



**Evaluation of the
Expanded Family LawLINE
Process Evaluation Report**

November 5, 2015

Prepared for:

The Legal Services Society of British Columbia

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
1.0 Introduction.....	1
2.0 Brief overview of the FAM LL.....	1
2.1 Profile of clients	4
3.0 Methodology.....	5
3.1 Document and data review.....	6
3.2 Key informant interviews	6
3.3 Client interviews	6
4.0 Findings.....	7
4.1 Implementation	7
4.2 Early indications of outcomes.....	12
5.0 Conclusions.....	22
5.1 Conclusions on implementation of the FAM LL.....	22
5.2 Conclusions on early indications of outcomes.....	23
6.0 Recommendations to further enhance the implementation process.....	25

Appendix A – FAM LL Logic Model

Appendix B – FAM LL Evaluation Matrix

Appendix C – Interview guides

Executive Summary

This report presents the process evaluation findings for the Legal Services Society (LSS) of British Columbia's Expanded Family LawLINE (FAM LL) pilot project. The pilot expands the Family LawLINE services through features such as setting appointments, so that clients can work with the same lawyer throughout the service; increasing the number of available service hours per client; and providing more administrative support to Roster Lawyers.

The evaluation looked at the implementation of the pilot from March 24, 2015 to June 8, 2015 and provided an assessment of its effectiveness and efficiency. The lines of evidence for the process evaluation included a review of key documents and the project database; interviews with key informants (LSS personnel and external stakeholders); and interviews with clients who had received services from the pilot. The conclusions and recommendations for the process evaluation are summarized below.

Conclusions on implementation of the FAM LL

Stakeholders generally agree that FAM LL has been implemented as planned: The transition from the old model to the new one was smooth, despite some minor delays. Some aspects of the model have not yet been implemented (e.g., the coaching model and the dedicated referral processes from Family Justice Counsellors (FJs)), but lawyers are delivering informal coaching to clients who will represent themselves in court. Lawyers may benefit from a “refresher” on FAM LL operations, procedures, and policies.

Some implementation challenges were identified: This includes issues with appointments and notifications, increased client waiting times and decreased call volume due to LSS intake processes, and increased lawyer time spent filling out forms. Minor challenges included glitches with the phone system and the LSS staff login system.

Interviewees believe that FAM LL has the capacity and sufficient resources to meet the demand for its services: Although there was an initial drop in caller volume, the revised LSS intake process helped bring more clients to the LawLINE. This also increased the workload of the Pilot Administrator, who must now enter client information into two databases. This revised process is temporary and will be reassessed at a later date. Respondents noted that clients often lack certain resources (Internet, email, scanners, or fax machines) that are needed to use the LawLINE to its full potential.

Available data show most clients (76%) have received one hour of service or less from the LawLINE: However, most cases in the database are still open and could receive more hours of service before their cases are closed. While it is not expected that every client will use the full six hours, the additional time gives more flexibility to provide services based on client needs.

The FAM LL model was generally well received by stakeholders: Respondents highlighted some key strengths of the LawLINE, including its high accessibility and convenience, and the increased efficiency resulting from a reduction in calls from clients who were inappropriate for the FAM LL service. They also provided several suggestions for fine-tuning the model, which involved minor process improvements.

Conclusions on early indications of outcomes

The intent of the process evaluation in considering early progress towards the achievement of outcomes was primarily to assist in identifying any potential pilot improvements and ongoing quality assurance. As such, conclusions on early indications of outcomes are summarized briefly below in point form:

- ▶ The pilot project is making strong efforts to maintain lawyer continuity, but it is not always practical to schedule clients' appointments with the same lawyers over time. Most cases to date only involved one client meeting.
- ▶ When lawyer continuity is not possible, the project maintains file continuity through the use of client files maintained by the Pilot Administrator. Clients who worked with more than one lawyer said that the transition between lawyers was smooth, and that the new lawyer was always brought up to speed on the case.
- ▶ The service is improving clients' knowledge of the family law process and legal options. The Advice Given Form and the availability of follow-up appointments are believed to be key factors in helping clients better understand the family law process.
- ▶ Clients had mixed views on whether they can better manage and resolve their legal issues as a result of the LawLINE. Clients found it helpful to receive advice on settling their case out of court, and on representing themselves in court. However, based on client interviews, clients desire more assistance with completing forms.
- ▶ About 43% of clients are accessing FAM LL before court proceedings or before they have a written agreement. This will be an important figure to track for the summative evaluation, since it is ideal for clients to access the project before their court date.
- ▶ The extent to which FAM LL helps clients resolve their legal problems is unknown, because there is no formal way to track resolutions. Also, the majority of interviewed clients have not yet resolved their legal issues.
- ▶ The majority of clients appear satisfied with the services provided by the FAM LL pilot project.
- ▶ External stakeholders are aware of the LawLINE, but know little about its services.
- ▶ The extent to which FAM LL integrates with other family law services is unclear. Internal stakeholders believe there has been little integration between FAM LL and FJCs to date, and there is a lack of data on the organizations or individuals that are referring clients to FAM LL.

Recommendations to further enhance the implementation process

- Recommendation 1:** Provide refresher training for Roster Lawyers for quality assurance purposes.
- Recommendation 2:** Review data capture and data entry procedures to ensure consistency, particularly as this relates to tracking Aboriginal ancestry among clients and identifying sources referring to FAM LL.
- Recommendation 3:** Develop a strategy to monitor rural and remote access to FAM LL. Coding city names into larger categories (regions) would better support a regional analysis.

1.0 Introduction

This report presents the process evaluation findings for the Legal Services Society (LSS) of British Columbia's Expanded Family LawLINE (FAM LL) pilot project. This evaluation is one of five evaluations being conducted of pilot projects implemented under the Justice Innovation and Transformation Initiatives (JITI).

The FAM LL evaluation includes a process evaluation, with a focus on implementation and early progress toward achieving outcomes, and a summative evaluation, which will focus on outcomes achieved. This report presents the findings of the process evaluation and covers the pilot project's activities from March 24, 2015 to June 8, 2015.

2.0 Brief overview of the FAM LL

Family LawLINE is a service that provides brief family law advice over the telephone for eligible clients. LawLINE lawyers give "next step" advice about issues such as parenting time, parenting contact/access, guardianship/custody, spousal support, child support, property, family agreements, and court procedures. Clients can access the province-wide service through LSS's call centre. Lawyers deliver the advice by accessing the telephone system from their private offices.

Through JITI funding, the program is being expanded in the form of a pilot project to provide greater continuity of advice and new services. The pilot is available province-wide. The project expands on the Family LawLINE model with the following new or modified features:

- ▶ **An appointment-based approach:** FAM LL will make efforts to schedule appointments so that clients may work with the same lawyer throughout the service, ensuring greater continuity; in the old model, there were no appointments, so clients would usually speak with a different lawyer at every call.
- ▶ **Up to six hours of service per client:** Under the old model, clients received a maximum of three hours of service, and the number of service hours was not tracked.
- ▶ **Document preparation:** LawLINE lawyers will identify and provide direction on legal forms for clients to complete. In some cases, they may edit or help draft documents. At the time of this report, an online platform for document sharing and review has not yet been developed. Documents can currently be shared via email. In the old model, lawyers could provide advice about documents, but they could neither review nor help draft the documents (as the documents could not be shared by email).
- ▶ **Administrative support:** A full-time Pilot Administrator will support the project in various ways, such as conducting client intake and screening processes, scheduling appointments, and maintaining client files; this support was not available under the old model.
- ▶ **Integration with the Mediation Referrals (MED REF) JITI pilot:** The expanded LawLINE will provide support to MED REF clients located throughout the province. Mediators will be able to refer clients to the LawLINE for advice before, during, and after the mediation process. Since MED REF did not exist at the time of the old LawLINE model, this is a new type of support.

- ▶ **Expanded ability for Family Justice Counsellor referrals:** Family Justice Counsellors (FJCs) located throughout the province will be able to refer clients to the LawLINE using a referral form. Although FJCs have always been able to refer clients to the LawLINE, the new referral form will provide much more information on the client, including contact information, a list of all other parties involved, and information on the case (such as the types of legal issues, and whether or not the client is currently in mediation). Clients will also be able to send an email to the pilot with documents that they prepared with their FJC (e.g., a proposed settlement arrangement), so that the Roster Lawyer can provide advice regarding the documents. As of the process evaluation, this feature has not yet been implemented.
- ▶ **Coaching for clients to represent themselves in court:** As of the process evaluation, the formal coaching model is still being developed; coaching services were not available under the old model.

As stated in its Project Charter, the objectives of FAM LL are the following:

- ▶ increase the number of clients served by FAM LL
- ▶ increase the number of clients in rural and remote areas accessing FAM LL services
- ▶ increase availability of FAM LL services for clients who cannot call during the original hours
- ▶ improve continuity of service for clients
- ▶ improve quality and consistency of FAM LL services
- ▶ improve clients' ability to prepare and submit court documents
- ▶ improve clients' ability to represent themselves effectively at all stages of their family law issue, including settlement and hearings
- ▶ improve clients' ability to achieve early resolution
- ▶ increase lawyers' ability to refer clients to local resources

The FAM LL pilot project is directly served by 15 personnel:

- ▶ a Lead Family LawLINE Lawyer, who leads and provides support to the Roster Lawyers, supervises the Pilot Administrator, and provides FAM LL services to clients
- ▶ a Pilot Administrator, who is responsible for answering phones, determining the urgency of client matters, determining the eligibility of clients for FAM LL services, creating and maintaining client files, scheduling appointments for Roster Lawyers, and many other assorted duties
- ▶ 13–15¹ Roster Lawyers, who provide FAM LL services to clients for a typical minimum of six to eight hours (split between two shifts) per week

¹ Since the Roster Lawyers are all private contractors, the number of available lawyers changes over time.

Clients may contact or be referred to FAM LL in a number of ways. The process is different for new clients and current LawLINE clients:

- ▶ If the client is new to LawLINE, then during the initial call, the FAM LL Pilot Administrator must complete a triage process² with the client to collect information, determine if their case is appropriate for the pilot project, and check for lawyer conflicts. If the client is ready to talk to a lawyer, or if the matter is urgent, the client may be transferred to the advice line queue to wait for the next available lawyer. Otherwise, the Pilot Administrator will book an appointment for the client, and the lawyer will call the client at the designated time. When possible, the Pilot Administrator will ask the client to provide any relevant documents for the lawyer to review before the appointment.
- ▶ If the caller is a current LawLINE client, the client will call the LawLINE voice mailbox and leave a message indicating that they would like to book an appointment. The Pilot Administrator will then call the client back to schedule the appointment. The lawyer will call the client at the designated time. If the matter is urgent, the Pilot Administrator will arrange an appointment the same day with whichever lawyer is available.³

Procedures for initiating contact with the LawLINE include the following:

- ▶ New clients may call LSS intake, and intake staff will assess clients to determine their appropriateness for various LSS services, including FAM LL. If a client is referred through LSS intake, they must still be triaged by the FAM LL Pilot Administrator.
- ▶ Current LawLINE clients may call LSS intake, and intake staff will redirect the call to LawLINE's voice mailbox, after which the Pilot Administrator will call the client and set up an appointment. If the client has an urgent matter, LSS intake can transfer the client directly to the Pilot Administrator queue.
- ▶ Current LawLINE clients may call the LawLINE voice mailbox directly, at which point they will leave a message indicating that they would like to book an appointment; the Pilot Administrator will then call the client and set up an appointment.
- ▶ A community organization may refer a client to FAM LL by providing the client with contact information for LSS intake, after which the client would call intake.

² A new client may be exempt from triage, depending on if they were already screened in as eligible via another JITI pilot.

³ Alternatively, if the client's previous LawLINE lawyer will be on duty the following day, and the client can wait a day before having an appointment, the Pilot Administrator may schedule the appointment for the following day, so that the client can see the same lawyer.

2.1 Profile of clients

Table 1 provides an overview of the clients accepted since the FAM LL pilot became fully operational, from March 24, 2015 to June 8, 2015. Of the 500 clients:

- ▶ 74% are female;
- ▶ at least 49% are over 30 years of age (about 37% did not provide their age);
- ▶ 46% are separated while 34% are single; and
- ▶ at least 10% are of Aboriginal ancestry (about 41% were not asked or declined to answer).

Table 1: Client demographics (n=500)		
	#	%
Gender		
Male	122	24%
Female	377	74%
Unknown	1	<1%
Age		
18 to 25	31	6%
26 to 30	38	8%
31 to 40	110	22%
41 to 50	79	16%
51 and over	58	11%
Unknown	184	37%
Marital status		
Common law	20	4%
Divorced	38	8%
Married	40	8%
Separated	229	46%
Single	172	34%
Widowed	1	<1%
Aboriginal ancestry		
Yes	50	10%
No	247	49%
No data	203	41%
Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.		

The most common opposing party types for FAM LL clients include other parent (47% of cases), ex-spouse (34%), and spouse (10%). Table 2 contains a complete listing of the opposing party types in client cases.

Table 2: Types of opposing parties (n=500)		
Opposing party type	#	%
Other parent	235	47%
Ex-spouse	169	34%
Spouse	51	10%
Other	37	7%
Common law spouse	4	1%
Sister	4	1%
Note: Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.		

The FAM LL database contains identified legal issues for 95 of the 500 cases (19%). Among these cases, the most common types of legal issues identified for clients are the following:

- ▶ parenting issues (45% of cases)
- ▶ child support (45% of cases)
- ▶ property division (34% of cases)
- ▶ divorce (32% of cases)

See Table 3 for the complete listing of legal issues identified.

Legal issue identified	#	%
Parenting issues	43	45%
Child support	43	45%
Property division	32	34%
Divorce	30	32%
Spousal support	26	27%
Family violence	16	17%
Maintenance enforcement	11	12%
Denial of parenting time	10	11%
Relocation	9	10%
Protection order (family member)	3	3%
Risk of removal	2	2%
Removal	2	2%

Note: Cases could include more than one legal issue; totals sum to more than 100%.

Based on available data, the majority (84%) of cases consisted of only one client meeting, while about 11% of cases had two meetings, and 3% had three meetings. Only about 2% of cases included four or five client meetings. The mean number of meetings per case is about 1.2. Table 4 contains a complete listing of the number of client meetings per case.

Number of meetings	#	%
1	203	84%
2	27	11%
3	8	3%
4	3	1%
5	1	<1%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.
 *Although there were 500 cases in the FAM LL project database, data regarding the number of meetings was only available for 242 cases (48% of cases).

3.0 Methodology

The process evaluation consists of three lines of evidence: a document and data review, interviews with key informants (LSS personnel and external stakeholders), and interviews with clients.

A FAM LL Project Working Group (WG), comprised of representatives from the LSS and the British Columbia Ministry of Justice (MOJ), is guiding the evaluation process. PRA held consultations with the WG to refine the key evaluation documents to guide the evaluation: the logic model and evaluation matrix, which are in Appendices A and B, respectively. The WG also reviewed and approved the data collection instruments used for the process evaluation. The data collection instruments are included in Appendix C.

3.1 Document and data review

PRA reviewed relevant documents produced by the pilot project, including the project manual and charter, descriptions and diagrams of the FAM LL model, and forms used by the pilot to collect information on its clients and the types of assistance provided. The data review for the process evaluation relies on available data in the pilot project database, since the focus of the process evaluation is on implementation of the pilot project. The summative evaluation will also include data from the LSS Client Information System (CIS) database, as well as data from the MOJ (e.g., Court Services Branch).

The data review faced a limitation in that the project database does not have fields to distinguish missing data from unavailable data (e.g., where an activity has not yet occurred). Where possible, other variables were used to assist with analysis and to determine whether the data was simply not yet available, rather than missing. In many cases, however, it is not possible to make this distinction. Later on, in the summative evaluation, as more cases are closed in the project database, it may become easier to make this distinction.

Another limitation of the data review occurred because the vast majority of cases (about 95%) are still marked as “open” in the database. Since these cases are still open, it is possible that these clients may still receive more hours of service, have more meetings, and/or receive different kinds of legal advice. Even though the database is up to date as of June 8, 2015, the data in the open cases will not be finalized until the cases are closed; therefore, the data analysis is likely to underestimate the final values of most variables. Some variables that are not affected by this limitation include the demographic information presented above; the stages of the cases when they were opened; and the referrals to FAM LL received from other services.

3.2 Key informant interviews

The process evaluation includes interviews with key informants to obtain their perspectives on pilot project implementation and early evidence of outcomes. Interviews were conducted by telephone with 14 internal stakeholders (the FAM LL Project Lead, the Pilot Lead Lawyer, the Pilot Administrator, and 11 Roster Lawyers) and five external stakeholders (three FJCs and two representatives of Community Resources). Some external stakeholders declined to be interviewed, citing a lack of knowledge about the LawLINE or its expansion.

3.3 Client interviews

To obtain feedback from FAM LL clients, PRA conducted 20 individual telephone interviews of about 20 minutes each with clients who used the service. Using the pilot project database as a guide, PRA attempted to contact clients who had a high number of service hours provided to them, to increase the likelihood that the clients could comment on multiple aspects of FAM LL. Interviews focussed on the clients’ experience and satisfaction with the FAM LL services, and how the services might be improved. To help improve the response rate, a flyer explaining the research and notifying clients that they might be contacted for an interview was provided to clients.

4.0 Findings

The process evaluation findings are presented based on the evaluation questions, which focus on the implementation of the pilot project and its early progress toward achieving its intended outcomes.

4.1 Implementation

1. Has the FAM LL been implemented as intended in Year 1? What challenges were met in implementation? How were challenges addressed and improvements made to the model?

Interviewees agreed that, so far, FAM LL has been implemented as planned. Several respondents mentioned that the transition from the old model to the new one was smooth, and that there were no major problems at the outset. One challenge during the planning phase of the process occurred when an individual in a lead role left the project, but this seemed to lead only to minor delays. Also, while the coaching model has not yet been implemented, internal stakeholders indicated that lawyers are offering informal coaching for clients to represent themselves in court. Finally, while some respondents described the training they received for the pilot project, a couple of respondents believed that the lawyers could benefit from “refresher” training on the operations, procedures, and policies of FAM LL (for the purposes of quality assurance and service consistency).

Respondents identified the following as challenges they have experienced during the first few months of the expanded model:

Challenges with appointments and notifications: One of the most common challenges expressed by interviewees related to setting appointments and notifying lawyers that the appointments have been made. While some lawyers said they believed the project intends to schedule client appointments with at least one or two days’ notice, several said they are consistently receiving same-day appointments. They indicated that, while working a shift for LawLINE, they do not have a convenient way to see whether same-day appointments have been scheduled. Some of them wished for a better notification system, such as appointment reminders that are copied to the lawyer’s personal or private practice email address. Since the lawyers typically deliver LawLINE services from their private offices, they would have faster access to these emails. Finally, a few respondents noted that it is challenging for them to deal with LawLINE client “cold calls” (same-day appointments with little or no notice) because they do not have time to review the client’s file before the call takes place.

Client waiting times and call volume: Stakeholders reported that clients are often frustrated by the length of time it takes to get an appointment or to speak to a lawyer directly. The problem seems to occur for new clients who call LSS intake looking for family law services and are then directed to FAM LL. In these cases, clients must be put on hold if either line is busy, and they must also go through two intake processes (LSS intake and FAM LL triage), often repeating the same information to different individuals. It was also suggested that LSS intake was having difficulty handling the volume of calls due to the transition to the new CIS.⁴ Interviewees

⁴ LSS. (2015). *03 FAM LL – Expanded Family LawLINE Decision Record*.

reported that, because of the increased time it took clients to pass through LSS intake, the LawLINE call volume dropped substantially. A few lawyers noted that they often sit for long periods without calls, only to receive a call from a client who complains about the long time they waited in the telephone queue or the time it took to get through intake.

According to interviewees, in response to this challenge, FAM LL Leads coordinated with LSS to implement a triage system at LSS intake. With the modified system, callers to LSS intake are screened to determine if they have a family law issue and if they are a potential LawLINE client, after which they may skip LSS intake and go directly to LawLINE's intake. At the time of the interviews, this system had very recently been implemented, but some interviewees said the call volume had since returned to normal levels. However, as a result of the new triage system, the FAM LL Pilot Administrator's workload increased, because they must now enter client information into two databases: LSS's CIS, which was previously done by LSS intake staff, and the FAM LL project database. LSS has indicated that this process is only temporary, and the situation will be assessed after LSS intake capacity returns to normal.⁵

Increased time required for filling out forms: Some internal stakeholders mentioned an increase in the time required to complete the client information forms for FAM LL. Also, some interviewees said they did not know when to fill out certain forms. For example, those who fill out forms during the calls said that the forms can distract them from their conversations with their clients. Alternatively, those who said they fill out most forms after their calls said that they are sometimes interrupted by an advice line call when they are trying to complete the forms.

Finally, a few respondents also mentioned some technical glitches with the pilot, including difficulties with the phone system, and with the LSS staff login system.

2. What external factors have influenced the implementation and success of the FAM LL?

Internal stakeholders most commonly mentioned the decrease in FAM LL client call volume because of the long wait time in the LSS intake queue. The new triage system seems to have restored client volume (but increased the workload of the FAM LL Pilot Administrator). Other external factors that had a perceived impact on the implementation of FAM LL included the following:

- ▶ **The learning curve for FAM LL lawyers:** Although training on the new model was an integral part of the implementation of FAM LL, a couple of interviewees said that there was an unexpectedly high learning curve for lawyers regarding the technical aspects of the model. Technical skills appeared to vary among the lawyers, leading to some early challenges in learning and entering information into new forms, for example. However, interviewees also suggested that the process will improve over time, as the lawyers will become more comfortable with the forms.

⁵ Ibid.

- ▶ **Collaboration with other services:** Even though it was too early in the project to assess its impacts, the new form for FJCs to use in referring clients to LawLINE was seen as a good way to facilitate the flow of clients to the LawLINE.⁶ In addition, stakeholders involved in the Family Maintenance Enforcement Program (FMEP) and the *Child, Family, and Community Service Act* (CFCSA) services agreed to distribute literature about the expanded LawLINE, which could have raised awareness about the program (but again, it was too early for stakeholders to assess this outcome).

3. Did the FAM LL have sufficient tools, resources, and capacity to meet demand and any intended targets?

Interviewees generally agreed that FAM LL had sufficient tools,⁷ resources, and capacity to meet service targets. In fact, most lawyers indicated that they had not received many LawLINE calls, and that they had a lot of “idle” time during their shifts. This is likely due to the challenges with clients going through LSS intake, as described above. Also, a few internal stakeholders mentioned that some lawyers left the project, and that two new lawyers were being hired, but that this would not have a substantial impact on the project or its services.

A few respondents suggested that the FAM LL Pilot Administrator is currently overburdened, especially because of the newly implemented LSS intake triage process, which resulted in the Pilot Administrator having to enter client information into two databases instead of one. However, a decision was made among the JITI managers to hire “floater” administrators to provide backup to the current JITI Pilot Administrators, especially during vacation or sick days. This decision could help reduce the data entry burden currently experienced by the FAM LL Pilot Administrator.

Some internal stakeholders mentioned that the lawyers could benefit from more training on the FAM LL model, especially regarding the forms and the processes for dealing with client files (for example, identifying when a file should be closed). Although all current personnel have undergone training, it was suggested that “refresher” training would help improve the quality and consistency of the services provided by FAM LL. Some interviewees suggested that the Roster Lawyers and Lead Lawyer should have a teleconference to discuss the early issues they are encountering, and to reach consensus on how to address challenges. They explained that, since they receive little or no feedback regarding the processes they follow, they have no way of knowing whether or not they are following FAM LL processes correctly. Also, while a couple of interviewees wished they could have face-to-face training instead of teleconference training, they acknowledged that this would be very expensive, since LawLINE lawyers are located throughout the province.

Another issue related to capacity is the number of service hours provided to clients, and whether clients are meeting or exceeding the limits. Under FAM LL, clients are allotted up to six hours of service, compared to the maximum of three hours they could receive under the old model. In rare cases, clients may be approved to exceed the maximum number of hours. However, the pilot project database contains only one example (out of 444) of a client exceeding the six-hour limit. In fact,

⁶ As of the process evaluation, the new form for FJCs is not yet in use.

⁷ One of the tools planned for FAM LL is an online platform for document sharing between lawyers and clients. However, as this tool has not yet been developed, its impact may be explored in the summative evaluation.

about 76% of clients received one hour of service or less. Another 19% received 1.1 to 2 hours of service, while 4% received 2.1 to 3 hours. These findings correspond to the observations of internal stakeholders, who said that most of their clients are only involved in one meeting. Table 5 presents a complete breakdown of the number of service hours per client (data are missing for 56 clients, about 11% of the total sample).

Number of hours per client	#	%
0.1 to 0.5 hours	157	35%
0.6 to 1 hours	183	41%
1.1 to 1.5 hours	60	14%
1.6 to 2 hours	21	5%
2.1 to 2.5 hours	7	2%
2.6 to 3 hours	9	2%
3.1 to 3.5 hours	1	<1%
3.6 to 4 hours	2	1%
4.1 to 4.5 hours	-	-
4.6 to 5 hours	1	<1%
5.1 to 5.5 hours	2	1%
5.6 to 6 hours	-	-
6.1 to 6.5 hours	-	-
6.5 to 7.0 hours	-	-
7.1 to 7.5 hours	1	<1%
Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.		

Since the vast majority of cases (95%) in the database are still open, the data above should be taken with caution, as clients who have open cases may still participate in further calls. It is worth noting that, among the 20 closed cases for which the number of service hours are available, the highest number of hours used is three (only one case). Among the 20 cases, 14 clients used less than one hour of service, while four used more than one but less than two hours, and one used more than two but less than three hours. One possible explanation for the aforementioned 14 cases which involved less than one hour of service is that a lawyer may determine that a client has a legal matter that is not covered by the LawLINE, and therefore the case would be closed immediately.

Finally, a few stakeholders noted that even though LawLINE has sufficient resources and capacity to deliver its services, clients often lack the resources to use LawLINE to its full potential. For example, lower income clients may not have access to the Internet, email, scanners, or fax machines, which would make it difficult for their lawyer to provide assistance in completing legal documents.

4. To what extent do the current processes and structure of the FAM LL support its efficient and effective delivery?

As noted earlier in this report, interviewees described a number of challenges in the implementation of the FAM LL pilot project (see Evaluation Question 1 above). Despite these challenges, most interviewees perceived the new model to be an improvement over the old one. Respondents described the strengths of the new model, while also highlighting some areas for improvement.

Reduced calls from inappropriate clients: Almost all respondents agreed that the number of inappropriate⁸ clients reaching the LawLINE has decreased since the implementation of FAM LL. They attributed this to the revised screening procedures at LSS intake and the triage process of the pilot project itself. In theory, the reduction of inappropriate calls would grant the lawyers more time to help clients who are appropriate for the service. However, some lawyers reported that they are still receiving calls from clients who do not qualify financially for the service, or who are inappropriate for FAM LL. In a few cases, lawyers discovered that the client actually exceeded the maximum income level for the service. Also, some stakeholders described clients who reach FAM LL expecting to receive legal representation services rather than a LawLINE lawyer. The lawyers then had to explain to the clients that this was not the case, much to the frustration of clients.

Training on new aspects of LawLINE: As mentioned in Evaluation Question 3 above, internal stakeholders described the training they received for FAM LL, and several indicated that they could benefit from refresher training on various processes of the project. However, there were other areas in which respondents indicated they wanted training or clarification. For example, they mentioned that even though the formal coaching model has not yet been developed, lawyers are still delivering informal coaching to clients, but not necessarily in a consistent manner. Also, many lawyers are uncomfortable with the required activity of assessing and recording their clients' abilities and capacities, both before and after engaging with the LawLINE.

Fine-tuning: Respondents noted several other situations where they believed that minor process improvements could make the project more effective or efficient.

- ▶ When lawyers receive client files so that they can prepare for appointments, the files are not necessarily organized in chronological order. Respondents said that assessing a client's case is difficult when the files are not in chronological order, and ordering them may make it easier.
- ▶ Some interviewees also expressed a preference for client documents to be attached to emails, rather than embedded in their calendars. Some reported difficulties with finding the files when they were not readily available in their email inbox.
- ▶ Project personnel who complete client forms are having to enter in the same information in more than one form (e.g., client name and other personal information). It was suggested that the forms could be merged into one format (such as Access) so that various common fields could be automatically copied to other forms.

⁸ Interviewees mentioned that inappropriate clients tended to be clients who were not financially eligible for the LawLINE, or clients who needed a different type of service to address their legal issue.

4.2 Early indications of outcomes

The process evaluation took place within the first three months of the FAM LL pilot project. At this time, the evaluation can support an early discussion of outcomes. The summative evaluation will provide a more extensive discussion of the outcomes of the project.

5. Did more clients access the FAM LL services, including clients from rural and remote areas and Aboriginal clients, after its expansion?

The process evaluation was not able to make a comparison of rural and remote or Aboriginal clients accessing the LawLINE before and after its expansion. This data was not collected prior to the expansion, and data collected in previous studies and evaluations was not comparable to the data in the FAM LL database. However, the data collected in the process evaluation may act as a baseline for comparison during the summative evaluation.

The only available data from the FAM LL database to provide a partial response to this question is the number and percentage of clients who self-identified as having Aboriginal ancestry. As indicated in Section 2.1, there were 50 such clients, which represents 10% of clients in the database (although data are missing for 41% of the cases, so the true proportion of Aboriginal clients is unknown).

6. Did the pilot project improve the continuity and consistency of the FAM LL services?

One of the goals of the FAM LL pilot project is to ensure continuity of service for clients. This goal is supported by the appointment-based approach of the project, in which clients may be better able to schedule subsequent appointments with the same lawyer. By matching clients and lawyers, both parties may form a rapport, and may have more efficient interactions, since the lawyer will not have to gather basic information on the client's case at every appointment. Therefore, when setting appointments, the Pilot Administrator attempts to maintain this continuity whenever possible. However, depending on the availability of the client and the lawyer, the client's court date, lawyer sick days, and other possible factors, it may not always be practical to schedule the client and lawyer together.

Even in cases where lawyer continuity is not possible, the FAM LL pilot can still maintain continuity of service through the use of the client's files. At each advice line call or appointment, lawyers record information about the case, including an "Advice Given" form, which then resides in a client file that is created and maintained by the Pilot Administrator. In the event that a client speaks with a different lawyer for a subsequent appointment, the new lawyer will have quick access to the client's file, and may review it before the appointment in order to learn about the case. If this process is followed, the lawyer will be better prepared to provide advice to the client, and continuity of service will be maintained.

There was consensus among the project stakeholders that the project is making efforts to maintain lawyer continuity in its appointments. However, respondents had mixed opinions on the extent to which lawyer continuity is actually occurring. They pointed out reasons why a client might see a different lawyer, such as the fact that a client may want an immediate appointment due to an emergency, but their previous lawyer might not be available immediately. They also indicated that

many of the client cases to date have only involved one appointment, so an assessment of lawyer continuity may not be possible.

As seen in Table 6, almost all of the cases (94%) had only one lawyer associated with the file, while 5% of cases involved two lawyers. Only two cases (less than 1%) involved three or four lawyers.

Number of lawyers	#	%
0	3	1%
1	472	94%
2	23	5%
3	1	<1%
4	1	<1%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

As noted in Section 2.1, based on the available data, the majority (84%) of cases in the FAM LL database involved only one client meeting. This likely accounts for the fact that most cases also only involve one lawyer. Since the project database contains less than three months of data, there is not enough information to conduct much more analysis on lawyer continuity. However, it is worth noting that among the 27 cases that had two meetings, 16 (59%) involved one lawyer, while the remaining 11 (41%) involved two lawyers. Therefore, it can be argued that lawyer continuity was maintained in 16 of the 27 cases, since the client spoke to the same lawyer for both meetings.

Stakeholders mentioned that even when lawyer continuity is not possible, the project can maintain file continuity through the use of client files maintained by the Pilot Administrator. Most respondents said the files were of high quality, and they described situations where they were able to read detailed information on a client's case — particularly the advice given and next steps for the client — before an appointment. However, a few interviewees reported some inconsistencies in the level of detail among the client files, with some files including a large amount of detail, and other files missing some information. They offered a possible explanation in that lawyers who have busy shifts may not have enough time to record much detail in the client's file.

Clients also provided some insights into the extent to which they were helped by the continuity of the service. About half of the clients interviewed for the evaluation said they had more than one appointment with LawLINE. Among these interviewees, about half of them said they spoke with the same lawyer at each meeting, while the other half had meetings with at least two different lawyers. The former group agreed that it was helpful having the same lawyer each time, and they appreciated that they did not have to repeat themselves at each meeting. Some of them also commented that the lawyer answered all their questions and helped move their case along. Among those who saw a different lawyer for each meeting, all of them said it was not a problem for them. Most of them said that the new lawyers were always familiar with the case before the appointment began. One of them said they had different questions at each appointment, so it did not matter that they saw different lawyers.

7. Have the FAM LL services improved clients' knowledge of the process, family law, and their legal options?

Almost all clients agreed that they found it helpful when the lawyer explained the family law process to them. Many clients said they knew little about the law or legal terminology before speaking to the lawyer, but that the lawyer explained everything clearly and addressed their concerns. Some clients mentioned feeling more confident and relaxed after receiving this information. Several indicated that their lawyer carefully explained the next steps they had to take to proceed in their case. However, a few clients were confused by the information they received, and a couple of them said the information was not relevant to their case.

There was consensus among internal stakeholders that FAM LL is improving clients' knowledge of the family law process and of their legal options (most external stakeholders did not have enough information to comment). Respondents believed this was due in part to the increased availability of service hours per client, from three to six hours.⁹ Interviewees also found the Advice Given Form to be extremely helpful in reaching this goal, as the written documentation provides clients with a permanent reminder about the advice given and suggested next steps. Several respondents explained that clients are often very nervous or emotional during appointments, and therefore they do not retain much information immediately after the meeting, so the written forms are especially useful for them.

The appointment-based approach was seen as another feature of FAM LL that assists clients in retaining information. Lawyers explained that, since clients have the option to attend follow-up appointments, the lawyers do not have to overwhelm clients in their first appointment by providing an excessive amount of information. Instead, they can provide a more manageable amount of information, and suggest realistic next steps for the client to complete before the second meeting. At the second meeting, having completed a reasonable amount of work, the client can then receive further advice and instructions. This was seen as preferable compared to the old model, where a lawyer might expect to see a particular client only once, and would therefore provide a vast amount of information in a single meeting that the client would have difficulty handling.

On the other hand, a few internal stakeholders suggested that some of the forms could be improved by including information that is normally given to most clients. For example, these respondents explained that they give certain kinds of information — such as contact information for other resources, links to court forms, and links to family law acts — to almost every client, which is a repetitive process that takes time. They suggested that such “standard” information could be automatically included in the Advice Given Form, which would save time in many cases. However, they also acknowledged that there are likely different opinions regarding what information should be considered “standard,” and that the project team would need to come to an agreement on this topic via a conference call or some other collaborative process.

⁹ As of this report, since only a few clients have used more than three hours of service, this may be a more hypothetical observation by the interviewees. In other words, the expanded hours *could* give the lawyers more time to explain the family law process and legal options to clients.

8. Have the FAM LL services increased client’s ability to manage and resolve their current legal issue? Future legal issues?

Clients interviewed for the evaluation provided their views on how different aspects of the LawLINE helped them increase their abilities to manage their legal issues. Overall, clients appreciated the advice they received on settling out of court, and for representing themselves in court (although this type of advice was not applicable for several clients). On the other hand, some clients said their ability to prepare court documents did not improve much as a result of the LawLINE.

Advice on settling out of court: For some clients, settling out of court was not an option. However, several clients mentioned that their lawyer recommended that they try other options before going to court, especially mediation. Others believed they had a better understanding of their options after speaking with the lawyer, without specifying which option they chose.

Help with preparing court documents: Several clients reported that their lawyer assisted them with preparing court documents. Most of the time, the lawyer simply sent the client links to online court forms, and they did not usually review the completed documents (although some lawyers said they would be willing to review the completed documents at a second appointment). A few clients said that, while they learned how to retrieve documents, they did not feel confident that they could fill in the forms without further assistance from a lawyer. A few others mentioned that they did not have access to a computer or the Internet, and so they could not use any online resources that the lawyer provided.

Advice on self-representation in court: Most clients who were interviewed for the evaluation said they did not receive advice on self-representation in court. In many of these cases, the client had not yet received a court date, while others said that their case did not involve going to court (a few of them said they avoided court because their LawLINE lawyer recommended mediation instead). Of the few clients who said they received advice on self-representation, most said the information helped them plan for different court scenarios, or made them feel more comfortable addressing the judge and presenting their arguments. A few mentioned that their lawyers directed them to online video tutorials showing how to conduct themselves in court. However, one client said they got the impression that their LawLINE lawyer could not help them prepare for court, and that they would have to see a local Duty Counsel instead.

Since FAM LL currently does not have a way to formally track whether or not its clients reach resolutions, stakeholders could only offer anecdotal or speculative impressions on this topic. Almost all interviewees said that, given the services and resources that FAM LL can provide, the project should be able to help clients resolve their current and future legal issues. They explained that FAM LL goes beyond strictly providing “legal advice” and instead coaches clients on how to manage their cases by providing information on legal rights, court processes, legal documentation, and advice on how to negotiate with other parties. Respondents also suggested that the Advice Given Form is critical for clients to retain most of the information they are given. A few stakeholders said they received positive comments from a few of their clients, although the lawyers typically do not hear from clients after they are finished interacting with the service. Also, respondents explained that the impact or success of FAM LL likely depends on a client’s ability and willingness to act on the information and advice provided to them.

9. Are clients accessing FAM LL services early in the process of dealing with their legal situation?

Stakeholders had mixed views on whether clients are accessing LawLINE early in their legal situations, with some arguing that it is too early in the pilot project to assess this outcome (i.e., the project needs time to serve more clients and close more files). Most interviewees reported seeing a wide variety of cases between two “extremes” of clients who access the service very early, and those who access it very late. Some stakeholders suggested that more clients would access the service early if information about LawLINE (e.g., brochures) were distributed to key areas, such as court registries throughout the province. A few recommended that brochures or posters should also be sent to non-legal facilities, such as community centres and medical clinics.

External stakeholders who refer clients to LawLINE said that the first time they meet with a client, they try to assess the clients’ legal situation and legal needs, and will refer them to LawLINE (or similar services) as soon as possible, if they believe the services will be useful for the client. One stakeholder also mentioned that they would only refer a client to LawLINE if the client did not have an immediate deadline, such as a court appearance the following day.

The FAM LL project database contains information on the stages of client cases when the files were opened, and therefore it can provide an assessment of the extent to which clients are accessing FAM LL early in their legal situations. For example, according to project data, about 43% of clients called the pilot before they had any court proceedings or written agreements. This will be an important figure to track for the summative evaluation, since it is ideal for clients to access the project before their court date (in order to receive coaching for self-representation in court and other kinds of advice). In about 15% of the cases, clients called after court action had commenced, but before they had a case conference. Another 13% of clients called after receiving a final order or agreement, and 12% called for a change in their final order or agreement. Table 7 provides a breakdown of the different stages of client cases when the files were opened.

Table 7: Stage of client case when file opened (n=500)

Stage of case	#	%
Before court proceedings or written agreement	213	43%
Court action commenced, before case conference	75	15%
After final order or agreement	64	13%
Change final order or agreement	60	12%
Before final order	24	5%
Unknown	23	4%
After case conference, before interim orders	20	4%
Pre-removal	10	2%
Presentation stage	8	2%
Protection stage	2	<1%
Continuing custody order	1	<1%

Note: Totals may not sum to 100% due to rounding.

10. Are the FAM LL services helping clients achieve resolutions to their legal problems?

As previously mentioned, FAM LL has no formal way of tracking client resolutions. The majority of interviewees agreed that there was no way to track these outcomes, although some said that the services are likely helping clients resolve their legal issues. A few internal stakeholders mentioned that, on occasions where they are able to see clients for a second appointment, the clients have sometimes commented that the advice received in the first meeting was helpful. Also, a few lawyers received emails from clients who thanked them for their services. Overall, stakeholders could only speculate on this outcome, with a few indicating that in the long-term, repeat clients may provide more information on the outcomes of their cases.

Since only about one-quarter of the interviewed clients said their legal matter was resolved, there were not many examples to show how FAM LL is helping clients achieve resolutions. However, among the clients whose cases were resolved, most agreed that LawLINE either helped significantly or helped somewhat in terms of reaching a resolution. Clients believed the information that their lawyer gave them was critical to the outcome of their cases. For example, one client said the online resources were useful, while another learned how to better deal with the opposing party. At least one client was able to settle out of court. Another client said that LawLINE helped them a bit, but that they really needed a lawyer on retainer in order to assist them with their case.

11. Are clients satisfied with their experience using the added FAM LL services? What, if anything, can be done to improve clients' experience?

Most clients said they were at least somewhat satisfied with their experience with LawLINE as a whole. Specifically, about two-thirds of the interviewed clients said that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the LawLINE services. Of the remaining third of clients, about half were only somewhat satisfied, while the other half said they were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied. Clients of FAM LL also discussed their experiences with specific aspects of the LawLINE service, including waiting times, ease of connecting with a lawyer, and satisfaction with the lawyer.

Clients' waiting times: Clients reported a wide range of waiting times between calling LawLINE for the first time and speaking to a lawyer. Nearly half of the interviewed clients said they spoke to a lawyer on the same day, often within five to ten minutes of making the call. About a quarter of the respondents said it took longer, as they either waited or were on hold for one or two hours before getting through. However, a few said that this wait time was not a problem for them. Another quarter said they had to wait two to three weeks before speaking with a lawyer. Some clients suggested that the LawLINE should hire more lawyers in order to reduce the waiting times. However, based on interviews with project stakeholders, the increased waiting times are more likely the result of LSS's intake capacity, even though clients may assume the problem is a lack of lawyers.

Ease of getting connected with a LawLINE lawyer: About two-thirds of the client interviewees said that it was easy for them to get connected to a LawLINE lawyer the first time they called, while the other third said they had a difficult time. Among those who found it easy, roughly half got to speak to a lawyer during the first time they called, while the other half had to wait for a call-back, but all of them found it to be a reasonable amount of time to wait. A couple of clients said they had to wait a long time, but that it did not pose a problem for them.

On the other hand, for clients who had difficulties getting connected to a LawLINE lawyer, a few said the wait time was too long. Others were confused by the system itself; for example, a few clients were confused that the first person they spoke to was not a lawyer, but rather an intake worker. A couple of other clients did not know why they were transferred to LawLINE, and they kept getting transferred to different departments or services, which was frustrating for them.

Satisfaction with the LawLINE lawyer: The majority of interviewed clients said they had a good or great experience talking with a LawLINE lawyer. Almost all interviewees agreed that the lawyers treated them with respect, and took the time to understand their case (although a few interviewees felt rushed during the call). Many clients said their lawyer was nice, had a pleasant demeanor, or made them feel comfortable during the call. Several others believed their lawyer acted in a professional manner. Some also commented that their lawyer was clear and concise in their explanations of legal issues. On the other hand, a couple of clients were confused or frustrated by the instructions that the lawyers gave them, especially when it came to retrieving and completing legal forms.

Among clients who were satisfied or very satisfied with the service as a whole, many said their lawyers were knowledgeable, thorough, and understanding of the clients' situation. Several clients said that their lawyer answered all the questions they had, and clarified many concepts that they did not previously understand. Others said the LawLINE is convenient and accessible, providing quick access to family law advice. Among the clients who said they were somewhat satisfied with the service, most believed the service helped them in some way, but also that they did not make much progress in their case. Others said they were confused about how the LawLINE works, and a couple of them said it was difficult to make appointments (even though the lawyer was helpful).

Of the few clients who were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied, the main challenge was that they believed the service did not offer them what they needed. For example, one interviewee said the advice was too brief, while another said that they could only be helped by a lawyer on a retainer. Another client said the program somewhat ignored them, and that they needed more help than they received.

Project stakeholders added that the new LawLINE model provides more services to clients, especially regarding the preparation and review of legal documents, and the more comprehensive Advice Given Form. However, some respondents cautioned that not all clients will be able to take advantage of these services, since some of them do not have access to the Internet, email, or fax machines. Therefore, the extent to which a client may be satisfied by the FAM LL model may depend upon the technical resources available to the client at home or in their community.

12. Have the enhancements to the FAM LL project increased internal efficiency and cost-effectiveness?

Although the cost-effectiveness analysis is an activity planned for the summative evaluation, the process evaluation was able to collect some anecdotal information regarding the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of FAM LL. This information may help inform the analysis to be done in the summative phase.

Despite the fact that the evaluation currently has no access to financial information, interviewees believed that FAM LL has increased the efficiency of the LawLINE services. The most common observation was that efficiency was gained through the implementation of a client screening process, which reduced the volume of inappropriate client referrals to the service. Previously, lawyers spent more time dealing with inappropriate clients, either by redirecting them to another service, or otherwise providing whatever assistance they could. The reduction in these referrals allowed the lawyers to focus their time on assisting other clients, and on completing data entry during their downtime. Interviewees provided other examples of efficiency gains, including the following:

- ▶ **Increased efficiency in subsequent client meetings:** Respondents suggested that meetings with repeat clients are more efficient due to the continuity of service provided. When the client can see the same lawyer for subsequent appointments (lawyer continuity), or when a new lawyer can access and review the client's file before the appointments (file continuity), then clients can spend less time re-explaining their case in each meeting. That said, respondents mentioned that most clients only attend one appointment, so substantial efficiency gains may not be observable until there are more repeat clients.
- ▶ **Improved retention of clients' knowledge:** As mentioned previously, stakeholders noted that clients tend to forget most of the information they receive during appointments, due to the high volume of information and the emotional stress of their legal situation. However, interviewees said that the written advice and other documentation helps clients retain more information, and therefore reduces the amount of time that lawyers spend reminding clients of this information.

13. Are the FAM LL referrals to other resources helpful to clients in resolving their family law issues?

Among the clients interviewed for the process evaluation, only a few discussed the helpfulness of referrals to other services (most of them had not received a referral, or could not recall whether they received a referral). A couple of them mentioned that the LawLINE lawyer advised them to see their local Family Duty Counsel on their court date, and the clients said that the Duty Counsel were very helpful in advancing their cases. Another client said that they were referred to a Family Justice Counsellor, whom they described as very helpful, having attended at least two appointments with them.

Since FAM LL has no way of tracking client outcomes, and the project is still in its early stages, stakeholders could not speak to the helpfulness of referrals to other resources. However, they did comment on the efforts being made by the pilot project to identify more resources to which clients may be referred. The challenge in many cases is that, since clients are located throughout

the province, there may be limited locally-available services, and the Roster Lawyers may have little or no knowledge about those services. Most lawyers said that they try to carefully consider the needs of their clients, but they often have to resort to Internet searches to retrieve contact information for local services that the clients could use. They also record this information and links to other resources (such as the LSS website, the RCMP, and local libraries) on the client's Advice Given Form. To provide more consistency in referrals to other resources, project personnel are currently compiling a list of resources located throughout various regions in the province. At the time of the interviews, most services in the northern parts of BC had been identified, while the team was still working to identify services in the southern regions. The goal is to provide each lawyer with a comprehensive list of resources and associated contact information that they can easily provide to clients.

14. How well does the FAM LL integrate into the suite of services available for clients with family law matters?

Both internal and external stakeholders shared their views on the awareness of the LawLINE among other family law services, and the actual integration between the services. Clients also provided information on how they first found out about the program.

Awareness of the LawLINE and the expanded services: Internal stakeholders shared mixed views about the extent to which other family law services are aware of LawLINE and its expansion. Some internal interviewees mentioned that various community agencies knew about LawLINE, as many of them had referred clients to the project and had sat in on the calls with clients. On the other hand, while many stakeholders mentioned that FJCs had been provided with briefing materials about the expanded services, they did not know whether those materials helped FJCs understand the pilot project. Several stakeholders also perceived a lack of awareness about the expanded LawLINE in the court registries across the province, and they suggested that FAM LL brochures should be distributed to the registries in order to raise awareness. Others mentioned that outreach activities were conducted with Mediate BC, the Child Protection Ministry, and the FMEP, but the impacts of these activities were unclear.

The perceptions of the internal stakeholders seemed to align with those of the external stakeholders, who often mentioned that they did not know much about LawLINE or its expansion. The FJCs interviewed for the evaluation said they were uncertain about many aspects of LawLINE, such as the waiting times for appointments, the maximum number of service hours per client, the availability of follow-up appointments, and the extent to which the lawyers can help clients prepare legal documents. Representatives of Community Resources seemed to have good general knowledge of LawLINE; they also mentioned that they had sat in on client calls to LawLINE, whereas FJCs had not sat in on the calls. This may explain why Community Resources representatives believed they had a good understanding of the program.

How clients found out about LawLINE: The clients interviewed for the process evaluation reported many different ways in which they first found out about the LawLINE. The two most common scenarios involved clients being referred to FAM LL by LSS/Legal Aid and clients finding the LawLINE number through Internet searches. Others reported finding out about LawLINE through friends, their local Family Duty Counsel, the phone book, information centres, the courts, or the provincial government (the Ministry of Family and Children Development).

Integration between FAM LL and other services: Internal stakeholders believed that there had not yet been much integration between FJCs and FAM LL. Many of them said that they had referred clients to FJCs (when they were available in a client’s local area), but that they had received few or no client referrals from FJCs. They described the potential of cooperation between the services, suggesting that LawLINE lawyers could provide advice to clients regarding negotiations and could review legal agreements, but overall they believe this has not occurred frequently. A few stakeholders said they would appreciate more dialogue with FJCs to determine if they are aware of FAM LL, and how they could improve the integration between the programs.

In contrast, external stakeholders said they had referred a large number of clients to the LawLINE. They described referring clients who needed advice regarding property, guardianship, self-representation in court, and the preparation of legal documents. However, the challenge for external stakeholders was that they had no way to assess the outcome or usefulness of their referrals, unless they happened to sit in on the call.

Information on organizations or individuals who referred clients to FAM LL was only available for about 4% of cases in the project database. Among the 18 recorded referrals, 10 referrals came from LSS/Legal Aid, and two came from court staff or the judiciary. Other referring organizations or individuals included Access Pro Bono, community agencies, FJCs, FMEP staff, a private lawyer, and a resource room or self-help centre (each of which represent only one recorded referral). External stakeholders (FJCs and Community Resources) said that they referred many clients to the LawLINE; however, the available data contain very few referrals to the pilot project. The reasons for this are unknown, and this issue should be explored early in the summative evaluation.

On the other hand, the data review found 388 instances of referrals from FAM LL to other organizations or individuals. The most common referrals included the LSS Family Law website (42% of referrals), the LSS Family Duty Counsel (29%), LSS/Legal Aid (26% of referrals), and FJCs (23%). In Table 8, the “Other” referrals from FAM LL to organizations or individuals included referrals to health professionals, social workers, FMEP income assistance, courthouse libraries, Aboriginal community agencies, Crown counsel/prosecutors, immigrant settlement or multicultural organizations, and law student clinics or programs.

Table 8: Referrals from FAM LL to other organizations or individuals (n=437)

Organization or individual	#	%
LSS Family Law website	163	42%
LSS Family Duty Counsel	113	29%
Legal Services/Legal Aid	100	26%
FJC	88	23%
Private lawyer	48	12%
Court staff or judiciary	42	11%
Other government	23	6%
Advocate or community agency	18	5%
Private mediator	17	4%
Justice Access Centre - resource room or self-help	12	3%
Police/victim services	11	3%
FMEP	10	3%
Access Pro Bono	8	2%
Other	32	8%

Note: Cases could involve more than one referral; totals will sum to more than 100%.

15. Were there any unintended consequences or outcomes of the FAM LL project identified in Year 1?

Some unintended consequences that were identified by interviewees were noted earlier in this report. The most common unintended consequences mentioned by interviewees were the drop in client volume that they attributed to the long waiting times at the LSS intake level and the increased workload for the FAM LL Pilot Administrator from entering client data into two databases. Other stakeholders noted that some clients may lack the capacity or resources (e.g., Internet, email, scanners, fax machines) needed to take advantage of the expanded LawLINE model. Interviewees also identified some other consequences which they believed were unintended:

- ▶ **Changed interaction with clients due to the forms:** A couple of respondents said that the new forms were a “distraction” that changed the interaction they had with their clients. They explained that their fixation on collecting the information required for the forms prevented them from devoting their full attention to comforting clients who were in difficult legal situations.
- ▶ **Increased efficiency of other LSS services:** One stakeholder believed that an increased number of referrals to LawLINE had reduced demand for the Family Duty Counsel services in their area. They saw this as an increase in efficiency, since the Duty Counsel services were overloaded and did not always have the capacity to meet client demand.

5.0 Conclusions

This section presents some brief conclusions of the process evaluation, based on the data collection and analysis performed to date.

5.1 Conclusions on implementation of the FAM LL

Stakeholders generally agree that FAM LL has been implemented as planned. Project personnel mentioned that the transition from the old model to the new one was smooth, despite some minor delays. Also, while some aspects of the model have not yet been implemented (e.g., the coaching model and the dedicated referral processes from FJCs), lawyers are delivering informal coaching to clients who will represent themselves in court. A few respondents believed that the lawyers could benefit from “refresher” training on the operations, procedures, and policies of FAM LL.

Some implementation challenges were identified, including some issues with appointments and notifications, increased client waiting times and decreased call volume, due to LSS intake processes and increased lawyer time spent filling out forms. Although these were the main challenges, some other minor challenges were identified, such as glitches with the phone system and the LSS staff login system.

Interviewees believed that FAM LL has sufficient resources and capacity to meet the demand for its services. Interviewees pointed out that, after an initial drop in caller volume, the revised LSS intake process helped bring more clients to LawLINE. However, this also increased the workload of the Pilot Administrator, who must now enter client information into two

databases (CIS and the FAM LL database). That said, this revised process is temporary, and will be reassessed at a later date. Finally, respondents noted that even though LawLINE has sufficient resources and capacity to deliver its services, clients often lack certain resources (Internet, email, scanners, or fax machines) needed to use LawLINE to its full potential.

So far, the available data show that most clients (76%) have received one hour of service or less from the LawLINE. However, since the vast majority of cases in the database are still open, it is possible that many clients could receive more hours of service before their cases are closed. Also, while it is not expected that every client will use their full allotment of six hours, the increase in available hours gives FAM LL more flexibility to provide services based on the needs of clients. In addition, with the LawLINE lawyers attempting to help clients reach early resolutions in their legal matters, much of the advice would likely occur in a compact time period.

The FAM LL model was generally well received by stakeholders. Respondents highlighted some key strengths of the LawLINE, including its high accessibility and convenience, and the increased efficiency resulting from a reduction in calls from clients who were inappropriate for the FAM LL service. They also provided several suggestions for fine-tuning the model, which involved minor process improvements.

5.2 Conclusions on early indications of outcomes

The pilot project is making strong efforts to maintain lawyer continuity, but stakeholders noted that it is not always practical to schedule clients' appointments with the same lawyers over time. The data review found that most cases to date only involved one client meeting, so a full assessment of lawyer continuity will not be possible until the database includes more cases with multiple meetings.

File continuity is being maintained. Stakeholders mentioned that even when lawyer continuity is not possible, the project can maintain file continuity through the use of client files maintained by the Pilot Administrator. Although a few pointed out that there are some inconsistencies in the client files, their overall reaction was positive. Also, clients who worked with more than one lawyer said that the transition between lawyers was smooth, and that the new lawyer was always brought up to speed on the case.

The service is improving clients' knowledge of the family law process and legal options. Clients agreed that the lawyers helped them by clarifying legal concepts and carefully explaining the next steps to be taken in their legal issues. Many clients said they felt more confident after receiving the information, and that they would not have been able to understand some of the legal terminology without help from the lawyer. Stakeholders believed that the Advice Given Form and the availability of follow-up appointments were key factors in helping clients better understand the family law process.

Clients had mixed views on whether they can better manage and resolve their legal issues as a result of the LawLINE. Clients found it helpful to receive advice on settling their case out of court, and on representing themselves in court. However, based on client interviews, clients desire more assistance with completing forms.

About 43% of clients are accessing FAM LL before court proceedings or before they have a written agreement. Although the evaluation did not have comparable data before the implementation of the new model, this will be an important figure to track for the summative evaluation, since it is ideal for clients to access the project before their court date.

The extent to which FAM LL helps clients achieve resolutions to their legal problems is unknown. The process evaluation could not assess the extent to which clients were better able to obtain resolutions to their family law issues, because there is no formal way to track resolutions. Also, the majority of interviewed clients had not yet resolved their legal issues. The summative evaluation may be able to provide more insight on this issue through a larger survey of clients.

The majority of clients appear satisfied with the services provided by the FAM LL pilot project. About two-thirds of the interviewed clients said that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the LawLINE services. Of the remaining third of the clients, about half were only somewhat satisfied, while the other half said they were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied.

Anecdotally, the new model appears to have increased the efficiency of the LawLINE. Stakeholders described increased efficiencies due to the continuity of the service, a reduction in inappropriate clients, and improved retention of knowledge by clients. The summative evaluation will expand the analysis of efficiency through the use of financial information.

External stakeholders are aware of the LawLINE, but know little about its services. The external stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation had referred clients to the LawLINE, but mostly were unaware of the types of services or the limitations of the services that clients could expect. In fact, a number of external stakeholders declined to be interviewed for the evaluation, citing a lack of knowledge about the specifics of the program. Internal stakeholders suggested that outreach activities should be conducted to improve the awareness of the program among external stakeholders.

The extent to which FAM LL integrates with other family law services is unclear. Most internal stakeholders believed there had been little integration between FAM LL and FJCs to date. Also, while external stakeholders said they referred many clients to the LawLINE, they had no way of knowing the outcomes of those referrals. Also, there is almost no data on the organizations or individuals who referred clients to FAM LL. A more extensive analysis of integration may be possible after FAM LL receives more client referrals.

6.0 Recommendations to further enhance the implementation process

Recommendation 1: Provide refresher training for Roster Lawyers for quality assurance purposes.

Some stakeholders reported inconsistent knowledge about their roles and responsibilities regarding the pilot project, including about the proper way to fill out client information forms, and when (or if) forms should be shared with clients. In addition, some lawyers said they were uncomfortable assessing client abilities for the purposes of data collection, and that they would like more clarification on this issue. It may be useful to provide refresher training or Frequently Asked Questions to the Roster, especially given the reported changes in client forms that have occurred over the duration of the project. Some lawyers also said they would like to have a teleconference session to discuss these issues with others on the Roster; however, given the schedules of all of the lawyers, this would likely require two or three teleconferences.

Recommendation 2: Review data capture and data entry procedures to ensure consistency.

The process evaluation lacked certain data needed to reach conclusions on some aspects of FAM LL, such as the proportion of Aboriginal clients accessing the services, and the referrals from other services to the LawLINE. About 40% of clients were not asked to provide information about their Aboriginal ancestry, and almost no referral data was entered in the database. In other words, although clients are under no obligation to provide information on their Aboriginal ancestry, it appears that about 40% are not being asked at all. Regarding referrals, it is unclear if the data are not being entered properly, or if the clients are simply failing to report (through their Acknowledgement Forms) that they were referred by another individual or organization. It will be important to collect more data on these issues in order to support the summative evaluation.

Recommendation 3: Develop a strategy to monitor rural and remote access to FAM LL.

The process evaluation did not have data from before the expansion of the LawLINE in order to assess changes in the numbers or proportion of clients accessing the service from rural and remote areas. However, it may be possible to monitor this issue and support conclusive findings in the summative evaluation. For example, the FAM LL database currently contains information on the city from which the client is calling, and their postal codes. However, there are over 130 cities listed in the database, with the majority of cities having less than ten clients associated with them in the data. Also, postal codes were only collected in about half of the cases.

- ▶ Coding the cities into larger categories (regions) would better support a regional analysis. If LSS can identify the regions for which they may be interested in monitoring access, PRA could code the cities into these categories. The data could then be monitored over time to determine whether access is changing in any rural and remote regions.
- ▶ Collecting postal codes on a more consistent basis would also help inform a regional analysis of access.

Appendix A – FAM LL Logic Model

	Program Activities	Program Outputs	Short-Term Outcomes	Medium-Term Outcomes
ACCESS	Implement a stakeholders engagement and marketing/recruitment plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of clients accessing Family LawLINE service from rural and remote areas of BC # of non-English speaking clients # of clients referred from Family Justice Services Division attending their scheduled LawLINE appointment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients are accessing the Family LawLINE service early in the process of dealing with their legal situation 	
SERVICES TO SUPPORT CLIENTS IN RESOLVING LEGAL PROBLEMS	Provide legal advice and information to qualifying low-income individuals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of clients accessing Family LawLINE service # of Family LawLINE clients receiving summary legal advice #, type of different Family Law issues Amount of time (service hours) per client 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients' knowledge of the legal process is increased Clients are more informed about family law and their legal options Clients are satisfied with the level of support received from FAM LL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAM LL clients achieve a resolution to their legal problem The client's overall ability to manage and resolve any future legal problems is improved Efficiency of the LSS Family Law Services is improved
	Provide document preparation services to Family LawLINE clients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of Family LawLINE clients receiving document preparation assistance for Supreme Court matters # of Family LawLINE clients receiving document preparation assistance for Provincial Court matters Amount of time (service hours) spent on document prep/client 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The client's ability to prepare and submit court documents is improved 	
	Provide support for the development and finalization of agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of full agreements reached # of partial agreements reached # of consent or orders filed # of agreements filed # of FJC clients provided summary advice on agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The client's ability to prepare and finalize agreements is improved 	
	Develop and implement formalized legal coaching services to Family LawLINE clients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of Family LawLINE clients receiving legal coaching services #, type of training received by FAM LL lawyers # of clients who use FLWS and other PLEI resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients are better prepared for their legal process Clients are more effective at representing themselves at all stages of dealing with their legal problem Lawyers feel that coaching was effective in better preparing clients 	
	Provide a continuous and consistent service to Family LawLINE clients <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheduling appointments/follow-up with clients Provide a standard set of processes for each client Lawyers spend less time gathering repeat information on clients who call multiple times 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of cases with full continuity of service (with a focus on file continuity: smooth case progression, even if the client sees different lawyers) # of referrals to FAM LL from Family Justice Counsellors # of referrals from FAM LL to other connected services (qualitative assessment only) # of hours spent per client 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuity of the FAM LL service is improved 	

Appendix B – FAM LL Evaluation Matrix

Framework for the Evaluation of the Family LawLINE Pilot Project		
Questions	Indicators	Data sources
Implementation		
1. Has the FAM LL been implemented as intended in Year 1? What challenges were met in implementation? How were challenges addressed and improvements made to the model?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder opinion on challenges/improvements Decision-records of changes made to improve model 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant interviews Document review
2. What external factors have influenced the implementation and success of the FAM LL?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder opinion FAM LL WG meeting minutes documenting external factors Evidence that decisions, actions, policies of external organizations/stakeholders affect the FAM LL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant interviews Document review
3. Did the FAM LL have sufficient tools, resources, and capacity to meet demand and any intended targets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receiving legal aid referrals in previous years (for catchment area) Stakeholder opinion that the FAM LL has sufficient tools and resources to satisfactorily meet demand Client opinion on the level of assistance provided by the FAM LL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAM LL database LSS CIS database Key informant interviews Client interviews
4. To what extent do the current processes and structure of the FAM LL support its efficient and effective delivery?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder opinion on the current processes and structure to support the project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key informant interviews
Outcome: Provision of legal advice and information		
5. Did more clients access the Family LawLINE services, including clients from rural and remote areas and Aboriginal clients, after its expansion?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of clients accessing FAM LL services from rural and remote areas of BC Stakeholder assessment of extent to which more clients from rural and remote areas and Aboriginal clients used the services after its expansion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAM LL database Key informant interviews
6. Did the pilot project ¹⁰ improve the continuity and consistency of the Family LawLINE services?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and percent of FAM LL clients who have continuous contact with a single lawyer Extent to which FAM LL clients felt it was helpful to work with the same FAM LL lawyer Extent to which clients who saw different lawyers felt there was still file continuity in their case Extent to which FAM LL clients felt they benefited from being referred from FAM LL to another service Extent to which clients are satisfied with continuity of service Lawyer perspective on the effectiveness/continuity of the new service model Time spent with clients for FAM LL services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAM LL database Client interviews Key informant interviews

¹⁰ The original wording of Question 6 was “Did the lead lawyer improve the continuity and consistency of the Family LawLINE services?” However, the wording was changed to reflect our evolved understanding of FAM LL. Through interviews, we discovered that continuity mostly depends upon factors other than the lead lawyer, such as the efforts made to schedule client appointments with the same lawyer, and the availability of both lawyers and clients.

Framework for the Evaluation of the Family LawLINE Pilot Project		
Questions	Indicators	Data sources
Outcome: Client experience and satisfaction		
7. Have the Family LawLINE services improved clients' knowledge of the process, family law, and their legal options?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which clients feel their knowledge of family law and the legal process is increased • Extent to which FAM LL clients feel more informed about their legal options • Key informant opinions on the extent to which clients increased their knowledge of the legal process • Feedback from FJCs/JAC staff regarding clients' level of preparedness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAM LL database • Client interviews • Key informant interviews
8. Have the Family LawLINE services increased client's ability to manage and resolve their current legal issue? Future legal issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which clients believe the FAM LL helped them better represent themselves • Key informant feedback on the improved ability of clients to represent themselves • Proportion of FAM LL clients who believe they could prepare/submit court documents on their own • Number and percent of FAM LL clients who file court documents • Number and percent of FAM LL clients who have had court documents rejected by the Court Registry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client interviews • Key informant interviews
9. Are clients accessing Family LawLINE services early in the process of dealing with their legal situation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and percent of clients accessing the FAM LL for help as a first option • Number and percent of FAM LL clients who accessed the service before filing a court application • Key informant assessment of the extent to which clients are accessing FAM LL services early in their legal process (especially whether they access FAM LL with enough time to prepare for self-representation in court) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAM LL database • Key informant interviews
10. Are the FAM LL services helping clients achieve resolutions to their legal problems?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of family law services provided to clients • Number and percent of FAM LL cases resolved by type of outcome (by information) • Number and percent of FAM LL cases not resolved and reasons why (by information) • Number of days from first contact with FAM LL to resolution (by information) • Number and percent of cases with resolutions out of court • Comparison of clients' ability to achieve out-of-court resolution between the start and end points of the case file • Extent to which clients believe that FAM LL support contributed to the resolution of their legal matter • Number of full agreements reached • Number of partial agreements reached • Key informant assessment of FAM LL impact on case resolutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAM LL database • Client interviews • Key informant interviews
11. Are clients satisfied with their experience using the added Family LawLINE services? What, if anything, can be done to improve clients' experience?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which FAM LL clients are satisfied with the level of support received from FAM LL • Key informant opinions on the quality of FAM LL services and improvements needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client interviews • Key informant interviews

Framework for the Evaluation of the Family LawLINE Pilot Project		
Questions	Indicators	Data sources
Outcome: Improved efficiencies		
12. Have the enhancements to the Family LawLINE project increased internal efficiency and cost-effectiveness?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant assessment of the efficiency and appropriateness of referrals to FAM LL • Decreased time spent by lawyers gathering repeat information from clients who call multiple times (anecdotal only; this was not tracked before the evaluation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews
Outcome: Integrated and comprehensive services		
13. Are the FAM LL referrals to other resources helpful to clients in resolving their family law issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number and type of services connected to FAM LL • Number and type of referrals from FAM LL to other services • Number and proportion of clients referred to FAM LL attending their scheduled FAM LL appointment • Key informant assessment of the proportion of clients attending their scheduled FAM LL appointments • Extent to which clients feel that the FAM LL referral to a support resource got them closer to a resolution of their legal issue • Stakeholder input on extent to which referrals are helping clients • Key informant opinions on the effectiveness of referrals from FAM LL services to other services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAM LL database • Client interviews • Key informant interviews
14. How well does the Family LawLINE integrate into the suite of services available for clients with family law matters?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease or “seamlessness” of client movement between services • Key informant assessment of the level of integration between FAM LL and Family Justice Counsellors (or other services) • Key informant assessment of the benefits to clients from integration with Family Justice Counsellors (or other services) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client interviews • Key informant interviews
15. Were there any unintended consequences or outcomes of the FAM LL project identified in Year 1?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant opinion on unintended consequences or outcomes of the FAM LL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews

Appendix C – Interview guides

**Legal Services Society of British Columbia
Family LawLINE Pilot Project Evaluation**

**Interview guide for internal stakeholders
(Project Lead, Lead Lawyer, Administrator, LSS intake, roster lawyers)**

The Legal Services Society of British Columbia (LSS) requires an evaluation of the Family LawLINE (FAM LL) additions pilot project which has been implemented under the Justice Innovation and Transformation Initiative (JITI). LSS hired PRA Inc., an independent research company, to assist in the evaluation. One component of the evaluation is to conduct telephone interviews with stakeholders who are familiar with FAM LL.

The interview should take no more than one hour. The information we gather through the interviews will be summarized in aggregate form. With your permission, we will audio record the interview. Although we will take notes throughout the interview, no one outside of PRA will see these notes or listen to the recordings.

The current evaluation focuses on the implementation of FAM LL to identify early issues and make recommendations to assist LSS management in improving/refining project implementation. This evaluation will also examine early indicators of success in meeting the project's objectives to increase access to family law services for people with low incomes and to help clients resolve their family law issues.

We realize you may not be able to answer all questions; please let us know, and we will skip to the next question.

Implementation of FAM LL

1. Please briefly describe your role in the implementation and/or delivery of the FAM LL pilot project. Were you involved in FAM LL prior to the pilot project? If so, in what capacity?
2. Based on your observations, has the project been implemented as planned? If not, why not?
3. Have any factors or stakeholders external to FAM LL affected, either positively or negatively, the implementation and success of the model? If yes, how has the project responded to mitigate problems or use opportunities?
4. In your opinion, does FAM LL have sufficient resources and capacity for providing the expected level of services? Please explain why or why not. What steps has FAM LL taken to overcome any resource challenges?
5. How efficient is the current intake and screening process? In your response, please consider the various points in the process (e.g., LSS intake, Pilot Admin). In your opinion, are appropriate clients/matters being streamed into FAM LL services? Are there any difficulties in assessing which clients/matters are appropriate for the pilot?
6. In your opinion, do the current structures and processes of FAM LL support its effective and efficient delivery? In your response, please consider structures and processes for handling the queue, establishing and maintaining a client file, setting appointment times, managing continuity of counsel (including the scheduling calendar), enabling timekeeping, and working online with clients. Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the model?

7. Have lawyers handling FAM LL calls and relevant LSS staff been appropriately prepared for their role in the project? Have they found tools developed for the project to be helpful?
8. Are there any other challenges not already discussed that were encountered during the implementation of FAM LL? How were these challenges addressed?

Progress towards achieving objectives

9. Are all relevant stakeholders aware of FAM LL and referring potential clients? (*Probe: Family Justice Counsellors, Mediate BC*) What more, if anything, is needed to increase awareness and referrals? (*Probe: how effective have communication activities been? Who is referring people to FAM LL?*)
10. Based on your best estimate, approximately what proportion of clients directly to FAM LL referred for appointments (e.g., by Family Justice Counsellors) attend their appointments? What do you believe are the reasons for non-attendance? Do you have any suggestions for how to reduce non-attendance?
11. Based on your experience, are clients accessing FAM LL services early in their family law process? Are they engaging the service with enough time to prepare for self-representation in court? If not, what needs to change for the clients to access the services sooner?
12. From your perspective, is FAM LL able to give clients a good understanding of the family law and the legal process? Of the options available to them for resolving their family law issue (e.g., *collaborative processes versus court*)? Please explain what services FAM LL provides that achieve this result for clients, and on what basis you believe client understanding improves after using FAM LL.
13. In your opinion, how do FAM LL services influence the client's ability to manage and resolve their own legal issue? What supports/information/tools does FAM LL provide clients that will result in increasing client capacity in this way? In your experience, are clients able/willing to handle the tasks expected of them?
14. Based on your experience, do you think that FAM LL services assist clients in achieving resolutions to their legal problems? What types of resolutions are most common (out of court through mediation, negotiation, etc., or litigation)? Please explain what services FAM LL provides that achieve this result for clients, and on what basis you believe FAM LL assists in resolving the client's legal matter.
15. What do you consider to be the key improvements made by the expanded FAM LL? How has the expanded FAM LL affected, positively or negatively, the efficiency of the LawLINE service? In what ways, if at all, do you think the expanded FAM LL will affect the efficiency of LSS's family law services more generally?
16. Please describe the FAM LL approach to referring clients to other legal and non-legal resources. For example, how does FAM LL determine when and to what other resources to refer clients? What activities has FAM LL undertaken to network with and connect to other resources across the province? Do you think there are any gaps in types of referral resources available to FAM LL?

17. Please describe how FAM LL works with the Family Justice Counsellors. How well integrated do you believe these two services are? Do you have any suggestions for improvement? Based on your experience, what are the benefits to clients and the family justice system of the relationship between FAM LL and the Family Justice Counsellors?
18. Have there been any unintended consequences or outcomes of the project, either positive or negative? If so, what were they?
19. Do you have any other suggested improvements for FAM LL that have not already been mentioned?
20. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your time.

**Legal Services Society of British Columbia
Family LawLINE Pilot Project Evaluation**

**Interview guide for external stakeholders
(Family Justice Counsellors, Mediate BC, Community Resources)**

The Legal Services Society of British Columbia (LSS) requires an evaluation of the Family LawLINE (FLL) additions pilot project, which has been implemented under the Justice Innovation and Transformation Initiative (JITI). LSS hired PRA Inc., an independent research company, to assist in the evaluation. One component of the evaluation is to conduct telephone interviews with stakeholders who are familiar with the FLL project.

The interview should take no more than one hour. The information we gather through the interviews will be summarized in aggregate form. With your permission, we will audio record the interview. Although we will take notes throughout the interview, no one outside of PRA will see these notes or listen to the recordings.

The current evaluation focuses on the implementation of the FLL project to identify early issues and make recommendations to assist LSS management in improving/refining project implementation. This evaluation will also examine early indicators of success in meeting the project's objectives to increase access to family law services for people with low incomes and to help clients resolve their family law issues.

We realize you may not be able to answer all questions; please let us know, and we will skip to the next question.

Implementation of the FLL pilot

1. Please briefly describe your involvement with the FLL pilot project (e.g., how your organization works with or interacts with FLL) or with clients of the FLL pilot project.
2. In your opinion, does the FLL have sufficient resources and capacity for providing the expected level of services? Please explain why or why not. To your knowledge, what steps has the FLL taken to overcome any resource challenges?
3. In your opinion, do the current structure and processes of the FLL support its effective and efficient delivery? Do you have any suggestions for improvements to the model?
4. Have you encountered any challenges in your interactions with the FLL? If yes, what are they, and have these challenges been addressed?

Progress towards achieving objectives

5. How would you rate your knowledge of the services available to clients at the expanded FLL? Are there particular aspects of the services of the FLL that you wish you better understood?
6. Do you refer your clients to the FLL? In what circumstances/for what issues do you refer to the FLL? In what circumstances would you not refer a potentially eligible client? Overall, how would you describe your experience of referring clients to the FLL?

7. Based on your experience, do your clients referred to FLL makes contact with FLL (either phone the FLL for one-time advice or attend their appointments)? What do you believe are the reasons for clients not following through with the FLL? (*Probe: accessibility issues, such as hours of service, language, comfort level, concerns with cultural sensitivity, lack of access to telephone*) Do you have any suggestions for how to encourage/support clients to follow through?
8. Based on your experience, are clients accessing FLL services early in their family law process? Are they engaging the service with enough time to prepare for self-representation in court? If not, what needs to change for the clients to access the services sooner?
9. From your perspective, is the FLL able to give clients a good understanding of the family law and the legal process? Of the options available to them for resolving their family law issue (*e.g., collaborative processes versus court*)? Please explain what services FLL provides that achieve this result for clients, and on what basis you believe client understanding improves after using the FLL.
10. In your opinion, how do the FLL services influence the client's ability to manage and resolve their own legal issue? What supports/information/tools does the FLL provide clients that will result in increasing client capacity in this way? In your experience, are clients able/willing to handle the tasks expected of them?
11. Based on your experience, do you think that FLL services assist clients in achieving resolutions to their legal problems? What types of resolutions are most common (out of court through mediation, negotiation, etc. or litigation)? Please explain what services FLL provides that achieve this result for clients, and on what basis you believe the FLL assists in resolving the client's legal matter.
12. What do you consider to be the key improvements made by the expanded FLL? How has the expanded FLL affected, positively or negatively, the efficiency of the LawLINE service?
13. Please describe the FLL approach to referring clients to other legal and non-legal resources? For example, how does the FLL determine when and to what other resources to refer clients? What activities has the FLL undertaken to network with and connect to other resources across the province? Do you think there are any gaps in types of referral resources available to the FLL?
14. In your opinion, how well integrated is FLL with other legal services, such as Family Justice Counsellors? Do you have any suggestions for improvement? Based on your experience, what are the benefits to clients and the family justice system of the relationship between FLL and other legal services, such as Family Justice Counsellors?
15. Have there been any unintended consequences or outcomes of the project, either positive or negative? If so, what were they?
16. Do you have any other suggested improvements for FLL that have not already been mentioned?
17. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your time.

**Legal Services Society of British Columbia
Family LawLINE Additions Evaluation**

Interview guide for clients

[Interviewer will read the following]: Thank you very much for agreeing to talk to me today. My name is <...> and I am from PRA, an independent research company. The Legal Services Society of British Columbia, you might know them as legal aid, has hired us to help them on a study of one of their services, the Family LawLINE — I'm just going to call it the LawLINE. LawLINE is a telephone service that offers legal advice to eligible clients with family law issues. Over the telephone, lawyers provide advice on legal processes and on possible options for resolving family law issues, including out-of-court settlements. They may also help with drafting documents. Recently, there have been some improvements made to the LawLINE, which are intended to expand the available services and make them more accessible to clients. Legal aid wants to know how well the LawLINE is working for clients. We understand you were or still are a client of the LawLINE, and that is why you were asked to take part in this interview.

I'd like to ask you some questions about the help you got from the LawLINE. Please be assured that I will not ask you anything personal about your family law matter, only about the services you received and how helpful these were to you. This information will help the Legal Services Society in identifying how the project can be improved.

The interview should take about 20 minutes. The information from your interview will be combined with other interviews and reported all together, so your name will not be mentioned. With your permission, I will audio record the interview for the purpose of note taking. No one outside of PRA will see your notes or hear your recording. If you cannot answer a question, let me know and we will skip to the next question.

[Begin audio recording]

1. How did you first find out about the LawLINE? Do you recall who told you about it? (*Probe: Family Justice Counsellor, Mediate BC, other agency*)
2. Were you referred to LawLINE by a lawyer or legal agency, or did you call LawLINE on your own, without a referral?
 - a. **[If they called on their own, without a referral]** When you contacted LawLINE, how long did you wait before you talked with a lawyer? Did you think the wait was too long or about right?
 - b. **[If they were referred to LawLINE]** How long after the referral did it take to get an appointment with the lawyer? Did you think the wait was too long or about right? (*Note for interviewer: after the pilot admin schedules the appointment, the lawyer will call the client at the designated time; the client does not call the lawyer for the appointment.*)
 - c. Were you in mediation at the time you first talked to a LawLINE lawyer? Had you already filed a court application? Did you have a court date that was in the next few days?

3. How easy or difficult did you find the process of getting connected to the LawLINE lawyer that first time? What made it difficult/easy?
4. How many times did you talk to a lawyer at LawLINE about your legal issue?
 - a. **[If more than once]** Did you always talk to the same lawyer at LawLINE about that issue?
 - i. **[If No]** How many different lawyers did you speak with? Do you know why you did not get to speak to the same lawyer every time? Did it make it harder to use the LawLINE? (*Probe: was the new lawyer already brought up to speed on your case? How smooth was the transition between lawyers?*)
 - ii. **[If Yes]** Did you find it helpful to speak to the same lawyer? In what ways did you find it helpful?
 - b. How would you describe your experience talking to the LawLINE lawyer?
 - i. Did you feel treated with respect?
 - ii. Did they take time to understand your legal issue?
5. What type of legal assistance did the LawLINE give you? Did they...
 - a. Explain family law and the court process to you?
 - i. Do you think that this helped you better understand the legal process and family law? Why or why not?
 - b. Tell you different ways that you could handle your legal matter, including how to resolve your matter without having to go to court?
 - i. How did you use that information? Did you feel more informed about the different ways you could handle your legal matter?
 - c. Help you with preparing documents?
 - i. What kind of help did you get? (*Probe: advice on how to prepare documents, lawyer helped draft document with you*) Do you feel like you can prepare and submit court documents on your own after getting the advice? Why or why not?
 - ii. Did you submit any court documents that you prepared to the court registry? Were they accepted? **[If No]** Do you know why not?
 - d. Give you advice on how to represent yourself in court?
 - i. Did that advice make you feel better able to represent yourself in court? In what ways did it help? Why did it not help you?
 - e. Refer you to online resources for information?
 - i. Did you use the online resources? Which ones, if you can recall? In what ways did you find it helpful? Were they helpful?
 - f. Refer you to other services, including other agencies, that could help you with your legal issues?
 - i. Did you use any of these other services? Which ones, if you can recall? Were they easy to use? Were they helpful?
 - g. Give you any other types of assistance?

6. Is your legal matter resolved yet? **[If No, skip to next question]** If yes, what was the resolution? Did you settle out of court? Do you have a full or partial agreement on your matter?
 - a. Do you think that the assistance you received from LawLINE helped you resolve your matter? If yes, how did it help you? If no, what help do you wish you had received that might have helped you resolve your legal matter?
7. Overall, how satisfied were you with the LawLINE services? What did you like the most about the LawLINE? What, if anything, would you change about LawLINE to make the services better?
8. Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for your time.