two vignettes (brief narrative examples, or snapshots) of typical cases that this project handled in the reporting period, if your organization handles such matters. Please keep each example to 150 words or less. Your text will wrap to the next page as needed to accommodate the examples you have provided.

- Use actual examples (not hypotheticals) of services delivered during this reporting period.
- Write for a lay audience; avoid legalese and technical language.
- Select examples that show how your services meet the needs of the target population addressed by your project -- for example, children, seniors, people with disabilities, victims of abuse and other vulnerable people.
- Describe the flow from a compelling need to effective legal assistance resulting in a successful conclusion for the client.
- Describe how the outcome of the service improved the client's situation.
- Include news clippings or other interesting descriptive materials, if available, related to the examples you have provided here.

2. Examples of “Impact” Cases, Class Actions or Other “Impact” Work

Fill out this section if during the reporting period your project had activity on one or more "impact" cases or projects - i.e., efforts that meet the following definition: An "impact" case or project is an effort that (1) affects significant segments of the eligible population, and (2) achieves or is expected to achieve relatively permanent improvement; in legal rights or basic living conditions of those affected.

A key element that distinguishes impact work is the concept of addressing a fundamental problem for the benefit of many people affected by that problem. An example of an impact *case* is an action to eliminate a major landlord's illegal harassment of low income tenants. An example of an impact *project* is administrative advocacy aimed at effecting a change in eligibility criteria for a major benefits program. An impact case or project is not defined solely by complexity or high level of effort - for example, a case should not be deemed "impact" simply because it took 100 hours to resolve.

Do not include any information that might violate the attorney/client privilege.

Provide brief narratives describing one or more impact cases or projects for which there was significant activity in the reporting period below.

- *Examples of "milestones" might include a decision by a court, a settlement negotiated with an opposing party, a change in behavior by a major employer of low income people, etc.*
- *Examples of "impacts" might include "25 families were enabled to avoid possible homelessness", "75 individuals were enabled to gain access to job training", etc.*
- *Write for a lay audience; avoid legalese and technical language.*
- *Make your description as brief as possible - 150 words, maximum.*

3. Examples of Other Services (“Matters”)

- If your project provided important services OTHER than those covered by "1" or “2” above, you may use the space on this page to provide no more than two brief narrative examples, each describing typical service provided by your project during the reporting period.
- Examples of types of services covered by this item could include community legal education, self-represented litigant assistance, referral network and technology-based services (e.g., web-based), or training of other legal services advocates.
- Describe the flow from a compelling need to effective service resulting in a successful conclusion for the recipient.
- Refer to other instructions for item "a" above (avoid "legalese," etc.).
- Please limit your response to 150 words or less.

Form C:
Project Staffing, Expenditures and Revenue
for Period _____ to _____

Program Name:	
Project Title:	

1. Expenditures and Staffing, By Line Item, For This Project

Cost Category		Number of Staff (FTE)	Cost		Total
			EAF Funds	Non-EAF Funds	
A. Personnel Costs:					
1.	Lawyers				$0
2.	Paralegal				$0
3.	Other Staff				$0
4.	**Subtotal**	**0.00**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
5.	Employee Benefits				$0
6.	**Total Personnel Costs**		**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
B. Non-Personnel Costs:					
1.	Contract Service/Clients				$0
2.	Other Non-Personnel Costs				$0
3.	**Total Non-Personnel Costs**		**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
C. Grand Total			**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

2. Sources of Revenue For This Project

Funding Source		EAF	Non-EAF	Total
A. Equal Access Fund				$0
B. IOLTA				$0
C. LSC				$0
D. Other *(list in decreasing order by funding amount.)*				$0
1.				$0
2.				$0
3.				$0
4.				$0
5.	All Other			$0
E. Total*		**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

** Amounts in this line should equal "Grand Total" amounts in section "1.c." above.*

Form D:
Case Services Report

Program Name:

Project Title:

1. Cases closed during reporting period.

Legal Problem	Major Reason Case Closed:											Total[1]
	a. Counsel and Advice	**b.** Brief Service other than Counsel and Advice	**c.** Referred After Legal Assessment	**d.** Insufficient Merit to Proceed	**e.** Client Withdrew or Did Not Return	**f.** Negotiated Settlement Without Litigation	**g.** Negotiated Settlement With Litigation	**h.** Administrative Agency Decision	**i.** Court Decision	**j.** Change in Eligibility Status	**k.** Other	
Consumer/Finance												-
Education/Employment												-
Family												-
Juvenile												-
Health												-
Housing												-
Income Maintenance												-
Individual Rights												-

Miscellaneous												-
Total Cases	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

[1]The numbers on this form should not include individuals who only receive information or attend community education programs; statistics regarding these services should be reported in Form E.

2. Ethnicity of clients in cases reported above

Client Profile	Under 18	18 - 59	60 and Over	Total
White - Not of Hispanic Origin				-
Black - Not of Hispanic Origin				-
Hispanic				-
Native American				-
Asian or Pacific Islander				-
Other				
Total	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Disabled				-

3. Gender of clients served

	Clients
Male	
Female	
Unknown	
Total	-

Form E:
Report on Legal Services Other than Cases ("Matters")

Project Name:

1. Community Legal Education

This section provides an opportunity for your program to describe any community legal education services it provides directly to low income individuals.

- *Do not include services in which an attorney-client relationship has been established (report those using Form D).*

a. Models Used		**Number of People Receiving Service**		
		(a) Measured	*(b) Estimated*	*(c) Total*
(1)	**Presentations to community groups** *Total number of people in audiences*			-
(2)	**Legal Education Brochures** *Total number of copies distributed*			-
(3)	**Legal Education Materials posted on Web sites** *Total number of page visits*			-
(4)	**Newsletter articles addressing Legal Ed topics** *Total number of copies distributed*			-
(5)	**Video legal education materials** *Total number of people to whom shown*			-
(6)	**Other** - List below	-	-	-
				-
				-
				-
	Total Number of People Receiving Service	**-**	**-**	**-**

b. Estimation Methods

If you indicated above that you estimated the numbers of people directly receiving these services, please describe briefly below the estimation methods and sources of data used.

2. Pro Per Assistance *Not included in "Case Services" statistics*

This section provides an opportunity for your program to describe any legal assistance you provided to individuals in clinics, workshops, or other settings to help them prepare to represent themselves in pro per proceedings. Do not include services in which an attorney-client relationship has been established (report those using Form D).

a. Models Used

		Number of People Receiving Service		
		(a) Measured	*(b) Estimated*	*(c) Total*
(1)	**Workshops or clinics** *Total number of participants*			-
(2)	**Help center at court** *Total number of people assisted*			-
(3)	**Self-help printed materials e.g., Divorce Kits** *Total copies distributed*			-
(4)	**Self-help materials (e.g. forms) posted on web sites** *Total page visits on these materials*			-
(5)	**Self-help materials (e.g. forms) posted on kiosks** *Total page visits on these materials*			-
(6)	**Other** - List below	-	-	-
				-
				-
				-
	Total Number of People Receiving Service	-	-	-

b. Estimation Methods

If you indicated above that you estimated the numbers of people directly receiving these services, please describe briefly below the estimation methods and sources of data used.

3. Referred *Not included in "Case Services" statistics*

- *Do not include services in which an attorney-client relationship has been established (e.g. no legal assessment) (report those using Form D).*
- *Use this form, e.g., for a free-standing telephone intake unit or hotline which provides no direct legal assistance itself that qualifies as "case" services, but which has the significant function of referring applicants to other appropriate providers of legal services.*
- *When you refer people to more than one other location, count them in the first appropriate category on the list. For example, if you refer someone to another legal services provider **and** to a social service agency, count it in number (1).*

a. Referred To:	**Number of People Receiving Service**		
	(a) Measured	*(b) Estimated*	*(c) Total*
(1) **Other provider** of civil legal services to low income people			-
(2) **Private bar** (LRS or individual private lawyers not affiliated with program)			-
(3) **Provider of human or social services** (non-legal)			-
(4) **Other source of assistance**, none of the above			-
Total Number of People Receiving Service	-	-	-

b. Estimation Methods

If you indicated above that you estimated the numbers of people directly receiving these services, please describe briefly below the estimation methods and sources of data used.

APPENDIX D -- ATTACHMENT 4

EAF PARTNERSHIP GRANTEE REPORT FOR FY 2003

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 each 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 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. Commission staff is available to consult with recipients in the development and implementation of evaluation plans.

Recipients may design the forms they use in their own projects. However, the forms and other evaluation tools used 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 is available to assist projects in the development of 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 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. *Evaluation Plan.* The evaluation plan must be submitted to the Trust Fund for approval. This should be done as soon as possible, but by no means later than July 1, unless correspondence with the Trust Fund Office explains in advance why that deadline cannot be met.

3. *End-of-Year Case Service Reports.* End-of-year case service reports include statistical information about the activities of the project, as described below under "service counting methods", and are due thirty days following the end of the grant period, on a date to be identified by the Trust Fund Office.

4. *Final Expenditure Report.* This report is due thirty days following the end of the grant period, on a date to be identified by the Trust Fund Office. Use the same form as is used for other Trust Fund expenditure reports.

5. *Final Evaluation Report.* The details of which are described below, is due forty-five days following the end of the grant year, on a date to be identified by the Trust Fund Office. Programs may request approval for submitting the evaluation report at a later date, if additional time is needed to complete the evaluation.

6. *Copies of materials.* Submit copies of materials developed for the project, or the index to lengthy manuals used by staff and volunteers, as attachments to the Final Evaluation Report.

Goals for Self-Represented Litigant Assistance

The following general goals for self-represented litigant assistance provide the basis for the Partnership Grant projects. The listing of these goals is followed by the specific questions about self-represented litigant assistance that will be the subject of evaluation.

The following general goals for self-represented litigant assistance provide the basis for the partnership grant projects. The listing of these goals is followed by the specific questions about self-represented litigant assistance that will be the subject of evaluation.

- Self-represented litigant 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.

- Self-represented litigant 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.

- Self-represented litigant 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.

- Self-represented litigant assistance can have an impact on the actual results of the case. In other words, assistance can 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. Please do not deviate from this order of questions when providing your answers. During a program's first grant cycle, these answers may lead to more subjective and less 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. Individual projects may need to respond to specific questions by explaining why that question could not be answered fully, is not applicable to their project, or must be adapted to provide relevant data regarding 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 self-represented litigants 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 self-represented litigants have reasonable expectations before they received self-represented litigant assistance, and did expectations change as a result of the assistance?

6. Were self-represented litigants satisfied with the assistance they received from the project?

7. Were self-represented litigants 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 the number of individuals served by their Partnership project as well as number of services 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 to count the total number of contacts with those clients, we encourage you to collect this data; 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 may take advantage of various services offered. 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 and type of informational workshops, video presentations or legal clinics conducted and total number of individuals attending each such session.

b. Number of one-on-one meetings to provide information to self-represented 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. 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 were 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 Partnership projects may be innovative and experimental. This will mean that in some cases the project will be tracking data other than those described above. It may also mean that the project, and the data it should collect, may 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

All recipients will be asked to include some outcome measurements, even in their first year evaluations. In subsequent years, programs will be required to undertake a more thorough measurement and evaluation of the projects. 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 provide support to programs requesting assistance with this aspect of the Partnership project.

Project staff should identify and define specific desired outcomes for self-represented 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 self-represented litigant 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 litigant's self-representation.

6. The use of court watchers – possibly students or other volunteers – who view self-represented litigants 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 self-represented litigants could be a valuable part of an evaluation plan that includes several other components.

Financial, Staffing, Case and Matters Reporting

Forms for reporting financial, staff, case and "matters" data were similar to those set out in attachment 4, above.