

HELPING PEOPLE NAVIGATE THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

AN EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY PARTNERS

PART 1

 **TIM
ROBERTS & ASSOCIATES CONSULTING**

January 2022

Acknowledgements

Published on the unceded traditional territory of the Coast Salish peoples, including the territories of the xwməθkwəyəm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and səlílwətaʔt/Selilwitulh (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.

Writer: Tim Roberts & Associates Consulting, Duncan, BC

Editor: Grace Yaginuma

Layout: Tamara Abram

Project sponsor: John Simpson

Helping People Navigate the Justice System: An Evaluation of Community Partners is published by Legal Aid BC, a non-profit organization that provides legal aid to British Columbians. LABC is separate from the BC government, its primary funder. It also receives grants from the Law Foundation and the Notary Foundation (of BC).

CONTENTS

Foreword	5
Executive summary	7
Objectives and methods of the current evaluation	7
Key conclusions.....	8
Key recommendations.....	9
Introduction	11
The genesis and purpose of the CP project.....	11
Findings of the 2013 evaluation.....	11
Changes in delivery locations since the 2013 evaluation	12
Overview of current CP locations	13
Objectives of the current evaluation	16
The methodology.....	16
Limitations to the study	17
1 Awareness of PLEI services.....	19
1.1 Data related to the ordering of PLEI materials	19
1.2 Data from interviews with justice navigators.....	28
1.3 Feedback from focus groups with justice navigators.....	33
1.4 Feedback from service users.....	34
1.5 Feedback from agencies	34
1.6 Whether the websites of CP organizations mention the CP program.....	38
2 Awareness and use of intake services	39
2.1 Data on legal aid applications.....	39
2.2 Data from interviews with justice navigators.....	43
2.3 Feedback from service users.....	46
2.4 Feedback from agencies	48

3	The capacity of justice navigators to identify and respond to individuals with legal issues	50
3.1	Overall nature of their work and the people they serve.....	50
3.2	The impact of COVID-19 on the work of justice navigators	51
3.3	Connection with other justice navigators	52
3.4	The capacity of justice navigators to act as a connector and provide deeper outreach in their service areas.....	52
4	Justice navigators’ satisfaction with the training and support they receive	54
4.1	The training and support provided.....	54
4.2	Participation in and assessment of training.....	58
5	The degree to which the CP program is reaching its target populations	61
5.1	Justice navigators’ perceptions on the degree to which target populations are being served	61
5.2	The agencies’ perceptions on the degree to which target populations are being served.....	65
	Conclusions and recommendations	67
	Conclusions.....	67
	Recommendations	69

Appendix 1: The deliverables listed in the contract with Community Partners	73
Appendix 2: Follow-up to the recommendations in the 2013 evaluation report.....	74
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for justice navigators	77
Appendix 4: Telephone questionnaire for agencies.....	81
Appendix 5: Online questionnaire 1 for agencies	85
Appendix 6: Online questionnaire 2 for agencies.....	87
Appendix 7: Telephone questionnaire for users.....	88
Appendix 8: Online questionnaire for users	90
Appendix 9: Instructions for writing the Most Significant Change story.....	92

FOREWORD

Evaluation is an important aspect of all services that Legal Aid BC provides. The Community Partner program was last evaluated in 2013, shortly after it was launched. The program has now been in operation for a decade. In 2020, we decided the time was right for a second evaluation.

The purpose of the second evaluation was to:

- ▶ assess how well the program was meeting the needs of low-income people in rural, remote, Indigenous, and hard-to-reach communities across BC;
- ▶ gather information and feedback from communities and individuals; and
- ▶ receive recommendations that would help us to improve the program.

An independent consulting firm, Tim Roberts and Associates Consulting (TRAC), worked with an LABC committee to develop the evaluation framework and carry out the evaluation. Members of the committee included Rupi Sahota, Alex Peel, Sarah Chau, and myself, John Simpson.

The environment for evaluation has changed substantially in the past 10 years. The rise of digital materials, online tools, and the unprecedented ability to videoconference has afforded many new opportunities. However, the evaluation tells us that people still need help navigating the justice system, still have use for print resources, and still have many other needs that community partnerships help address.

The evaluation shows that we're reaching marginalized people in a meaningful way, and also provides us with a roadmap for improvement. We're excited to use this evaluation to improve the way we provide services in BC.

We'd like to sincerely thank everyone who gave their time to participate in this evaluation.

It was conducted entirely during the COVID-19 pandemic, a time that was extremely difficult for service providers and members of the public. It presented significant challenges for the evaluation team, as lockdowns, office closures, and other measures impacted our ability to reach the people whose feedback was essential to the evaluation. People needing Community Partner services often face multiple barriers and challenges, quite apart from the stress and trauma of dealing with a serious legal problem. We're especially grateful to people who took the additional time to speak to TRAC.

A special thanks to all 26 of our Community Partners who took the time to provide their thoughts and feedback to TRAC through focus groups and one-to-one interviews. Thank you as well for all the time spent recruiting people to speak to TRAC. We know how valuable your time is and sincerely appreciate the effort.

Finally, thank you to the team at TRAC for your patience and perseverance in getting this done during the pandemic. We kept extending your deadline hoping the pandemic would end, and it just never did. You were extremely adaptable and patient with us on this, and we thank you for your professionalism.

This evaluation was made possible with funding from the LABC/Law Foundation of BC Research Fund.

Sincerely,
John Simpson, Manager, Community and Publishing Services
Legal Aid BC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Community Partners Information and Outreach Services program of Legal Aid BC (LABC) was established in 2010 to increase:

- ▶ awareness of and access to LABC's services and intake in marginalized (Indigenous and remote) communities throughout the province;
- ▶ the capacity of individuals in rural, remote, and Indigenous communities to identify and respond to legal issues; and
- ▶ access to LABC intake and to its public legal education and information (PLEI) resources province-wide.

An evaluation in 2013 found that Community Partners (CPs) were making a positive difference for people in rural, remote, and Aboriginal communities across BC. At that time, there were 24 CPs. Currently, five of the original sites no longer have a CP service, but seven sites have since been added, for a current total of 26.

OBJECTIVES AND METHODS OF THE CURRENT EVALUATION

The current evaluation began in the autumn of 2020, with the following five objectives:

- 1 Assess whether awareness of public legal education and information (PLEI) services has been increased in CP communities.
- 2 Assess whether awareness of intake services has been increased in CP communities.
- 3 Assess the degree to which the capacity of CPs to identify and respond to individuals with legal issues has grown, and describe ways in which this capacity can reasonably be enhanced.
- 4 Assess the satisfaction of CPs with the support and resources LABC provides, and describe ways in which they could be improved.
- 5 Describe the populations that the program is reaching, the extent to which they include the target populations (rural, remote, culturally isolated, and Indigenous communities), and ways targeting could be improved.

The evaluation was undertaken between October 2020 and September 2021 primarily using the following methods:

- ▶ Analysis of aggregated data about legal aid applications at the CP sites, Crown publications ordered from each CP site, and LABC website usage by the CP site
- ▶ Focus groups with justice navigators¹
- ▶ Telephone interviews with each justice navigator
- ▶ Telephone interviews and online questionnaires with people using the CP sites, and with other agencies in the CP community (or with the CP agency but with someone other than the justice navigator)
- ▶ Soliciting a “most significant change” story from each justice navigator, intended as a qualitative example of the impact of CP services
- ▶ A review of the training activities conducted by CP staff and other resource persons to train the justice navigators

KEY CONCLUSIONS

The following are key conclusions of the evaluation. See “Conclusions and Recommendations” (page 67) for more details.

Awareness of PLEI resources

- ▶ Orders of PLEI materials since 2013 show a peak in 2014/15, followed by fluctuations and then a sharp decline with the start of COVID-19 in 2020/21.
- ▶ The most frequently ordered materials relate to family and abuse matters.
- ▶ PLEI is generally seen as a supplement to (rather than a replacement for) direct contact with a person who can give people guidance in sorting out their legal issues.
- ▶ The demand by people the CP helps for hard-copy materials will likely continue to exceed the demand for digital materials.

Awareness and use of intake services

- ▶ Annual overall numbers of legal aid applications have remained relatively constant in the CP communities since 2014.
- ▶ Family law matters are the most frequent category for which justice navigators have been asked to provide help.

1. “Justice navigator” is the term used for the person who delivers Community Partner services in each community. “Community Partner” is the organization that the justice navigator works at.

- ▶ Assistance by justice navigators doesn't necessarily result in a legal aid application. A large part of the justice navigator's service is to help individuals sort out where they need to go, gather materials, and/or help them complete forms.
- ▶ There are high levels of satisfaction with the assistance people have received from the justice navigators.

The capacity of justice navigators to identify and respond to individuals with legal issues

- ▶ The legal, social, and personal issues involved in matters brought to the justice navigators are complex and often require considerable sensitivity to emotional trauma.
- ▶ Much of the justice navigator's task is to help individuals to assemble the necessary documents to pursue legal support or social/financial support or benefits, or to advance their situation in some way. Many individuals are often digitally challenged, lack computers and Wi-Fi access, and sometimes lack transportation or live far from the justice navigator's office.

Satisfaction with training and support

- ▶ Overall satisfaction with training is very high.
- ▶ There is divided opinion on whether, post-COVID-19, it will still be necessary to meet in person, or whether virtual training (which is ongoing) is a more convenient and cost-effective substitute.

The degree to which the CP program is reaching target populations

- ▶ A significant majority of the justice navigators feel the program is reaching target populations. Nevertheless, personal traumas and incapacities, the challenge of using digitized materials, a lack of computers and/or Wi-Fi, and a lack of transportation are significant problems for many individuals in these populations.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of key recommendations related to the five subject areas of this report. See "Conclusions and recommendations" (page 69) for more details.

Creating awareness of PLEI resources

- ▶ Encourage justice navigators periodically to use Facebook to advertise specific publications or new PLEI materials they may feel are relevant to the people they serve.

- Encourage all organizations in which a justice navigator is based to mention the Community Partners program on their websites.
- Produce a short video involving two or three justice navigators about the service that Community Partners provides.
- Create simple flow charts clarifying where people can access other services related to social/legal matters frequently brought to justice navigators (e.g., housing or income-related government services).

Intake services

Recommendations on intake services are related closely to how to increase the justice navigators' overall capacity — see the next point.

Supporting the justice navigators' capacity to respond to individuals with legal issues

- Adjust the number of paid hours of service for justice navigators in some locations, especially if they need to travel a significant distance to an Indigenous reserve or a geographically remote community in their service area.
- Consider making gas cards available to justice navigators in some large service areas that can be offered to people who need to travel longer distances to meet the justice navigator.
- Ask new justice navigators if they'd like to be paired with more experienced justice navigator "mentors" with whom they can connect as needed. The mentor would preferably be in a CP area with similar characteristics.

Training and support

- Continue the current approach of virtual training in the coming year, but formally poll the justice navigators about the mode of delivery they'd prefer and the topics they'd like covered in future years.

Reaching the target population

- Add more hours to paid CP work if it enables more effective outreach to smaller communities in the service area.
- Create a CP location in central BC west of 100 Mile House and possibly in Prince Rupert.

INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of an evaluation of the Community Partners Information and Outreach Services program of Legal Aid BC (LABC). This section describes:

- ▶ the genesis and purpose of the project in 2010,
- ▶ key findings of an evaluation in 2013,
- ▶ changes in delivery locations since the 2013 evaluation, and
- ▶ the objectives of the current evaluation, as determined in our framework of September 4, 2020, and incorporated in the plan of December 3, 2020.

THE GENESIS AND PURPOSE OF THE CP PROJECT

As described in the request for proposals that LABC issued for this evaluation, they launched the Community Partner Project in 2010 to:

increase community capacity in smaller, difficult to reach communities throughout the province, particularly rural, remote and Indigenous communities, using trusted and established organizations to identify and help address legal needs by building on existing resources and improved networking. . . . Services are delivered in communities where it would not be feasible to open an office location, or where the needs of the community were better served by providing multiple access points to respond to cultural barriers and the impact of colonization on Indigenous communities. By contracting with existing organizations, LABC can reach these communities most effectively.

A detailed list of Community Partner (CP) services (or “deliverables”) can be found in the contract with CPs. See appendix 1 for this list.

The long-term goals of the CP project are to increase the following:

- ▶ Awareness of and access to LABC’s services and intake in marginalized (Indigenous and remote) communities throughout the province
- ▶ The capacity of communities and individuals in rural, remote, and Indigenous communities to identify and respond to legal issues
- ▶ Access to LABC intake and to its public legal education and information (PLEI) resources province-wide

FINDINGS OF THE 2013 EVALUATION

The 2013 evaluation found that the CP initiative was making a positive difference for people in rural, remote, and Indigenous communities across BC. Within this overall favourable analysis, the report made recommendations on five areas in which the program could be further enhanced:

- 1 Expand the network of services to reach as many small communities as possible.
- 2 Consult with CPs regarding new outreach materials and outreach strategies.
- 3 Redesign the data collection forms in consultation with Community Partners and LABC program stakeholders.
- 4 Consider options for maximizing the financial efficiency across the Community Partners.
- 5 Continue to monitor referral rates for CP communities annually.

Further details on these recommendations, as well as the follow-up measures taken by the CP program staff, are given in the following section (in relation to additional service locations) and in appendix 2.

CHANGES IN DELIVERY LOCATIONS SINCE THE 2013 EVALUATION

In response to the first recommendation, CP staff made several changes in the number and location of CP services. Most changes occurred in 2014/15. Others resulted from changes in personnel or in the organizations in which the CP service was located. These changes and the current locations are shown in appendix 2.

At the time of the 2013 evaluation, there were 24 Community Partners. Since then, five locations are no longer served by CPs, six new locations were added in 2014/15, and one was added in 2019. The locations where there is no longer a CP service are Vancouver, Boston Bar, Burns Lake, Vanderhoof, and Canim Lake Band. The communities that gained a CP service are Ashcroft, Campbell River/Gold River (which have two justice navigators,² one in each community), Lytton, Grand Forks, Hope, and Port Hardy/Alert Bay (which are served by one justice navigator). Fort St. John had a prior contract, but the current contract is with a different agency.

We currently have 26 Community Partners. At the time of the evaluation, there were 26 justice navigators. (This number fluctuates, with some agencies with more than one justice navigator, and some positions that become temporarily vacant.)

2. As mentioned in a footnote in the executive summary, “justice navigator” is the person who delivers Community Partner services in each community.

OVERVIEW OF CURRENT CP LOCATIONS

Table 1 shows the current CP locations and contracted organizations, their history, and the communities they serve. Supplementary data about their operations are as follows:

- ▶ All contracts are for part-time work. The amount of each contract ranges from approximately \$10,000 to \$20,000 depending on the hours per week, which in turn relates to the area and number of communities served. The number of hours per week for contracts in 2018–21 has ranged from 5 to 28 hours. These hours include the one-on-one consultations with people as well as outreach activities (with a target given). The contract amounts are inclusive of staff wages, operating costs, travel expenses, and administrative costs.
- ▶ The contract for Port Hardy/Alert Bay is an expanded contract for \$40,000. It provides three days per week of legal information, outreach, and related services designed to meet the needs of the local Indigenous community.
- ▶ As shown by the asterisks in the second column of the table, 10 of the CPs are an Indigenous agency or a First Nation or serve a high proportion of Indigenous people (Bella Coola, Merritt, and Hazelton). Justice navigators in several other communities (e.g., Maple Ridge, 100 Mile House, and North Vancouver) have regular contacts with a First Nation in their service area.
- ▶ Twenty-four workers from 18 agencies received Indigenous cultural competency training that the Indigenous Reconciliation Group provided for the CP program in April 2019.
- ▶ As of 2020, five of the CP agencies have a family law advocate, and one has two family law advocates. In two other CP locations, there are family advocates in the community. In 17 CP locations, there is at least one poverty law advocate either at the CP agency or elsewhere in the community. In four of these locations, the justice navigator is also the poverty law advocate.

Table 1: Current CP locations (a total of 26 Community Partner contracts)

Location	Organization	History	Communities
100 Mile House	Canadian Mental Health Association (100 Mile House)	Formerly with Women’s Centre Society	100 Mile House, Canim Lake Band
Abbotsford (Anti Poverty) (second location is in Chilliwack with a separate justice navigator but under the same contract)	Archway Community Services — Anti Poverty, Advocacy and Addictions Services	Same from the beginning (formerly called Abbotsford Community Services)	Fraser Valley (primarily Abbotsford, Chilliwack, Mission)

Location	Organization	History	Communities
Abbotsford (Multicultural)	Archway Community Services — Multicultural and Immigrant Integration Services	Same from the beginning (formerly called Abbotsford Community Services)	Abbotsford, Aldergrove
Ashcroft (second location is in Clinton)	South Cariboo Elizabeth Fry Society	New in 2019	Ashcroft, Clinton, Spences Bridge
Bella Coola	Social Health and Economic Development Society of Bella Coola (S.H.E.D. Society)*	Same from the beginning	Bella Coola, Anahim Lake, Bella Bella, Klemtu, Wuikuiux F.N., Shearwater, Hartley Bay
Campbell River (second location is in Gold River with a separate justice navigator but under the same contract)	Laichwiltach Family Life Society*	New in 2014/15	Campbell River, Gold River, Quadra Island, Cortes Island, Tahsis
Cranbrook	Community Connections Society of Southeast BC	Same from the beginning	Cranbrook, Creston, Fernie, Sparwood, Elkford, Invermere, Golden
Fort St. John	Nenan Dane zaa Deh Zona Family Services Society*	New in 2014/15; contract also changed from S.U.C.C.E.S.S.	Fort St. John, Dawson Creek, Chetwynd, Fort Nelson, Kelly Lake; the First Nation in Blueberry River, Doig River, Fort Nelson, Halfway River, Kelly Lake, Prophet River, Sauteau, West Moberly
Grand Forks (second location is in Midway)	Boundary Family Services Society	New in 2014/15; contract changed from Boundary Women's Coalition	Grand Forks, Midway, Greenwood, Rock Creek, Christina Lake, Beaverdell, Bridesville
Haida Gwaii (two offices: Old Massett and Skidegate)	Haida Gwaii Legal Project Society*	Same from the beginning	Skidegate, Masset, Old Masset, Queen Charlotte, Sandspit, Port Clements
Hazelton	Upper Skeena Counselling & Legal Assistance Society*	Same from the beginning	Houston, Smithers, Moricetown, Hazelton, Kispiox, Gitsegukla, Kitwanga, Gitanyow, Glen Vowell, Hawgilget
Hope	Read Right Society	New in 2014/15	Hope, Yale
Keremeos	Lower Similkameen Community Services Society	Same from the beginning	Keremeos, Cawston, Hedley, Ollala
Lytton (second location is in Lillooet)	Lytton First Nation*	New in 2014/15	Lytton, Lillooet

Location	Organization	History	Communities
Maple Ridge (second location is in Pitt Meadows)	Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows Community Services	Same from the beginning	Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, Katzie F.N.
Merritt	Nicola Valley Advocacy Centre*	Same from the beginning	Merritt, Logan Lake, Princeton, Ashcroft, Cache Creek, Spences Bridge
Nelson (second location is in Castlegar)	The Advocacy Centre (Nelson Cares Society)	Same from the beginning	Nelson, Kaslo, Nakusp, Slocan Valley, New Denver, Salmo, North Kootenay Lake, Fruitvale
North Vancouver	North Shore Community Resources Society	Same from the beginning	North and West Vancouver, Bowen Island, Lions Bay, Squamish, Tsleil Waututh F.N.
Penticton	Penticton and Area Access Society (The Access Centre)	Same from the beginning	Penticton, Summerland, Osoyoos, Oliver
Port Hardy (second location is in Alert Bay)	'Namgis Community Services*	New in 2014/15	Port Hardy, Alert Bay
Powell River	Powell River Community Resource Centre	Same from the beginning	Powell River, Lund
Prince George	Prince George Urban Aboriginal Justice Society*	Same from the beginning	Prince George
Seabird Island (near Agassiz)	Seabird Island Band*	Same from the beginning, but currently vacant	Chawathil, Squiala, Cheam, Kent municipality
Sechelt	Sunshine Coast Community Services Society/Community Resource Centre	Same from the beginning	Sechelt, Gibsons, Pender Harbour
Trail	Trail Family and Individual Resource Centre Society (FAIR)	Same from the beginning	Trail, Rossland
Vernon	Archway Society for Domestic Peace	Same from the beginning (formerly called Vernon Women's Transition House Society)	Vernon, Coldstream, Lumby, Cherryville, Armstrong, Enderby, Falkland

**This is an Indigenous agency or community or serves a high proportion of Indigenous people.*

OBJECTIVES OF THE CURRENT EVALUATION

As described in the framework we submitted on September 4, 2020, these are the five objectives of the current evaluation:

- 1 Assess whether awareness of public legal education and information (PLEI) services has been increased in CP communities.
- 2 Assess whether awareness of intake services has been increased in CP communities.
- 3 Assess the degree to which the capacity of CPs to identify and respond to individuals with legal issues has grown, and describe ways in which this capacity can reasonably be enhanced.
- 4 Assess the satisfaction of CPs with the support and resources LABC provides, and describe ways in which they could be improved.
- 5 Describe the populations that the program is reaching, the extent to which they include the target populations (rural, remote, culturally isolated, and Indigenous communities), and ways targeting could be improved.

Findings in relation to these five objectives are presented in sections 1 to 5.

THE METHODOLOGY

The following methods were used for this evaluation:

- ▶ Analysis of aggregated data about legal aid applications at the CP sites, Crown publications ordered from each CP site, and LABC website usage by the CP site
- ▶ Two sets of focus groups with justice navigators in October 2020 (two groups) and November 2020 (three groups). The themes in October were “Challenges” and “What has worked,” and in November, “Building capacity for deeper outreach” and “Improving ability to act as a connector.”
- ▶ Individual telephone interviews of approximately 90 minutes with each justice navigator, conducted between January and May 2021. See appendix 3.
- ▶ Telephone interviews and online questionnaires with people using the CP sites, and with agencies in the CP communities (or with the CP agency but with someone other than the justice navigator). See appendixes 4 to 8.
- ▶ Soliciting a “most significant change” story from each justice navigator, to qualitatively show the impact of CP services. Instructions for writing the story are in appendix 9. The 19 stories that were submitted are in a separate volume of this report as part 2.
- ▶ Spot-checks of websites of agencies for whom or with whom the CPs work, to see if the CP program or the justice navigator was mentioned

- ▶ A review of the training activities conducted by CP staff and other resource persons to train the justice navigators

Table 2 shows the targets, completions, and number of CPs represented in the telephone interviews, online questionnaires, and Most Significant Change stories. Twenty-five CPs are represented by at least one method.

Table 2: Targets and completion for key methods

Method	Target	Total completed	Number of CPs represented in the evaluation methods
Telephone interview with people accessing services	4 per justice navigator location	36	14 CPs are represented in the user interviews or questionnaires
Online questionnaire with people accessing services	As many as possible per location	5	
	Total interviews/questionnaires	41	
Telephone interview with agencies	1 per justice navigator location	24	23 CPs are represented in the agency interviews or questionnaires
Online questionnaire with agencies	2 per justice navigator location	46	
	Total interviews/questionnaires	70	
Soliciting a Most Significant Change story	1 per justice navigator	19	19 CPs are represented by a story
Total number of CPs represented			25 of the 26 CPs were represented by a justice navigator story, a user, and/or an agency

Notes:

- We targeted all 26 justice navigators, including the two justice navigators for the Campbell River/Gold River CP.
- Originally the target for the online questionnaires with people accessing CP services was four per justice navigator. This was revised in June 2021 to two per justice navigator.
- There were two agency questionnaires. The first in the spring of 2021 (n = 29) was to agencies identified by justice navigators in their community as ones they had worked with. A second shorter agency questionnaire was added in August 2021 (n = 17), sent to general agencies in the CP communities from a list maintained by the CP program, but with whom the justice navigator may or may not have developed systematic contacts.

LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

Two limitations have been experienced in this study. The first is quantitative, relating to the impact of COVID-19 on the completion of interview targets. The second limitation is qualitative, relating to the fact that most justice navigators have additional roles in their communities.

COVID-19 has had a significant impact on our completion rates for agency and user interviews, and on the timing for the submission of this report. The study began in August 2020 and was originally scheduled to be finished in the spring of 2021. However, many office locations (where justice navigators worked and other community agencies) were closed for part of or all of 2020. Even when offices have reopened, they've usually been closed to walk-in traffic. This has affected the success in completing targets for both agency and user interviews. As a result, in February 2021 the evaluation completion date was extended to July 31, 2021, and in May 2021 was extended again to December 31, 2021.

Furthermore, many of the service users of the CP program can be characterized as vulnerable individuals in one or more ways. At the best of times, this can make it difficult for justice navigators to secure an agreement with them to do a telephone interview, much less an online questionnaire. COVID-19 has simply exacerbated these difficulties, even though potential interviewees have been offered honorariums, and agency respondents have been offered draw prizes for their agency.

In response to these limitations, two adjustments were made. In June 2021 the target for user interviews was reduced from four to two persons per location (see note 2 in table 2). Nonetheless, as discussed in section 2.3, the 42 persons who were interviewed as users of the services represent only 14 of the 26 CP locations. Secondly, in June 2021 a second online questionnaire was developed and sent to agencies in CP communities using a separate database maintained by Community Partners. This resulted in a modest increase in agency respondents (see note 3 in table 2).

A second limitation is qualitative. It relates to the fact that almost all justice navigators have one or more roles in their community in addition to the one for which they're paid by the Community Partners initiative. Especially in user interviews, it was at times difficult for the interviewee to separate out elements of service they received that related to other roles the justice navigators played (e.g., as poverty law or family law advocates). They simply saw the justice navigator as a person who was helping them with one or more issues. The justice navigator role is not one that creates an ongoing relationship or case file with persons they assist. These individuals are therefore called "persons" or "people" rather than "clients." However, when the individuals assessed the quality of the justice navigator's assistance, in some cases there was likely a positive "halo effect" in the ratings because of assistance that the justice navigator could offer in their other roles.

1 AWARENESS OF PLEI SERVICES

This section presents data on the level of awareness of PLEI materials in the communities served by Community Partners, and how that has changed over the years the program has existed. Data sources for this section include data from LABC about publication orders, interviews and focus groups with justice navigators, and telephone interviews and online questionnaires with service users and with agencies.

1.1 DATA RELATED TO THE ORDERING OF PLEI MATERIALS

The ordering and distribution of PLEI materials by CPs is one proxy for gauging community awareness of those materials. If materials are physically available in a community, people are more likely to encounter them. The Internet is of course another source of awareness, which will be discussed in section 1.1.

Table 3 shows changes in the number of publications ordered in each year from 2014/15 to 2019/20. Data from previous years, drawn from the 2013 evaluation report, are provided in a footnote to the table. The table shows that most of the CPs have placed orders in each year, but the overall volume of orders has fluctuated. In the period covered in the 2013 evaluation report, there was a significant increase in orders in 2011/12. Since that year, there have been three other peaks in orders — in 2014/15 (when several new CPs entered the program), 2017/18, and 2019/20. As will be shown in table 5, there were 3,080 publication materials ordered in 2020/21, which is the lowest total in 10 years, presumably a reflection of reduced demand and activity because of COVID-19.

Table 4 explores the relationship between the volume of orders and the population size of the communities. It lists the communities served by the CP, the combined population for each group of communities based primarily on 2016 census data, the total publications ordered between 2014 and 2020 (as per table 3), and the ratio of publication orders to the area population. This is one measure of the degree of “coverage” of the CP location with PLEI materials.

Table 4 shows the following:

- Six of the highest eight ratios (#1–8) are in communities with a population of about 7,000 or less.
- Seven of the nine lowest ratios (#17–25) are in communities with combined populations of over 40,000.
- The eight ratios in the middle (#9–16) have a mixture of population sizes.

Thus, in general terms, this measure indicates that PLEI coverage is proportionately more extensive in communities with smaller overall populations. This conclusion is in part simply logical, as it takes more time, effort, and resources to reach larger populations. Significant parts of these larger populations may also not fit the CP target group, who have greater needs.

Table 3: Number of publication orders, 2014–20

	Organization	Number of publication orders						
		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
1	The Advocacy Centre (Nelson Cares Society)	372	235	175	455	205	626	2,068
2	Archway Community Services — Multicultural and Immigrant Integration Services	1,052	758	520	1,296	1,310	1,485	6,421
3	Archway Community Services Community Legal Advocacy Centre (Chilliwack)	2,984	2,235	749	2,614	1,759	2,143	11,463
4	Archway Society for Domestic Peace (Vernon)	1,561	1,602	1,835	1,428	2,158	96	8,680
5	Boston Bar First Nation*	--	353	--	--	--	--	353
6	Boundary Women’s Coalition/Transition House	625	125	--	608	206	455	2,019
7	Canim Lake Band (Canim Lake Wellness Centre)*	--	--	--	480	11	--	491
8	Community Connections Society of Southeast BC	655	--	237	25	72	2,842	3,831
9	Elizabeth Fry Society* (Prince George and District; Burns Lake)	--	70	331	75	--	150	626
10	Haida Gwaii Legal Project Society	--	--	--	332	--	--	332
11	Laichwiltach Family Life Society	455	295	101	381	126	--	1,358

	Organization	Number of publication orders						
		2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
12	Lower Similkameen Community Services Society	51	42	700	221	--	650	1,664
13	Lytton First Nation	1,282	1,870	304	2,789	1,168	707	8,120
14	Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows Community Services	1,101	797	929	1,934	988	1,319	7,068
15	'Namgis Community Services	1,452	75	165	240	572	275	2,779
16	Nenan Dane zaa Deh Zona Family Services Society	1,592	707	--	--	273	225	2,797
17	Nicola Valley Advocacy Centre	955	781	1,082	541	982	437	4,778
18	North Shore Community Resources Society	943	40	30	194	--	400	1,607
19	Penticton and Area Access Society (The Access Centre)	1,541	445	527	827	752	1,544	5,636
20	Powell River Community Resource Centre	150	--	165	109	--	392	816
21	Prince George Urban Aboriginal Justice Society	428	117	1,110	720	683	1,919	4,977
22	Read Right Society	1,468	219	66	270	365	240	2,628
23	Social Health and Economic Development Society of Bella Coola (S.H.E.D. Society)	127	263	97	540	179	878	2,084
24	S.U.C.C.E.S.S.** (Fort St. John)	--	80	--	25	--	--	105
25	Sunshine Coast Community Services (Community Resource Centre)	129	--	396	231	--	202	958
26	Seabird Island Band	--	--	169	450	--	--	619
27	Trail Family and Individual Resource Centre Society (FAIR)	1,322	888	1,079	198	50	1,190	4,727
28	Upper Skeena Counselling & Legal Assistance Society	1,753	3,575	--	989	--	1,417	7,734
29	Women's Centre Society (100 Mile House and district)	1,285	145	51	--	241	--	1,722
	Total	23,283	15,717	10,818	17,972	12,100	19,592	99,482

*No longer a CP.

**No longer a CP. The CP role is assumed by Nenan Dane zaa Deh Zona Family Services Society.

Note: Publication orders before 2014 (from the 2013 evaluation report): 2009/10: 2,895; 2010/11: 2,653; 2011/12: 22,963; 2012/13: 12,830.

Table 4: Publication orders in relation to the population of the area, 2014–20

	Organization	Communities served	Area population (2016 census)	Publication orders, 2014–20	Ratio of publication orders to population
1	Lytton First Nation	Lytton, Lillooet	2,407	8,120	3.373
2	Upper Skeena Counselling & Legal Assistance Society	Houston, Smithers, Moricetown, Hazelton, Kispiox, Gitsegukla, Kitwanga, Gitanyow, Glen Vowell, Hawgilget	11,065	7,734	0.699
3	Women’s Centre Society (100 Mile House and district)	100 Mile House, Canim Lake Band	2,503	1,722	0.688
4	‘Namgis Community Services	Port Hardy, Alert Bay	4,862	2,779	0.572
5	Social Health and Economic Development Society of Bella Coola (S.H.E.D. Society)	Bella Coola, Anahim Lake, Bella Bella, Klemtu, Wuikuixv F.N., Shearwater, Hartley Bay	3,856	2,084	0.540
6	Lower Similkameen Community Services Society	Keremeos, Cawston, Hedley, Ollala	3,311	1,664	0.503
7	Trail Family and Individual Resource Centre Society (FAIR)	Trail, Rossland	12,346	4,727	0.383
8	Read Right Society	Hope, Yale	7,010	2,628	0.375
9	Nicola Valley Advocacy Centre	Merritt, Logan Lake, Princeton, Ashcroft, Cache Creek, Spences Bridge	15,921	4,778	0.300
10	Boundary Women’s Coalition/Transition House	Grand Forks, Midway, Greenwood, Rock Creek, Christina Lake, Beaverdell, Bridesville	9,036	2,019	0.223
11	Archway Society for Domestic Peace (Vernon)	Vernon, Coldstream, Lumby, Cherryville, Armstrong, Enderby, Falkland	67,988	8,680	0.128
12	Penticton and Area Access Society (The Access Centre)	Penticton, Summerland, Osoyoos, Oliver	60,330	5,636	0.093
13	Community Connections Society of Southeast BC	Cranbrook, Creston, Fernie, Sparwood, Elkford, Invermere, Golden	47,518	3,831	0.081

	Organization	Communities served	Area population (2016 census)	Publication orders, 2014–20	Ratio of publication orders to population
14	Haida Gwaii Legal Project Society	Skidegate, Masset, Old Masset, Queen Charlotte, Sandspit, Port Clements	4,317	332	0.077
15	The Advocacy Centre (Nelson Cares Society)	Nelson, Kaslo, Nakusp, Slocan Valley, New Denver, Salmo, North Kootenay Lake, Fruitvale	26,988	2,068	0.077
16	Seabird Island Band	Chawathil, Squiala, Cheam, Kent municipality	8,793	619	0.070
17	Nenan Dane ʔaa Deh Zona Family Services Society	Fort St. John, Dawson Creek, Chetwynd, Fort Nelson, Kelly Lake; the First Nation in Blueberry River, Doig River, Fort Nelson, Halfway River, Kelly Lake, Prophet River, Saulteau, West Moberly	40,186	2,797	0.070
18	Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows Community Services	Maple Ridge, Pitt Meadows, Katzie F.N.	111,571	7,068	0.063
19	Prince George Urban Aboriginal Justice Society	Prince George	82,290	4,977	0.060
20	Powell River Community Resource Centre	Powell River, Lund	14,152	816	0.058
21	Sunshine Coast Community Services (Community Resource Centre)	Sechelt, Gibsons, Pender Harbour	19,419	958	0.049
22	Archway Community Services — Anti Poverty, Advocacy and Addictions Services	Fraser Valley (primarily Abbotsford, Chilliwack, Mission)	299,614	11,463	0.038
23	Archway Community Services — Multicultural and Immigrant Integration Services	Abbotsford and Aldergrove	173,588	6,421	0.037
24	Laichwiltach Family Life Society	Campbell River, Gold River, Quadra Island, Cortes Island, Tahsis	42,822	1,358	0.032
25	North Shore Community Resources Society	North and West Vancouver, Bowen Island, Lions Bay, Squamish, Tsleil Waututh F.N.	221,024	1,607	0.007

Table 5 shows data on two categories of publications ordered in the 12-month period from April 1, 2020, to March 31, 2021. “Legal info materials” includes booklets, graphic novels, and fact sheets on areas of law, legal procedures, and rights of parties in various difficult social/legal situations. They’re intended to be substantive but accessible. “Promotional materials” include brochures, fridge magnets, wallet cards, posters, and folders intended to inform and remind the public about the existence of the Community Partner service or about LABC.

The table shows that legal information publications made up two-thirds of the orders, and promotional materials one-third. However, in eight of the 19 communities, 50% or more of the orders were for promotional materials. There is no intrinsic ratio that is “ideal”; both sets of materials serve essential purposes. The legal information materials are important as a means to directly inform people about the legal dimensions of their legal issues and how to address them. In any given year, it may be important to distribute new or revised legal materials that are appropriate for a particular agency (e.g., a women’s centre, Indigenous organization, or housing association). The promotional materials are for maintaining or expanding awareness of the service in the communities served by the justice navigator. This can be essential in communities where there is a high turnover of agency staff, and/or where justice navigators are trying to extend awareness to new communities or agencies.

Table 6 shows the names of the publications ordered from April 1, 2020, to March 31, 2021, sorted by the number of orders. The overall total for 2020/21 relates to the second column of table 5 (with a minor discrepancy in the totals) — that is, table 6 just includes legal information materials and not promotional materials. It shows the following:

- ▶ The most frequently ordered publications relate to family and abuse matters. Welfare rights were the second most frequent category, followed by criminal matters.
- ▶ Sixteen CPs ordered publications in this period. (There were only two instances where more than half of them ordered the same title. This may indicate differentiated outreach, or of the tailoring of orders to local community needs.)
- ▶ Four percent of the publication orders (72 out of 1,950) were in non-English languages, most of which were Punjabi.

Table 5: Type of publication that Community Partners ordered from April 1, 2020, to March 31, 2021

Organization	Legal info materials	Promotional materials	Total
The Advocacy Centre (Nelson Cares Society)	30 68%	14 32%	44
Archway Community Services — Anti Poverty, Advocacy and Addictions Services	30 37%	50 63%	80
Archway Community Services — Multicultural and Immigrant Integration Services	465 90%	50 10%	515
Archway Society for Domestic Peace (Vernon)	151 100%	--	151
Canadian Mental Health Association (100 Mile House and district)	203 73%	77 27%	280
Community Connections Society of Southeast BC	180 59%	124 41%	304
Haida Gwaii Legal Project Society	10 26%	29 74%	39
Laichwiltach Family Life Society	47 100%	--	47
Lower Similkameen Community Services Society	129 56%	100 44%	229
Lytton First Nation	--	45 100%	45
Maple Ridge/Pitt Meadows Community Services	80 88%	11 12%	91
'Namgis Community Services	70 41%	100 59%	170
Nicola Valley Advocacy Centre	--	36 100%	36
Penticton and Area Access Society (The Access Centre)	215 50%	217 50%	432
Powell River Community Resource Centre	16 13%	103 87%	119
Prince George Urban Aboriginal Justice Society	240 72%	92 28%	332
Social Health and Economic Development Society of Bella Coola (S.H.E.D. Society)	35 78%	10 22%	45
Sunshine Coast Community Services (Community Resource Centre)	58 82%	13 18%	71
Trail Family and Individual Resource Centre Society (FAIR)	--	50 100%	50
Total	1,959 64%	1,121 36%	3,080

Note: Only CPs that ordered publications in this period are included in this table.

Table 6: The number of copies of each publication ordered from April 1, 2020 to March 31, 2021

Title	Total no. of orders	No. of CPs	Notes
<i>Coping with Separation during COVID-19</i> booklet	164	7	
<i>Safety in Relationships: Same Gender</i> booklet	153	10	
<i>Mothers Leaving Abusive Partners</i> booklet	149	7	Includes 15 in Punjabi
<i>Leaving Abuse</i> graphic novel	130	4	
<i>For Your Protection</i> booklet	122	5	10 in Punjabi
<i>Safety in Relationships: Trans Folk</i> booklet	119	9	
<i>Keeping Aboriginal Kids Safe</i> booklet	117	4	
<i>Live Safe, End Abuse</i> fact sheet and folder	116	6	31 in several languages
<i>Your Welfare Rights: How to Apply</i> booklet	86	5	
<i>Separation Agreements</i> booklet	73	5	
<i>Clear Skies</i> graphic novel	72	3	
<i>Your Welfare Rights: Welfare Benefits</i> booklet	71	4	
<i>Is That Legal?</i> booklet	58	3	
<i>Living Together or Living Apart</i> booklet	57	5	5 in Punjabi
<i>Your Welfare Rights: When You're on Welfare</i> booklet	56	4	
<i>Parents' Rights, Kids' Rights</i> booklet	46	4	
<i>Defending Yourself: Assault</i> booklet	40	3	
<i>Defending Yourself: Mischief</i> booklet	37	3	
<i>Defending Yourself: Possession of an Illegal Drug</i> booklet	37	3	
<i>Gladue Report Guide</i> booklet	36	2	
<i>Gladue Submission Guide</i> booklet	36	2	
<i>Defending Yourself: Breach of a Court Order</i> booklet	31	2	
<i>Defending Yourself: Theft Under \$5,000</i> booklet	31	2	
<i>Coping with Separation Handbook</i> booklet	27	3	
<i>If You Can't Get Legal Aid for Your Child Protection Case</i> booklet	20	1	
<i>Sponsorship Breakdown</i> booklet	11	1	In Punjabi and Spanish
<i>Representing Yourself in a Criminal Trial</i> booklet	11	2	
<i>Income Assistance on Reserve in BC</i> booklet	10	1	
<i>Defending Yourself: Possession of Property Under \$5,000 Obtained by Crime</i> booklet	10	1	

Title	Total no. of orders	No. of CPs	Notes
<i>Working with Your Legal Aid Lawyer</i> fact sheet	10	1	
<i>A Second Chance</i> graphic novel	7	2	
<i>How to Become a Child's Guardian</i> fact sheet	5	1	
<i>Guide to Aboriginal Harvesting Rights</i> booklet	2	1	
Total	1,950	16	

1.2 DATA FROM INTERVIEWS WITH JUSTICE NAVIGATORS

Interviews were held with each of the justice navigators, part of which focused on changes in the awareness of and demand for PLEI resources in the communities they served. In addition to the comments below, it should be noted that in the Most Significant Change stories submitted by justice navigators, over half the stories included references to the distribution of PLEI (see the list of themes in the introduction to part 2).

In terms of the volume of publications ordered or distributed from year to year, numerous factors were at play:

- ▶ Demand for publications has decreased since COVID-19 because fewer people were accessing CP offices, other community offices were closed or had limited access, and events such as community fairs (where publications would be distributed) haven't been taking place. Courthouses weren't open, so courthouse libraries returned publications during that period.
- ▶ If the CP office had a new justice navigator, there was sometimes an initial reduction in orders as the justice navigator was familiarizing themselves with the new role. At the time of the evaluation, 12 justice navigators had occupied their position for less than two years.
- ▶ A new justice navigator would sometimes review the stock of publications and throw out outdated or lower-demand materials.³ They then ordered new publications, which sometimes created an inflated count of the number of publications distributed.⁴

³. Legal Aid BC informs CP staff if publications have become outdated, and also recommends that justice navigators dispose of outdated materials.

⁴. CP administrators state that in the first months of a new justice navigator's tenure, there is typically little or no outreach.

- In some communities there was less receptiveness about using PLEI materials. (E.g., “Many people just want to talk to a lawyer; they don’t want to educate themselves.”)
- Co-location of the CP service in a community resource centre often increased traffic flow and demand for publications. By contrast, in some communities, libraries lacked space for publications or staff to monitor their supply so could not stock them. In these situations, overall volumes were less.
- The number of copies ordered is considered a “distribution count,” which was sometimes inflated simply because a publication was updated. In this situation, the outdated copies weren’t actually distributed.
- In some communities, personal contact with the justice navigator was imperative for non-literate or low-literacy individuals. This would lower the demand for PLEI.

Justice navigators were asked about factors related to the demand for hard-copy versus online materials. The responses indicate that hard-copy publications will unlikely be replaced significantly by the availability of online materials. This is especially important in the context of the CP service, which aims to reach people in geographically remote locations or marginalized groups:

- The number of justice navigators who said the main demand was for hard-copy publications exceeded those who said people preferred online materials.
- In some cases, the demand for online materials was an impact of COVID-19. A justice navigator in a remote location said, “Our office was open to the public, but we do a lot by phone or email, more frequently because of COVID-19. People send emails, and we send links to publications or send them as an attachment. If they don’t have computers, I will sometimes bring them an iPad and either drop it off for a few hours if they have Wi-Fi at home, or the person may sit in our office driveway with me and work through the application together with me.” Another emphasized that legal literacy involves another level of complexity above general literacy, so she tends to work directly with people in her office 99% of the time.
- In several communities the access to Wi-Fi was limited, so demand for hard-copy publications was correspondingly higher.
- Several justice navigators noted that older people often lack confidence working online.
- One justice navigator noted that homeless people have no storage space for hard-copy publications.
- One justice navigator noted that in their area, many people deliberately live off-grid, again reducing the demand for online materials.
- Several justice navigators noted that some people prefer to work with hard-copy publications because the justice navigator can circle and highlight important

sections of a document for them. Others said that people like being able to take the publications with them if they're going to court.

- Several justice navigators noted that Facebook was a primary way of advertising the availability of publications, especially in Indigenous and smaller communities. One justice navigator said that if LABC has new publications, she automatically posts them on Facebook.

Numerous factors were at play concerning the area of law for which there was demand for PLEI materials:

- Most justice navigators connected people with PLEI material concerning family, criminal, and some civil matters (principally landlord and tenant), but overall, the largest single area of assistance concerned family matters.
- Family issues have been exacerbated because of the stresses associated with the pandemic, and often relate to problems about parenting time. These issues include guardianship, child protection orders, parenting rights and responsibilities, parenting time between former partners, and co-parenting agreements.
- In many cases, publications on one (or more) of the three main types of matters (family and abuse; welfare rights; and criminal matters) were not ordered because it was covered by another service offered by the agency where the justice navigator worked (e.g., family advocates).
- In almost all cases, the justice navigator had another job that complemented their activity as navigators. For example, several justice navigators are also poverty law advocates or victim service workers. They therefore were conversant with housing or criminal matters, resulting in slightly increased proportions of those case types compared with other justice navigators.
- One justice navigator noted that COVID-19 stimulus funds had meant that motels were upgrading their premises, and they were evicting residents who had lived in the motel for several years. This resulted in numerous landlord and tenant cases being brought to the justice navigator.
- In several areas served by justice navigators, there is a significant number of seniors or retirees. There is thus a significant demand for assistance with wills and estates.
- A justice navigator noted that Asian students are coming to BC to engage in farm work, hoping that this employment will be a pathway to citizenship. This creates a demand for materials on immigration and citizenship.

There was no significant pattern in the types of people requesting publications. Most publications have been ordered by males and females in roughly equal proportions. However, six justice navigators stated that females constituted their major caseload, and two justice navigators primarily served males. Three justice navigators said Indigenous people were the primary users of their service, and two said immigrants.

The main reason for changes in demand for publications during the justice navigator's tenure has been COVID-19, which has generally lowered overall demand. At the same time, COVID-19 has increased the focus on family, welfare, and housing matters. Two justice navigators mentioned increased numbers of immigrants, and two identified floods and wildfires as factors that have increased demand for publications on financial or housing-related matters.

A primary goal of Community Partners is to reach out to geographical and social communities in the CP service area that are not as robustly served by normal delivery structures (e.g., legal clinics, local agents, and social or housing agencies). It's helpful to understand what has enhanced or limited such outreach. Several justice navigators identified factors in the demand for publications depending on the communities served:

- ▶ In service areas that include small Indigenous reserves, justice navigators are sometimes considered outsiders despite outreach efforts and/or the offer of part-time positions to Indigenous residents of the reserve. This in turn limits demand for publications.
- ▶ Another justice navigator serving Indigenous communities said there is frequently demand for information on on-reserve housing matters.
- ▶ There is reduced capacity to develop an effective network (for referrals) with other services in the community when positions go vacant, which in turn impacts demand for publications.
- ▶ In the smallest communities, there is a lack of local agencies that can serve as a repository for publications or that can communicate a demand for publications. However, small communities served by health centres or libraries can have effective distribution points for publications.
- ▶ There was decreased ability during COVID-19 to do outreach and to leave publications with agencies that have temporarily closed.
- ▶ Variations in wealth and possibly literacy within an area served by the justice navigator frequently impacts demand for publications.

The following are examples of distribution locations for publications that have been used by justice navigators:

- ▶ In Indigenous communities: band offices, friendship centres, Native Courtworker offices, and health offices at the reserve's band office
- ▶ In communities in general, depending on the size and range of the location's services: hospitals, probation and community corrections facilities, court registries, libraries, prenatal classes, drug/alcohol treatment centres, Service BC, victim services (often at RCMP offices), Ministry of Child and Family Development and various other BC ministries (in larger centres), child resource centres, medical/health

centres, dental centres, counsellors, recreation centres, neighbourhood houses, homeless shelters, and food banks. In some communities, several social agencies are in one central office.

- A justice navigator in one community left pamphlets at grocery stores.
- Community fairs and events, workshops (often just leaving brochures about the service), and interagency meetings
- Publicity through Facebook. One justice navigator said, “In small communities, people eat up Facebook. I post notices to each of seven Facebook communities/groups. I share a graphic/photo of my service, and I ask, ‘Are you looking for information about (various topics)?’” Facebook was most frequently mentioned by justice navigators serving Indigenous communities.
- One justice navigator said that with smaller libraries he may leave business cards but not actual publications.
- Several justice navigators said that because of COVID-19, some repositories for publications have been temporarily discontinued. For example, in one hospital, swivel racks have been removed, as well as the chairs and tables with magazines or other materials; one library has requested that materials not be left with them.
- One justice navigator with a large service area said she is connected with approximately 30 services that she informs about publications, initially by phone and — if possible — with a follow-up visit.

Justice navigators were asked whether, when distributing publications to multi-service agencies, they left materials at the central desk or with each service. Although three relied on the agency to distribute them, all others said they distributed materials to each service. As recently noted, some justice navigators made advance phone calls to agencies about new publications.

The justice navigators were also asked about the degree of staff turnover in agencies, and how they deal with it in terms of distributing publications. Approximately a third of justice navigators said the turnover is significant, and it’s therefore necessary to be constantly rebuilding relationships. Three justice navigators mentioned this specifically in the context of Indigenous bands where there might be a complete turnover of personnel following an election. Others identified the dynamics of small communities as a factor, where individuals may hold two or three jobs to piece together their livelihood. If they leave the community, their loss may be felt in several agencies, and therefore require more contacts by the justice navigator to maintain continuity. A final factor mentioned by a couple of justice navigators was that COVID-19 has led senior staff in some agencies to retire, thus necessitating contacts with new agency staff. Several justice navigators noted that when there is staff turnover, the agency in question may introduce new staff at an interagency meeting.

1.3 FEEDBACK FROM FOCUS GROUPS WITH JUSTICE NAVIGATORS

Numerous comments from focus groups with justice navigators in October and November 2020 underscore the appropriate uses and limitations of PLEI materials for the groups of people they're trying to reach. The following themes emerged from these sessions:

- ▶ Literacy and technological challenges: People are often challenged by what they perceive as complex, technical PLEI. Others simply don't like reading and/or have literacy challenges. Still others are challenged by technology. "A pamphlet is not a human being." "PLEI resources are really good, but most people don't want them. They just want their hands held." "Most people will not use complex PLEI. If I hand them a booklet, I can pretty much guarantee they won't use it. They will use something that directs them to a service and is very simple."
- ▶ Emotional challenges: Because of transportation barriers and challenging weather in winter, people are often exhausted when travelling from a remote location. People also may be accessing services when they're stressed or in a state of crisis. Their mindset in these circumstances is simply to receive help on an urgent matter, not to learn about the law.
- ▶ Some approaches to encourage more extensive or effective use of PLEI:
 - Continue to provide and expand PLEI in languages spoken by significant groups of people (see the "Notes" column in table 6 as an example).
 - Use videos to explain the role of justice navigators to complement outreach by email.
 - Create videos about selected high-volume topics (e.g., tenant rights, and divorce and separation). Where COVID-19 puts constraints such as Plexiglas, and the person is otherwise open to going through PLEI, share materials with the person using tablets.
 - Connect with people by Zoom or telephone, to walk them through PLEI content. Some people have pay-as-you-go phone plans or limited Wi-Fi access, which may reduce the feasibility of this method, so these approaches can sometimes be used in combination with bringing the PLEI materials to the person.
- ▶ Peoples' legal issues are often multi-layered and require several social services in addition to what the justice navigator can provide. For some key problem areas, it may be helpful to develop a flow chart that can help people understand where they can go to access related services or information.
- ▶ It has been noted in section 1.2 that Facebook is used effectively by some justice navigators to talk about new PLEI materials that may be of interest to people with legal issues. One justice navigator has even distributed PLEI in Christmas hampers when on an outreach initiative in the community.

1.4 FEEDBACK FROM SERVICE USERS

Based on combined telephone and online feedback from service users, 55% said they wanted and obtained some form of print or online PLEI materials from the justice navigator. However, in most of these cases they were also wanting face-to-face assistance and/or referrals in relation to their legal issues. People's expectation is that the justice navigator provides hands-on service. Print or online PLEI may in some cases be useful to them, but primarily as a supplement to their more substantive interactions with the justice navigator. This conclusion is reinforced by the feedback from justice navigators in sections 1.2 and 1.3, which addressed the mindset of the people they assist with legal issues. This also suggests that the distribution of PLEI materials serves as much to advertise the existence of the justice navigator service as it does to provide legal information.

This generalization is not intended to suggest that justice navigators are providing legal advice. Section 2 addresses the justice navigators' role in referring people to LABC and other formal legal sources of assistance. Rather, it's intended to underline that an important function of the justice navigator is to help individuals sort out their legal issues and gather materials and information for any next steps. PLEI is part of that process, but primarily as a supplement, not the essence of their activity. In addition to the 69% of people who were referred to LABC, 60% were referred to other agencies or were given help completing various government forms and/or contacting agencies (e.g., advocate organizations for seniors, E.I., Human Rights Tribunal, CPP). This is also evident in the examples listed on page 3 of part 2 (the justice navigators' Most Significant Change stories).

Twenty-nine percent of user respondents self-identified as Indigenous. Fifty percent of this group — roughly the same as for non-Indigenous people — were helped with locating PLEI materials, 75% with legal aid applications, and 83% with other contacts. As with non-Indigenous people, there was a significant expectation of help beyond the use of PLEI materials.

1.5 FEEDBACK FROM AGENCIES

Tables 7 and 8 show the PLEI-related activities of agencies with whom justice navigators connected. (Sometimes this would be their own agency but someone who wasn't the justice navigator was being interviewed.) This information was solicited using telephone interviews as well as online questionnaires that were sent to agencies. In both cases the agencies were identified by the justice navigator.

The following patterns are evident in table 7:

- ▶ The engagement of agencies with the PLEI-related activities listed in the table can be characterized as moderate. Nonetheless, these results do indicate that there is some spread of PLEI engagement into the wider community.
- ▶ Slightly more emphasis is placed on helping individuals use LABC websites and on referrals to LABC for more legal information.

Table 7: Frequency of PLEI-related activity by community agencies

Activity	Frequency of activity					Average rating on a 5-point scale
	Never	Not very frequently	Neither frequently nor infrequently	Quite frequently	Very frequently	
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. Ordering hard-copy law-related publications through LABC (n = 51)	16 31%	11 22%	11 22%	11 22%	2 4%	2.45
2. Assisting individuals to use one or more of the four LABC websites (n = 23)	2 9%	5 22%	5 22%	8 35%	3 13%	3.22
3. Referring individuals to services other than LABC for legal information (n = 50, no response = 1)	10 20%	10 20%	11 22%	15 30%	4 8%	2.86
4. Referring individuals to LABC to get legal aid or info about eligibility (n = 51)	2 4%	10 20%	5 10%	22 43%	12 24%	3.20

Note: There was one telephone survey and two online surveys. The second activity in the table was only asked about in the telephone survey. Ratings for the other activities are from both the telephone survey and the first online survey. The second online survey didn't include questions about any of these activities.

The 24 respondents in the agency telephone survey were also asked if they ever scan LABC's site or subscribe to LABC's blog *The Factum* to see if there are new publications that could help a person with a particular issue; 42% said they access LABC materials in these ways, 21% said they usually use other sites, and 38% said they do not scan any sites. Of non-LABC sites, Clicklaw was mentioned three times, and People's Law School, Dial-A-Law, and JP Boyd were each identified once.

Table 8 shows the following:

- ▶ Ratings for scanning the websites for a person are very slightly higher than for referring the person to the sites. This conclusion reinforces comments made in section 1.4 about the tendency to be hands-on with people who face social/legal challenges. (Note, however, the small number of respondents for the data on scanning activity.)
- ▶ Legal Aid BC is the most frequently accessed site, followed by Family Law in BC and MyLawBC. The lower rate of access to Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC is understandable in that it targets Indigenous people.

Table 8: Frequency with which agency respondents scan or refer people to LABC websites

LABC websites	Frequency of activity					Average rating on a 5-point scale
	Never	Not very frequently	Neither frequently nor infrequently	Quite frequently	Very frequently	
	1	2	3	4	5	
Scanning (n = 14)						
Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC	5 36%	5 36%	1 7%	1 7%	2 14%	2.29
Family Law in BC	1 7%	0 0%	6 43%	3 21%	4 29%	3.64
Legal Aid BC	0 0%	1 7%	3 21%	5 36%	5 36%	4.00
MyLawBC	5 36%	2 14%	4 29%	2 14%	1 7%	2.43
Referring people to websites (n = 28)						
Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC	10 36%	9 32%	3 11%	6 21%	0 0%	2.18
Family Law in BC	4 14%	10 36%	6 21%	7 25%	1 4%	2.68
Legal Aid BC	3 11%	3 11%	8 29%	9 32%	5 18%	3.36
MyLawBC	7 25%	8 29%	6 21%	4 14%	3 11%	2.57

Note: The question about scanning sites was asked only in the telephone survey. The question about referring people was asked in the first online survey. The second online survey didn't include either question.

We also compared the scanning results (table 8) with overall visits to the four sites from each of the communities served by Community Partners. Since the four sites became fully operational at different times, to ensure comparability the data was selected from April 1, 2016, to March 31, 2020. The overall visits in this period were:

- Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC: 26,039
- Family Law in BC: 2,489,357
- Legal Aid BC: 700,055
- MyLawBC: 277,497

In table 8, frequency ratings of visits reported by agencies were highest for the Legal Aid BC site, followed closely by Family Law, and then by MyLawBC and Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC. In the results for overall visits, Family Law was significantly higher than Legal Aid BC, while the other two sites were in the same order as the scanning results. It should be emphasized that although the overall visit results are drawn from the communities served by the Community Partners, no claim is made that the visits were a result of justice navigator activity. Furthermore, the results in table 8 were subjective estimates by respondents of how much they scanned or referred to the sites, whereas the comparison figures are for actual visits to the site.

Two additional questions were asked of agency respondents regarding their interactions with the justice navigator around PLEI. Responses were as follows:

- Agency telephone respondents: Talking about their initial contacts with the justice navigator, 42% specifically identified the fact that the justice navigator could supply or refer them to legal publications on various topics. This fact was nested in their overall perception of the justice navigator as a channel to legal aid, as well as being a person who could help individuals make applications and gather information for various law-related purposes.
- Agency online respondents: 82% of respondents addressed the question of how they brought the availability of legal information to the person's attention. 17% said they just mention the availability of PLEI, without providing assistance; 39% actively connect people to one or more types of PLEI materials; 43% refer them to the justice navigator for information about publications. Ten respondents said they had a display rack with PLEI materials at their office.
- Agency telephone respondents: 14 of the 24 agencies were in contact with the justice navigator several times per week, four approximately twice per month or variably, and five once a month or less frequently. Nonetheless, at the time of the interview, all felt solidly connected with the justice navigator.

- ▶ Agency telephone respondents: Of the 23 respondents who described their usual purpose in contacting the justice navigator, 70% said it was to obtain law-related publications. Contacts regarding legal aid applications are described in section 2.4 of this report.

1.6 WHETHER THE WEBSITES OF CP ORGANIZATIONS MENTION THE CP PROGRAM

We reviewed the websites of the 26 organizations where the justice navigators are located to determine if the CP program was mentioned. Only six sites specifically mentioned CP as a program, usually with a brief explanation of its purpose. Five others mentioned the legal program in the same CP organization (e.g., a legal advocacy clinic), which would ultimately lead people to learn about the CP program if they make a contact. Two other sites referred to LABC; if the LABC site is then accessed, there is a listing of all CP projects in BC.

We also reviewed the websites of 24 agencies that were involved in the telephone survey for this study. Of these websites, only two mentioned the CP program, and both agencies were those in which a justice navigator was employed. Two other agencies (a courthouse and an RCMP victim services site) identified LABC as a resource, which, as stated above, contains a listing of all CP sites.

2 AWARENESS AND USE OF INTAKE SERVICES

This section presents data on the level of awareness and use of LABC intake services by individuals with legal issues in CP communities and how that has changed over the years the program has existed. The data sources for this section include data from LABC on legal aid applications, interviews with justice navigators, and telephone interviews and online questionnaires with service users and with agencies.

2.1 DATA ON LEGAL AID APPLICATIONS

In addition to the PLEI role described in section 1, the main role of justice navigators is to refer individuals, where requested and/or appropriate, to an LABC office or local agent where they can apply for legal aid. Note that the following analysis doesn't extend to the subsequent decisions made by LABC and the referral of a legal aid contract to a lawyer. That decision is internal to LABC and is not influenced by the activities of the justice navigator.

There are two potential impacts of the CP program on applications for legal aid. The first is to increase awareness of the potential for legal aid through justice navigators' outreach activities with individuals in geographical and social communities that are normally underserved. Increased awareness logically may lead to an increased rate of legal aid applications. The second impact may have the opposite effect. That is, in working with individuals, the justice navigator may help reduce applications to LABC that are clearly inappropriate. The analysis that follows doesn't attempt to separate these two effects. Furthermore, there are many factors that will influence legal aid applications in a population area, including eligibility of the legal matter, crime levels, social conditions, family breakdown, and the existence of other services besides those of CPs in the service area. This analysis simply shows patterns of legal aid applications over time and in relation to area population size.

Table 9 shows annual legal aid applications in the CP communities between April 1, 2014, and March 31, 2020. The following patterns are evident:

- ▶ The total number of applications has been relatively constant from year to year. In 2019/20, applications were 1% higher than the previous high in 2014/15 with minor fluctuations in the intervening years. In the 2013 evaluation report, overall applications in CP communities dropped in the year after the program was initiated. The report postulated that as awareness of legal aid grew in the communities (an objective of the initiative), applications would grow as well.

- ▶ If you compare the applications in 2014/15 with those in 2019/20, of the 26 CPs, 11 had a decrease in overall applications, three were roughly the same, and 12 increased. All sites had fluctuations within the six years.

Table 9: Applications for legal aid, 2014–20, by CP location

CP location	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
1 Seabird Island (near Agassiz, with outreach to Chawathil, Squiala, and Cheam)	229	198	213	200	171	153	1,164
2 Alert Bay (second location is in Port Hardy)	184	190	204	181	189	174	1,122
3 Abbotsford (Anti Poverty)* (second location is in Chilliwack, with outreach to Mission)	1,634	1,316	1,348	1,390	1,447	1,471	8,606
4 Abbotsford (Multicultural)* (with outreach to Aldergrove)	1,584	1,461	1,330	1,346	1,389	1,413	8,523
5 Grand Forks (with outreach to Midway)	83	84	81	69	81	91	489
6 100 Mile House (with outreach to Canim Lake)	44	68	82	73	69	71	407
7 Cranbrook† (with outreach to Creston, Fernie, Sparwood, Elkford, Invermere, and Golden)	299	301	432	473	486	511	2,502
8 Haida Gwaii* (two locations: Skidegate and Old Massett)	68	35	38	45	45	52	283
9 Campbell River‡ and Gold River	546	559	605	539	492	503	3,244
10 Bella Coola (also serving Bella Bella and Klemtu)	67	59	65	55	43	51	340
11 Keremeos	38	34	46	52	46	34	250
12 Fort St. John* (with outreach to many communities and First Nations)	280	358	349	278	257	282	1,804

CP location	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	Total
13 Lytton (second location is in Lillooet)	90	100	76	83	81	125	555
14 Maple Ridge (second location at Katzie F.N.)	757	784	766	793	834	875	4,809
15 Nelson† (second location is in Castlegar, with outreach to Kaslo and Nakusp)	204	223	228	234	215	236	1,340
16 Merritt (serving Nicola Valley)	151	148	139	98	148	162	846
17 North Vancouver*	426	383	404	385	424	583	2,605
18 Powell River	222	205	200	225	223	238	1,313
19 Prince George‡	1,868	1,806	1,748	1,488	1,496	1,423	9,829
20 Hope (with outreach to Yale and Agassiz)	106	115	127	97	100	104	649
21 Ashcroft (with outreach to Clinton and Spences Bridge)	34	27	41	33	26	36	197
22 Sechelt (with outreach to Gibsons and Pender Harbour)	49	43	49	42	55	48	286
23 Penticton* (with outreach to Oliver, Summerland, and Osoyoos)	590	607	726	1,172	1,212	974	5,281
24 Trail†	81	106	116	99	83	69	554
25 Hazelton* (with outreach to Smithers‡, Houston, and several other F.N. communities)	110	139	172	145	126	131	823
26 Vernon* (with outreach to Coldstream, Lumby, and Armstrong)	675	689	629	552	585	679	3,809
Total	10,419	10,038	10,214	10,147	10,323	10,489	61,630

*The location has a local agent.

†The location had a local agent until 2016.

‡The location has a local agent as well as a Parents Legal Centre.

Table 10 shows the ratio of applications to population over the same six-year period in each of the CP areas. Several patterns are evident:

- ▶ The three highest ratios of applications to population are for the same communities that had the highest ratio of PLEI orders to population in table 4 (Lytton, 100 Mile House, and Port Hardy/Alert Bay).
- ▶ Except for Prince George, eight of the nine highest ratios of applications to population are in CP areas with populations under 14,200.
- ▶ Except for Trail and Sechelt, five of the seven lowest ratios of applications to population are in CP areas with a population over 19,500 (and four are over 100,000).

In general, these broad community patterns for legal aid applications are similar to those for PLEI demand.

The data in table 10 also suggests that there is no positive correlation between the existence of a local agent in the CP location and the rate of applications for that area’s population. In fact, there are only four local agents in the 14 communities with the highest ratios of applications to population, versus eight local agents in the 12 communities with lower ratios of applications to population. This might suggest that Community Partners are especially helpful in facilitating the application process in communities that don’t have a local agent.

Table 10: Legal aid applications in relation to area population, from highest to lowest ratios

	CP location	Area population (2016 census)	Legal aid applications, 2014–20	Ratio of applications to population
1	Alert Bay (second location is in Port Hardy)	4,862	1,122	0.231
2	Lytton (second location is in Lillooet)	2,407	555	0.231
3	100 Mile House (with outreach to Canim Lake)	2,503	407	0.163
4	Seabird Island (near Agassiz, with outreach to Chawathil, Squiala, and Cheam)	8,793	1,164	0.132
5	Prince George‡	82,290	9,829	0.119
6	Powell River	14,152	1,313	0.093
7	Ashcroft (with outreach to Clinton and Spences Bridge)	1,824	170	0.093
8	Hope (with outreach to Yale and Agassiz)	7,010	649	0.093
9	Bella Coola (also serving Bella Bella and Klemtu)	3,856	340	0.088
10	Penticton* (with outreach to Oliver, Summerland, and Osoyoos)	60,330	5,281	0.088

	CP location	Area population (2016 census)	Legal aid applications, 2014–20	Ratio of applications to population
11	Campbell River‡ and Gold River	42,822	3,244	0.076
12	Keremeos	3,311	250	0.076
13	Hazelton* (with outreach to Smithers‡, Houston, and several other F.N. communities)	11,065	823	0.074
14	Haida Gwaii* (two locations: Skidegate and Old Massett)	4,317	283	0.066
15	Vernon* (with outreach to Coldstream, Lumby, and Armstrong)	67,988	3,809	0.056
16	Grand Forks (with outreach to Midway)	9,036	489	0.054
17	Merritt (serving Nicola Valley)	15,921	846	0.053
18	Cranbrook† (with outreach to Creston, Fernie, Sparwood, Elkford, Invermere, and Golden)	47,518	2,502	0.053
19	Nelson† (second location is in Castlegar, with outreach to Kaslo and Nakusp)	26,988	1,340	0.050
20	Abbotsford (Multicultural)* (with outreach to Aldergrove)	173,588	8,523	0.049
21	Fort St. John* (with outreach to many communities and First Nations)	40,186	1,804	0.045
22	Trail†	12,346	554	0.045
23	Maple Ridge (second location at Katzie F.N.)	111,571	4,809	0.043
24	Abbotsford (Anti Poverty)* (second location is in Chilliwack, with outreach to Mission)	299,614	8,606	0.029
25	Sechelt (with outreach to Gibsons and Pender Harbour)	19,419	286	0.015
26	North Vancouver*	221,024	2,605	0.012

*The location has a local agent.

†The location had a local agent until 2016.

‡The location has a local agent as well as a Parents Legal Centre.

2.2 DATA FROM INTERVIEWS WITH JUSTICE NAVIGATORS

Regarding the volume of applications for legal aid, interviews with the justice navigators added subjective data on cases since April 1, 2020, to the results in table 9. Fifteen justice navigators estimated that there were more applications for legal aid in this period, six felt there were less, and five said application volume hadn't changed. In general, this means that the overall volume of applications has continued to rise slightly. COVID-19 has had differential impacts on legal aid applications in the CP areas considered as a whole. In some cases, it has reduced volume because some offices where the justice navigator

worked have been closed. This in turn has meant individuals who need hands-on help have been less easy to serve, even though justice navigators have made significant efforts to adapt to their circumstances — for example, by meeting off-site or dropping off materials for them. In other cases, COVID-19 has led to more applications because it has exacerbated family matters.

Regarding the primary legal issues for which they have given assistance, justice navigators frequently mentioned more than one category. Their responses were also not solely for matters that resulted in an application to legal aid. In other words, they were helping define where individuals needed to go to address one or more presenting issues. The primary issues were as follows — and in several cases, more than one issue was identified as being major ($n = 31$ for 26 respondents):

- Family law (divorce, guardianship, parenting time, visiting rights, family violence): 15
- Housing, landlord and tenant: 5 (One justice navigator mentioned that a low-income housing project was being established in her community, resulting in more housing inquiries.)
- Criminal matters: 4
- Wills/estates: 3
- Employment standards: 2
- Immigration: 1
- CERB (Canada Emergency Response Benefit): 1

In terms of the primary or most frequent types of person served, there was again more than one answer in several cases ($n = 31$ for 26 respondents):

- All types of people: 6
- Females: 6
- Males: 5
- Immigrants: 4
- Indigenous people: 4
- A band member with a husband who is not: 1
- Students: 1
- Seniors: 1
- Transgender: 1
- Families generally: 1
- Marginalized individuals: 1

One comment concerned how legal aid matters were directed in an Interior community:

I don't deal with Vancouver. People are frustrated with the outside world in [my local communities]. But if somebody is right in front of them, it helps. I fill out the application while they are on the phone and submit it to [the local agent in a nearby community]. It feels more hands-on to people than doing the rigamarole of the call centre. It's easier to deal with somebody in front of them one on one.

The reasons for the particular types of legal aid services (or for assistance with other referrals) demanded are similar to those described for PLEI — that is, that COVID-19 has generally increased the focus on family matters, but also on related welfare and housing issues. Three justice navigators also mentioned that the increased numbers of immigrants in their jurisdiction have reinforced this pattern. Two said the aging population has increased demand for assistance with wills.

The reasons for differences in demand for intake services or for other forms of assistance are similar to those described for publications in section 1.2. For example:

- ▶ COVID-19 generally has increased demand for applications concerning family issues. COVID-19-related shutdowns in the hospitality sector have in some cases impacted new immigrants and have generated employment or immigration inquiries.
- ▶ In service areas that include small Indigenous reserves, justice navigators are sometimes considered outsiders despite outreach efforts and/or the offer of part-time positions to Indigenous residents of the reserve. This results in fewer inquiries about applying for legal aid.
- ▶ Another justice navigator serving Indigenous communities said there is frequently demand for assistance regarding on-reserve housing matters.
- ▶ There is reduced capacity to develop an effective network (for referrals) with other services in the community when positions go vacant, which in turn impacts the demand for assistance with applications.
- ▶ There was decreased ability during COVID-19 to do outreach with agencies that have temporarily closed and/or at community fairs.

There are other factors impacting demand for applications or other forms of assistance:

- ▶ Sometimes issues come in “clusters” because people tell each other about the service they've used. This is most frequent in family issues or wills and estates matters.
- ▶ One justice navigator felt that a rise in drug charges was likely due to increased policing.
- ▶ Aging populations result in increased demand for assistance with wills and estates.

For the most part, outreach regarding legal aid intake applications is handled similarly to outreach for the distribution of publications. This also includes making contacts with new staff in community agencies and deciding how information about the justice navigator service is distributed in multi-service agencies, as described in section 1.2.

The process of application assistance is more intense; it involves one-to-one connection and gathering of information and forms. Most of the justice navigators said they try to get prospective applicants into their office for this process, but several engage the applicants at least initially by phone, or by creating a three-way call or Zoom meeting with the legal aid office after initial discussion with the legal aid applicant, after which the justice navigator “stays in the background during the rest of the call.” One justice navigator has said he has also done this at the home of the applicant.

2.3 FEEDBACK FROM SERVICE USERS

Table 11 shows feedback from people using the justice navigator services about the assistance they received when seeking legal aid representation or in processing their legal concerns through another appropriate agency. Feedback from service users in relation to PLEI has been addressed in section 1.4.

It should be emphasized that although there were 42 overall users, they represent only 14 of the 26 CP locations, so the sample can't be seen as representative of the users of the overall program. Nonetheless, the overall positive assessment of the service they received indicates that these justice navigators are meeting the needs of people, in terms of advancing their legal issues. They do this by putting them in direct contact with LABC, helping them gather materials to facilitate representation, and/or pursuing other types of resolution through appropriate agencies.

Twelve of these respondents were Indigenous. All stated that the justice navigator provided them information in a manner that was sensitive to their culture. In most cases this simply meant that the person was treated with full respect as a human being, and/or that the justice navigator was well known in the community for awareness of Indigenous issues and cultural differences. In a couple of cases this also meant providing Indigenous-specific materials pertaining to the legal issue, or that the justice navigator informed them of workshops related to Indigenous issues.

Table 11: Users' feedback on the service provided by justice navigators

Question	Response		
1. Did the justice navigator help you to contact LABC by phone?	Yes	31	74%
	No	11	26%
	Total responses	42	
2. Did the justice navigator help you apply to receive representation by a legal aid lawyer?	Yes	29	69%
	No	13	31%
	Total responses	42	
3. Did the justice navigator refer you to another agency or resource to help you resolve your problem?	Yes	25	60%
	No	17	40%
	Total responses	42	
4. Overall, how satisfied were you with the service provided by the justice navigator?	Very dissatisfied	0	0%
	Somewhat dissatisfied	0	0%
	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	3%
	Quite satisfied	4	10%
	Very satisfied	35	88%
	Total responses	40	
	Average rating on a 5-point scale: 4.9		

When asked for any changes they'd recommend, most respondents reiterated their strong satisfaction with the service of justice navigators. For example:

- ▶ "I don't know if I would be here if she had not helped me so fully through the dark days of the criminal trial. She is outstanding at what she does. Is very compassionate, 100 percent human being."
- ▶ "No recommendations. Again, the justice navigator is super accessible, and I know how to reach her after hours."
- ▶ "None. His expertise was good, never dropped the ball, always timely, not just for me, but for others too. We can get 'clouded' with self-pity; for me it was good for both of the cases."

Several added specific suggestions. Some of them related more to the process by LABC after an application, or were likely made on the assumption that the justice navigator was employed full-time:

- ▶ "As a full-time working mom, it would be helpful if the justice navigator service could be accessed in the after-work hours, even if it was just by phone or through email. When working it is impossible to make a private phone call."
- ▶ "Once individuals are connected to legal aid, it would be good to provide more information about what the process looks like." (This would be information about expectations around legal representation, and qualifications for legal aid such as salary, as in how much do you have to make before you can't receive legal aid?)

- “A faster reply from the justice navigator after the initial reach-out email would have been helpful, even though two days is pretty good.”
- “I know they had trouble getting enough people to help on the phone. They need more volunteers and funds, e.g., to answer calls.”
- “My complaint is not about [the justice navigator] but about the need for government service to help translate what to do with paperwork for people with challenges.”
- “The more resources she could have would be better. It would also be useful to have a confidentiality agreement to sign, just in case she ends up working with the other side. An extra layer of security.”
- “Nothing at the justice navigator’s level. She does a fabulous job with what she has. I found legal aid very frustrating. Short of having a legal aid office in [CP’s community], nothing else.”

When asked about how they found out about the justice navigator services in relation to legal aid intake, 33 users responded as follows:

- Through a justice service (e.g., courthouse, parole officer, victim assistance), local agency, community group, or Indigenous organization: 14
- From previous contact/the justice navigator is well known generally: 9
- Family/friend/relative: 7
- Google/online search/Facebook: 3

These results indicate that systematic contacts with as many local agencies/groups as possible have been a productive strategy in spreading knowledge about the service, and they should be continually maintained and renewed. (As was shown in section 1.5, agencies generally feel solidly connected with justice navigators in their community.) At the same time, the combination of being “well known generally” and of users connecting to the service through “family/friends/relatives” suggests that the justice navigator’s services have reached a significant threshold of common knowledge in the community. The category of “Google/online search/Facebook” implies independent research by people who haven’t discovered the service by the above means. Although it’s a small category, it indicates that online information is nonetheless helpful in spreading the word about the service.

2.4 FEEDBACK FROM AGENCIES

Table 12 summarizes the feedback from 29 agencies from the online questionnaire about the type of service connections they make for individuals who wish to apply for legal aid. These 29 agencies had been identified by justice navigators as ones to whom they relate, both for PLEI and for legal aid applications.

Table 12: Frequency of agencies' referrals to justice navigators for legal aid

Question	Response		
1. How frequently do you refer individuals to LABC?	Never	1	3%
	Not very frequently	6	21%
	Neither frequently nor infrequently	4	14%
	Quite frequently	13	45%
	Very frequently	5	17%
	Total responses	29	
Average rating on 5-point scale: 3.5			
2. In what way do you refer people?	1. Just mention the LABC number	6	21%
	2. I actively connect them to LABC	4	14%
	3. I refer them to the justice navigator for help connecting with LABC	5	17%
	4. Sometimes 1, sometimes 2	5	17%
	5. Sometimes 1, sometimes 3	4	14%
	6. Sometimes 2, sometimes 3	1	3%
	7. Sometimes any of the three methods	3	10%
	8. Not applicable; I don't refer	1	3%
	Total responses	29	

Note: This data is from the first online questionnaire with agencies.

All but one of the agencies said they refer individuals to LABC. Sixty-two percent do so “quite” or “very frequently.” They may or may not involve the justice navigator in that process. Forty-five percent of respondents either automatically refer individuals to the justice navigator, or they do so part of the time.

In the agency telephone survey, of 23 respondents who described their purposes for contacting the justice navigator, 22 (96%) said it could involve a request to the justice navigator to provide an individual with assistance applying for legal aid. However, 65% said these contacts could involve other reasons as well (e.g., applying to some agency other than LABC about a law-related matter, and/or obtaining PLEI materials).

An additional 17 agencies from communities served by justice navigators were sent surveys in the summer of 2021 by LABC. These agencies had not been specifically mentioned by justice navigators, so it was not anticipated that they'd have a referral relationship. However, of these 17, four said they had had contact with the justice navigator to request a referral to legal aid for an individual.

These results indicate a moderate direct involvement in legal referrals by agencies, apart from connections they make with the justice navigator in some of the contacts they have with people. We don't know whether this referral activity already existed prior to Community Partners or was stimulated by the program, but it does suggest that a solid capacity for legal assistance has developed in the communities.

3 THE CAPACITY OF JUSTICE NAVIGATORS TO IDENTIFY AND RESPOND TO INDIVIDUALS WITH LEGAL ISSUES

This section explores the views of justice navigators about their capacity to identify and respond to people with legal issues, any structural limitations on their ability to do so, and ways in which this capacity can reasonably be enhanced. It draws primarily on interviews with the justice navigators, supplemented by some focus-group feedback. This section closely relates to section 4, in which more detailed information is provided about the training and support the justice navigators have received.

3.1 OVERALL NATURE OF THEIR WORK AND THE PEOPLE THEY SERVE

Justice navigators made two sets of comments about the overall nature of their work.

The core objectives of Community Partners are to enhance geographical outreach to individuals in less served areas; social outreach to specific populations (e.g., Indigenous persons, farm workers, and immigrants); and personal outreach to individuals with a variety of social, mental health, and financial challenges. The legal, social, and personal issues in these situations are often complex, requiring sensitivity on the part of the justice navigator to an individual's emotional trauma. The presenting issues often spill over into areas not handled by LABC (e.g., power of attorney, wills and estates, workers' compensation). Several justice navigators talked of the need to set healthy boundaries around the type, complexity, and/or number of legal issues for which they can provide assistance. Several others simply said they needed more hours in order effectively to service demand.

The justice navigator often needs to help individuals assemble the necessary information and documents to pursue legal assistance. People in the target group also frequently lack computer literacy and/or can't afford a computer (estimated by one justice navigator as approximately 40% of people) so are dependent on the justice navigators to help assemble documents and with related communications. This process usually requires face-to-face meetings in which the justice navigator can also make phone calls to help initiate direct contact with LABC. Many justice navigators cited an example of this situation as one in which they felt they had made a real difference, because the individuals simply wouldn't have been able to advance their case without help.

3.2 THE IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON THE WORK OF JUSTICE NAVIGATORS

At the time of writing, COVID-19 has been a factor for the past two years. Justice navigators made the following observations about its impact on their work.

COVID-19 has in some instances reduced access to the services of a justice navigator (both because of facility closures and the lack of community fairs or meetings to publicize the service), as well as reduced the justice navigator's capacity for outreach to individuals with needs. In these affected locations, it has reduced the overall volume of legal issues that the justice navigator would normally have handled, and in many cases has resulted in more time and special arrangements required on the part of the justice navigator to meet with people. As one justice navigator commented:

COVID has impacted access [in general]. . . . Gathering paperwork is harder for people because of lesser access to resources, so I have to help them more. In general, legal info is hard for people to access. They need to plan, phone, be consistent with appointments. Alcohol is very common, and dims people's awareness. It is much easier for them just to be able to drop in.

(However, as was shown in table 9 in section 2.1, the overall volume of legal aid applications across all sites hasn't decreased over the past seven years.)

When asked how significantly COVID-19 has affected their ability to respond to individuals with legal issues, justice navigators responded on a five-point scale (where 1 = not at all, 2 = to a minor degree, 3 = neither a little nor a lot, 4 = quite significantly, 5 = very significantly). There were responses in all categories, and the average response was 3.5. For those who felt the impact was quite or very significant, mention was most frequently made that a relaxed physical presence is less possible during COVID-19 (e.g., they can't work readily side by side with people to review papers or "click our way through forms together," they can't read people's reactions as readily, and sometimes they have to "de-escalate" the person's emotions). In addition, many seniors can't hear as well on the phone, but it may not be possible to meet in person.

On the other hand, one justice navigator felt that COVID-19 has resulted in a more sensitive way of dealing with people:

COVID has helped me develop a much deeper sense of flexibility, creativity and assessment. Before it was just in-depth intake which results in outcomes and goals. Now it involves a greater honouring and grace and sensitivity to impacts on peoples' lives — e.g. 'How has Johnny managed this past year? What have been the strengths that have allowed him to cope?' We now work with people in a more honouring way.

3.3 CONNECTION WITH OTHER JUSTICE NAVIGATORS

Justice navigators were asked whether they felt the need for more connection with other justice navigators. Of 25 who responded, 60% felt they would, and 40% didn't feel this need. The response for the most part reflects the length of time the justice navigators have been part of the CP program. Seven of the 10 who did *not* feel the need for more connection have been with the program since 2016 or earlier, whereas of the 15 who *did*, 13 joined the program in 2017 or later. Especially for the most recent justice navigators (nine of whom joined the program in 2020 or 2021), there is a feeling that they have a lot to learn from their colleagues who have longer standing in the program.

The following were suggested as circumstances for greater connection:

- ▶ A "northern BC" group, which would likely have common issues
- ▶ Justice navigators in smaller communities, who may wish to share strategies
- ▶ Justice navigators acting as a mentor for a new justice navigator, or just being available to give a second opinion
- ▶ A chat group to bounce ideas off colleagues — for example, "This person had this type of issue; have you seen this before?" or "Is this a good way to distribute materials?"

3.4 THE CAPACITY OF JUSTICE NAVIGATORS TO ACT AS A CONNECTOR AND PROVIDE DEEPER OUTREACH IN THEIR SERVICE AREAS

Connecting people to sources of PLEI and to legal aid has been discussed in sections 1 and 2. However, over and above these specific types of connection, it's important to describe what it means for a justice navigator to be a good connector in general. Focus groups with justice navigators in November 2020 addressed approaches to create deeper outreach in their communities and to be more effective connectors for the populations they serve. The following points were made:

- ▶ Place the justice navigator service in offices that are close to other workers who deal with social/legal matters (e.g., family justice counsellors, victim service workers, domestic violence workers, Native Courtworkers, health workers). This aids quick referrals and thereby reduces an individual's frustration if a problem is not within the justice navigator's purview, as the person can often be walked next door.
- ▶ Similarly, in outreach communities, arrange to have the space the justice navigator uses located in a "hub" location with at least one other key service provider (e.g., local band office).

- To reduce frustration and develop effective referrals, create mechanisms that would inform the justice navigator of staff changes in agencies to which they might regularly refer individuals. This knowledge is often transmitted through interagency meetings.
- When a justice navigator conducts outreach in very small communities, the visibility of the justice navigator's services may make a person feel an increased sense of stigma accessing the service. It may be difficult to ensure the anonymity and privacy of individuals as they enter the justice navigator's office building or space. If a community has several streets, it may be better to locate the justice navigator's office in one that is less frequented. Nonetheless, even if it's impossible to ensure that the coming and going of a person won't be observed by others in the community, the key preventive measure is to ensure absolute confidentiality of the justice navigator's interactions with the person.
- Sometimes consultation by phone may be feasible to avoid circumstances where there is a lack of physical privacy.
- It's important to build trusting relationships with band offices in small communities to ensure a meaningful presence during outreach visits. Even if the justice navigator is Indigenous, this process may take several months or years, especially where there is turnover either in the justice navigator position or in band staff.
- In many isolated communities, Wi-Fi is inadequate. Texting is often a preferred method for connecting with people.
- Facebook is often an effective method of connecting and advertising services, especially in Indigenous communities.
- Effectively connecting a person with resources often takes more than one meeting to be able fully to understand their challenges.
- Lack of or difficulty with transportation can be an impediment for individuals wanting to connect with a justice navigator. Gas cards may incentivize people to get to an appointment with the justice navigator. It can be helpful if the justice navigator can arrange appointment times in a small town that they're visiting to coincide with infrequent bus schedules. This may be especially important for individuals requiring childcare.
- Where they exist, local radio stations and newspapers can be used to publicize the CP service and/or to announce a justice navigator's visit to a moderate-size or small community.

4 JUSTICE NAVIGATORS’ SATISFACTION WITH THE TRAINING AND SUPPORT THEY RECEIVE

This section describes the training and support provided to justice navigators in the CP program and how they assess that support.

4.1 THE TRAINING AND SUPPORT PROVIDED

Apart from the community engagement coordinators and justice navigators connecting by phone as needed, there have been four mechanisms to support and provide resources to the justice navigators: CP conferences, training videos, Indigenous cultural competency training, and outreach community visits. Each is described below.

4.1.1 CP conferences and virtual sessions

A conference was held annually in Vancouver or Richmond until COVID-19 necessitated virtual sessions in 2020. A list of training topics is shown in table 13. In some cases, the sessions were attended by all justice navigators; in others, they selected from a choice of sessions. It’s not clear at this point whether in-person conferences will resume in the future, or whether recorded webinars and virtual meetings will become the standard training method.

Before 2020, approximately 10 one-hour webinars were hosted for CPs every year. The blending of annual training and monthly webinars into regularly scheduled Zoom meetings and webinars has been one result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Table 13: CP training sessions at annual conferences or by webinars, 2012–21

Year and conference type	Sessions
2012 Combined with the Provincial Advocates Conference (PAC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family Law PLEI resources (with a focus on the new Family Law Act) • LSS* publications — accessibility and usability • Community engagement evaluation • Legal information outreach workers (LIOWs) • LSS mobile website • Innovative outreach ideas • The new Family Law Act: Overview and analysis • LSS update • Case scenarios — responding to common questions from clients

Year and conference type	Sessions
2013 Combined with PAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharepoint site “show and tell” • Internet safety • Family Law Act PLEI: What’s working and what isn’t? • New materials for Community Partners (revised edition of the CP Orientation Manual and promotional materials) • Case scenarios and focus group: Child protection publications • Family law resources • Update on the new FLA and relevant case law • Publishing services updates: What’s new this year (online separation agreement guide; new Supreme Court family forms) • MyLawBC: Exploring user needs for online tools
2014 Combined with PAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access Pro Bono — the APB advice clinics • Justice Innovation pilot projects (overview of five new projects) • Protection orders update • Civil Resolution Tribunal update • Child protection legal update
2015 Combined with PAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal Aid intake (coverage and eligibility criteria, preparing clients, exception reviews, and discretionary files) • Justice Innovation and Transformation Initiatives (JITI) — eligibility, accessing services • Publishing services updates — new Aboriginal, family law, and family violence resources; MyLawBC; usability testing • Community Partner roundtable • Skills for dealing with high-conflict personalities • Clicklaw — improving access and referrals • Can I help you with that? — the line between legal information and legal advice
2016 Combined with PAC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MyLawBC — dialogue tool; how to promote MyLawBC in your community • Is that a conflict? Juggling multiple hats (i.e., helping a client when you are wearing one hat, then helping a client who is in conflict with the first, while wearing your LSS hat) • What’s new in PLEI in BC? • Outreach roundtable — what outreach are you doing in your community? • Resources to help with residential tenancy disputes • Working with LSS intake and an update on the Justice Innovation Transformation Initiatives • The Public Guardian and Trustee (PGT) • Client scenario

Year and conference type	Sessions
<p>2017 Combined with PAC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous awareness training — historical information, terminology, legal status, statistical analysis, myths, do's and don'ts in building relationships with Indigenous peoples • Best practices for applying for legal aid • Updates on resources and referrals • LSS Indigenous services — what they do at LSS, including the process for requesting a Gladue report and new publications
<p>2018 No conference</p>	<p>The community engagement coordinator was on leave in 2018, so conference attendance was replaced by two webinars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New publications • LSS updates
<p>2019 Concurrent with conference for local agent intake assistants. (There was some participation in PAC, which happened separately. Justice navigators who are also Law Foundation advocates attended two days of PAC.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indigenous cultural competency training — Indigenous Canada, individual cultural competency, resilience and healing in Indigenous communities, role of ally/challenging racism, reconciliation • Legal information and resource referral — framing conversation to identify client's issue and how you can help; what to do when the client presents various barriers in accessing resources; best practices • Online resources and tools — new developments • LSS reconciliation and access plan — how it will guide LSS in advancing reconciliation and ensuring services better meet the needs of Indigenous peoples in BC
<p>2020 Virtual conference, concurrent with PAC. Justice navigators who were advocates could also attend PAC sessions that aren't listed here.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing trauma-informed advocacy services • Providing non-gendered, non-binary advocacy services; supporting transgendered clients • Supporting clients with mental health issues • Self-care: Understanding the value of boundaries • Accessibility for people with disabilities • CP evaluation focus groups sessions • CCDI (Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion) sessions on diversity and unconscious bias
<p>2021 24 sessions between April and November. All sessions were by webinar. Some sessions were also for advocates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gladue transition • Native Courtworkers and Intake • Refreshed MyLawBC website walk-through • Indigenous languages • COVID-19 updates on immigration law • General CP updates • Pathway for women with precarious status fleeing violence • Trauma-informed practice • LABC intake and resources • Recognition of Kamloops Residential Schools discovery • Family law and COVID-19 • Family law and protection orders • Criminal duty counsel update

Year and conference type	Sessions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediation info on family law and child protection matters • Wills and estates • Residential tenancy law and COVID-19 • Parents legal centres • Overview of elder law • Overview of Access Pro Bono services • CP chitchat • Family law and mediation services • Supporting women, children, and youth experiencing or at risk of violence • Trauma-informed advocacy strategies • LABC family law and child protection: new resources and services • Supporting clients facing challenges • Self-care approaches for advocates

*LSS is Legal Services Society, the previous name of Legal Aid BC.

4.1.2 Training videos

Three videos were created by the two community engagement coordinators in 2019 to help newly hired justice navigators understand their roles as a Community Partner for LABC. The first video (14 min.) presents five short role plays. The first four are of typical interactions with people accessing CP services: a mother with a child protection concern, a young person charged with assault and wanting legal aid, a woman fleeing domestic violence, and a wife wanting a divorce. The fifth is a sample outreach telephone discussion a justice navigator might have with a community agency in a small outlying community.

The second and third videos (7 min. and 21 min.) are discussions with two experienced justice navigators in different communities (Bella Coola and Pitt Meadows). The Bella Coola video explores how the justice navigator differentiates between her justice navigator role and a second role as a community advocate, and how she deals with confidentiality in a very small community. The Pitt Meadows video focuses on the justice navigator's approach to outreach with a local First Nation; it emphasizes the critical role of building relationships over time that lead to trust and effective service delivery in this situation.

Between July and December 2020, four other videos were recorded. They weren't specifically created for the CP program but were seen as useful background for new justice navigators and are posted on the CP YouTube page. The four titles are *Legal Aid Intake and Applications* (52 min.), *Civil Resolution Tribunal* (62 min.), *New Family Contracts* (23 min.), and *Accessibility for People with Disabilities* (57 min.).

Finally, two other videos were recorded in 2021 and are used by the community engagement coordinators for orientations: *Overview of LABC Intake Services* (37 min.) and *LABC Print and Online Resources* (16 min.).

4.1.3 Indigenous cultural competency training

Indigenous cultural competency training was provided to justice navigators in 2017 as part of the Provincial Advocates Conference, and in 2019 as part of the CP conference, so has not been taken by justice navigators who have been hired in the past two years. Three sessions related specifically to serving Indigenous people were also offered in April and May 2021: “Gladue transition,” “Native Courtworkers and intake,” and “Indigenous languages.” Plans are also underway to provide a self-paced online multi-module training called “The Path” in 2022.

4.1.4 Outreach community visits

Prior to 2018, outreach visits to CP communities were made in person by one of the community engagement coordinators. The coordinators tried to visit every CP location once every three years. Some locations had more visits — for example, if there was a new executive director in the agency where a justice navigator was located, or if there were performance issues requiring on-site training. Usually, these visits were between April and the end of August, and they involved visits to several sites in a region.

In January 2019 visits were made to Abbotsford, Campbell River, Haida Gwaii, and Maple Ridge. In 2019/20, visits were made to Cranbrook, Prince George, Keremeos, Merritt, Penticton, Vernon, North Vancouver, Grand Forks, Nelson, Trail, and Port Hardy, and two times to Fort St. John. Since that time (and reinforced by the emergence of COVID-19), there have been no in-person visits. In most cases, the Internet connection is strong enough for a virtual equivalent of a physical visit.

4.2 PARTICIPATION IN AND ASSESSMENT OF TRAINING

A large majority of the justice navigators said they had participated in all the training sessions that have been offered since they joined the program. The exception to the high participation in training is the series of 24 webinars in 2021 (from April to November). In terms of attendance by justice navigators and by people who were from organizations in the same community, the average attendance was 6.6 participants overall, and 5.7 for justice navigators only. Attendance at the sessions was not related to the length of time participants had been a justice navigator. The average participation rate for those who had been justice navigators since before 2018 was 5.8 sessions, versus 5.6 for those who had become justice navigators in 2018 or later. Most of the sessions were recorded and made

available for later viewing, so it's highly likely that each justice navigator had more overall exposure to this form of training.

Justice navigators' overall satisfaction with the training was rated on a five-point scale (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = not very satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = quite satisfied, and 5 = very satisfied). Of 25 justice navigators who provided ratings, the average response was 4.5, with none lower than a 3. Clearly this is a strongly favourable response. Table 14 presents justice navigators' ratings of the four methods used to increase their skills. Again, overall ratings of each method were high.

Topics suggested by justice navigators for future training were diverse. They included continued focus on trauma-informed advocacy, working with specific target groups such as persons with limited mental capacity and persons with disabilities, and working with Indigenous persons. Other target groups and their legal situations included grandparents, immigrants, tenants, and families (e.g., protection orders, and parenting plans for separated parents).⁵ In terms of training needs in other legal areas, there was mention of civil matters not covered by legal aid, such as wills and estates, and topics related to the Canada Revenue Agency such as child tax benefits and CPP payments being reduced to pay for debts. One justice navigator suggested a strategic session on how to organize an effective community forum (after COVID-19), and another recommended a session in which all justice navigators shared information on resources that they use.⁶

Table 14: How justice navigators rate the training and support they receive

Area rated	Response			Comments
Annual CP conference	1. Not helpful at all	1	5%	Some preferred in-person for networking or because they don't like Zoom, while others preferred remote training because it was less stressful in terms of travel and personal arrangements, covered more material over a longer period, and required less budget.
	2. Not very helpful	--		
	3. Neither helpful nor unhelpful	--		
	4. Quite helpful	9	43%	
	5. Very helpful	11	52%	
	Total responses (n/a = 6)	21		
	Average rating*: 4.4			

5. Note that several of these topics have in fact been addressed in some of the sessions over the years, but justice navigators who have been hired in recent years won't have taken them.

6. These suggestions should also be considered in tandem with the approaches discussed in the October 2019 LABC report *Online Training for Community-Based Intermediaries: Survey Findings and Implications* (legalaid.bc.ca/sites/default/files/2020-03/cpsIntermediaryOnlineTrainingSurveyFindingsOctober2019.pdf).

Area rated	Response		Comments	
Training videos	1. Not helpful at all	--	The lower ratings were because you can't interact with the presenters as with a webinar or Zoom. And some justice navigators felt they could be done simply with written materials instead. Otherwise, they were considered easy to watch.	
	2. Not very helpful	2		10%
	3. Neither helpful nor unhelpful	1		5%
	4. Quite helpful	12		57%
	5. Very helpful	6		29%
	Total responses (n/a = 6)	21		
	Average rating: 4.0			
Indigenous cultural training	1. Not helpful at all	--	LABC training was highly praised ("They really get down to basic stuff and nitty gritty"), whereas Law Foundation training was more about trauma in general and less grounded in Indigenous experience. (Note that LABC training was one-day training in person, whereas Law Foundation training was virtual for one to two hours.)	
	2. Not very helpful	--		
	3. Neither helpful nor unhelpful	2		11%
	4. Quite helpful	2		11%
	5. Very helpful	14		78%
	Total responses (n/a = 9)	18		
	Average rating: 4.7			
Outreach community visits by the community engagement coordinators	1. Not helpful at all	--	Overall, the visits were appreciated even though they haven't been possible during COVID-19. Many of the justice navigators framed their remarks with explicit acknowledgement of the considerable support they've received from Alex Peel and Sarah Chau, either in response to a request or in their proactively reaching out to the justice navigator. This is especially true for justice navigators who have been hired more recently. The two engagement coordinators are considered to be good communicators both in person and virtually ("Can't rate these two highly enough!"), and the visits are a good opportunity to ask questions about diverse issues (e.g., one visit was to help evaluate the justice navigator's materials). One said the visit helped "open our eyes more in terms of our existence in relation to the band office."	
	2. Not very helpful	--		
	3. Neither helpful nor unhelpful	1		5%
	4. Quite helpful	5		25%
	5. Very helpful	14		70%
	Total (n/a = 7)	20		
	Average rating: 4.7			

*On a five-point scale.

5 THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE CP PROGRAM IS REACHING ITS TARGET POPULATIONS

This final section examines the degree to which the overall CP program has been able to reach the intended target populations. In general terms, these populations or communities have one or more of the following characteristics:

- ▶ They're geographically isolated (in rural and/or remote communities).
- ▶ They're part of a social/cultural visible minority (e.g., Indigenous persons or communities, immigrants, or racialized individuals).
- ▶ They're socially and/or economically disadvantaged or impoverished.

Perceptions of the justice navigators and of agency respondents about deepening outreach in their communities are reported in the next two sections.

5.1 JUSTICE NAVIGATORS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE DEGREE TO WHICH TARGET POPULATIONS ARE BEING SERVED

Justice navigators were asked about their ability to respond to individuals with related non-legal issues, and the degree to which they're reaching their target populations overall. Table 15 identifies the four primary issues mentioned by the 26 respondents and ways in which the justice navigators addressed them. Other issues mentioned were income security, access to benefits, childcare, family maintenance, and residential schools. In general, justice navigators help people clarify and prioritize their issues and access appropriate services.

Table 15: Primary non-legal issues and the service the justice navigator provided

Primary issue	Frequency (26 respondents)	Percentage of justice navigators identifying this issue	How the issue was dealt with
1. Personal mental/physical health-related problems (e.g., fetal alcohol syndrome, ADHD, alcoholism, trauma) impacting a person's capacity	18	69%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ask if the person wishes to see a counsellor; if yes, connect them. • Help with applications to substance abuse and health (including mental health) services. • Refer the person to themselves in another role they serve at their agency. • Accompany the person if they're afraid to go to the service provider alone, which is common. • Advise the person on the conditions of service (e.g., to be dry for one week prior to alcohol treatment).
2. Housing/homeless issues	9	35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to homeless outreach and shelters.
3. Domestic violence/abuse	6	23%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to women's programs. • Make reports to the police or RCMP. • Obtain cell phones for safety.
4. Lack of transportation/physical isolation	4	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Help set up transportation. • Do service by phone.

Justice navigators were asked the degree to which they feel the CP program is reaching its target populations. As shown in table 16, the response is primarily positive. On the negative side, several justice navigators mentioned that there had been several turnovers in the position before they assumed the role. This had meant the target population was either unaware of the service, or unclear whether it still existed. Another justice navigator said that a significant problem is that she serves a very rural area in which many residents don't have telephones or Internet access, and in which transportation is sparse. This would create a greater demand for the justice navigator to undertake physical outreach involving more significant transportation time and costs.

On the positive side, several justice navigators felt that their CP role works well with the other formal roles they have at the community agency, so that in many cases they're referring people to themselves (or others in their agency). Another was surprised to see how many people in her small community were following her on Facebook. Her presence was larger than she had realized.

Table 16: The degree to which justice navigators feel the program is reaching target populations

Degree to which the population is reached	Frequency	Percentage
Hardly at all	--	--
Only to a small extent	1	4%
Neither to a small or large extent	3	12%
To quite a large extent	9	35%
To a very large extent	13	59%
Total responses	26	
Average rating on a 5-point scale: 4.3		

When asked about the least well-served groups in their area, the two most frequent responses were Indigenous communities and people in rural areas who lack transportation. Regarding the former, several justice navigators emphasized the need to build trust. (“It’s a real trust that needs to be built. When that reputation gets out there, it builds. It is critical in a small community. It’s almost more important to have the right person rather than necessarily the fully knowledgeable person.”) Referring to the latter group, one justice navigator said, “As long as they can phone me and have access to technology to get documents to me, it’s okay.” However, it’s often the most rural who lack the communication technology that’s required. This person mentioned there are huge pockets in her area with no service at all.

When asked how they interpret the CP mandate to offer services in a culturally sensitive and appropriate way, the primary responses were about authenticity: being a good listener, letting the person fully tell their story, meeting them where they’re at, avoiding condescension, clarifying points if unsure what is said. Especially when dealing with a significant Indigenous population, cultural sensitivity also means in some cases locating physically in a band office or Indigenous agency office, having a justice navigator who is Indigenous, and appreciating differences between Indigenous cultures. One justice navigator who deals significantly with immigrant workers also speaks Farsi, and another Punjabi.

As shown in table 17, most justice navigators feel that digitization of materials is a challenge for individuals they serve. They said that many of the people they help don’t have a computer. Frequently, they don’t have a data plan. In a few locations, Wi-Fi access is unreliable or non-existent. Many seniors are unaccustomed to extensive computer usage, and other people are challenged in terms of literacy. In these cases, the justice navigator usually offers to meet them at the office or another setting where they can use a computer. Justice navigators have also said that this is preferable as you can walk through forms

together. One setting offers inexpensive computers and a computer class in some cases. Apart from these situations, there are also some people who have Wi-Fi and can manage to navigate documents with assistance from a justice navigator by telephone.

Table 17: The degree to which justice navigators feel that digitization of materials is a challenge for individuals

Degree to which digitization of materials is a challenge	Frequency	Percentage
1. Not a challenge at all	1	4%
2. Not much of a challenge	3	11%
3. Neither a major nor minor challenge	4	15%
4. Fairly significant challenge	12	44%
5. Very severe challenge	7	26%
Total responses	27	
Average rating on a 5-point scale: 3.8		

Twelve of the justice navigators had no suggestions for improving the CP program, and they expressed pleasure at being part of the program. Individual suggestions by other justice navigators for improvements included:

- Make a vehicle available in a remote area with significant distances so justice navigators can better serve people who lack transportation.
- Ensure publications are up to date (e.g., *Tenant Survival Guide*, or create a new guide).
- Create a CP location in central BC west of 100 Mile.
- Create a program in Burnaby and/or New Westminister.
- Give more hours, especially where travel would extend the reach more effectively in remote communities.
- Give justice navigators a raise.
- Develop a video of a justice navigator helping a person with a form or some legal issue.
- Be flexible about how a justice navigator serves different communities. No one-size-fits-all.
- Retain in-person province-wide conferences.
- Create more resources for people with learning disabilities, using simpler, point-form explanations.
- Create individual access for justice navigators to a lawyer for a summary legal opinion on an issue.

- ▶ Have a laptop that can be made available at an agency so a person can come to the agency to scan or print documents when a justice navigator is working from home.

5.2 THE AGENCIES' PERCEPTIONS ON THE DEGREE TO WHICH TARGET POPULATIONS ARE BEING SERVED

In the first online questionnaire for agencies, respondents were asked whether there are communities or groups of individuals in their geographical area that still lack effective access to legal information or assistance, or for whom digital access is a problem, and for whom increased outreach would be helpful. Even though these were areas served by justice navigators, 83% of respondents answered yes, that increased outreach would still be helpful. They identified a range of primary groups still in need, including rural residents and/or persons from outlying communities lacking transportation, low-income individuals, seniors, women fleeing domestic violence, individuals with disabilities and/or mental health issues, Indigenous individuals, 2SLGBTQ+, and persons in criminal court.

The following are a few examples of these different groups and some suggestions about how they can best be served. In general, they speak of social, geographical, digital literacy, and connectivity challenges:

- ▶ "We have a significant senior population that either has no computer access or very limited internet connectivity."
- ▶ "Much of our rural and remote areas have limited connectivity, or lack of technological skills. They would be best served through outreach by more traditional means — newspaper ads, posters, and pamphlets in the usual places. Having advocates like the Advocacy Centre are incredibly helpful as well."
- ▶ "Some people do not have access to transportation or getting to the building. Having this position as an outreach position too would be ideal, to be able to meet the person where they are at."
- ▶ "There is a striking deficit in the ability for marginalized folks (homeless, senior, Indigenous, developmentally delayed, disabled, deaf, people in psychosis) to access legal services due to not having the resource (i.e., no phone, no computer, no internet, inconsistent Wi-Fi, no phone minutes) [or] the knowledge of how to use such resources or the capacity to use such things."
- ▶ "Indigenous, Homeless, Low-income population. Anyone without internet access."
- ▶ "The population has typically been impacted by trauma and need a support person to help them connect and navigate the system."

Selected recommendations include the following. All were offered while at the same time expressing appreciation for the existing service:

- “A service that provides quick guidance to individuals who do not qualify for legal aid for various reasons, or a sliding scale option would be beneficial, e.g., a person may own their own home, but since buying, has gone on WC [workers’ compensation] or has retired, thus leaving them with limited income.”
- “The hours could be increased?”
- “This position currently covers too big of a geographical area to truly meet the lived experience of community members to be served. The position requires more hours for sure.”
- “The justice navigator serves our jurisdiction well and we would like to see her at court as often as possible.”
- “In-person drop-in services to assist individuals who have no fixed address and no telephone.”

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section briefly summarizes the main conclusions of this report and provides recommendations on how to deliver the CP program in the coming years.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the program is very well delivered. Feedback from people and agencies about the assistance offered by the justice navigators is consistently positive. The justice navigators in turn feel they're well supported by the two community engagement coordinators. The recommendations from the 2013 evaluation report have been substantially implemented.

Conclusions related to the five evaluation objectives discussed in sections 1 to 5 are summarized below.

Awareness of PLEI resources

- ▶ Orders of PLEI materials since 2013 show a peak in 2014/15, followed by fluctuations and then a sharp decline with the start of COVID-19 in 2020/21.
- ▶ The most frequently ordered materials relate to family and abuse matters.
- ▶ PLEI is generally seen as a supplement to (rather than a replacement for) direct contact with a person who can give people guidance in sorting out their legal issues. Thus it's anticipated that the number of orders will remain constant (except when the CP program expands into new communities or there are significant new titles, which could increase PLEI orders).
- ▶ The demand for hard-copy materials by the people the CP is targeting will likely continue to exceed the demand for digital materials.

Awareness and use of intake services

- ▶ Annual overall numbers of legal aid applications have remained relatively constant in the CP communities since 2014. The highest ratios of applications to population tend to be in CP areas with smaller populations, while the lowest are in higher population communities.
- ▶ Family law matters are the most frequent category for which justice navigators have been asked to provide help.
- ▶ Assistance by justice navigators doesn't necessarily result in a legal aid application. A large part of the justice navigator's service is to help individuals sort out where they need to go, gather materials, and/or help them complete forms.

- Overall, people have expressed high levels of satisfaction with the assistance they've received from the justice navigators. The justice navigators are seen as highly culturally sensitive and compassionate service-providers.

The capacity of justice navigators to identify and respond to individuals with legal issues

- The legal, social, and personal issues involved in matters brought to the justice navigators are complex and often require considerable sensitivity to emotional trauma.
- Much of the justice navigator's task is to help individuals assemble the necessary documents to pursue legal support or social/financial support or benefits, or to advance their situation in some way. Many individuals are often digitally challenged, lack computers and Wi-Fi access, and sometimes lack transportation or live far from the justice navigator's office.
- These situations may require the justice navigator to set boundaries in terms of the extent of service.
- Thoughtful insights expressed by justice navigators in section 3.4 about what is involved in being effective connectors, combined with their very positive ratings in section 4.2 of the training they've received, suggest that they have a strong capacity to respond to people with complex and sensitive issues.

Satisfaction with training and support

- Although overall satisfaction with training is very high, there is divided opinion on whether, post-COVID-19, it will still be necessary to meet at annual conferences in Vancouver and Richmond, or whether virtual training (which is ongoing) is a more convenient and cost-effective substitute. The annual conferences have a limited number of topics that can be covered, but they offer one-on-one time for justice navigators to connect in person. A virtual training schedule allows for more sessions on a variety of topics over time, but attendance by a majority of justice navigators for any given session is problematic. There is a diversity of suggestions by justice navigators for future training content.

The degree to which the CP program is reaching target populations

- A significant majority of the justice navigators feel the program is reaching target populations. Nevertheless, personal traumas and incapacities, the challenge of using digitized materials, a lack of computers and/or Wi-Fi, and a lack of transportation are significant problems for many individuals in these populations. These issues will require ongoing consideration and adjustments in delivery of the program. The possibility of additional CP sites should also be considered.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations in relation to the five subject areas of this report.

Creating awareness of PLEI resources

- 1 Encourage justice navigators periodically to use Facebook to advertise specific publications or new PLEI materials they may feel are relevant to the people they serve.
- 2 Encourage all organizations in which a justice navigator is based to mention the Community Partners program on their websites.
- 3 Produce a short video involving two or three justice navigators in the production of a short video about the service that Community Partners provides. The video could be used by justice navigators (in their communications with people) or added to websites of organizations in which they work.
- 4 Create simple flow charts clarifying where peoples can access other services related to social/legal matters frequently brought to justice navigators (e.g., housing or income-related government services). This may also be useful to those in communities not served by the CP program.

Intake

Recommendations on intake services are related closely to how to increase the justice navigators' overall capacity. See the next section.

Supporting the justice navigators' capacity to respond to individuals with legal issues

- 1 Adjust the number of paid hours of service for justice navigators in some locations, especially if they need to travel a significant distance to an Indigenous reserve or a geographically remote community in their service area.
- 2 Consider making gas cards available to justice navigators in some large service areas that can be offered to people who need to travel longer distances to meet the justice navigator.
- 3 Ask new justice navigators if they'd like to be paired with more experienced justice navigator "mentors" with whom they can connect as needed. The mentor would preferably be in a CP area with similar characteristics. If this type of support is desired, consider slight adjustments in hours of pay for both the mentor and the learner. Another similar suggestion is to establish one or two regional or "comparable community" groups (e.g., in the north) who can discuss common problems.

Training and support

- 1 Continue the current approach of virtual training in the coming year, but formally poll the justice navigators about the mode of delivery they'd prefer and the topics they'd like covered in future years.

Reaching the target population

- 1 As per the recommendation in "Supporting the justice navigators' capacity to respond" above, add more hours to paid CP work if it enables more effective outreach to smaller communities in the service area.
- 2 Create a CP location in central BC west of 100 Mile House. Even though there is a CP location in Hazelton, we'd also recommend a location in Prince Rupert. There was no recommendation to this effect from a justice navigator, but it's a logical interpretation of the CP mandate to extend the reach to unserved communities.

One justice navigator recommended creating a location in Burnaby or New Westminister. Given the decision not to continue with the Atira service in Vancouver, we feel it wouldn't be consistent to locate in either of these communities.

APPENDIXES

HELPING PEOPLE NAVIGATE THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

APPENDIX 1: THE DELIVERABLES LISTED IN THE CONTRACT WITH COMMUNITY PARTNERS

In LABC's contract with a Community Partner, the deliverables are listed in a schedule as follows.

As per the CP contract with Legal Aid BC, the services are as follows:

- 1 Advertise to members of the community within the Service Area the nature and availability of the Services.
- 2 Maintain and distribute a current supply of LSS* and other public legal education and information (PLEI) materials that are accessible to the public at locations providing intake services, including courthouses, and at agencies providing service to low-income clients.
- 3 Help people to contact LSS by phone and to find PLEI materials on the computer.
- 4 Refer and assist people to apply for legal aid representation through LSS intake services over the phone, or by other means including but not limited to LSS Local Agents.
- 5 Refer and assist people in using the LSS website, the Family Law website, Clicklaw, and other websites and PLEI material that may help them to resolve their problems.
- 6 Refer people to individuals, agencies, or other sources that may help them to resolve their problems, including but not limited to legal advice and advocacy services provided by LSS or other service providers.
- 7 Participate in LSS-sponsored conferences and community forums or training events, and other relevant community-based conferences and events to promote the Services.
- 8 Promote and provide law-related community development and/or public legal education activities and information for advocates, Aboriginal and other community stakeholders, and the general public.
- 9 Liaise with community groups, organizations, and intermediaries to improve awareness of LSS intake services and PLEI materials.
- 10 Report to LSS as required on all activities and services.
- 11 Perform such other functions reasonably related to the above.

**Legal Services Society, the legal name of Legal Aid BC.*

APPENDIX 2: FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE 2013 EVALUATION REPORT

Recommendation #1 — CP locations: “Consider strategies for expanding the network of services in a manner that will service as many small communities as possible. This may include placing CP organizations in rural/remote communities that can provide support to a network of smaller local communities in their region.”

Actions taken:

- The gaps noted in the Kootenays and the far northern regions of the province were addressed, with a new CP in Cranbrook (located in East Kootenay) and Port Hardy/Alert Bay (located on the north end of Vancouver Island, where there are no other legal aid services).
- All new contracts added in 2014/15 were with agencies that had a support network to reach smaller communities in their region.

Recommendation #2 — Enhancing outreach: “Hold a consultation with CPs regarding new outreach materials and support for developing new outreach strategies to people and other organizations in their communities. This may include webinars that bring CPs together to brainstorm workshop topics/ materials, to discuss experiences with outreach and share tips and resources. CPs will have ideas about framing the language on the cards and posters to minimize any chances for confusion.”

Actions taken:

- Since late 2016, webinars are hosted every month (for the most part) through WebEx for training and discussion (provided by the community engagement coordinator or other LABC staff).
- Regular emails are sent to communicate LABC updates (e.g., publication releases/revisions, LABC news), and CPs continue to be invited to regional conferences held in their area.
- CPs are invited to attend regional conferences in their area to connect with other service organizations. The community engagement coordinator also supports them through in-person site visits (as needed or in conjunction with regional conferences) to provide specific training to CPs and to connect them (plus their agency) with other LABC services in their community.

- Site-specific promotional materials are provided multiple times per year to help CPs promote legal aid services to their community.
- One-on-one webinars are also held to provide more specific training to CPs (topics include CP program orientation, LABC services and resources, etc.).

Recommendation #3 — Administrative requirements: “Re-design the data collection form in consultation with partners and LSS program stakeholders (CP coordinator, manager and LSS’s Policy and Planning department) to ensure program reporting meets the needs of all. | Engage in a review of the purpose and objectives for providing webinars and consider whether any of the CP suggestions are feasible. Once review is complete, consult with CPs to develop an approach that enhances the benefits of these resources.”

Actions taken:

- In 2014, the monthly report was redesigned with feedback from the community engagement coordinator, the manager of the Community and Publishing Services department, and the Policy and Planning department. In 2015, a data-tracking sheet was developed to help CPs collect relevant data for reporting. (Note: Since the 2017/18 fiscal year, reporting is completed through Simple Survey rather than Fluid Surveys.)
- To address the concern that CPs can’t all attend the same webinars because of their different work schedules, webinars are held on different days and throughout the year instead of on a fixed day of the week, so CPs can attend at least some. Webinars rotate between Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday at different times (9 a.m., 11 a.m., or 3 p.m.). As well, webinars can be recorded and reviewed at a different time.

Recommendation #4 — Enhancing resources: “Consider options for maximizing the financial efficiency across the community partners. This may include putting more resources in communities where demand for services is higher or growing.”

Actions taken:

- Budget guidelines were developed in 2017, and all CPs were asked to have no more than 10% of the CP budget be allocated for administrative expenses so that the majority of the budget goes toward service delivery costs (e.g., salaries and benefits of CP staff, travel expenses, direct service operating costs, staff training). The guidelines were adopted from a version of the Law Foundation of BC policy with respect to administrative versus program costs.

- ▶ A one-time grant was given out in 2017 to support technology needs, enhance service delivery, provide training for staff, increase community engagement, or provide public legal education.

Recommendation #5 — Ongoing program monitoring: “Continue monitoring the referral rates for CP communities annually to assess this question.”

Action taken:

- ▶ Questions are asked in the monthly reports to gather referral rates.

APPENDIX 3: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR JUSTICE NAVIGATORS

A BACKGROUND

- 1 Name of respondent _____
- 2 Contact telephone number _____
- 3 Community in which the justice navigator is located _____
- 4 Geographic area served _____
- 5 Since what year has justice navigator been in this role at the agency he/she works for? (from CP data) _____
- 6 Trend in overall PLEI orders since 2013 (from publications data)

B INTERVIEW

- 1 Awareness of and demand for PLEI resources in the CP service area
 - a) How would you describe changes you have seen in the demand for PLEI resources since you have been a justice navigator, in terms of:
 - i) overall volume (more PLEI demand? Less demand? No change?)
 - ii) in hard-copy publications versus online (website) information sources (is one of these formats becoming more frequently requested?)
 - iii) area of law for which there are requests
 - iv) the sectors from which requests are coming from (e.g., outlying areas? Males or females? Indigenous, Afro-Canadian, immigrant, LGBTQ, or other populations?)
 - v) any other changes?
 - b) To what do you attribute these changes in demand that you have described? (e.g., outreach you have conducted? Changes in the makeup of the communities you serve? COVID-19? Economic or social changes?)
 - c) Are there differences in any of these aspects of demand, depending on the communities to which you conduct outreach?
 - d) What sources of PLEI exist in the communities that you serve, to which you can and most frequently do refer people? (E.g., libraries, advocacy centres, social agencies.)

- e) What outreach do you undertake to communicate information to agencies about new or existing sources of PLEI (either hard-copy or online websites)?
 - f) In agencies with multiple services, do you go to each service, or rely on the overall agency to distribute information?
 - g) Is there much staff turnover in these agencies, and if so, how do you deal with it?
- 2 Awareness of and demand for intake services in the CP service area
- a) How would you describe changes you have seen in the demand for legal aid intake services since you have been a justice navigator, in terms of:
 - i) overall volume (more demand? Less demand? No change?)
 - ii) area of law for which there are requests?
 - iii) the sectors from which requests are coming from (e.g., outlying areas? Males or females? Indigenous, Afro-Canadian, immigrant, LGBTQ, or other populations?)
 - iv) any other changes?
 - b) To what do you attribute these changes in demand that you have described? (e.g., outreach you have conducted? Changes in the makeup of the communities that you serve? COVID-19? Economic or social changes?)
 - c) Are there differences in any of these aspects of demand, depending on the communities to which you conduct outreach?
 - d) Is the outreach you undertake to describe intake services done in the same way as you described for PLEI services (see 1e)?
- 3 Your capacity to respond to individuals with legal issues
- a) Your Community Partnership contract outlines 11 deliverables as part of your contract. Please describe areas in which your capacity to deliver has changed (either increased or decreased), and the degree to which you are being supported in providing those deliverables. (INTERVIEWER: Have the deliverables list available, or send it to the justice navigator in advance.)
 - b) Can you give examples where you feel you have been particularly effective? (*Note: May be addressed through most significant change stories or focus group.*)
 - c) What are the most significant challenges or limitations that you have faced in serving individuals with legal issues?
 - d) What training sessions have you completed to date?
 - e) How satisfied are you with the training you have received? (1 = not satisfied at all, 2 = not very satisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = quite satisfied 5 = very satisfied)

- f) What do you feel should be the priority areas for further training or repeat training?
- g) How significantly has COVID affected your ability to respond to individuals with legal issues? (1 = not at all, 2 = to a minor degree, 3 = neither a lot nor a little, 4 = quite significantly, 5 = very significantly)
- h) *(If applicable)* Please describe in what way COVID has impacted your ability to respond.
- i) Would you like to have more connection with other justice navigators? If so, for what purpose, by what means, and with justice navigators in what types of communities?
- j) Please rate the following in terms of their helpfulness to your work as a justice navigator. Then indicate how they could be improved or be made more helpful.

Area rated	Rating: 1 = not helpful at all; 2 = not very helpful; 3 = neither helpful nor unhelpful; 4 = quite helpful; 5 = very helpful	Ways to improve this area
Annual community partner conference		
Training videos		
Indigenous cultural competency training		
Outreach community visits by community engagement coordinators		

- 4 Your capacity to respond to individuals with related non-legal issues
 - a) What problems do you frequently encounter with people you serve that are not strictly legal, but may nonetheless impact their legal issues?
 - b) What types of referrals to agencies do you make in these cases?
 - c) What factors affect your capacity to make such referrals? (e.g., low availability of resources in your area, your own knowledge of resources, your time availability)

5 Degree to which the program is reaching target populations

- a) Overall, to what extent is the program reaching the target populations in your area (rural, remote, culturally isolated, and Indigenous communities)?
(1 = hardly at all, 2 = only to a small extent 3 = neither to a small nor large extent, 4 = to quite a large extent, 5 = to a very large extent)
- b) Which of the target populations is least well served?
- c) In practical terms, how do you interpret the CP mandate to offer services in a culturally sensitive and appropriate way? What does this mean to you, and how do you carry out this mandate in practice?
- d) Is digitization of materials and their delivery through technology a challenge for individuals needing access to legal information in any of the communities you serve? If so, to what degree, and how do you deal with this challenge?
(1 = technology is a very severe challenge, 2 = technology is a fairly significant challenge, 3 = technology is neither a major nor minor challenge, 4 = technology is not much of a challenge, 5 = technology is not a challenge at all).
Rating = _____

How to deal with this challenge:

- e) How could a restructuring of your justice navigator role or outreach to locations result in more effective service to these populations?

6 Recommendations

Do you have any other comments or recommendations you would like to make to improve the CP program?

APPENDIX 4: TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AGENCIES

A BACKGROUND

- 1 Name of respondent _____
- 2 Contact telephone number _____
- 3 Name of agency _____
- 4 Community in which agency is located _____
- 5 Geographic area served _____
- 6 People you primarily help _____
- 7 Indigenous agency or agency who primarily serves Indigenous people?
Yes ____ No ____
- 8 Types of services offered _____
- 9 Size of agency (approximate number of staff) _____

B INTERVIEW

- 1 Outreach by justice navigator:

Please tell me when and how you first learned of the justice navigator service, and the result of that contact.

 - a) when _____
 - b) how? (Did you or the justice navigator first make the contact; was it in person?)
 - c) results (i.e., what did you learn in terms of resources or procedures from the contact(s)? Explore info about applying to Legal Aid, new info about LABC publications, new info about LABC websites.)
 - d) *(If agency identified as Indigenous or primarily serves Indigenous people in A7)*
Do you feel the justice navigator has provided you, your agency, or people you serve with culturally appropriate information? 1 = not at all, 2 = not usually, 3 = neither yes nor no, 4 = yes, usually, 5 = yes, always
Reason for rating: _____

2 Contacts initiated by agency:

How frequently have you or your agency initiated contact with the justice navigator since that time (i.e., in 1a), and for what purposes?

a) frequency _____

b) purposes (circle all that apply):

1 Obtain law-related publications for the agency or for an individual
(if possible, specify type)

2 For someone who needed help to apply for Legal Aid or contact Legal
Aid BC for another reason

3 Other (please specify) _____

3 Agency's use of services:

a) In general, when assisting someone with identifying resources that might be helpful, do you just mention these services, or actively connect them to these services yourself or through someone in your agency, or do you refer them to the justice navigator for help?

1 Just mention the services

2 Actively connect people to the services myself or within my agency

3 Refer them to the justice navigator for help

4 Other (specify _____)

b) How frequently have you undertaken the following services (either by helping the person yourself, or by referring them to the justice navigator)? (Answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = never, 2 = not very frequently, 3 = neither frequently nor infrequently, 4 = quite frequently 5 = very frequently)

1 Ordering hard-copy law-related publications through Legal Aid BC.
Rating: _____

2 Assisting the person to use one or more of the four LABC websites.
Rating: _____

3 Referring individuals to services other than LABC for legal information.
(e.g., Clicklaw, People's Law School, Access Pro Bono, Law Foundation
Advocate) Rating: _____

4 Referring individuals to Legal Aid BC. (either to get Legal Aid or obtain
information about eligibility) Rating: _____

c) Do you ever scan the Legal Aid BC site (or some other site) or subscribe to Legal Aid BC's blog called "The Factum" to see if there are new publications that could help someone with a particular legal issue?) (Circle any that apply)

1 Yes, from Legal Aid BC

2 Usually use other sites

3 No, I don't scan any sites for this purpose

(If yes, which sites do you use most frequently? _____)

d) (If said "Yes, from Legal Aid BC" in question 3c) To which of the following Legal Aid websites have you referred people? (Answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = never, 2 = not very frequently, 3 = neither frequently nor infrequently, 4 = quite frequently, 5 = very frequently)

Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC ____

Family Law in BC ____

Legal Aid BC ____

MyLawBC ____

4 Overall impact of justice navigator:

a) Overall, how would you rate the impact of the justice navigator service in terms of informing your community about the availability of legal information and assistance? (1 = no impact, 2 = not much impact, 3 = neither a lot nor a little impact, 4 = a fair amount of impact, 5 = a lot of impact)

Rating: _____

b) Reason for rating: _____

c) Has there been a change in the justice navigator in your community, or has it always been the same person? 1. Same person 2. Person has changed 3. Don't know

d) (If identified as Indigenous agency in A7) To what degree do you feel that the justice navigator in your community has helped increase Indigenous people's access to legal aid services? (1 = not at all, 2 = not much, 3 = neither a lot nor a little, 4 = quite a lot, 5 = a lot)

Reason for answer: _____

5 Recommendations:

a) Do you feel there are communities or groups of individuals in your geographic area that presently lack effective access to legal information or assistance, or for whom digital access is a problem, and for whom increased outreach would be helpful?

1. No 2. Yes

b) *(If yes to 5a)* What type of population has these needs, and in which geographic area(s)?

c) *(If yes to 5a)* How can this best be done?

d) Do you have any other comments or recommendations to make about the service of the justice navigator?

APPENDIX 5: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE 1 FOR AGENCIES

This questionnaire was for agencies in BC who may have referred people to a Community Partner.

- 1 Name of agency _____
- 2 Community in which your agency is located _____
- 3 Is your agency an Indigenous agency (or one that primarily serves Indigenous people)?
Yes ___ No ___
- 4 Types of services your agency offers _____
- 5 How frequently do you provide the following justice-related services, and in what way do you provide the service?

Type of service	Frequency 1. never 2. not very frequently 3. neither frequently nor infrequently 4. quite frequently 5. very frequently	How you provide the service 1. Just mention the service 2. Actively connect people to the service myself or within my agency 3. Refer them to the justice navigator for help
a) Ordering law-related publications through Legal Aid BC		
b) Referring individuals to Legal Aid BC		
c) Assisting someone to use one or more of the four LABC websites.		
d) Referring individuals to services other than LABC for legal information (e.g., Clicklaw, People’s Law School, Access Pro Bono, Law Foundation Advocate)		

- 6 (If applicable) To which of the following Legal Aid websites have you referred people? (Answer on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = never, 2 = not very frequently, 3 = neither frequently nor infrequently, 4 = quite frequently, 5 = very frequently)

Aboriginal Legal Aid in BC ____

Family Law in BC ____

Legal Aid BC ____

MyLawBC ____

- 7 How would you rate the impact of the justice navigator service in terms of informing your community about the availability of legal information and assistance? (1 = no impact, 2 = not much impact, 3 = neither a lot nor a little impact, 4 = a fair amount of impact, 5 = a lot of impact)

Rating: ____

Reason for rating: _____

- 8 a) Do you feel there are communities or groups of individuals in your geographic area that lack effective access to legal information or assistance, or for whom digital access is a problem, and for whom increased outreach would be helpful?

1. No 2. Yes

- b) (If yes to 8a) What type of population has these needs, and how can they best be served?

- 9 Do you have any other comments or recommendations to make about the service of the justice navigator?

APPENDIX 6: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE 2 FOR AGENCIES

This questionnaire directed to agencies begins with information about the Community Partners program.

Legal Aid BC funds a program called Community Partners that provides a “justice navigator” service through a variety of agencies in the province. The role of the justice navigator is both to assist individuals to connect with Legal Aid, and/or to provide people with written or online legal materials. The locations of the 26 Community Partners justice navigator services in the province can be found at this link:

legalaid.bc.ca/legal_aid/communityPartners

The role of this brief survey is to get feedback from agencies in BC who might have referred people to the Community Partners justice navigator service.

- 1 Name of your agency _____
- 2 Is your agency an Indigenous agency (or one that primarily serves Indigenous people)? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___
- 3 Community in which your agency is located _____
- 4 Have you referred people to the Community Partners justice navigator service in your community or in a location near you? 1. No ___ 2. Yes ___
 - a) (If yes) For what purpose? (Please tick any that apply)
 - To get a referral to a legal aid or private lawyer
 - To get legal materials (pamphlets, booklets) or be helped on a legal website
 - To be referred to services other than Legal Aid BC for legal information
 - Other (please specify _____)
- 5 How would you rate the impact of the justice navigator service in terms of informing your community about the availability of legal information and assistance? (1 = no impact, 2 = not much impact, 3 = neither a lot nor a little impact, 4 = a fair amount of impact, 5 = a lot of impact)

(If you feel you can't assess the impact, just leave the rating blank.)
Rating: ___ Reason for rating: _____
- 6 Do you have any other comments or recommendations to make about the service of the justice navigator?

APPENDIX 7: TELEPHONE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USERS

A BACKGROUND

- 1 Name of service user _____
- 2 Contact telephone number _____
- 3 Best day of week and time to call _____
- 4 Community _____
- 5 Date of contact with justice navigator service _____
- 6 Name of justice navigator _____
- 7 Services offered
 - a) helping to contact LABC by phone 1. Y ___ 2. N ___
 - b) assisting user to apply for legal aid representation 1. Y ___ 2. N ___
 - c) helping to find PLEI materials or use websites on the computer
1. Y ___ 2. N ___
 - d) referring people to individuals, agencies, or other sources to help them resolve their problems 1. Y ___ 2. N ___
 - e) other 1. Y ___ 2. N ___ (if "yes," specify)
- 8 Does user identify as Indigenous?
1. Y ___ 2. N ___ 3. Declined to answer ___ 4. Didn't ask ___

B INTERVIEW

Note to interviewer: Explain, if necessary, that the person from whom they received service is referred to as the "justice navigator" in this interview. You may also use the justice navigator's actual name (see A6).

- 1 How did you find out about the justice navigator service provided by (name of CP agency)? (INTERVIEWER: Clarify pathway, e.g., media, posters, another agency, outreach event.)
- 2 What was the reason for your contact, and what did you hope would happen? (INTERVIEWER: Clarify whether user — or somebody he/she knew — had a legal problem, and if so, what it was; or if just needed information and needed help finding it.)

- 3 The notes from the justice navigator said that he/she provided the following services (mention those in A6). Is this what you remember too? Y ___ N ___
If not, describe difference: _____
- 4 Describe any steps you took to follow through on the issues you had, either during or after your contact with the justice navigator (INTERVIEWER: e.g., talked to LABC, applied for legal aid, obtained PLEI materials or online info that were needed, followed through with other agencies that the justice navigator recommended. If possible, identify PLEI materials, websites or agencies involved, and explore how easy it was for the user to access — for technological reasons — understand and make use of the information.)
- 5 What was the outcome of the steps you took? (INTERVIEWER: e.g., describe if got needed info, whether successful in legal aid application, or got assistance from another agency to which they were referred. If they defined themselves as having a problem, did it get resolved, or is it on the way to resolution?)
- 6 Overall, how satisfied were you with the service provided by the justice navigator? (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = somewhat dissatisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = quite satisfied, 5 = very satisfied)
Rating: _____
a) Reason for rating _____
- 7 (*If self-identify as Indigenous in Part A-8*) You identify as an Indigenous person. Do you feel that the justice navigator provided you information in a manner that was sensitive to your culture?
1. Y ___ 2. N ___
a) Can you give me an example of this cultural sensitivity, or lack of it?
b) (*If replied "no" in Q. 7*) In what way might the information he/she provided have been more sensitive to your culture or to you as an Indigenous person?
- 8 The justice navigator's role is to help people by providing legal information and legal resources, and by referring them to legal services. Do you have any other comments or recommendations about how the justice navigator service could be improved to meet this objective?

APPENDIX 8: ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USERS

- 1 Name of your community _____
- 2 Do you identify as Indigenous? 1. Yes ___ 2. No ___ 3. Prefer not to answer ___
- 3 How did you find out about the justice navigator service?
- 4 What services did he/she provide to you, and what was the result for you?

Service provided by justice navigator	Yes or no?	If you received this service, what was the result for you? (Leave blank if you did not receive this service)
a) Helped me to contact Legal Aid BC by phone		Did you get your question answered? _____
b) Helped me apply to receive representation by a legal aid lawyer		Were you successful at getting a lawyer to represent you? _____
c) Helped me to find PLEI materials or use websites on the computer		Did you get the materials you needed? What types of materials or websites? _____ _____
d) Referred me to another agency or resource to help me resolve my problem		Which agency? Did they help you to resolve the problem? _____ _____

- 5 Overall, how satisfied were you with the service provided by the justice navigator? (1 = very dissatisfied, 2 = somewhat dissatisfied, 3 = neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4 = quite satisfied, 5 = very satisfied) Rating: _____
 - a) Reason for your rating _____

- 6 If you identified yourself as Indigenous in question 2, do you feel that the justice navigator provided you information in a manner that was sensitive to your culture?
1. Yes ___ 2. No ___
- a) *(If replied "no" in Q. 6)* In what way might the information he/she provided have been more sensitive to your culture or to you as an Indigenous person?
- 7 The justice navigator's role is to help people by providing legal information and legal resources, and by referring them to legal services. Do you have any recommendations about how the justice navigator service could be improved to meet this objective?

APPENDIX 9: INSTRUCTIONS FOR WRITING THE MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE STORY

The following explanation and instructions about the Most Significant Change story were sent to the justice navigators in January 2021.

WHAT IS MSC?

International Aid Organizations pioneered the *Most Significant Change (MSC)* evaluation approach as a strategy for evaluating grassroots community development initiatives at the local level in developing countries. The purpose of this model is to learn more about program outcomes from the people who are closest to them. This truly participatory research approach gives those delivering and receiving the services an opportunity to identify and define the most significant outcomes for their local communities. This approach offers tremendous learning opportunities for all involved, particularly the funding/ coordinating organization, and is a highly effective means of identifying unintended benefits. The stories and ideas generated from this method can provide rich data that will help us understand more about how the program has been implemented and what the outcomes have been, while also inspiring us to consider the program's potential for the future and areas for improvement.

COMMUNITY PARTNER EVALUATION AND THE MSC APPROACH

Please submit one short story describing the most significant change experienced as a result of the community partner initiative. Please frame your story under one of four predetermined categories. These categories are meant to provide guidance — they are not meant to be rigid, and are deliberately broad, and there is a catchall category. The purpose of this exercise is to hear about the impact as the communities and organizations see them.

The story should respond to the question: "What was the most significant change to ____ as a result of the Community Partnership initiative?"

The domains of change are:

- 1 People's awareness of and access to legal aid
- 2 The capacity of your community to help people in need of legal assistance
- 3 Your organization's ability to fulfill its mandate, or meet the needs of the people it serves
- 4 Any other large changes not captured by other domains

Additional questions that may help frame your story:

- ▶ Why do you think this difference is important?
- ▶ Why was this story significant for you?

Your story doesn't need to be long. Please write something that is reflective of the change you would like to tell us about.