

ATTACHMENT A:
Sampling Process, Client Consent Process
and Final Characteristics of Samples
for the Client Survey

	Page
1. Overview	A-2
2. Process for Selecting Samples	A-2
3. Process for Obtaining Client Consent	A-4
4. Follow-Up and Second Round of Consent Calls	A-7
5. Final Characteristics of Samples	A-8
a. Community Legal Services (CLS).....	A-8
b. Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania (LASP).....	A-11
c. Laurel Legal Services (LLS).....	A-13
d. MidPenn Legal Services (MPLS)	A-16
e. Neighborhood Legal Services Association (NLSA).....	A-19
f. Northwestern Legal Services (NWLS)	A-22
g. North Penn Legal Services (NPLS)	A-24
h. Pennsylvania Health Law Project (PHLP).....	A-26
i. Philadelphia Legal Assistance (PLA)	A-28
j. Southwestern Pennsylvania Legal Services (SPLS).....	A-31

1. OVERVIEW

The Client Survey was carried out using computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) facilities and trained survey interviewers at Northwestern Michigan College (NMC) in Traverse City, Michigan. The Resource worked with the ten legal aid organizations participating in the Client Survey to select representative samples totaling 400 clients (an average of 40 per program) from the universe of all cases closed by advice-only or brief services between July 1 and December 15, 2011.

The sample selection and consent processes were carried out in the following steps:

- a. Each program provided The Resource with a master list containing the case numbers (but no client names or telephone numbers) of all advice-only and brief services cases closed during the 5-1/2 month sampling period. This list was prepared by the program through a process of querying the program's case management system (CMS).
- b. The Resource selected from each program's master list a probability sample of cases to be included in the Client Survey, using a stratified random sample (SRS) design. (See "Process for Selecting Samples" below.)
- c. Program staff or volunteers called all of the clients on the sampling list to seek consent. (See "Process for Obtaining Consent" below.)
- d. The program then forwarded a list to The Resource containing contact information for those clients who had agreed to participate in the survey. This list was passed on to the survey team at NMC to be used in the interviews.
- e. NMC and The Resource tracked the progress of the interviews against the Stratified Random Sampling design. Where necessary, further consent-seeking calls by programs were carried out until the sample goals were met. (See "Follow-Up and Second Round of Consent Calls" on page A-7 of this Attachment.)

2. PROCESS FOR SELECTING SAMPLES

To stay within the budget available for the Client Survey, and based on preliminary per-interview cost estimates, the Pennsylvania IOLTA Board set a goal of 500 completed interviews for the Client Survey. For the ten programs, this translated to a goal of having an average of 50 completed client interviews per program.¹

To complete 50 interviews, we estimated NMC would need a list of consenting clients from each program containing 150 names. That figure was estimated by applying information about success rates achieved by the 2002 Hotline Study.²

¹ Although we sought an average of 50 interviews per program, the goal was lower for some programs that provided a limited range of services. For example, the goal was 25 interviews for Pennsylvania Health Law Project (PHLP), the cases of which consist almost exclusively of helpline (telephone-based) advice-only and brief services. In effect, PHLP's cases cover just one-half of the sampling matrix table (see Exhibit A-1 and related discussion). Accordingly, a sample of 25 of PHLP's cases is equivalent to a sample of 50 cases for another program that handles both telephone-based and in-person cases. Similarly, the sampling goals were lower for other programs such as Southwestern Pennsylvania Legal Services and Laurel Legal Services that handle very few brief services cases through their telephone-based legal assistance systems.

² In the 2002 Hotline Study, it took an average of three attempts for each completed interview. The range for the five programs in the Study was 35 to 45 percent. See "Pearson, Jessica and Lanae Davis, "The Hotlines Assessment Study: Final Report;" 2002, available at <http://www.nlada.org/DMS/Documents/1037903536.22/finalhlreport.pdf>.

To determine how many clients would have to be called by the programs in order to obtain 150 consenting clients, we assumed a success rate 35 percent.³ Dividing 150 by 35 percent yielded a figure of 430 calls per program.

To ensure that the samples represented as closely as possible the population of cases handled by each program, The Resource used a stratified random sampling (SRS) design. With this design, samples are drawn at random from each of several “strata” of the population, rather than pooling all cases for the population as a whole (known as simple random sampling). Stratified random sampling is used in studies where the number of cases to be sampled is very small relative to the population. It ensures that the sample will include examples of all the important segments of the population – a goal that might not be achieved if the researchers were to rely on chance alone to determine the composition of the sample as is done with simple random sampling.

As indicated in Exhibit A-1 on the next page, the master lists were stratified according to four variables:

- **Legal Aid Program** (10 programs total – see the map on page 5 of the Client Survey report).
- **Service Model** applied in each case – “Telephone-Based” versus “In-person”
- **Service Type** – “Advice & Counsel” versus “Brief services” (*as these terms are defined for statistical reporting purposes by funders Pennsylvania IOLTA, Pennsylvania Legal Aid Network, Inc. and the Legal Services Corporation*).⁴
- **Legal problem** –Standardized across Pennsylvania Legal Aid Network programs. Cases were sampled randomly from five “legal problem” strata defined by the four most frequent legal problem types handled by each legal aid program in the Client Survey, plus a stratum consisting of all problem types other than the top four.⁵

³ We assumed the program would face a challenge similar to the researchers in the 2002 Hotline Study, where a large percentage of clients had moved, changed phone numbers, were not at home, did not answer, or for other reasons could not be contacted by telephone. The range of success rates in the 2002 Hotline Study was 35 to 45 percent across the five programs that participated. We used a conservative figure of 35 percent for purposes of estimating the numbers of clients who would need to be called.

⁴ In the legal aid community, “Advice & Counsel cases” are also called “advice-only cases,” or abbreviated as “advice cases.” In this report, these terms all mean “Advice & Counsel” cases as defined in the Case Statistical Reporting (CSR) Handbook issued by the Legal Services Corporation, available at http://grants.lsc.gov/sites/default/files/Grants/RIN/Grantee_Guidance/CSR/CSR%20Handbook%202008%20as%20amended%202011.pdf.

⁵ The top four legal problem types differed by program. To maximize representativeness of samples, the samples were stratified to reflect each program’s unique case type distribution. For example, the cases of Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania (LASP) were stratified into the following five groups: (1) custody/visitation; (2) private landlord/tenant; (3) bankruptcy/debtor relief; (4) unemployment compensation; and (5) all other legal problem types. Cases were then sampled randomly from each stratum.

Exhibit A-1: Sampling Matrix
Estimated Number of Clients to Be Called By Each Program
to Obtain 50 Completed Interviews
Cases Stratified by (a) Legal Problem (5 strata)⁶; (b) In-Person versus Telephone-Based Model; and (c) Advice-Only versus Brief Service

Legal Problem	In-Person		Telephone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	20	20	20	20	80
Custody/Visitation	20	20	20	20	80
Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	20	20	20	20	80
Mortgage Foreclosures Other than Predatory Lending/Practices	20	20	20	20	80
Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types	80	80	80	80	320
All Other Problem Types	28	28	28	28	110
Total	108	108	108	108	430

3. PROCESS FOR OBTAINING CLIENT CONSENT

From the onset of the Client Survey, there was strong consensus among sponsors, program participants and the research team at The Resource that informed consent would be obtained from clients prior to requesting any personally-identifiable information, such as client names or telephone numbers, from the legal aid programs.

After consultation with the Steering Committee, and receipt of a requested informal opinion from the Pennsylvania Bar Association, the Pennsylvania IOLTA Board approved a procedure developed by The Resource whereby the programs themselves would seek consent from their clients whose cases had been selected for the survey samples by the research team, from lists from which all personally-identifiable information had been redacted. Once consent was obtained, the clients' names and telephone numbers, along with salient variables about their cases, such as legal problem and type of service provided, were forwarded to the interviewing team at Northwestern Michigan College (NMC), under a confidentiality agreement between The Resource and NMC conforming to Michigan's Confidential Research and Investment Information Act.

Cases involving domestic violence were deleted from the lists from which the samples were drawn, out of a concern that contacting those clients might put some of them in danger.

The instructions provided to the programs for use in the consent calls are indicated in Exhibit A-2 on the following page. The sample script used by the volunteers and program staff members for making the calls is provided in Exhibit A-3 beginning on page A-6.

⁶ The legal problem types that defined the "Top Four" differed by program – see previous footnote.

Exhibit A-2: Instructions Provided to the Programs for Carrying Out the Sampling and Client Consent Process

Overview:

1. Program provides researchers with a master list of cases closed during sampling period.
2. Researchers select probability sample of cases to be included in study and provide list back to program indicating case numbers of clients to be called for consent.
3. Program staff or volunteers call 430 clients and provide contact information back to researchers for clients who have consented.
4. Researchers interview clients who have consented to be included in study.

Step One: *Program provides The Resource with master list of clients served during sampling period.*

1. Resource provides program's Case Management System (CMS) specialist with instructions and a query script to be used for exporting a master list of cases from the program's CMS containing the data fields needed for the study.
2. Program e-mails the exported master list to The Resource. *Note: No client names or phone numbers will be included on this list. The program will retain client-identifiable information until after the clients have consented to have their information released to the researchers in Step Three below.*

Step Two: *Resource and NMC select probability sample of clients to be contacted.*

1. **As soon as master list is received from program:** Researchers (Resource and NMC) select probability sample of cases to be contacted by the program.
2. **Resource sends list of sampled cases back to the program** indicating case numbers to be included in calls by the program. Scientific sampling techniques will be used to ensure the sample is representative of the total population of advice and brief services cases handled by the program.

Step Three: *Program staff or volunteers seek consent from clients.*

1. **Starting on January 11:** Program staff and/or volunteers call the clients whose cases are included in the tracking sheet of sampled cases. We have estimated that 430 clients⁷ will need to be called by each program in order to obtain consent from enough clients to complete the survey.

(See Exhibit A-3 – Script for Obtaining Client Consent.)

2. **Callers will record the results of each call on the Sample List provided by The Resource.**

Instructions for use are provided directly within the Excel workbook containing the Sample List. Spaces are provided on the Sample List for recording the results of each call, including whether or not the caller was successful in contacting the client, whether or not the client has consented to be included in the survey, the best time for the surveyor to call, and an alternative phone number in case the number provided in the Sample List is not the best number for the surveyor to call.

⁷ Some programs will have fewer cases, depending on their volume of advice and brief service cases.

For purposes of determining the best time for the surveyor to call the client, please note the following hours during which the surveying will take place:

a. Monday – Friday:

- 9 a.m. to noon
- 1p.m. to 4 p.m.
- 6 p.m. to 9 p.m.

b. Saturday

- 1p.m. to 4 p.m.

3. **ASAP – no later than January 20:** Program sends to The Resource a copy of the completed Sampling List containing names and phone numbers of clients who have consented to be interviewed for the study, and with the client-identifiable information (names and phone numbers) DELETED for clients who have NOT consented to participate.

Step Four: NMC researchers conduct survey.

Using the Sample List, NMC surveyors will conduct Computer-Aided Telephone Interview (CATI) survey of the clients who have consented.

Exhibit A-3 **Call Script for Seeking Client Consent**

Hello, I'm calling to speak with [client name].

- If the client is not available, reply: *“Is there a convenient time when I might try calling again for [client name]?”*
- If asked to identify who is calling, reply: *“I am [your name], and I'm calling from a local community organization. Is there a convenient time when [client name] might be available?”*
- If prodded for information about your purpose, reply: *“I'm sorry, but I really need to talk directly with [client name]. Is there a convenient time when I can call [him or her] back?”*

Once the client is reached... *“Hi, my name is [your name]. I am calling from [name of your legal services program]. Do you have just a few minutes now for us to talk?”*

- If no, then ask: *“Is there a convenient time when I could call you back?”*
- If still no, and/or it is clear the client doesn't want to proceed, then thank him or her and hang up. Mark the sampling sheet, *“Client does not want to participate.”*
- If yes, then thank the client and continue...

“Back in [month and year of when the case was opened], you contacted our program for legal help with a question that you were concerned about.

I am calling now because our organization is involved in a survey by our state funder to determine how effective our legal help is.

Since you are a past client of ours, I am calling for your permission to provide your name and information about your case to the researchers who are conducting the study. They are from Northwestern Michigan College.

If you provide me with permission today, then you will be interviewed by telephone about your opinion of our services. The interview will take about ten minutes of your time.

*Any information that the researchers obtain from us or from you about your case will be kept totally confidential. Even **[name of your legal services program]** will not learn any individual feedback you supply the researchers.*

*Your decision today about whether or not to take part in the survey is entirely VOLUNTARY. No matter what you decide, it will NOT in any way affect your ability to receive help from **[name of legal services program]** in the future. If you do NOT want to participate, just tell me now and you will NOT be contacted again for the survey.*

*Do you have any questions or concerns about the survey or what I just said? **[Caller will make note of any questions or concerns.]***

*Do you agree to have your name and information provided to the research organization or do you choose NOT to participate in the survey? **[Caller will record the response – YES or NO – on the sampling list.]***

[If YES, then explain that an interviewer should be calling within the next few weeks, and ask: Are there particular days of the week, and hours of the day, that it will be best for the surveyor to call you?

- ***Record the information on the Sample List – Consent Yes or No, best day and time to call, and the other information requested.***

*Thank you for your time today. If you have any questions, please contact **[name of your legal services program]** at your convenience. Would you like me to give you that number? **[Provide your program's primary telephone number]**. Have a great **[day/evening]**.*

End of Call Script

4. FOLLOW-UP AND SECOND ROUND OF CONSENT CALLS

All ten programs made strong efforts in support of the Client Survey in the face of severe other demands on staff and volunteer resources at the time the survey was underway – especially the need to maintain services to clients during a period of exceptionally high demand during January and February 2012. It turned out that the programs' success rates in reaching clients for the consent requests were lower than the assumed 35 percent. The highest rate achieved by a program was 27 percent; in that instance the program obtained consent from 116 of the total 430 clients whom were called.

The highest success rates were achieved by programs that made three rounds of calls and then left messages on phones answered by voice mail. Programs whose resources allowed only two rounds of calls had lower success rates.

Once the survey was underway, The Resource and NMC monitored the interviewing process to ensure that the desired 50 completed interviews per program would be as evenly distributed across all the cells of the sampling matrix (see Exhibit A-1) as possible. Since the sampling matrix contained 20 cells, this meant that only two or three cases could be allowed in each cell in order for all cells to be adequately populated. Once the target of two or three interviews for each cell had been completed, the interviewers shifted their efforts to call clients reflecting other cells of the sampling matrix.

In February 2002, The Resource and NMC reviewed progress in populating the sampling matrices. The Resource then estimated how many additional interviews would be needed in order to populate all cells of the sampling matrix for each program and, based on the success rates achieved to date, how many additional consent-seeking calls would be needed by each program.

Based on that analysis, The Resource produced a set of randomly-selected case numbers for a second round of consent-seeking calls by each program, again using a stratified random sampling design, aimed at populating cells of the sampling matrices for which significant gaps still remained in completed interviews at that time. Those calls were completed and the consenting clients interviewed by mid-March 2012.

5. FINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLES

As indicated in the tally below, the total number of completed interviews was 400, an average of 40 per program. The number of completed interviews per program ranged from 26 to 58.

1) NWLS:	58 surveys
2) NLSA:	55
3) NPLS	54
4) LASP:	50
5) PLA:	50
6) PHLP:	28
7) MPLS	27
8) CLS:	26
9) LLS:	26
10) SPLS:	26
<hr/>	
400 surveys	

In the remainder of this section, the samples are analyzed individually for each of the ten programs that participated in the survey.

a. Community Legal Services (CLS)

The table on the next page compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race), and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Age**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Race:**
 - African American: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (92 versus 72 percent).
 - Hispanic: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (zero versus 14 percent).

- **Legal Problem**

- Predatory Lending/Practices Other Than Mortgage Foreclosures: The sample contained a slightly *higher* percentage of cases than the population (23 versus 15 percent).
- Collection: The sample contained a *higher* percentage of cases than the population (35 versus 7 percent).

Exhibit CLS-1: Community Legal Services
*Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
 Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011*

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	10	38%	755	33%	
Female	16	62%	1,533	67%	
Unknown		0%	1	0%	
Total	26	100%	2,289	100%	
Age					
Under 18	0	0%	27	1%	
18-59	20	77%	1,842	80%	
Over 60	6	23%	420	18%	
Total	26	100%	2,289	100%	
Race					
White	2	8%	198	9%	
African American	24	92%	1,645	72%	
Hispanic	0	0%	320	14%	
Native American	0	0%	2	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	44	2%	
Other	0	0%	80	3%	
Total	26	100%	2,289	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Consumer	Predatory Lending Practices (Other than Mortgages)	6	23%	353	15%
Consumer	Public Utilities	3	12%	341	15%
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	3	12%	328	14%
Consumer	Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	9	35%	166	7%
Sum of Top Four Problems		21	81%	1,188	52%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>5</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>1,101</i>	<i>48%</i>
Total		26	100%	2,289	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for three out of the five rows of the sampling matrix. “Predatory Lending Practices,” “Collection” and the pooled category, “All Other Problem Types” were represented by more than five completed interviews each. The sample contained fewer than five interviews for each of the other two legal problem types sampled – “Public Utilities” and “Private Landlord/Tenant.” Accordingly, comparisons of results would be less likely to reveal statistically significant differences between results for those legal problem types versus results for other legal problem types.

The sample had good numbers of cases in the columns reflecting significant elements of the program’s caseload. The low number of sampled cases in the two “Phone” columns did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as the program does not operate a telephone-based intake and legal assistance system.⁸

**Exhibit CLS-2: Community Legal Services
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)**

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Predatory Lending Practices (Other than Mortgages)	279	63	7	3	352
Public Utilities	158	170	4	9	341
Private Landlord/Tenant	291	32	4	1	328
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	129	36	1	0	166
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	857	301	16	13	1,187
All Other Problem Types	778	264	42	18	1,102
Total	1,635	565	58	31	2,289

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Predatory Lending Practices (Other than Mortgages)	4	2	0	0	6
Public Utilities	3	0	0	0	3
Private Landlord/Tenant	2	1	0	0	3
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	5	4	0	0	9
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	14	7	0	0	21
All Other Problem Types	3	2	0	0	5
Total	17	9	0	0	26

⁸ The cases in the “phone” columns of the “population” table above likely reflect cases for which intake was done through a program office but most of the advocates’ contact with clients occurred by telephone.

b. Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania (LASP)

The table below compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Age**
- **Race**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Legal Problem**
 - Custody/Visitation: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage than the population (20 versus 28 percent).
 - Private Landlord/Tenant: The sample contained a slightly *higher* percentage than the population (18 versus 11 percent).

Exhibit LASP-1: Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania
*Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
 Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011*

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	16	32%	522	27%	
Female	34	68%	1,437	73%	
Unknown		0%	-	0%	
<i>Total</i>	50	100%	1,959	100%	
Age					
Under 18	0	0%	24	1%	
18-59	42	84%	1,694	86%	
Over 60	8	16%	241	12%	
<i>Total</i>	50	100%	1,959	100%	
Race					
White	26	52%	1,036	53%	
African American	21	42%	774	40%	
Hispanic	1	2%	83	4%	
Native American	0	0%	2	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	19	1%	
Other	2	4%	45	2%	
<i>Total</i>	50	100%	1,959	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Family	Custody/Visitation	10	20%	553	28%
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	9	18%	216	11%
Consumer	Bankruptcy/Debtor Relief	5	10%	203	10%
Income Maintenance	Unemployment Compensation	5	10%	136	7%
Sum of Top Four Problems		29	58%	1,108	57%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>21</i>	<i>42%</i>	<i>851</i>	<i>43%</i>
Total		50	100%	1,959	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews in all rows of the sampling matrix. All legal problem types were represented by at least five completed interviews.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews in all columns of the sampling matrix except “Phone/Brief Service.” The low number of sampled cases in that column (4) did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as the program’s population of cases contained very few of those cases as well (24 out of a total of 1,959 cases during the sampling period – approximately 1 percent).

Exhibit LASP-2: Legal Aid of Southeastern Pennsylvania
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Custody/Visitation	417	68	67	1	553
Private Landlord/Tenant	165	17	34	0	216
Bankruptcy/Debtor Relief	159	4	40	0	203
Unemployment Compensation	94	19	21	2	136
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	835	108	162	3	1,108
All Other Problem Types	475	161	194	21	851
Total	1,310	269	356	24	1,959

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Custody/Visitation	3	5	2	0	10
Private Landlord/Tenant	5	2	2	0	9
Bankruptcy/Debtor Relief	2	0	3	0	5
Unemployment Compensation	3	1	1	0	5
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	13	8	8	0	29
All Other Problem Types	6	7	4	4	21
Total	19	15	12	4	50

c. Laurel Legal Services (LLS)

The table on the next page compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Race**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Age**
 - Under 18: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (8 versus 2 percent).
 - 18-59: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (73 versus 90 percent).
 - Over 60: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (19 versus 8 percent).
- **Legal Problem**
 - Private Landlord/Tenant: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage of cases than the population (12 versus 19 percent).
 - Collection: The sample contained a slightly *higher* percentage of cases than the population (15 versus 9 percent).

Exhibit LLS-1: Laurel Legal Services
*Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
 Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011*

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	6	23%	142	29%	
Female	20	77%	349	71%	
Unknown		0%	-	0%	
Total	26	100%	491	100%	
Age					
Under 18	2	8%	12	2%	
18-59	19	73%	441	90%	
Over 60	5	19%	38	8%	
Total	26	100%	491	100%	
Race					
White	22	85%	440	90%	
African American	3	12%	47	10%	
Hispanic	1	4%	2	0%	
Native American	0	0%	1	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	-	0%	
Other	0	0%	1	0%	
Total	26	100%	491	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Family	Custody/Visitation	8	31%	165	34%
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	3	12%	92	19%
Consumer	Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	4	15%	42	9%
Income Maintenance	Unemployment Compensation	1	4%	32	7%
Sum of Top Four Problems		16	62%	331	67%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>10</i>	<i>38%</i>	<i>160</i>	<i>33%</i>
Total		26	100%	491	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for two out of the five rows of the sampling matrix. “Custody/Visitation” and the pooled category, “All Other Problem Types” were represented by more than five completed interviews each. The sample contained fewer than five interviews for each of the other three legal problem types sampled – “Private Landlord/Tenant,” “Collection,” and “Unemployment Compensation.” Accordingly, comparisons of results would be less likely to reveal statistically significant differences for those legal problem types.

The sample had good numbers of cases in the columns reflecting significant elements of the program’s caseload. The low number of sampled cases in the “Phone/Brief Service” column did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as only 1 percent of the program’s population of cases during the sampling period was served using that model.

Exhibit LLS-2: Laurel Legal Services
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Custody/Visitation	24	41	98	2	165
Private Landlord/Tenant	8	1	82	1	92
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	7	2	32	1	42
Unemployment Compensation	8	2	22	0	32
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	47	46	234	4	331
All Other Problem Types	32	25	102	1	160
Total	79	71	336	5	491

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Custody/Visitation	3	1	3	1	8
Private Landlord/Tenant	0	0	3	0	3
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	2	1	1	0	4
Unemployment Compensation	0	1	0	0	1
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	5	3	7	1	16
All Other Problem Types	5	2	3	0	10
Total	10	5	10	1	26

d. MidPenn Legal Services (MPLS)

The table on the next page compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Age**
- **Race**

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Sex**
 - Male: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (48 versus 30 percent).
 - Female: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (52 versus 70 percent).
- **Legal Problem**
 - Private Landlord/Tenant: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage of cases than the population (22 versus 33 percent).
 - Custody/Visitation: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage than the population (11 versus 19 percent).
 - Unemployment Compensation: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (22 versus 5 percent).

Exhibit MPLS-1: MidPenn Legal Services
Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	13	48%	672	30%	
Female	14	52%	1,548	70%	
Unknown		0%	-	0%	
Total	27	100%	2,220	100%	
Age					
Under 18	1	4%	23	1%	
18-59	24	89%	1,971	89%	
Over 60	2	7%	226	10%	
Total	27	100%	2,220	100%	
Race					
White	18	67%	1,519	68%	
African American	3	11%	287	13%	
Hispanic	6	22%	358	16%	
Native American	0	0%	9	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	11	0%	
Other	0	0%	36	2%	
Total	27	100%	2,220	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	6	22%	722	33%
Family	Custody/Visitation	3	11%	426	19%
Consumer	Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	4	15%	212	10%
Income Maintenance	Unemployment Compensation	6	22%	117	5%
Sum of Top Four Problems		19	70%	1,477	67%
<i>All Other</i>		8	30%	743	33%
Total		27	100%	2,220	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for three out of the five rows of the sampling matrix. “Private Landlord/Tenant,” “Unemployment Compensation,” and the pooled category, “All Other Problem Types” were represented by more than five completed interviews each. The sample contained fewer than five interviews for each of the other two legal problem types sampled – “Custody/Visitation” and “Collection.” Accordingly, comparisons of results would be less likely to reveal statistically significant differences for those legal problem types.

The sample had good numbers of cases in the columns reflecting significant elements of the program’s caseload. The low number of sampled cases in the “Phone/Brief Service” column did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as only 1 percent of the program’s population of cases during the sampling period was served using that model.

Exhibit MPLS-2: MidPenn Legal Services
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	316	101	295	10	722
Custody/Visitation	168	91	164	3	426
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	92	14	105	1	212
Unemployment Compensation	81	7	29	0	117
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	657	213	593	14	1,477
All Other Problem Types	317	202	211	13	743
Total	974	415	804	27	2,220

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	2	2	2	0	6
Custody/Visitation	1	1	1	0	3
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	2	2	0	0	4
Unemployment Compensation	3	2	1	0	6
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	8	7	4	0	19
All Other Problem Types	3	2	3	0	8
Total	11	9	7	0	27

e. Neighborhood Legal Services Association (NLSA)

The table on the next page compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Age**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Sex**
 - Male: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (42 versus 28 percent).
 - Female: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (58 versus 72 percent).
- **Race**
 - White: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (44 versus 60 percent).
 - African American: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (56 versus 38 percent).
- **Legal Problem**
 - Federally Subsidized Housing: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (24 versus 9 percent).
 - All Other Legal Problems: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (29 versus 41 percent).
 - Legal problems other than the Top Four: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (29 versus 41 percent).

Exhibit NLSA-1: Neighborhood Legal Services Association
Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	23	42%	667	28%	
Female	32	58%	1,753	72%	
Unknown		0%	2	0%	
Total	55	100%	2,422	100%	
Age					
Under 18	3	5%	26	1%	
18-59	49	89%	2,231	92%	
Over 60	3	5%	165	7%	
Total	55	100%	2,422	100%	
Race					
White	24	44%	1,447	60%	
African American	31	56%	916	38%	
Hispanic	0	0%	14	1%	
Native American	0	0%	4	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	7	0%	
Other	0	0%	34	1%	
Total	55	100%	2,422	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	13	24%	567	23%
Family	Custody/Visitation	8	15%	455	19%
Housing	Federally Subsidized Housing	13	24%	226	9%
Family	Divorce/Separation/Annulment	5	9%	174	7%
Sum of Top Four Problems		39	71%	1,422	59%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>16</i>	<i>29%</i>	<i>1,000</i>	<i>41%</i>
Total		55	100%	2,422	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for all five rows of the sampling matrix. There were five or more cases in each row. Accordingly, comparisons of results would be more likely to reveal statistically significant differences between those legal problem types than if significant gaps in legal problems types had existed.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews in all columns of the sampling matrix. The sample accordingly provided a good representation of the program’s caseload in terms of phone-based versus in-person service delivery and advice-only versus brief service.

Exhibit NLSA-2: Neighborhood Legal Services Association
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	34	20	456	57	567
Custody/Visitation	83	57	311	4	455
Federally Subsidized Housing	22	20	148	36	226
Divorce/Separation/Annulment	32	1	140	1	174
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	171	98	1,055	98	1,422
All Other Problem Types	146	112	668	74	1,000
Total	317	210	1,723	172	2,422

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	3	6	2	2	13
Custody/Visitation	2	0	2	4	8
Federally Subsidized Housing	5	4	1	3	13
Divorce/Separation/Annulment	2	1	2	0	5
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	12	11	7	9	39
All Other Problem Types	2	6	5	3	16
Total	14	17	12	12	55

f. Northwestern Legal Services (NWLS)

The table below compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Age**
- **Race**

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Legal Problem**
 - Private Landlord/Tenant: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage of cases than the population (16 versus 25 percent).
 - Collection: The sample contained a *lower* percentage of cases than the population (3 versus 14 percent).
 - Legal problems other than the Top Four: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (52 versus 34 percent).

Exhibit NWLS-1: Northwestern Legal Services
Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	15	26%	381	29%	
Female	43	74%	934	71%	
Unknown		0%	-	0%	
Total	58	100%	1,315	100%	
Age					
Under 18	0	0%	28	2%	
18-59	54	93%	1,166	89%	
Over 60	4	7%	121	9%	
Total	58	100%	1,315	100%	
Race					
White	52	90%	1,147	87%	
African American	6	10%	147	11%	
Hispanic	0	0%	16	1%	
Native American	0	0%	-	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	-	0%	
Other	0	0%	5	0%	
Total	58	100%	1,315	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	9	16%	324	25%
Family	Custody/Visitation	11	19%	288	22%
Consumer	Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	2	3%	182	14%
Consumer	Collection Practices/Creditor Harassment	6	10%	68	5%
Sum of Top Four Problems		28	48%	862	66%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>30</i>	<i>52%</i>	<i>453</i>	<i>34%</i>
Total		58	100%	1,315	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for four out of the five rows of the sampling matrix. The sample contained fewer than five interviews for “Collection/Creditor Harassment.” Accordingly, comparisons of results would be less likely to reveal statistically significant differences between results for that legal problem type versus results for other legal problem types.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews in all columns of the sampling matrix. The sample accordingly provided a good representation of the program’s caseload in terms of phone-based versus in-person service delivery and advice-only versus brief service.

Exhibit NWLS-2: Northwestern Legal Services
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	5	8	267	44	324
Custody/Visitation	65	83	126	14	288
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	5	3	142	32	182
Collection Practices/ Creditor Harassment	0	1	11	56	68
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	75	95	546	146	862
All Other Problem Types	116	91	216	30	453
Total	191	186	762	176	1,315

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	0	2	4	3	9
Custody/Visitation	3	2	3	3	11
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	0	0	1	1	2
Collection Practices/ Creditor Harassment	0	0	3	3	6
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	3	4	11	10	28
All Other Problem Types	10	8	6	6	30
Total	13	12	17	16	58

g. North Penn Legal Services (NPLS)

The table below compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Age**
- **Race**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Legal Problem**
 - Private Landlord/Tenant: The sample contained a *lower* percentage of cases than the population (15 versus 28 percent).
 - Mortgage Foreclosures Other Than predatory Lending/Practices: The sample contained a *higher* percentage of cases than the population (13 versus 5 percent).

Exhibit NPLS-1: North Penn Legal Services
Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	18	33%	647	31%	
Female	36	67%	1,432	69%	
Unknown		0%	6	0%	
Total	54	100%	2,085	100%	
Age					
Under 18	2	4%	26	1%	
18-59	43	80%	1,794	86%	
Over 60	9	17%	265	13%	
Total	54	100%	2,085	100%	
Race					
White	40	74%	1,514	73%	
African American	5	9%	245	12%	
Hispanic	6	11%	230	11%	
Native American	0	0%	11	1%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	8	0%	
Other	3	6%	77	4%	
Total	54	100%	2,085	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	8	15%	585	28%
Family	Custody/Visitation	10	19%	408	20%
Consumer	Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	7	13%	221	11%
Housing	Mortgage Foreclosures Other than Predatory Lending/Practices	7	13%	95	5%
Sum of Top Four Problems		32	59%	1,309	63%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>22</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>776</i>	<i>37%</i>
Total		54	100%	2,085	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for all five rows of the sampling matrix. There were five or more cases in each row. Accordingly, comparisons of results would be more likely to reveal statistically significant differences between those legal problem types than if significant gaps in legal problems types had existed.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews in all columns of the sampling matrix. The sample accordingly provided a good representation of the program’s caseload in terms of phone-based versus in-person service delivery and advice-only versus brief service.

**Exhibit NPLS-2: North Penn Legal Services
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)**

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	58	57	404	66	585
Custody/Visitation	56	46	268	38	408
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	31	56	112	22	221
Mortgage Foreclosures Other than Predatory Lending/Practices	13	31	43	8	95
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	158	190	827	134	1,309
All Other Problem Types	124	164	421	67	776
Total	282	354	1,248	201	2,085

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Private Landlord/Tenant	3	3	2	0	8
Custody/Visitation	2	4	1	3	10
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	4	0	2	1	7
Mortgage Foreclosures Other than Predatory Lending/Practices	1	1	5	0	7
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	10	8	10	4	32
All Other Problem Types	4	6	7	5	22
Total	14	14	17	9	54

h. Pennsylvania Health Law Project (PHLP)

The table below compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Age**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Race:**
 - White: The sample contained a *lower* percentage than the population (54 versus 70 percent).
 - African American: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (39 versus 23 percent).
- **Legal Problem**
 - Medicaid: The sample contained a *lower* percentage of cases than the population (79 versus 93 percent).
 - Other Health: The sample contained a *higher* percentage of cases than the population (11 versus 1 percent).

Exhibit PHLP-1: Pennsylvania Health Law Project
Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>	
Sex					
Male	10	36%	190	39%	
Female	17	61%	283	58%	
Unknown	1	4%	12	2%	
Total	28	100%	485	100%	
Age					
Under 18	2	7%	35	7%	
18-59	17	61%	317	65%	
Over 60	9	32%	133	27%	
Total	28	100%	485	100%	
Race					
White	15	54%	339	70%	
African American	11	39%	113	23%	
Hispanic	1	4%	11	2%	
Native American	0	0%	-	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	9	2%	
Other	1	4%	13	3%	
Total	28	100%	485	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Health	Medicaid	22	79%	451	93%
Health	Home and Community Based Care	2	7%	12	2%
Health	Medicare	1	4%	9	2%
Health	Other Health	3	11%	7	1%
Sum of Top Four Problems		28	100%	479	99%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>0</i>	<i>0%</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>1%</i>
Total		28	100%	485	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for the most important row of the sampling matrix. The sample consisted mainly of “Medicaid” cases, which (at 93 percent) overwhelmingly constitutes the bulk of the program’s caseload for low-income clients. (The program also serves people at higher income levels using funds from sources other than PLAN or IOLTA. Those cases are not reflected in the population figures indicated below.)

The fact that the sample contained fewer than five interviews for each of the other legal problem types did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as those problem types constitute less than one percent of the program’s population of cases for low-income clients.

The sample had good numbers of cases in the columns reflecting significant elements of the program’s caseload. The low number of sampled cases in the “In-Person/Brief Service” column did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as very few of the program’s population of cases during the sampling period were provided with in-person brief services.

Exhibit PHLP-2: Pennsylvania Health Law Project
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Medicaid	37	14	245	155	451
Home and Community Based Care	1	0	2	9	12
Medicare	2	0	4	3	9
Other Health	0	1	5	1	7
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	40	15	256	168	479
All Other Problem Types	0	0	5	1	6
Total	40	15	261	169	485

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Medicaid	5	2	10	5	22
Home and Community Based Care	0	0	0	2	2
Medicare	1	0	0	0	1
Other Health	0	0	2	1	3
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	6	2	12	8	28
All Other Problem Types	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	2	12	8	28

i. Philadelphia Legal Assistance (PLA)

The table on the next page compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Age**
- **Race**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Sex**
 - Male: The sample contained a slightly *higher* percentage than the population (44 versus 35 percent).
 - Female: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage than the population (56 versus 65 percent).
- **Legal Problem**
 - Mortgage Foreclosures Other Than predatory Lending/Practices: The sample contained a *lower* percentage of cases than the population (14 versus 42 percent).
 - Custody/Visitation: The sample contained a slightly *higher* percentage than the population (18 versus 10 percent).
 - Unemployment Compensation: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (24 versus 7 percent).

Exhibit PLA-1: Philadelphia Legal Assistance
*Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
 Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011*

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	22	44%	1,447	35%	
Female	28	56%	2,685	65%	
Unknown		0%	1	0%	
Total	50	100%	4,133	100%	
Age					
Under 18	0	0%	26	1%	
18-59	41	82%	3,490	84%	
Over 60	9	18%	617	15%	
Total	50	100%	4,133	100%	
Race					
White	11	22%	819	20%	
African American	32	64%	2,578	62%	
Hispanic	6	12%	395	10%	
Native American	0	0%	3	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	84	2%	
Other	1	2%	254	6%	
Total	50	100%	4,133	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Housing	Mortgage Foreclosures (Other than Predatory Lending/Practices)	7	14%	1,728	42%
Housing	Other Housing	9	18%	542	13%
Family	Custody/Visitation	9	18%	410	10%
Income Maintenance	Unemployment Compensation	12	24%	309	7%
	Sum of Top Four Problems	37	74%	2,989	72%
	All Other	13	26%	1,144	28%
	Total	50	100%	4,133	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for all five rows of the sampling matrix. There were five or more cases in each row. Accordingly, comparisons of results would be more likely to reveal statistically significant differences between those legal problem types than if significant gaps in legal problems types had existed.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews in all columns of the sampling matrix. The sample accordingly provided a good representation of the program’s caseload in terms of phone-based versus in-person service delivery and advice-only versus brief service.

**Exhibit PLA-2: Philadelphia Legal Assistance
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)**

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Mortgage Foreclosures (Other than Predatory Lending/Practices)	130	15	1,422	161	1,728
Other Housing	34	3	452	53	542
Custody/Visitation	38	3	309	60	410
Unemployment Compensation	186	25	83	15	309
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	388	46	2,266	289	2,989
All Other Problem Types	416	104	507	117	1,144
Total	804	150	2,773	406	4,133

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Mortgage Foreclosures (Other than Predatory Lending/Practices)	0	2	3	2	7
Other Housing	1	2	3	3	9
Custody/Visitation	3	0	4	2	9
Unemployment Compensation	2	1	5	3	11
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	6	5	15	10	36
All Other Problem Types	2	3	2	7	14
Total	8	8	17	17	50

j. Southwestern Pennsylvania Legal Services (SPLS)

The table on the next page compares the distribution of the completed interviews with that of the population of cases handled by the program on three sets of demographic characteristics (sex, age and race) and on legal problem type. As indicated in the table, the sample matched the population within a few percentage points on the following variables:

- **Sex**
- **Race**
- **Legal Problem** other than those noted below

Disparities between the sample and population were noted for the following variables:

- **Age**
 - 18-59: The sample contained a slightly *lower* percentage than the population (81 versus 91 percent).
 - Over 60: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (19 versus 7 percent).
- **Legal Problem**
 - Other Housing: The sample contained a *lower* percentage of cases than the population (15 versus 48 percent).
 - Private Landlord/Tenant: The sample contained a *higher* percentage of cases than the population (23 versus 14 percent).
 - Legal problems other than the Top Four: The sample contained a *higher* percentage than the population (42 versus 22 percent).

Exhibit SPLS-1: Southwestern Pennsylvania Legal Services
Comparison of the Client Survey Sample with the Population of Cases
Handled During the Sampling Period, July 1 through December 15, 2011

Characteristics	SAMPLE: Clients Interviewed in Survey		POPULATION: All Clients Served During Sampling Period		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Sex					
Male	7	27%	120	23%	
Female	19	73%	408	77%	
Unknown		0%	2	0%	
Total	26	100%	530	100%	
Age					
Under 18	0	0%	7	1%	
18-59	21	81%	484	91%	
Over 60	5	19%	39	7%	
Total	26	100%	530	100%	
Race					
White	23	88%	468	88%	
African American	2	8%	49	9%	
Hispanic	0	0%	2	0%	
Native American	0	0%	2	0%	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0%	1	0%	
Other	1	4%	8	2%	
Total	26	100%	530	100%	
Legal Problems: Top Four and All Other					
Housing	Other Housing	4	15%	252	48%
Housing	Private Landlord/Tenant	6	23%	73	14%
Employment	Other Employment	3	12%	51	10%
Consumer	Collection Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment	2	8%	35	7%
Sum of Top Four Problems		15	58%	411	78%
<i>All Other</i>		<i>11</i>	<i>42%</i>	<i>119</i>	<i>22%</i>
Total		26	100%	530	100%

The tables below display the sampling matrices for this program in terms of *raw numbers of cases*. One goal of the stratified random sampling effort was to ensure that the *sample* matrix (the blue table below) was populated with at least one completed interview in each cell; and better, with two or more interviews. Another goal was to ensure that each row and column of the sampling matrix contained a subtotal of at least five completed interviews, the minimum number the research team deemed to be required in order to conduct statistical significance tests on differences between results of the different variables being examined: advice-only versus brief services; telephone -based versus in-person service; and legal problem type.

The sample had good numbers of completed interviews for two out of the five rows of the sampling matrix. “Private Landlord/Tenant” and the pooled category, “All Other Problem Types” were represented by more than five completed interviews each. The sample contained fewer than five interviews for each of the other three legal problem types sampled – “Other Housing,” “Other Employment,” and “Collection.” Accordingly, comparisons of results would be less likely to reveal statistically significant differences between results for those legal problem types versus results for other legal problem types.

The sample had good numbers of cases in the columns reflecting significant elements of the program’s caseload. The low number of sampled cases in the “Phone/Brief Service” column did not present a problem for the Client Survey inasmuch as none of the program’s population of cases during the sampling period was served using that model.

**Exhibit SPLS-2: Southwestern Pennsylvania Legal Services
Sampling Matrices – NUMBERS OF CASES
Population (Pink) versus Sample (Blue)**

POPULATION: All Cases Closed During Sampling Period, by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Other Housing	245	2	5	0	252
Private Landlord/Tenant	18	17	38	0	73
Other Employment	46	2	3	0	51
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	10	3	22	0	35
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	319	24	68	0	411
All Other Problem Types	46	16	57	0	119
Total	365	40	125	0	530

SAMPLE: Cases of Clients Interviewed in Survey by In-Person vs. Phone; Advice vs. Brief Service; and Legal Problem					
Top Four Problems and All Other, By Major Reason	In-Person		Phone		Total
	Advice	Brief Service	Advice	Brief Service	
Other Housing	4	0	0	0	4
Private Landlord/Tenant	1	2	3	0	6
Other Employment	3	0	0	0	3
Collection Incl. Repossession/ Deficiency/Garnishment	0	2	0	0	2
<i>Subtotal - Top Four Problem Types</i>	8	4	3	0	15
All Other Problem Types	1	2	8	0	11
Total	9	6	11	0	26

ATTACHMENT B:

Copy of Interview Questions Used in the Client Survey

PA IOLTA: Survey of Legal Aid Clients in PA

Final Version 2/2/12

Please mark which Legal Aid Organization served client.

50. Organization

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Legal Services | <input type="checkbox"/> North Penn Legal Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laurel Legal Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Northwestern PA Legal Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Legal Aid of Southeastern PA | <input type="checkbox"/> PA Health Law Project |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MidPenn Legal Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Philadelphia Legal Assistance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neighborhood Legal Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Southwestern PA Legal Services |

(NOTE TO CALLERS: All "Do Not Read" comments or responses are marked in blue.)

Hello. My name is (NAME) and I am calling for ({Q50}). I am doing an evaluation to see how {Q50} can improve its services. I work for an independent polling organization that is not part of {Q50} or the government. I understand that someone from {Q50} contacted you some time ago and obtained your consent to have me call you. Are you still willing to participate in our survey? **IF NO - If the client seems clear that he/she does NOT want to participate, then thank him/her and terminate. (DO NOT ENTER SURVEY) IF YES - Continue:** We estimate that this survey should take about 15 minutes to complete. I can assure you that your answers will be completely confidential. Even {Q50} will not learn any individual feedback you supply to me. Your decision to participate will NOT affect your ability to receive help from {Q50} in the future. May we begin the survey? **If client indicates this is not a convenient time, try to reschedule. If Yes, continue with survey.**

1. {Q50} indicated that you contacted them for help in (Month/year when file OPENED from call sheet) and they completed their assistance to you in (Month/Year when case was CLOSED from call sheet). Does that sound correct?

- Yes
- No - (If the client indicates not, then ask when the client received help from the program and write the response here).

If no, indicate other dates:

I will now ask you some questions about the legal problem for which you contacted {Q50}.

2. Can you tell me briefly about why you contacted {Q50}?

INTERVIEWER: If the client's answer to Question 2 above seems to fit the Legal Problem indicated on Call Sheet, then ask the following confirming question: "So from what you've told me, am I correct in saying that you were dealing with a (read the Legal Problem from Call Sheet - e.g., "Bankruptcy") problem"

3. According to our records, it is indicated that the reason you contacted{Q50} was [INSERT PROBLEM CATEGORY and TYPE FROM CALL SHEET], is that correct?

- Yes (Go to Q4)
- No (Go to Q5)

4. Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Category, Type and Code and go on to question 6

Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Category here. _____

Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Type here. _____

Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Code here _____

5. Refer to the list of legal problem categories and pick the detailed Legal Problem that seems to fit the client's answer to Question 2 above. Follow up with a confirming question: "So from what you've told me, am I correct in saying that you were dealing with a (read the category you picked from the list: for example, "Predatory lending") problem?" If necessary, continue probing until you are able to confirm one of the Legal Problem types (e.g. "Bankruptcy"). Enter below the client-agreed code and go on to question 6:

Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Category here. _____

Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Type here. _____

Enter the confirmed Legal Problem Code here _____

I will now ask you some questions about how you interacted with {Q50}.

6. Which of the following most accurately describes your conversations with the legal advisor who helped you with your problem:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ENTIRELY BY PHONE. I never met face-to-face with an advocate about my problem. | <input type="checkbox"/> ENTIRELY FACE-TO-FACE. I never spoke by phone with a legal aid advocate about my problem. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MOSTLY BY PHONE, but I met once or twice with the advocate face-to-face. | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/Didn't answer |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MOSTLY FACE-TO-FACE, but I spoke once or twice with the advocate by telephone. | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Other - Please describe:

7. How many times in total would you say you spoke with the legal advisor who helped you, both in person and on the phone about your problem?

- Once
- Twice
- Three times
- 4-10 times
- More than 10 times
- Not sure/Didn't answer

8. Did you get legal help with this problem from someone other than {Q50}?

- No (Skip to Question 10)
- Yes

49. Which of ONE of the following helped you most?

- A staff person at another free legal services organization, other than Q50
- A staff person at the court.
- A private attorney I hired
- A private attorney who helped me for free.
- Not sure/Didn't answer
- Other

If Other, please describe:

9. Did your legal advisor at {Q50} refer you to this source of help?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/Didn't answer

10. Did you ever receive a letter or other written material from {Q50} about your problem?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/Didn't answer

11. Did anyone from {Q50} ever take the initiative to contact you later to see how you were doing or if you needed more help with your problem?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure/Didn't answer*

Now I'm going to go over with you a list of services provided by {Q50}. For each, I'd like you to indicate whether or not you received that service. If you did, then I'll ask you some follow-up questions about it.

12. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem give you verbal information and help in understanding the law regarding your problem?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q13)
- No (Skip to Q14)
- Don't Know (Skip to Q14)*

13. How useful was this?

- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

14. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem send you written information?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q15)
- No (Skip to Q16)
- Don't know (Skip to Q16)*

15. How useful was this?

- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

16. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem tell you where you could get more information or additional resources?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q17)
- No (Skip to Q18)
- Don't know (Skip to Q18)

17. How useful was this?

- Very
- Somewhat
- Not at All

18. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem give you advice about how to deal with a private party connected with your problem, such as a landlord or someone to whom you may owe money?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q19)
- No (Skip to Q22)
- Don't know (Skip to Q22)

19. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q20)
- Partially tried (Go to Q21)
- No (Go to Q21)
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q22)

20. How well did this work for you?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Worked very well | <input type="checkbox"/> Did not work |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Worked somewhat | <input type="checkbox"/> Too soon to tell |

21. Why not? (Choose all that apply)

- Didn't understand/forgot instructions*
- Nothing could be done*
- Too hard/not worth the effort*
- Tried, no one called back/couldn't get through*
- Afraid/discouraged/no confidence*
- Other -describe*
- Changed my mind*

Please describe:

22. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem tell you how to represent yourself in court?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q23)*
- No (Skip to Q26)*
- Don't know (Skip to Q26)*

23. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q24)*
- Partially tried (Go to Q25)*
- No (Go to Q25)*
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q26)*

24. How well did this work for you?

- Worked very well*
- Did not work*
- Worked somewhat*
- Too soon to tell*

25. Why Not? (Choose all that apply)

- Didn't understand/forgot instructions*
- Nothing could be done*
- Too hard/not worth the effort*
- Tried, no one called back/couldn't get through*
- Afraid/discouraged/no confidence*
- Other - describe*
- Changed my mind*

Other, please describe:

26. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem give you advice about how to deal with a government agency?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q27)*
- No (Skip to Q30)*
- Don't know (Skip to Q30)*

27. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q28)*
- Partially tried (Go to Q29)*
- No (Go to Q29)*
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q30)*

28. How well did this work for you?

- Worked very well*
- Did not work*
- Worked somewhat*
- Too soon to tell*

29. Why Not? (Choose all that apply)

- Didn't understand/forgot instructions*
- Nothing could be done*
- Too hard/not worth the effort*
- Tried, no one called back/couldn't get through*
- Afraid/discouraged/no confidence*
- Other - describe*
- Changed my mind*

Other, Please describe:

30. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem tell you how to represent yourself in an agency proceeding?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q31)*
- No (Skip to Q34)*
- Don't know (Skip to Q34)*

31. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q32)*
- Partially tried (Go to Q33)*
- No (Go to Q33)*
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q34)*

32. How well did this work for you?

- Worked very well*
- Did not work*
- Worked somewhat*
- Too soon to tell*

33. Why Not? (Choose all that apply)

- Didn't understand/forgot instructions
- Too hard/not worth the effort.
- Afraid/discouraged/no confidence
- Changed my mind
- Nothing could be done
- Tried, no one called back/couldn't get through
- Other - describe

Other, Please describe:

34. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem review your income or other qualifications for public benefits and tell you how to apply for benefits?

- Yes (if Yes, Go to Q35)
- No (Skip to Q38)
- Don't know (Skip to Qa38)

35. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q36)
- Partially tried (Go to Q37)
- No (Go to Q37)
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q38)

36. How well did this work for you?

- Worked very well
- Worked somewhat
- Did not work
- Too soon to tell

37. Why Not? (Choose all that apply)

- Didn't understand/forgot instructions
- Too hard/not worth the effort
- Afraid/discouraged/no confidence
- Changed my mind
- Nothing could be done
- Tried, no one called back/couldn't get through
- Other - describe

Other, Please describe:

38. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem help you to fill out a form, or make a call, or write a letter?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q39)
- No (Skip to Q42)
- Don't know (Skip to Q42)

39. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q40)
- Partially tried (Go to Q41)
- No (Go to Q41)
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q42)

40. How well did this work for you?

- Worked very well
- Worked somewhat
- Did not work
- Too soon to tell

41. Why Not? (Choose all that apply)

- Didn't understand/forgot instructions*
- Nothing could be done*
- Too hard/not worth the effort*
- Tried, no one called back/couldn't get through*
- Afraid/discouraged/no confidence*
- Other - describe*
- Changed my mind*

Other, Please describe:

42. Did the legal advisor who helped you with your problem refer you to another organization for help?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q43)*
- No (Skip to Q46)*
- Don't know (Skip to Q46)*

43. Did you do what that person suggested?

- Yes (If Yes, Go to Q44)*
- Partially tried (Go to Q45)*
- No (Go to Q45)*
- N/A - Info Only (Skip to Q46)*

44. How well did this work for you?

- Worked very well*
- Did not work*
- Worked somewhat*
- Too soon to tell*

48. Is your legal problem solved?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - completely (Go to Q49) | <input type="checkbox"/> No, not at all (Skip to Q50) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - somewhat (Go to Q49) | <input type="checkbox"/> Too soon to tell (Skip to Q50) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, not completely (Skip to Q50) | <input type="checkbox"/> Not sure/Didn't answer (Skip to Q50) |

Only Read if Q48= Yes Completely or Yes Somewhat: "I'm going to go over with you a list of possible outcomes. For each, I'd like you to indicate whether or not you achieved that outcome."

Note to interviewer:

CONFIRMED PROBLEM MATCHES CALL SHEET (in Q4): Previous Legal Problem Category entered: {Q4.a} Previous Legal Problem Type entered: {Q4.b} Previous Legal Problem Code entered: {Q4.c}
CONFIRMED PROBLEM DID NOT MATCH CALL SHEET (in Q5): Previous Legal Problem Category entered: {Q5.a} Previous Legal Problem Type entered: {Q5.b} Previous Legal Problem Code entered: {Q5.c}
Complete Question 49 by asking about (just) the outcomes associated with that legal problem.

49. Outcomes Confirmed by the Client (complete as many as are listed, up to four).

1st Outcome Code (#) Confirmed by the Client	_____

2nd Outcome Code (#) Confirmed by the Client	_____

3rd Outcome Code (#) Confirmed by the Client	_____

4th Outcome Code (#) Confirmed by the Client	_____

If NONE of the outcomes listed apply - Other, Please Specify	_____

53. Since you got help from {Q50}, has your problem situation...

- Gotten better/improved?*
- Stayed the same?*
- Gotten worse?*
- Not sure/didn't answer*

54. In general, how helpful was {Q50}?

- Very helpful (Skip to Q57)*
- Not very/not at all helpful (Continue to Q55)*
- Somewhat helpful (Skip to Q57)*
- Not sure/did not answer (Skip to Q57)*

55. In your own words, why do you say {Q50} was NOT helpful? {Probe for details and record the response.}

56.

Based on your answer to the last question, please indicate "True" or "False" to the following statements, based on how well they apply to the help provided to you by {Q50}.

	<i>True</i>	<i>False</i>
I couldn't understand what I was told or what I was supposed to do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I was told to do things, but I didn't understand how to do them.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I didn't have time to do what I was told to do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Things changed and the advice didn't make sense any more.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tried, but couldn't get through to the people I was supposed to.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tried, but I made mistakes.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tried, but it was too difficult/hard.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I tried, but the court didn't accept my pleading.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I wanted a lawyer or someone at Legal Aid to do more for me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There was nothing anyone could do.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please Specify:

57. Based on your experience, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	<i>Totally Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Totally Disagree</i>	<i>Not Applicable or Don't Remember</i>
I received clear direction from the legal staff at {Q50}.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I was able to understand the legal system better.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I felt better prepared for taking the steps required in my case.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I was able to move my case forward to the next step.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I had less stress or anxiety about the legal experience.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I did better than I could have without {Q50}'s help.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would contact {Q50} again if I had another legal problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

58. In your own words, what WOULD HAVE MADE {Q50} work better for you? {Probe for details and record the response.}

59. Which of the following statements indicate things that could improve {Q50}?

	<i>Totally Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Agree</i>	<i>Mostly Disagree</i>	<i>Totally Disagree</i>	<i>Not Applicable or Don't Remember</i>
More time spent on my problem by the legal advisor who helped me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
More opportunities to meet face-to-face with the legal advisor.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Make it easier to get through on the phone.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Explain things using non-legal terms that an ordinary person can understand.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide more written materials and resources about my legal problem.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Call me back later to check on my progress and offer additional advice.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Offer more hours in early morning or late evening or on Saturday or Sunday.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provide more help with my kind of legal problem, instead of limiting the service that they offer.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This completes our survey. Thank you for your willingness to participate.

INTERVIEWER: Capture the following information from the CALL LIST---Even if *different* information has been recorded from client.

60. CASE Number

61. PCODE

63. Client Name:

64. Phone:

65. Alternate Phone (if provided):

66. Gender

Male

Female

67. Age

68. Primary Language

69. Interpreter

Yes

No

70. DATE CASE FILE CLOSED:

71. "R" CLOSED:

72. DATE CASE FILE OPEN:

73. "P" CODE (Legal Problem Code)

74. LEGAL PROBLEM CATEGORY: (From List of Legal Problem Codes KEY)

75. LEGAL PROBLEM TYPE: (From List of Legal Problem Codes KEY)

76. CALL DATE:

77. CALLER INITIALS:

78. LSPN#

ATTACHMENT C:

OUTCOME CATEGORIES USED IN THE CLIENT SURVEY

Outcomes Associated with Specific Legal Problems, by Problem Code

Legal Problem Categories and Codes			Applicable Outcomes ("Main Benefits")	
Major Category	Legal Problem Code	Legal Problem Name	Benefit Code	"Plain English" Labels for Main Benefits
Consumer	1	Bankruptcy/Debtor Relief	101	Filed for Bankruptcy under Chapter 7 or 13
			102	Debt Payment Negotiated
			103	Debt Avoided/Money Saved
	2	Collection (Incl. Repossession/Deficiency/Garnishment)	201	Stopped debt collection harassment
	3	Contracts/Warranties	301	Overcame illegal sales contracts and/or warranties
	4	Collection Practices/Creditor Harassment	401	Overcame discrimination in obtaining credit
	5	Predatory Lending Practices (Other than Mortgages)	501	Prevented or overcame utility termination
	6	Loans/Installment Purchase (Other than Collection)	601	Obtained credit
Education	7	Public Utilities	701	Prevented or overcame utility shut-off (including phone)
			801	Overcame Unfair Sales Practices
			1101	Overcame suspension or expulsion
			1102	Obtained right to special education
	11	Education	1104	Educational Program Obtained/Preserved
			1105	Educational Appropriateness Improved

Employment	21	Employment Discrimination	2101	Overcame job discrimination
	22	Wage Claims and other FLSA (Fair Labor Standards Act) Issues	2201	Obtained wages due
	29	Other Employment	2901	Prevented wrongful discharge
			2902	Prevented illegal taking of employment benefit, e.g., pensions
			2904	Obtained an expungement (that is, got an unfavorable item removed from criminal record)
			2940	Got an arrest removed from my record
			2942	Got a pardon for a conviction
			2944	Police Records Corrected
			2946	Criminal Identity Theft in State Police Records - Corrected
			2948	Errors & Criminal Identity Theft in Criminal Court Records - Corrected
			2950	Inaccurate Criminal Reports by Vendors Corrected
			2952	Legal Restrictions - Ex Offenders - Able to Keep Job
			2954	Rights -Ex Offenders - Demand Letters - Obtained job or back pay
2956	Rights-Ex Offenders - Equal Emp Opp - Obtained Job or Back Pay			

Family

30	Adoption	3001	Successful Adoption
31	Custody/Visitation	3101	Obtained or maintained custody of children
		3102	Obtained or preserved right to visitation
32	Divorce/Separation/Annulment	3201	Obtained a divorce, legal sep., or annulment
33	Adult Guardian/Conservatorship	3301	Guardianship / Conserv. Obtained guardianship for disabled adult
		3302	Obtained guardianship for adoption for dependent child
		3303	Inappropriate Adult Guardianship Averted
34	Name Change	3401	Got name changed
35	Parental Rights Termination	3501	Prevented termination of parental rights
36	Paternity	3601	Established paternity for a child
37	Domestic Abuse	3701	Obtained protective order for victim of domestic violence
		3702	Issued warning to another party against "defiant trespass"
		3703	Got a protective order against me withdrawn or vacated
38	Support	3801	Obtained, preserved or increased child support
		3802	Decreased child support obligation
		3803	Obtained, preserved or increased spousal support
		3804	Decreased spousal support obligation

Juvenile	41	Delinquent	4102	Delinquency – consent decree obtained
			4103	Delinquency – informal consent obtained
			4104	Delinquency – charges withdrawn / dismissed
			4105	Delinquency – Expungement (removal of unfavorable item from criminal record) granted
	42	Neglected/Abused/Dependent	4201	Obtained benefits of emancipation
			4202	Obtained child protective order
			4204	Obtained child protective services without formal order
Health	51	Medicaid	5101	Gained access to Medicare or Medicaid provider
	52	Medicare	5201	Obtained/preserved/increased Medicare or Medicaid benefits/rights
	59	Other Health	5901	Obtained benefits of EPSDT (Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment) program
			5902	Prevented premature hospital discharge
			5903	Prevented nursing home abuse or assured nursing home quality care
			5904	Overcame denial of admission to emergency room
			5905	Stopped harmful medical treatment
			5906	Obtained health or disability insurance
			5908	Medical Benefits Obtained/Preserved
5909	Medical Treatment Obtained/Preserved/Improved			

Housing	61	Federally Subsidized Housing	6101	Obtained access to housing
	62	Homeownership/Real Property (Other than Foreclosure)	6201	Avoided foreclosure or other loss of home
	63	Private Landlord/Tenant	6301	Prevented eviction from rental housing
			6302	Overcame illegal charges by landlord
			6303	Overcame denial of tenant's rights under lease
			6304	Enforced tenant's rights to decent, habitable housing
			6305	Obtained repairs to dwelling
			6306	Housing/Shelter Preserved
			6307	Housing/Conditions Improved
	64	Public Housing	6401	Prevented denial of public housing tenant's rights
69	Other Housing	6901	Prevented illegal discrimination in obtaining housing	
Income Maintenance	71	TANF (Public Assistance Benefits)	7101	Obtained/preserved/increased AFDC/other welfare benefit/right
	72	Social Security (Other than SSDI)	7201	Black Lung
	73	Food Stamps	7301	Obtained/preserved/increased food stamps eligibility/right
	74	SSDI (Social Security Disability Income)	7401	Obtained/preserved/increased Social Security benefit/right
	75	SSI (Supplemental Security Income)	7501	Obtained/preserved/increased Supplemental Security or Disability benefit/right
	76	Unemployment Compensation	7601	Obtained/preserved/increased Unemployment comp. benefit/right
	77	Veterans Benefits	7701	Obtained/preserved/increased Veterans Benefits
	78	State and Local Income Maintenance	7801	Obtained/preserved/increased Worker's Compensation

Individual Rights	81	Immigration/Naturalization	8101	Immigrant avoided deportation
			8102	Undocumented immigrant obtained legal status
			8103	Immigrant family unit kept intact
	83	Prisoner's Rights	8301	Obtained/preserved/increased benefits/rights of prisoners
	84	Disability Rights	8401	Obtained/preserved/increased benefits/rights of disabled persons
			8402	Obtained/preserved/increased benefits/rights of instit. persons
Miscellaneous	91	Legal Assist. To Non-Profit Org. or Group (Incl. Incorporation/ Dissolution)	9101	Obtained incorporation/tax exempt status
	91	Legal Assist. To Non-Profit Org. or Group (Incl. Incorporation/ Dissolution)	9102	Obtained assistance with other structural or governance issues.
	92	Indian/Tribal Law	9201	Preserved or achieved Indian / Tribal benefits or rights
	93	Licenses (Drivers, Occupational, and Others)	9301	Overcame illegal taking of or restriction to a driver's license
	94	Torts (Personal Injury)	9401	Defended a Tort (Personal Injury)
	95	Wills/Estates	9501	Obtained a will
			9502	Obtained a living will or health proxy or power of attorney

99 Other Miscellaneous

9900	Stopped illegal activity other than that covered under Order of Protection against domestic violence
9901	Obtained other benefit (specify)
9902	Income Obtained/Preserved
9903	Essential Property Regained/Preserved
9904	Other Right/Privilege/Benefit Obtained/Preserved
9905	Monetary benefit achieved
9906	Money Won/Saved for Government
9907	Community Education Provided
9910	Pro Se (self represented litigant) goals achieved
9911	Power of Attorney document Prepared
9912	Medical Power of Attorney document Prepared
9913	Document Prepared