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Educating Legislators About Legal Aid

By Carol A. Bergman, Vice President, Government Relations & Public Affairs
Legal Services Corporation

Legislation to create the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) was signed into law by President Nixon in 1974, and federal funding for civil legal aid has enjoyed bipartisan support ever since. Taking the time to educate federal and state legislators about our work is central to ensuring that they understand how tax dollars are being spent in their communities.

We have organized workshops at national conferences over the past few years to help all legal aid programs learn different ways to reach out to legislators to explain the value of the constituent services provided, so that legislators see legal aid programs as the resources they are.

LSC grantees are prohibited from lobbying — that is, from contacting legislators to seek support for LSC funding. Grassroots lobbying is also prohibited, making it illegal for LSC grantees to ask others to contact legislators and seek their support for LSC funding.

LSC grantees are permitted, however, to educate Members of Congress, congressional staff, and the public about the role of civil legal aid in their communities. In workshops at the annual NLADA conference and at the Equal Justice Conference, we have encouraged people to reach out to their congressional Representatives and Senators and invite them to see the programs that serve their districts and states and learn about the work being done on behalf of their constituents.

Constituents often call upon their legislators for help when veterans’ or other benefits are denied, when they are victims of consumer fraud, or when a natural disaster occurs. Referring eligible constituents to legal aid is an important service. What follows is a basic primer on setting up meetings with Members of Congress and their staff, and several examples of what that can look like in action in two different states: Wisconsin and Ohio. Although the focus here is on federal legislators, the guidance is equally applicable to elected officials at the state level.

Nuts and Bolts

Scheduling meetings with Members of Congress and congressional staff can be labor-intensive — but it is well worth the effort. Preparation is key, as you will see from some of the stories below, to ensure that the meetings are as productive as possible.

Whom to meet with: LSC grantees service areas do not necessarily track with congressional districts. As a result, your service area may touch multiple congressional districts. It is important to reach out to all legislators representing your service area. Civil legal aid enjoys bipartisan support in Congress, and all Members care about providing good constituent service. Personal relationships can be critical to helping legislators understand our work.

And don’t forget about newly elected Members. You can be a great asset to a new legislator just learning the job.

Where to meet: The first decision is where to meet: in the district or in Washington. There are many advantages to meeting legislators in their districts. First of all, it is easier and less expensive for you — you live there. Second, legislators are often much more accessible in their districts. You just need to pay attention
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to the congressional calendar, which is available from the Speaker’s office in the House and from the Majority Leader’s office in the Senate. Legislators have regularly scheduled work periods around most federal holidays, in addition to often being in the district on Friday or Monday. And thirdly, it is the caseworkers in the congressional office in the district who are likely to be most familiar with the work of legal services. That is because constituent calls about problems and challenges that people are facing are directed to the caseworkers, so they are apt to be a sympathetic ear.

Another option is to invite legislators and their staff to come visit your program. As you will see from the stories below, this can be a wonderful opportunity to showcase the work you do on behalf of their constituents.

Of course you can also go to Washington and set up meetings with legislators there. That can be more complicated; it is easier to start with meetings in the district and then decide if a trip to Washington would be a good use of your time and budget.

How to ask: It can be intimidating to request a meeting with a Member of Congress, so you want to prepare and be very clear about your ask. Regardless of whether the meeting is in the District or in Washington, the first step is to call the scheduler and explain that you want a meeting. You will be asked the purpose of the meeting, how much time you need, and the names of the people who will be coming — so you need to be prepared. You may also be asked to put the request in writing; every congressional office does things differently.

What if the legislator is not available? It is just as important to meet with the staff! Sometimes that is the best way to start a relationship with your Member of Congress or Senator. In the district office, ask to meet with the caseworker if you cannot set up a meeting with the legislator; in Washington ask to meet with the legislative director.

You should agree to meet with whomever the legislator’s office wants you to meet with. That’s an important foot in the door to begin the conversation.

Preparation: Do your homework! Go to the Member’s website and review his/her priorities. Look for points of connection — where did the Member go to school, what was his/her profession before entering Congress, did s/he play sports? As in any social situation with people you don’t know, small talk helps. You should also research the Member’s voting history.

Be sure you know whether or not the legislator and the staff are lawyers. It is a very different conversation when you have to begin with an explanation of the difference between civil and criminal law; many people without a legal background are unaware that there is no right to counsel in a civil case.

Come prepared with data: Have information about the clients you serve, the kinds of cases your program handles, and the eligible poverty population in the Member’s district. Focus on the issues likely to be of greatest interest to the Member, such as veterans, seniors, children, domestic violence, natural disasters, pro bono. Bring a few write-ups of client success stories with you that you can speak to knowledgeably and/or leave behind for them to read.

Even though you may be scheduled to meet for thirty minutes, you may have only ten. And that may be walking with the legislator en route to another meeting; this often happens in Washington, but may happen in the district as well if it is a busy day. So be sure you can give your elevator speech without notes, and that you have your topline information ready to go. Everything else should be backup.

Practice: Taking the time to prepare who is going to say what will increase your confidence and allow you to make your presentation concisely.

Leave-behind: Always have one to three pages to leave behind with the staff. This allows you to back up your conversation and provide more detail than the time allowed.

Follow up: Hopefully you were raised to write thank you notes! If not, it is time to learn. This is an opportunity to respond to any questions and issues that arose during your meeting, and thank the Members and staff for their time.

Have information about the clients you serve, the kinds of cases your program handles, and the eligible poverty population in the Member’s district. Focus on the issues likely to be of greatest interest to the Member, such as veterans, seniors, children, domestic violence, natural disasters, pro bono.
Education in Action: Examples

It is helpful to hear what it actually looks like to educate legislators and their staff. The stories below come from LSC grantees in Ohio and Wisconsin.

Wisconsin
From Vicky Selkowe, Director of Legislative, Rulemaking, and Training Compliance, Legal Action of Wisconsin

Two years ago, as a newly hired Legislative & Compliance Director, I asked our Executive Director, "Have we regularly held meetings with Members of our Congressional delegation to educate them about what we do?" "Nope," he replied. "But we should."

Indeed, we should. Our staff are doing tremendous work helping low-income people access justice. We're providing high-quality civil legal aid to Wisconsin's veterans, survivors of violence, families with children, the elderly, people with disabilities, migrant farmworkers, and others. But we weren't telling one of our largest funders any of this. Nor were we ensuring that they knew how to send their constituents to us for assistance.

So we set out to change all of that. Wisconsin has a Congressional delegation of ten members: six Republicans and four Democrats. In 2015 and again in 2017, we're trying to meet with all of them. In 2015, the first year we had ever attempted educational meetings with our delegation, we met with seven of the 10, and five of those meetings were with the Member of Congress.

Our first meeting with a Member of Congress required considerable staff planning and time. The Member had agreed to come to our office, and we were excited and nervous. We carefully thought through which staff would attend the meeting, who would say what and in what order, what "leave behind" we would prepare to show the Representative our projects and outcomes. But less than five minutes into the meeting, as we walked the Representative through our one-pager showing our total budget, the funding we receive from LSC and from other sources, how many attorneys and offices we have, and, most importantly, our annual outcomes, our nervousness dissipated when the fiscally conservative Representative said, impressed, "Wow, you run a lean shop!" "Yes, we do," we said. "And we're proud of how we steward limited resources to ensure access to justice for so many low-income Wisconsinites."

It is not hard to get meetings with Members of Congress. Start with email requests to their district schedulers (for in-district meetings) and be flexible to accommodate the Member’s busy and unpredictable schedule. Offer to host the meeting at your office. Preparing for the meetings takes time and effort: we found that our staff benefited from considerable time prepping for these meetings, thinking through the best outcomes and client success stories to share, and reviewing LSC compliance practices to ensure that all staff understand the differences between “educating,” which we are allowed to do, and “lobbying,” which we are not. Last fall, we partnered with our state’s Access to Justice Commission to bring Voices for Civil Justice to Wisconsin to help train our staff on how to most effectively talk about our work.

These investments of time and resources have opened up numerous opportunities for better relationships and partnerships with our Congressional delegation. Congressional staff now have a clearer understanding of our services, how to best refer constituents to us, and of our limited resources and all we accomplish with our LSC funds. We continue to build upon these relationships to ensure that our delegation knows of our new programs and initiatives, and that the delegation understands the impact that LSC funding has on our ability to provide high-quality civil legal aid to their constituents across the state.

Ohio
By Colleen Cotter, Executive Director, The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland

Since 2010, The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland has made a concerted effort to educate Members of Congress who represent our service area about our work, and the value that we bring to their constituents. Our efforts have been focused on both the district office and the D.C. office. We make an annual trip to Washington with a board member and sometimes another supporter.

We meet with every member of our delegation or a member of their staff. We also meet with the district staff, prior to our D.C. visit.

This has certainly taken an investment of time, and a bit of money. However, we think that it has paid off, in that our delegation and their staff have a much better
understanding of what we do, and the value we bring to their constituents and to them. During each visit to D.C. we run into a lot of our northeast Ohio colleagues who are doing the same thing. Here are a few examples that illustrate the impact of our meetings and how our D.C. trips work in reality:

- We have had a wide variety of experiences in our meetings. We have met in the hallway with the most junior member of the staff. We have also spent an hour with Members in their offices. And we frequently end up with something different from what we expected. We try to go in expecting anything and prepared for anything. Whomever we meet with, our goal is to make a connection.

- We have been able to maintain contact after our visits. Several Members of Congress have visited our offices in response to our invitation. We also have received invitations to attend the Members’ events in the community. Recently a Member attended a Legal Aid house party, where he observed the impact and support we have in his district.

- We have received many follow-up calls from Congressional staff members. They call us for on-the-ground information about the impact of various laws and regulations, including client stories. For example, one Member of Congress was interested in the impact between being categorized as a contractor instead of an employee. We connected his staff with our attorneys who have expertise in employment law and tax law. They came away with information that was helpful to their work, and they got to experience the Legal Aid Society of Cleveland as experts in the work we do.

- We have also secured four keynote speakers for our annual event as a result of the connections we have made during these visits: Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor, U.S. Representative John Lewis (GA), and Senators Sherrod Brown (OH) and Rob Portman (OH).

- We have had the opportunity to train constituent services staff about the work that we do, and our staff has received training from constituent services staff about how they can help us in our work. We are currently planning a bigger constituent services event, organized by the staff of one Democratic Representative and one Republican Representative. They will invite the constituent services staff of our entire congressional delegation to an event to learn about Legal Aid and the services we provide.

**Conclusion**

As you can see, there is no one way to do this. Some grantees find it helpful to bring a member of their Board of Directors to meetings; others may include a client. Grantees who set up these meetings every year learn what works best for them.

Educating Members of Congress about civil legal aid is critical, and no one is in a better position to help increase their understanding than the folks who work with clients on a daily basis.

---

1. Carol A. Bergman has served at the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) since March 2012 and is responsible for managing LSC’s communications and relationships with Congress, the executive branch, the media, and the general public. Carol has been engaged in federal legislative and policy work for more than twenty-five years. She served as director of legislative affairs for drug policy in the Clinton White House, and as associate counsel for the Committee on Government Operations in the U.S. House of Representatives, under Chairman John Conyers. She has also worked for several non-governmental organizations on a wide range of domestic and international issues that disproportionately impact poor people, including HIV/AIDS, domestic violence, and criminal justice reform.

   Carol has testified before the U.S. Congress, the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and several state legislatures. She is an adjunct professor at George Washington University where she has taught congressional affairs in the Department of Global Health. She has also taught at American University’s Washington College of Law where she was a resident fellow in the Program on Law and Government. She has a B.A. from Hampshire College in Amherst, MA and a J.D. from Golden Gate University School of Law in San Francisco, CA. She is licensed to practice law in Massachusetts. Carol may be reached at bergmanc@lsc.gov.

2. Vicky Selkowe is Legal Action of Wisconsin’s Director of Legislative, Rulemaking, and Training Compliance. She oversees staff compliance with LSC regulations, tracks legislation and rulemaking related to low-income Wisconsinites, and when requested, informs legislators and policymakers on the effects that legislation and regulations will have on Legal Action’s clients and their rights. Vicky has been engaged in policy advocacy and legislative work for more than twenty years in Wisconsin. A Skadden Fellow, Vicky represented low-income clients in employment, housing, and public benefits matters before going on to lead
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statewide anti-poverty policy advocacy efforts. Prior to joining Legal Action in 2014, Vicky served for nearly six years as Chief of Staff to a Wisconsin Legislator, staffing him on the legislature’s budget committee. Vicky earned her Bachelor’s Degree from Beloit College and her law degree from the University of Wisconsin Law School. Vicky may be reached at vss@legalaction.org.

Colleen Cotter is the Executive Director of The Legal Aid Society of Cleveland, serving in that position since 2005. Colleen serves on the Board of Directors of the Saint Luke’s Foundation and the Cleveland Metropolitan Bar Association. She is President of the United Way of Greater Cleveland Council of Agency Executives. She is also a member of the Cleveland Marshall College of Law Visiting Committee Executive Committee and the Cleveland Rape Crisis Center Sing Out! Chorale. She was a member of the Leadership Cleveland Class of 2011 and previously served on the boards of the Ohio Legal Assistance Foundation, the Center for Community Solutions, and the National Legal Aid and Defender Association. She serves on the Legal Services Corporation Legal Needs Advisory Committee and previously served on LSC’s Data Project Advisory Committee and Pro Bono Task Force. Her 2007 speech entitled “Justice and Healthy Communities” was published in Vital Speeches of the Day. She was the 2015 recipient of Cleveland Crain’s In-House Counsel Award, non-profit category.

Colleen previously worked as a consultant to legal aid organizations and their funders. She has also worked for Indiana Legal Services and Pine Tree Legal Assistance in Maine, where she served as a Skadden Fellow. She clerked for the Honorable Cornelia Kennedy of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. She received her JD, summa cum laude, from Indiana University School of Law- Bloomington, and her BA, cum laude, from the University of Notre Dame. Colleen may be reached at colleen.cotter@lasclev.org.
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Strategic Data Analytics
Start Here: Mission/Goals

- **What do you want to achieve for your clients?**

- **Remind yourself of the contents of your:**
  - Strategic plan
  - Mission
  - Priorities
  - Case acceptance guidelines

- **What do you need to know?**
  - What do you want to know?

---

**The Legal Aid Society of Eastern Virginia** is committed to promoting equal application of justice and removing impediments to fairness for the low-income and vulnerable families of eastern Virginia.

**Blue Ridge Legal Services** is committed to eliminating poverty-based inequities in the civil justice system by providing high-quality legal advice and representation to low-income residents of our service area, folks who would otherwise be unable to obtain legal help due to their poverty.

**Southwest Virginia Legal Aid Society**’s mission is to champion equal justice for low-income Virginians and to work to remedy the conditions that burden the low-income community.

**The mission of the Legal Aid Justice Center** to seek equal justice for all by solving clients’ legal problems, strengthening the voices of low-income communities, and rooting out the inequities that keep people in poverty.

**The mission of the Virginia Legal Aid Society** is to resolve serious legal problems of vulnerable people, promote economic and family stability, reduce poverty through effective legal assistance, and to champion equal justice.

**It is the mission of Legal Services of Northern Virginia** to promote justice for a better community by providing civil legal assistance to those facing the loss of a critical need.
Data Questions

Who is eligible?
- How many?
- Demographics?
- Legal problems?

Who requests assistance?
- How many?
- Demographics?

Who do we help?
- How many?
- Demographics?
- Legal problems?
- Staff or pro bono?

How do we help?
- How many at what levels of service?
- Levels of service by demographics?
- Levels of service by legal problem?
- Levels of service by staff or pro bono?

What resources?
- Total hours?
- Total hours by substantive group?
- Total hours by legal problem?
- Total hours by staff or pro bono?

Outcomes?
Data Analysis Framework

For legal aid-specific data analysis ideas and examples

https://daf.lsntap.org

Data Analysis Framework Matrix

- Fundamental, high-level data questions in columns
- Analyzee types are in rows
- The intersecting boxes provide links to detailed sub-questions, descriptions of the analyses, and example analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Who is eligible?</th>
<th>Who requests assistance?</th>
<th>Who do we help?</th>
<th>How do we help?</th>
<th>What resources are required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Snapshot</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Distribution</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Concentration</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Go</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quick Detour: Data Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bad Data</th>
<th>Good Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Misunderstanding of clients’ needs</td>
<td>• Understanding of clients’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ineffective services</td>
<td>• Assess/improve effectiveness &amp; impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inefficiencies</td>
<td>• Assess/improve efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erroneous reporting to funders</td>
<td>• Impress funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stuck in the weeds/can’t see the big picture</td>
<td>• Can see the big picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Celebrate success</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Snapshots

Poverty Rates, 2015

Served by Poverty Level, Cook County, IL, 2015

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 5-Year Estimates, Table S1701; generated by Rachel Perry; using American FactFinder; http://factfinder.census.gov; (April 28, 2017)

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 ACS 1-Year Estimates, Table S1701; generated by Rachel Perry; using American FactFinder; http://factfinder2.census.gov; (29 November 2016), and LAF LegalServer Data.

Strategic Data Analytics
Examples of Comparisons

Legal Aid’s Vulnerable Population Overlap Analysis
2015 Intakes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerable Populations (Total Intakes)</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>Households with Children</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Domestic Violence Victims</th>
<th>Veterans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence Victims</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
Examples of Trends

**Annual Change in Intakes & Area Poverty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Legal Aid Intakes</th>
<th># &lt;125% Poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td></td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes in Levels of Service, 2011 to 2015**

**CONSUMER**

- 2011: 82% (18% Brief, 64% Extended)
- 2015: 79% (21% Brief, 58% Extended)

**HOUSING**

- 2011: 75% (25% Brief, 50% Extended)
- 2015: 57% (43% Brief, 14% Extended)

**FAMILY**

- 2011: 75% (25% Brief, 50% Extended)
- 2015: 69% (31% Brief, 38% Extended)

**PUBLIC BENEFITS**

- 2011: 79% (21% Brief, 58% Extended)
- 2015: 69% (31% Brief, 38% Extended)

Sources:

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
Examples of Spatial Analyses

Percentage of Cases Closed with Extended Service, New Mexico, 2016

Served Case Concentration Among Poverty Population, New Mexico, 2015

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1701; generated by Rachel Perry; using American FactFinder; http://factfinder2.census.gov; (26 April 2017). NMLA Pika data.
What do we need to know to better serve seniors (60+)?

Questions:
- What % of the poverty population are seniors?
- What % of all intakes are seniors?
- What % of all served clients are seniors?

Snapshot Analyses
- External Data:
  - 2015 Poverty Population: 13% seniors
- Internal Data:
  - 2015 Intakes: 15% seniors
  - 2015 Served: 14% seniors

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
How do seniors compare to other vulnerable populations?

Comparison Analyses

Share of Poverty Population, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Share of Poverty Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 years and Over</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty Rate, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Poverty Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 years and Over</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School Graduate</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1701; generated by Rachel Perry; using American FactFinder; http://factfinder2.census.gov; (26 April 2017).
How have seniors’ needs changed over time?

Trend Analyses

**Share of Intakes**

Graph showing the share of intakes over time for different groups:
- 60 Years and Older
- Hispanic
- Native Americans
- Less than High School Graduate

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
Where do senior intakes originate?

Geographic Concentration Analysis

Sources: U.S. Census Bureau; American Community Survey, 2015 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1701; generated by Rachel Perry; using American FactFinder; http://factfinder2.census.gov; (26 April 2017). NMLA Pika data.
Analyses & Findings lead to new Data Questions

- From the analysis of senior data, what jumped out re: DV cases?
  - 37-DV intakes have increased 2.5 times for seniors
  - 37-DV intakes have doubled for non-seniors
What else do we need to know to better serve DV victims?

- Organization prioritizes DV victims
- New DV field provides additional internal data
- No Census data
- Intake Demographics (2016):
  - **Race/Ethnicity:**
    - 58% Hispanic
    - 24% White
    - 9% Native American
  - **Age:**
    - 30% 26-34 years
    - 28% 35-45 years
    - 6% 60 years+
  - **Education:**
    - 14% Less than High School Graduate

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
Are we serving DV Victims at a higher rate than other clients?

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
What level of service do we provide to DV victims?

In 2016, 22% of non-DV clients received extended service.

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
From where do our DV intakes originate?

Source: NMLA Pika Data.
Safety-Related Outcomes

OUTCOMES IN CASES INVOLVING SAFETY ISSUES
Cases Closed with Extended & Brief Service
1/1/2017 to 3/31/2017

Overall Success Rate: 95%
Number of Cases: 206
(All Extended Service cases + Brief Service cases with Outcomes entered)

Total Persons Helped: 505
Adults: 276
Children: 229

Goal: Safety is improved for 95% of clients with safety issues:

Goal 95%
Achieved 95%

Top Legal Problem Codes with Safety Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Divorce / Separation/Annulment</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Private Landlord/Tenant</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Custody / Visitation</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wage Claims and other</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLSA (Fair Labor Standards Act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Collection (Repof/Def/ Garnish)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clients with Safety Outcomes by Age:

- 65+ years: 13.1%
- 55-54 years: 14.5%
- 35-54 years: 44.2%

Clients with Safety Outcomes by Race:

- Black or African American: 10%
- Two or More Races: 3%
- White: 83%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 2%
- Asian: 2%

Clients with Safety Outcomes by Gender:

- Male: 28%
- Female: 72%

Cases with Safety Outcomes by Poverty Ranges:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Below 100% of FPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-125% of FPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-200% of FPL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-250% of FPL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Clients with Safety Outcomes who are Disabled: 23%

% of Clients with Safety Outcomes who are Veterans: 5%

Source: CLSAZ Pika Data.
QUESTIONS?

Rachel J. Perry
Strategic Data Analytics
Rachel.Perry@SDAstrategicdata.com
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I. What is the A2J Lab?

Who we are

• researchers
• at Harvard Law School
• focused on understanding **what works** toward enhancing access to justice

What we do

• conduct rigorous evaluations through **randomized studies**
• adapt lessons and apply methods from other fields to the law
II. What Are RCTs?
Step 1: Define Interventions and Outcomes

• What is the legal problem the program would address?

• What intervention would most likely alleviate the problem?

• What outcomes matter the most?
  ➢ Adjudicatory
  ➢ Procedural justice
  ➢ Systemic costs

• How can you measure them?
Step 2: Use Your Data

- Case administrative data
  - Dispositional outcomes
  - Time to disposition

- Partner data
  - Law enforcement
  - Social service agencies
Step 3: Choose Outcome Metrics

- Subjective measures
  - Surveys
  - Focus groups
  - Interviews

- Objective measures
  - Historical data
  - Video observation
  - Case file reviews and audits
Step 4: Deciding How To Randomize

- What do researchers have to consider?
  - How and when to assign to treatment and control groups
  - Carefully applying intervention to treatment participants
  - Avoiding pitfalls

- Why randomize?
  - Gold standard for causality
  - Ethical allocation method
Step 5: Designing a Randomized Evaluation

- Court-researcher collaboration
- How long does it take?
- How much does it cost?

![Graph showing power vs observed difference over time for Alameda Discrete Outcome 1.](Notes: (1) Base rate = 0.50; (2) 120 cases per month; (3) One treatment condition.)
III. Case Study
Intimate Partner Violence Triage
Why Study Triage?

- Screening + intake
- Assess the case
- Assign to level of service

Levels of Service:
- No assistance
- Limited advice + self-help
- Full representation
Why Study Triage?

Nascent demand

Screening + intake

Assess the case

Assign to level of service

Limited advice + self-help

No assistance

Full rep.
The Study

• Elements
  ➢ Self-help materials
  ➢ Field operation: RCT of triage decisions
  ➢ Outcomes: both short term (restraining orders) and long term

• Partnership
  ➢ Community Legal Aid Society of Ohio
  ➢ University of Akron Psychology Department
  ➢ More
CPOs filed in 8 OH Counties (2014)

Total Number of CPOs filed: 2250

CLAS Attorneys Full Rep: 150

With Counsel: 480

*Each Blob = 30 CPO cases
# Do Attorneys Make a Difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Full CPO, Success Rate with Attorneys</th>
<th>Full CPO, Success Rate without Attorneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbiana</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Do Attorneys Make a Difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Full CPO, Success Rate with Attorneys</th>
<th>Full CPO, Success Rate without Attorneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbiana</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Do Attorneys Make a Difference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Full CPO, Success Rate with Attorneys</th>
<th>Full CPO, Success Rate without Attorneys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Columbiana</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medina</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trumbull</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Can We Win vs. Can We Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Call + Self-Help</th>
<th>Full Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Call + Self-Help</td>
<td>Full Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can We Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Call + Self-Help</th>
<th>Full Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intake and Eligibility Determination

Randomization

Triage Protocol 1: CLA Staff Assigns Level of Service

- Level A: Full Representation
- Level B: Telephone call; Packet

Triage Protocol 2: Randomizer Assigns Level of Service

- Level A: Full Representation
- Level B: Telephone call; Packet

Double Randomization
Measuring Outcomes

- Where do lawyers make a difference?
- What is the effect of a restraining order?
- How are lawyers making triage decisions?
- Adjudicatory outputs + longer term outcomes
Thank You!

a2j lab .org
Bringing Evidence to Bear on Practice:
Planning for Effective Communications

Equal Justice Conference,
May 5, 2017
Driver's license suspensions push poor deeper into poverty, report says
Drivers in California who are unable to pay traffic fines for minor infractions are frequently having their licenses suspended by traffic courts — a policy that has had a disproportionate impact on poor and working-class people, according to a study released Wednesday.

In an Alameda County traffic court case, for example, a $25 ticket given to a motorist who had failed to update the home address on her driver’s license within the state law’s allotted 10 days led a traffic court judge to suspend her license when she was unable to pay the fine.
Driver’s License Suspensions Create Cycle of Debt

By SHAILA DEWAN   APRIL 14, 2015

RELATED COVERAGE
New York City Plans to Transform Summons Process
APRIL 14, 2015

More National Coverage
Ticket amnesty could benefit thousands

At least 300,000 Bay Area residents could be eligible for help under a California law that went into effect Thursday to cut old ticket fines and reinstate lost driver’s licenses, according to a legal service and advocacy group.

The state is allowing certain income-dependent reductions, ranging from 50 to 80 percent, on fines issued before Jan. 1, 2012.

Through March 2017, California drivers can catch a 50 to 80 percent break on unpaid traffic tickets with an amnesty period on penalties and fees.

National Coverage Leads to Policy Change
Why Plan?

Communication happens – with or without you.
“IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHERE YOU ARE GOING, YOU'LL END UP SOMEPLACE ELSE.”

— YOGI BERRA
Communications Plan

TACTICS

Messages

Messengers (Influencers)

Context

Decision Makers (Power Audiences)

Objective (S.M.A.R.T.)
A well-defined objective is the bedrock of a good plan.
Objectives

A well-defined objective answers the question, “What will success look like?”
A goal is different than an objective.

*Maryland Access to Justice Commission’s broad goal is to expand access to justice and quality of justice for all Marylanders.*
A “well-defined” objective is:

Specific
Measurable
Attainable
Realistic
Time-bound
S.M.A.R.T. Objective

During the 2018 legislative session, avert sunset of the “Filing Fee” bill to sustain the state’s current level of funding to the Maryland Legal Services Corporation that results from filing fees.

Specific
Measurable
Attainable
Realistic
Time-bound
Decision Makers

Who has the power to make your objective a reality?
Decision Makers

What are their core concerns and values?

↑ DECISION MAKERS (Power Audiences) ↑

↑ Objective ↑ (S.M.A.R.T.)
Why Focus on Core Concerns and Values?
Values

Equal Treatment
Fairness
Opportunity
Community
Justice for All

Issues

Domestic Violence
Elder Abuse
Affordable Housing
Civil Rights
Education
Poverty

Policies

Record Expungement
Affordable Care Act
Title VII
Fair Housing Laws
VOCA
The persuadable public is of two minds about poverty/poor people

- Individual responsibility
- Overdependence on government
- Us v. Them stereotypes

- Shared responsibility
- Community
- Pragmatism
- Opportunity
The Narrative “Umbrella”

- Fairness
- Freedom from Discrimination
- Opportunity
- We’re all in it together
- Government works
- Policy successes
- Systemic barriers
- Justice for all
- Focus on evidence

- Poor people are lazy
- Too much reliance on government handouts
- You get ahead if you try
- Assuming Discrimination
- Bashing government
- Myth-busting
- Market forces correct imbalances
Context- Internal

- Access to data, research
- Communications resources (staff, $, tools)
- Media savvy & potential pitchable material (stories, clients, innovations, upcoming reports)
- Allies, partnerships
Context - External

- Timing, key events/opportunities
- Other organizations are working on the issue - are they with or against us?
- Barriers / misconceptions / misinformation
- Competing issues
Messengers

Who can influence your Decision Makers?
Messages

What you want the Decision Makers to **think**, **feel**, or **do**?
Tactics

- Media tied to release of report
- Social media
- Advertising
- Events
- Newsletters / email
- Individual conversations
Communications Plan

TACTICS

Messages

Messengers (Influencers)

Context

Decision Makers (Power Audiences)

Objective (S.M.A.R.T.)
Media Tips

- Plan Ahead

- Consider Timing

- Have Strong Supporting Materials

- Loop Us in
Stay Informed. Add Your Voice.

Join the JusticeVoices Network:
bit.ly/joinjusticevoices