

PART I - FACE SHEET

APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE		1. TYPE OF SUBMISSION: Application <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Construction															
Modified Standard Form 424 (Rev.02/07 to confirm to the Corporation's eGrants System)																	
2a. DATE SUBMITTED TO CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE (CNCS):		3. DATE RECEIVED BY STATE: 21-JAN-11	STATE APPLICATION IDENTIFIER:														
2b. APPLICATION ID: 11AC124526		4. DATE RECEIVED BY FEDERAL AGENCY:	FEDERAL IDENTIFIER: 09ACHCA0010017														
5. APPLICATION INFORMATION																	
LEGAL NAME: Administrative Office of the Courts DUNS NUMBER: 124971982		NAME AND CONTACT INFORMATION FOR PROJECT DIRECTOR OR OTHER PERSON TO BE CONTACTED ON MATTERS INVOLVING THIS APPLICATION (give area codes): NAME: Nicole Claro-Quinn TELEPHONE NUMBER: (415) 865-4504 FAX NUMBER: INTERNET E-MAIL ADDRESS: nicole.claro@jud.ca.gov															
ADDRESS (give street address, city, state, zip code and county): 455 GoldenGate Ave San Francisco CA 94102 - 3660 County: San Francisco																	
6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EIN): 943105441		7. TYPE OF APPLICANT: 7a. State Government 7b. Other State Government															
8. TYPE OF APPLICATION (Check appropriate box). <input type="checkbox"/> NEW <input type="checkbox"/> NEW/PREVIOUS GRANTEE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CONTINUATION <input type="checkbox"/> AMENDMENT If Amendment, enter appropriate letter(s) in box(es): <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> A. AUGMENTATION B. BUDGET REVISION C. NO COST EXTENSION D. OTHER (specify below):		9. NAME OF FEDERAL AGENCY: Corporation for National and Community Service															
10a. CATALOG OF FEDERAL DOMESTIC ASSISTANCE NUMBER:94.006 10b. TITLE: AmeriCorps State		11.a. DESCRIPTIVE TITLE OF APPLICANT'S PROJECT: JusticeCorps															
12. AREAS AFFECTED BY PROJECT (List Cities, Counties, States, etc): Counties of Los Angeles, Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and San Diego		11.b. CNCS PROGRAM INITIATIVE (IF ANY):															
13. PROPOSED PROJECT: START DATE: 09/05/11 END DATE: 09/01/12		14. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF: a.Applicant <input type="text" value="CA 008"/> b.Program <input type="text" value="CA 008"/>															
15. ESTIMATED FUNDING: Year #: <input type="text" value="2"/>		16. IS APPLICATION SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS? <input type="checkbox"/> YES. THIS PREAPPLICATION/APPLICATION WAS MADE AVAILABLE TO THE STATE EXECUTIVE ORDER 12372 PROCESS FOR REVIEW ON: DATE: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO. PROGRAM IS NOT COVERED BY E.O. 12372															
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;">a. FEDERAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 1,018,884.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. APPLICANT</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 723,978.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. STATE</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. LOCAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>e. OTHER</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>f. PROGRAM INCOME</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 0.00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>g. TOTAL</td> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 1,742,862.00</td> </tr> </table>		a. FEDERAL	\$ 1,018,884.00	b. APPLICANT	\$ 723,978.00	c. STATE	\$ 0.00	d. LOCAL	\$ 0.00	e. OTHER	\$ 0.00	f. PROGRAM INCOME	\$ 0.00	g. TOTAL	\$ 1,742,862.00	17. IS THE APPLICANT DELINQUENT ON ANY FEDERAL DEBT? <input type="checkbox"/> YES if "Yes," attach an explanation. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	
a. FEDERAL	\$ 1,018,884.00																
b. APPLICANT	\$ 723,978.00																
c. STATE	\$ 0.00																
d. LOCAL	\$ 0.00																
e. OTHER	\$ 0.00																
f. PROGRAM INCOME	\$ 0.00																
g. TOTAL	\$ 1,742,862.00																
18. TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF, ALL DATA IN THIS APPLICATION/PREAPPLICATION ARE TRUE AND CORRECT, THE DOCUMENT HAS BEEN DULY AUTHORIZED BY THE GOVERNING BODY OF THE APPLICANT AND THE APPLICANT WILL COMPLY WITH THE ATTACHED ASSURANCES IF THE ASSISTANCE IS AWARDED.																	
a. TYPED NAME OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE: Nicole Claro-Quinn		b. TITLE:	c. TELEPHONE NUMBER: (415) 865-4504														
d. SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE:			e. DATE SIGNED: 05/06/11														

Narratives

Executive Summary

The JusticeCorps program addresses a vital need--increasing access to justice for all, especially low-income and non-native English speakers trying to resolve family law, civil, or small claims case without the assistance of a lawyer. JusticeCorps members are placed in legal access self-help centers, where they provide information and referrals, assist in completion of forms, and help people navigate the entire court process. Since 2004, 600 members have served over 100,000 Californians.

Rationale and Approach

A. Rationale and Approach

1. Compelling Community Need

The National Legal Services Corporation (LSC), the institution charged by Congress to report on the level of assistance required to respond adequately to the civil legal needs of low income individuals and families, has well documented our nation's continually growing "justice gap." Their recent report shows that nearly one million people are turned away from LSC funded legal aid programs every year in the U.S. In California, where urban area unemployment and poverty rates are rising faster than those in other states, the gap between the need for and the availability of legal assistance is especially significant. The California State Bar's Access to Justice Commission reports that less than one-third of the legal services needs of low income Californians are met. Stated another way, there is only one legal aid lawyer for every 8,361 low income Californians in need.

According to the California Judicial Council Task Force on Self-Represented Litigants, over 4 million people come to court each year without an attorney to represent them, typically because they cannot afford one. In most types of family law cases approximately 80% of petitioners are self-represented. For housing law cases, over 90% are self-represented. These individuals may have been turned away by legal aid providers, or they may not have known how to find a legal aid provider in the first place. Some go to court with papers they have been formally "served," but are unable to fully understand what they mean. Others come to find out how to start a case, or how to move their case to conclusion. Still others come

Narratives

to court thinking all they need is a simple piece of paper, only to find out it's not simple at all. For example, a woman could come to court to get copies of a "Divorce Judgment" that she needs to prove she was divorced long ago for a new apartment lease application -- only to discover that her case was never completed. (There is no written "Judgment" on file with the court.) She has nowhere to go but to the court for answers.

Given that fewer people can afford private attorneys and that legal aid services are not available to most who need them, our judicial branch can't simply sit back and watch litigants lose their way in the system. As California Supreme Court Chief Justice Ronald George stated in a speech before the State Assembly in 2007, "The numbers of self-represented litigants continues to rise and their needs will, in my opinion, pose the single most challenging issue for the courts. The self-help legal access centers provided in the courthouses are making a difference but are far from sufficient to meet the urgent needs of unrepresented litigants." The most basic of human needs: caring and providing for our children; protecting personal safety; and securing housing and shelter, are put in serious jeopardy when people cannot move past their legal problems. Yet millions of people each year find themselves attempting to resolve complex issues in a court system designed for highly trained attorneys--not the average citizen--to navigate.

If we fail to make an impartial court system accessible to those without attorneys for matters such as requesting a restraining order to avoid elder abuse, or responding to an eviction notice, then we are jeopardizing community stability. Legal issues important to families left unresolved have far reaching societal impacts. When a family breaks apart without the ability to establish solid child custody and support orders, children are left in turmoil, unsure who will pick them up from school and help with their homework, at which house they will sleep or who will take them to the doctor when they are sick. Such instability decreases the likelihood of success in school for that child, lowering their chances to obtain a solid education and become a productive citizen.

While expanding attorney representation in civil cases nationwide is an important long term goal that

Narratives

could help some of the people described above, court-based self-help programs are an effective approach that is meeting the needs right now in communities around California. California's court-based self-help centers are an innovative, community-driven approach to supporting people who come to court without lawyers. Staffed by attorneys, paralegals, and experienced court clerks, the centers provide assistance to parties dealing with a variety of issues.

Legal matters involving family, housing and financial stability can be complex and usually involve multiple essential steps to reach full resolution. Typically they involve filling out many pages of forms, serving official notice on other parties, participating in mediation and sometimes appearing in the courtroom before a judge or a commissioner. When emotions and anxieties run high among litigants going through difficult personal situations, the court environment becomes even more intimidating. Add language barriers or limited education to the mix and challenges only intensify. For these reasons, it's an invaluable service to have well trained assistants representing the court, providing important information about process and procedure to the public.

Take, for example, the situation a Spanish-speaking San Francisco resident found himself in last summer. He came to the court's self-help center because he had been served with an eviction notice and did not understand why. A Spanish-speaking JusticeCorps member listened to his story and learned that the man was renting a small house for himself, his wife and two children. The JusticeCorps member helped to confirm that the bank was foreclosing on the house and evicting the tenants because the homeowner was not paying his mortgage even though the tenants were paying their rent to him. With the JusticeCorps member's help, the tenant was able to file a response to the notice and secure the right to stay in the house an additional 20 days while looking for a new, safe place for his family. Without the assistance of the self-help center, supported by JusticeCorps, the tenant and his family would have been forcibly removed from the apartment by the Sheriff without time to find a new home.

Collectively, the counties participating in this 2010 California JusticeCorps proposal represent nearly half (47%) the entire state population. These JusticeCorps partners--Los Angeles, San Diego, Alameda,

Narratives

San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties--all have fully operational court-based legal access self-help centers that have been participating in the JusticeCorps program for two or more years (San Diego is in its third year of operation, supported by an Education Award Only grant). The courts in these counties see thousands of people in their centers each month. Data from the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) on those who are seen in just one type of self-help center, the Family Law Facilitator's (FLF) Office, gives us an idea of the volume of people needing help. Across the 6 counties in this proposal, in 2008-09, over 163,000 people were seen, many on multiple occasions. Of those people seen, up to 65% of them were very low income. Up to 89% of them were from minority ethnicities. Total numbers of people coming to all types of court-based self-help centers are not collected in every county, but are much larger, including the proportions of those from low income and minority backgrounds.

2. Description of Activities and Member Roles

JusticeCorps members play a critical role in improving the capacity of our courts to provide access to justice for all Californians, regardless of their resources. Because the majority of the 285 total members recruited are full-time undergraduate students at partner campuses, most (265 members) serve in 300-hour positions. They are asked to commit to one all day (8 hour) or two half-day (4 hour) shifts each week over the course of their academic year. Additionally, 20 members, typically alumni who previously served in JusticeCorps, are recruited for full-time positions acting as team leaders, volunteer coordinators or case management fellows, in addition to providing the same direct service as the minimum-time members.

JusticeCorps members serve in a variety of capacities in the court-based self-help centers, primarily providing three key types of services:

- 1) Providing litigants with information about options and referrals to appropriate services within or outside the courts;
- 2) Assisting to identify and complete legal forms and procedures, one on one or in workshops;
- 3) Observing in the courtroom and providing litigants with information after courtroom sessions.

Narratives

In many cases, members will be providing some or all of these types of assistance to the same litigant during one visit or multiple subsequent visits. The types of services JusticeCorps members provide are best illustrated by the following real life examples.

* A distressed woman and her two toddler sons walk into the self-help center 15 minutes before the doors close. She carries with her an eviction notice and wants to know her options. Her first point of contact is with a JusticeCorps member who asks a few quick, basic questions about the woman's living situation including how long she has lived in her apartment, who else lives there, if she has been able to pay the rent on time and to whom she writes the checks. He reads the notice she has brought with her and sees that today is the last day to respond or face forcible eviction from the sheriff's office. He discusses the case with his supervising attorney and then explains to the woman that she can complete a form that will allow her to stay longer in the home. He helps the woman fill out the form while occupying the boys with coloring books and blocks. They finish the form and the supervisor quickly reviews it. The member explains how to file the papers and the woman expresses concern about her financial situation. He provides referrals to a neighborhood food bank and employment services for her to take with her. He tells her that the filing office is downstairs and she runs to submit her paperwork in time. This process results in her being granted a 20-day reprieve from eviction -- enough time to find new, safe housing for her family.

* A man sits in the back of a divorce workshop room filled with 10 other litigants, all at the same stage in filing for divorce. He squirms a bit in his chair. A few minutes into the workshop he begins to yell out "this isn't helping, you people won't help me." The JusticeCorps member assisting the attorney in facilitating the workshop walks over to find out if she can help, but the man is upset and keeps yelling. The attorney thinks he may need to be asked to leave the workshop. With the attorney watching, the member sits down with the man and asks some questions. He explains he isn't feeling well, that he's tired and can't do all this paperwork. He also explains that he was shot 2 years ago and that he has a brain injury. The member confirms with the attorney that the man qualifies for ADA services then goes

Narratives

back to explain to him that he has a right to be accommodated by the court based on his disability. She explains that if it would make him more comfortable, she can help him in a smaller, quieter room next door. One-on-one the man's anxiety is reduced and the member is able to provide enough attention to be of assistance. She also provides him with a referral to a county mental health program and explains that when he comes back in a few weeks to file his final paperwork he does not have to wait in line but rather can follow the blue signs to the ADA window.

* A Spanish-speaking woman goes before a judge for a hearing regarding custody and visitation of her children. Although someone translates for her while the judge states the orders, she feels confused and worries that she does not fully understand what was said. Then the judge points out the JusticeCorps member sitting in the back in the blue shirt, and explains that she is available to answer questions. The JusticeCorps member goes into the hallway with the woman and reviews in simpler language what the judge said. She also explains that the self-help center is one floor above and that she can go there for help to get the child custody and visitation schedule the judge approved put into a written order. The woman is relieved to have someone patiently explain what the judge said and what it means for her and her children, as well as the next steps needed to create an enforceable order.

* An elderly Vietnamese woman comes to the self-help center because she is fearful of her neighbor who yells at her and trespasses on her property. She wants to know if she has any legal options to keep him from bothering her. She speaks with the court's intake screener who refers her to a JusticeCorps member so that she may file to request a temporary restraining order (TRO). The member listens as the woman tries to explain (English is her second language) that the man lives across the street from her and he often verbally and emotionally abuses her while trespassing on her premises. The member reviews the facts with the supervising attorney, pulls the appropriate packet of forms from the center's files, and slowly explains each page to the woman as she fills them out. The member spends time helping write down the woman's story as she explains it for her written declaration, since she is not literate in English. After completing the forms the member reviews them with the supervisor, makes copies and

Narratives

explains the instructions for filing, serving notice and attending a court hearing. The member directs her to the filing window where her papers are processed so the TRO is granted. The woman is able to go home that evening with a greater sense of safety and security knowing the police will be notified of the TRO.

* A Spanish-speaking woman comes to the center with an official letter from the court. A JusticeCorps member at the front desk reads the letter and explains that the woman has been summoned for a caseflow status review in the "virtual" courtroom. The member directs her, explaining that instead of a judge, she will see court clerks and a JusticeCorps fellow who will review what is needed to move her case forward. During the review, the woman tells a JusticeCorps fellow that she has been paying a "Notario" to do her divorce case but she can't afford to pay anymore and she doesn't understand why her case isn't done. (Notarios, common in Hispanic neighborhoods, prepare legal documents for a fee. Most are unlicensed and unqualified, preying on low income non-English speakers, leaving them with inadequate documents and incomplete cases.) The member explains that the letter from the court simply states that her initial divorce case was started, but that it's been more than 90 days without notice being served on her husband. The member explains how to serve the appropriate papers on the other party and how to provide proof of service back to the court. The woman is also offered an appointment to then return to the self-help center to be assisted with the next steps in her case.

These situations are representative of common self-help center interactions. The effect of the members' service in these instances, as one site supervisor explained, "allows the attorneys that staff the self-help centers to become an octopus with eight arms." The members do not do the work of court staff, but rather, they complement it, expanding and enhancing the services the centers can provide so that more people are served more promptly and thoroughly. While members can sit with a litigant for 30 or more minutes to listen to their story, center staff could never do that without jeopardizing the ability to assist dozens of other litigants. During a workshop the member can concentrate assistance on the neediest participants and work the room to make sure everyone is keeping up, leaving the attorney free

Narratives

to assess, teach, and review. They can offer information to litigants in other languages when center staff who speak those languages may not be available. Through JusticeCorps, the self-help centers are able to serve more people, more thoroughly. The 2009 independent program evaluation showed that across all 6 JusticeCorps study sites, each JusticeCorps member serves an average of 12 people a day.

With 265 minimum time and 20 full time members across the participating counties, 2 or more JusticeCorps members are almost always on-site during the centers' open hours. Shifts of 4-8 hours once or twice a week for 9 or more months ensure that members are at the center frequently enough to receive sufficient on-site training and experience with the full variety of litigant issues.

Member training is most intensive in the first 2 months of service when members are still getting acclimated to legal terminology and court procedure. Subsequent trainings aim to both improve member confidence in their growing legal knowledge and inspire them to complete their commitment, even when midterms, holiday vacations and finals get in the way. Close, constant member supervision and mentoring also play a critical role in maintaining confidence and dedication. The more accessible the supervisor, the more engaged and committed the member becomes to their service. Well trained and supervised members are best equipped to answer questions and provide the public with thorough and helpful information. Members also continue to train during their service hours. When they are not assisting litigants, they often occupy their time with self-guided study including readings and web-based trainings.

3. Measurable Outputs and Outcomes

JusticeCorps' primary "Needs and Services" aligned outcome focuses on serving litigants in the centers. As our Performance Measurement Worksheet states, in 2010-2011 members will 1) provide 85,000 instances of assistance to litigants; 2) specifically providing appropriate information and referral, and 3) and helping litigants to complete packets of legal forms accurately. (See section C.1. for full description of performance measures.)

The "Information and Referral" members provide can range from directing litigants to the appropriate

Narratives

courthouse department or a future workshop, identifying litigants' potential need for legal representation and providing them with a list of legal aid organizations, or identifying a need for assistance by specific social service providers. Legal forms require varied time and attention. For example, at certain stages of a divorce case forms may be up to 10 pages. Other cases might require a 1 page document that must be completed and filed so litigants can resolve or move to the next phase of their case.

Members' instances of assistance are tracked and measured daily through member-completed and supervisor-approved tally sheets and review forms. In addition to rating members' work on the review forms, site supervisors conduct an "end-of-shift" debrief with each member to reflect on the cases they dealt with that day, identify areas for improvement, and recognize members' success.

4. Community Involvement

The establishment of self-help centers in the courts was a direct response to community need. In 2002, the AOC helped to facilitate community meetings in each California county to collect feedback from the public on what they would like to see in court-based legal access self-help center services. Each county structured their centers to meet community needs, but resources varied. Even today some self-help centers are only open a limited number of hours and are understaffed. When JusticeCorps began in Los Angeles in 2004, it was designed to allow center staff to serve more people, more thoroughly.

In 2006, with help from AOC researchers from the Center on Children and Families in the Courts, JusticeCorps program staff was able to connect with the Los Angeles community, by facilitating focus groups with self-help center users. They asked what was helpful about the services received, got recommendations for improvement, and made sure the program was addressing the appropriate community need. Program staff also collects input from the community through their legal aid partners including Neighborhood Legal Services and Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles. These non-profits regularly survey center users to collect information for continuous service improvement and justification for resource requests.

Narratives

While JusticeCorps is the only AmeriCorps program of its kind, training undergraduate students to provide assistance to the public in court-based legal access self-help centers, program staff have built relationships with other national service programs in the legal services arena including Equal Justice Works (EJW). Though EJW fellows are typically law school graduates qualified to provide legal representation for the underserved, the underlying community need address is the same--improving access to justice to help individuals and families move toward safer and more stable lives. JusticeCorps and EJW staff are working to raise the profile of this critically important service as legal services are essentially unrepresented in the focus areas identified in the new Serve America Act. JusticeCorps and EJW staff continue to submit proposals for facilitating National Service conference workshops together. JusticeCorps and EJW staff also work together to identify potential service day opportunities at local sites.

As our partnership forms show, the program maintains relationships with a number of other locally based community organizations, including La Raza Community Resource Center in San Francisco, San Diego and San Francisco Volunteer Lawyers Program, and also Service for Peace, which provides group opportunities for days of service.

One of the strongest aspects of the JusticeCorps program is its potential for replication. The original Los Angeles model was devised with the goal of replicating the program throughout the state. That goal continues to be met as JusticeCorps has expanded to the Bay Area, San Diego, and will begin a multi-county partnership in Sacramento, Yolo, and Placer counties in Fall 2010. While California is the only judicial system in the nation with court-based self-help legal access centers in nearly every county, many other states are now in the process of opening centers in their courts. As funding and resources for national service expand over the next several years under the Serve America Act, a partnership between judicial systems and AmeriCorps programs could open up hundreds of opportunities in an emerging, important, and fulfilling arena of national service. AOC program staff, which takes a lead role in expanding JusticeCorps' reach, has advised Bar Foundation staff in Chicago about replicating the

Narratives

program. As a result, Chicago and New York will jointly submit an application for an AmeriCorps planning grant to explore creating JusticeCorps programs in their cities. Montana, Texas, New York, New Hampshire and Hawaii have also reached out to learn more about the program. AOC staff continues to develop strategies and seek outside funding to develop tools and resources to support nationwide program replication.

Organizational Capability

D. Organizational Capability

1. Sound Organizational Structure

The AOC is the staff agency to the Judicial Council of California, the policymaking body of the state court system. The AOC is responsible for a variety of programs and services to improve access to a fair and impartial judicial system and is organized into offices in San Francisco, Sacramento, and Los Angeles, with a staff of more than 800 serving the courts in all 58 counties.

The first goal listed in the Judicial Council's most recent Strategic Plan, Justice in Focus, is "Access, Fairness and Diversity," specifically that "All Californians will have equal access to the courts and equal ability to participate in court proceedings." In the effort to promote "accessibility," AOC staff helped to implement several significant improvements in our court system. First, AOC staff helped to oversee the implementation of Assembly Bill 1058 providing a full time Family Law Facilitator to assist with child support cases in every county. In addition, staff helped establish 5 pilot Self-Help Centers around the state. The centers build on the work of the facilitators and provide other much needed services many of which are targeted to specific ethnic communities in need.

For the last 6 years, agency-wide, the AOC has administered an average of \$4.1 million in federal grants and contracts. These funds include over \$600,000 in Department of Justice (DOJ), Violence Against Women Office funding to conduct a Violence Against Women Judicial Education project, \$1 million from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to administer the Access to Visitation program for the state, and over \$3 million from HHS for the Court Improvement Project to strengthen

Narratives

juvenile dependency court programs in the state. Most recently, the agency was awarded \$424,000 of Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Recovery Act funds for an evidence-based probation supervision project, and \$500,000 for the evaluation of a new parolee reentry court project.

This and all other special funding administered by the AOC is managed by our finance department's grant accounting unit. All JusticeCorps sub-grantee expenses are tracked, verified and reported on by an assigned staff person in the grants accounting unit. The AOC has never defaulted on any of its contracts nor had any grant contracts terminated for cause.

The AOC's finance division is responsible for providing an integrated program of budget planning, asset management, accounting, procurement, contract management, and facility coordination to the judicial branch and all California Superior courts. As such, the division maintains extensive written fiscal policies and procedures manuals for the judicial branch, including all of the California trial courts, about budgeting, procurement and contracts. As a state agency, the AOC is subject to the single audit act under the direction of the California Bureau of State Audits.

The AOC is a large agency with a solid administrative infrastructure. But without AmeriCorps support, the JusticeCorps program would not be possible. The AOC provides limited, legislated funding to the courts to hire Family Law Facilitators and to fund model self-help programs, but it does not have a means to support the court-based self-help legal assistance program innovations being undertaken by JusticeCorps. It's the AmeriCorps program structure that provides the mechanism to make the necessary connections with local universities and community based organizations.

The AOC's ability to provide sound programmatic and fiscal oversight is bolstered by the experience and expertise of the program partnership. The program partners fall into three general categories: 1) Court Partners: The AOC; LA, Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Diego Superior Courts; 2) University partners and 3) community based partners, including Neighborhood Legal Services, Legal Aid Foundation of LA, Public Counsel, Legal Aid of San Mateo County, and San Diego Volunteer Lawyers.

Narratives

In LA, the JusticeCorps program has built on the partnerships that operate the self-help programs. In the Bay Area members assist representatives from community partners who run workshops at court sites on subjects including divorce. In San Diego, members assist in clinics run by San Diego Volunteer Lawyers

As a government agency, the AOC does not have a board of directors. The 2 primary AOC JusticeCorps staff are housed within the AOC's Executive Office Programs Division. Nicole Claro-Quinn, AOC Senior Court Services Analyst, is the Statewide JusticeCorps Program Director. Abigail Birnbaum, whose .60FTE position is funded through the AmeriCorps grant, has been the Statewide JusticeCorps Program Coordinator since 2007. In addition, Martha Wright, who was JusticeCorps founding Statewide Director, continues to work with the program providing consultation, working on program expansion and replication, and exploring external funding opportunities. Ms. Claro-Quinn and Ms. Birnbaum, and a designated AOC grants accountant in the Finance Division, are responsible for managing the day-to-day operations of the program at a statewide level, including: subcontracting AmeriCorps grant funds to the partner courts; collecting and reporting on all invoices for approved, budgeting program expenses; collecting performance measure data from local program staff and submitting the final reports to the funder; identifying training resources including physical locations, materials, and speakers; maintaining the program web site with content input from the local programs; and attending annual California Volunteers conferences. AOC staff also conducts monthly conference calls with all program directors together, attends annual all partner meetings and makes regular site visits to meet with program staff, observe in the centers or participate in trainings.

Local program staff are headquartered at LA Superior's downtown court building, Alameda Superior's Oakland court building, and San Diego's Downtown Central Courthouse. LA maintains 3.5 full time staff, and 7 part time university representatives. The Bay Area has 3 full time staff and 4 university representatives. San Diego has operated as a small Education Award Only program with the equivalent of .75 staff, and if this proposal is successful, will increase to 1 full-time staff member and one .50 staff

Narratives

member. In all three regions the JusticeCorps staff teams are responsible for recruiting, placing and managing JusticeCorps members; coordinating and communicating with their placement sites; and managing the relationships with the partner universities and community based organizations. Local staff teams schedule and facilitate their site supervisor and university representative meetings and annual all partner meetings each spring. All JusticeCorps staff also meet as a group at the CaliforniaVolunteers annual conference. Key program staff:

AOC Statewide Program Director Nicole Claro-Quinn (.25 FTE in-kind): Nicole Claro-Quinn, who has 15 years of experience in community outreach and nonprofit development, has overseen the JusticeCorps program for the past 3 years. Ms. Claro-Quinn is the program's primary point of contact representing the AOC (as the intermediary organization on behalf of the courts) with the funder, working day-to-day with program staff to troubleshoot and manage budgets, developing new partnerships, working to diversify the program's funding and resources to achieve sustainability, and answering inquiries from interested parties outside the program.

AOC Statewide JusticeCorps Program Coordinator Abigail Birnbaum (.60 FTE grant funded): With the program first expanded in year 4, adding 150 more members and several new partners, the AOC hired an Analyst, Abigail Birnbaum to support statewide program coordination. Ms. Birnbaum is responsible for supporting development of training, testing, recruitment/retention efforts for the program and its lead courts, JusticeCorps alumni outreach, and coordinating statewide program policies. In 2007 Ms. Birnbaum was the AOC graduate intern for the JusticeCorps program and in 2008 she received her Master's degree in Public Administration from San Francisco State University.

AOC Statewide JusticeCorps Fiscal Administrator (.33 FTE grant funded with admin allocation): With the administrative funds provided in the grant award, the AOC will provide a part time position in the Finance Division dedicated to all final fiscal reporting on these grant funds. This Fiscal Administrator will collect and verify and finalize reports on all time sheets, invoices and financial documentation from the partner courts consistent with the program's approved budget and AmeriCorps fiscal guidelines.

Narratives

L.A. Program Director Jennifer Kalish, PhD (1FTE grant funded): A full time employee of L.A. Superior Court, Ms. Kalish has been running the L.A. program, in consultation with her supervisor, Kathleen Dixon, since it began in 2004. She has a background in Service Learning from UCLA. She was the guiding force behind creating the program protocols as they exist today and is responsible for developing the member supports in place to help improve retention. In her role as program director, Ms. Kalish oversees the program on a daily basis, is integral to development of new program elements such as the JusticeCorps Fellows program, coordinates partners and member trainings, directs program staff and oversees the collection of data for performance measurement.

L.A. Program Coordinator Sheree Andaya Valdoria (1 FTE partial grant-funded, partial in-kind): A full time employee of L.A. Superior Court, Ms. Valdoria has also been with the program since it first began. She coordinates site assignments of members, planning and coordinating training events, overseeing the collection of member timesheets, and reporting on member hours.

L.A. Program Coordinator Katrina Lindsey (1 FTE partial grant-funded, partial in-kind): A full-time employee of LA Superior Court, Ms. Lindsey performs similar duties as those described for Sheree's position. Ms. Lindsey took on this position in 2008, after her first year working with JusticeCorps in the program assistant position.

L.A. Program Assistant (.50 FTE grant-funded): Currently vacant, this position is responsible for providing administrative support to the program staff, including tracking and collecting member paperwork, processing member travel reimbursements, and providing support to coordinate trainings.

JusticeCorps managing attorney Kathleen Dixon, who founded the program in 2004, continues to provide day-to-day oversight to the Los Angeles JusticeCorps program.

The positions of the Bay Area and San Diego Program staff have been modeled on the LA staff and are the same unless otherwise specified:

Bay Area Program Director Dan Siskind (1 FTE grant funded): A full time employee of Alameda Superior Court, Mr. Siskind has been running the Bay Area program since August 2006. In his tenure as

Narratives

director of the Bay Area program, he created and developed the JusticeCorps team leader member position, and has successfully steered the program through its first multi-county incarnation. Mr. Siskind served two terms as a Teach for America AmeriCorps member and has worked as an AmeriCorps Site Supervisor. As an Executive Branch fellow he served with the California Service Corps.

Bay Area Program Coordinator Cindy Thorpe (1FTE in-kind): Ms. Thorp, who has more than 20 years of experience as an attorney specializing in many areas of family law, was most recently a staff attorney at the Santa Clara court, where she also acted as a JusticeCorps supervisor. She joined the Bay Area staff in 2009.

Bay Area Program Assistant Tere Kong (1 FTE in-kind): A full time employee of Alameda Superior Court, Ms. Kong has been with the program since 2006. Prior to JusticeCorps, she worked for the Family and Children's Bureau of the court for 8 years.

Mr. James Brighton, Director, Planning and Research provides management oversight for the Bay Area program.

San Diego Program Director (1 FTE grant-funded): This position will mirror the job responsibilities of the Los Angeles and Bay Area directors'. Ms. Kathleen Abbott (whose qualifications are described below) has occupied this position as a .50 FTE for the duration of the San Diego Education Award Only program, and she will continue in a .50 FTE capacity as the program coordinator. Should this proposal be accepted, a new full-time employee will be hired by San Diego Superior to run the JusticeCorps program.

San Diego Program Coordinator Kathleen Abbott (.50 FTE in-kind): In addition to her 3-year tenure with the JusticeCorps program and her more than 20 years at San Diego Superior, has experience with court programs, implementing grant funded projects, working with universities and college students, and recruiting volunteers and managing court partnerships.

Ms. Julie Myres, Manager of Volunteer and Outreach Services for San Diego Superior, who has provided management oversight of the program since it began in San Diego 3 years ago, will continue in

Narratives

this role.

University Representatives (part-time, grant funded): 7 in LA, 4 in the Bay Area, and 2 in San Diego: Former JusticeCorps alumni are recruited to assist in the recruitment, coordination and support of members

JusticeCorps staff at the AOC are overseen by a manager with strong knowledge of the program, who advocates for AOC funding and provides program development support. The matching funds provided by the AOC to LA, Alameda, and San Diego Superior are governed by Memoranda of Understanding that explicitly outline how the funds are to be used to support the program, when the superior courts are to report on the expenditure of the funds and how the funds will support the mandatory matching funds requirements for the proposed AmeriCorps grant.

The AOC staff will continue to be the primary contact for the designated California Volunteers program officer. AOC staff will work with California Volunteers to develop the contract, refine and improve performance measures and either include local program staff in conference calls or trainings, or pass the materials along to assure local staff benefit as well. AOC staff will also identify and coordinate the attendance of local program staff at any relevant statewide self-help legal access conferences that are sponsored by the AOC for court staff and justice system partners throughout the year.

2. Sound Record of Accomplishment as an Organization

The California Judicial branch has been recognized nationwide as a leader in improving access to justice for people in need. The AOC has a strong track record in this regard, but leadership initiatives they have put forward would not exist without the courts that provide services, see the need, and develop their own innovative solutions. The AOC is proud to be a partner who can help take programs to scale, but the solid foundation of all the JusticeCorps partner courts makes this possible.

The JusticeCorps program is helping to bring attention to the issues of access to justice faced by our courts and communities and the significant barriers still present. In the long run, the program will help to generate support in terms of long term volunteer assistance including assistance from trained

Narratives

students through the partnerships developed with local universities and law schools, new community based private partnerships. Partnerships between the universities and the legal services community have been established that didn't exist before JusticeCorps. The program can also help to justify requests to decision makers in the judicial branch and state legislature that the court-based self-help centers are considered "core functions" of the courts and that appropriate funding is incorporated into the courts annual base budgets. The JusticeCorps program's significant contributions to increasing the public's trust and confidence in their courts is going a long way toward achieving that goal.

3. Success in Securing Community Support

In its first 6 years of implementation, the program and the work of its members has been incredibly well received by court staff and executives, judges, universities and other partners. This enthusiastic support of this innovative effort has translated into a commitment by the participating local courts to fund program staff positions and find matching funds for full-time living allowance (the other program staff are supported with AOC matching funds given to the courts and this AmeriCorps grant).

Program staff at the state and local levels are working to leverage this broad-based support to increase resources and achieve a more diversified funding base. The Los Angeles Court was awarded a 2008 Bar Foundation grant of \$10,000 to train site supervisors and increase member retention. The court has applied for a 2009 award to focus on civic engagement training. The AOC and local program staff will also work with our partner private sector legal aid organizations to apply for private foundation funding from organizations interested in civic engagement and legal services projects like the Weingart and Parsons Foundations. We are actively pursuing a partnership with Equal Justice Works, which has the potential to unearth new streams of funding.

Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy

E. Cost Effectiveness and Budget Adequacy

With a requested corporation share of \$1,021,835, the 2010-11 JusticeCorps program proposed cost per MSY is \$13,431, slightly higher than our prior year due to a revised program design that includes an

Narratives

expanded number of F/T members (93 additional members total). Two of the Full-Time members will act as team leaders for the San Diego program, 4 are team leaders in the Bay Area (whose work this past year has helped strengthen retention and increased the impact of JusticeCorps service in the Bay Area), and Los Angeles has added 2 members to its cohort of F/T Case Management Fellows.

For this proposed 2010-2011 program, the AOC and the local superior courts will both be providing matching funds to support some of the personnel costs. The local courts will also provide the additional funds needed to support over half of the cost of the living allowance for the 20 proposed full time members. Our proposed budget quantifies a 42% match, well above the required 38% match for programs in their seventh year. Other additional matching funds not quantified in the budget include the supervisory time provided by either the court or their non-profit legal aid organization partner and the university service learning or community based learning director's time for overseeing general member recruitment and the employment of the university reps.

Evaluation Summary or Plan

N/A

Amendment Justification

NOT SENT

Clarification Summary

Program Start Date: 9/11/2010

Program End Date: 9/9/2011

PROGRAMMATIC CLARIFICATION ITEMS

1. Given that there are a multitude of national service programs operating in the same counties and cities served by JusticeCorps, clarify how the program engages and collaborates with other national service programs in its service area aside from Equal Justice Works.

Clarification Summary Response: The California JusticeCorps program partners with additional local AmeriCorps programs in other important ways as well. First, most of our partner campuses participate

Narratives

in or even lead other AmeriCorps programs such as Bonner Leaders at the UC Berkeley Campus, BruinCorps at UCLA and Bridging Borders at San Jose State University. JusticeCorps partners with those programs on our partner campuses to leverage student recruitment resources and also to identify and participate in national service days. Second, JusticeCorps has offered its full-time members first aid and CPR training through California SafeCorps. And finally, JusticeCorps program staff at the statewide level confer regularly with other California programs such as AmeriCorps Restoring Youth and Communities and Bay Area Community Resources AmeriCorps regarding program policies and practices, overcoming administrative and implementation challenges. JusticeCorps also has a state-level staff representative on the Board of the California AmeriCorps Alliance whose mission is to support California AmeriCorps programs' capacity to achieve the highest ideals and goals of national and community service.

2. Clarify the "manager" position that oversees JusticeCorps staff at the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC). Who does this person report to and what is their role and responsibilities in the applicant's organizational structure? Additionally, within what department in the organization does the JusticeCorps program reside and how does the AOC (or the department that administers JusticeCorps within AOC) assess its effectiveness as a government entity?

Clarification Summary Response: The JusticeCorps manager is an in-kind match-funded position that acts as the direct contact with CaliforniaVolunteers, the state agency that oversees AmeriCorps funding in California. Nicole Claro-Quinn, who has held this role for three years, works for the Administrative Office of the Courts, the legal applicant on this grant proposal. In her role as statewide director of the JusticeCorps program, she maintains contact with CalVolunteers, coordinates all programmatic and fiscal reporting to CV, and works day-to-day with program staff that are running the JusticeCorps program at their courts. In addition, Ms. Claro-Quinn manages the sub-grant contracts that govern program funding for each regional program and oversees funding agreements governing other state

Narratives

monies committed by the AOC to supplement court matching funds.

Ms. Claro-Quinn works in the Promising and Effective Programs (PEP) Unit of the AOC's Executive Office Programs (EOP) and reports directly to that Unit's Manager, John A. Larson, a member of the EOP Executive Team. EOP works closely with the Judicial Council and courts throughout the state on a variety of programs--the PEP unit houses not only the JusticeCorps program but also the Jury Improvement program; the Innovations in the California Courts program, which identifies, promotes, and fosters creative and cost-effective programs furthering access to the courts for the public; a Civics Education program that works with teachers throughout the state to develop K-12 curriculum around the judicial branch and the constitution; and the AOC's Grants Management and Development program, which supports courts and the entire branch in its efforts to diversify funding and launch new projects.

Every five years the Judicial Council and the AOC engage in a strategic planning process, immediately followed by an Operational Planning process to implement the most recent Strategic Plan. Both documents are considered plans that apply to the entire Judicial Branch--the Strategic Plan lists as one of its primary goals "to increase access to justice," and the Operational Plan contains a number of objectives to reach that goal. The AOC uses the Strategic Plan goals and Operational Plan objectives to measure milestone and benchmark achievements throughout each documents' tenure. In addition, the AOC regularly surveys the courts on a variety of subjects to assess need for training and technical assistance in HR, Finance, I/S, Research, and programmatic functions.

3. Clarify the organizational plan (not programmatic plan) for self-assessment and continuous improvement. This is different than the independent program evaluation, site observations, focus group, and feedback surveys to evaluate the impact of the JusticeCorps program.

Clarification Summary Response: Each region meets with its organizational partners at least twice a year

Narratives

to discuss challenges and successes and identify opportunities for development. In addition to reviewing current progress towards Performance Measurements, the groups discuss staffing issues, potential for member training content, potential for applying for grants to increase staff training opportunities, and any organizational circumstances that may have an effect on the program. (For example, the budget crisis at the governmental and university level; court reorganizations that may have an impact on the program; etc.) AOC staff takes a lead role in monitoring and raising questions throughout the year regarding budget needs, staffing, etc. Each year prior to and during the Continuation or re-compete process, statewide staff revisits organizational goals (e.g., program policy, program staffing, program funding) and reaches consensus on how best to reach those goals or identify new ones.

4. Clarify the roles of the site supervisors in the program design, and if the site supervisors are hired by the program or are they current employees of the court serving as volunteer supervisors to the members.

Clarification Summary Response: Site supervisors are staff attorneys already employed by the participating courts, or by the legal aid agencies that run the court-based self help centers. Site supervisors take on oversight of JusticeCorps members in addition to their duties as self-help center attorneys. In this oversight role, they are responsible for mentoring, training, and scheduling a cohort of JusticeCorps members. This includes regularly monitoring members' progress, including reviewing their work daily--signing off on timesheets and tracking sheets that detail and assess Information and Referral and legal document assistance--and performing twice-yearly performance reviews for the members in their cohort. Site supervisors are responsible for anywhere from 5-12 members, depending on the region, size of their center, and number of members assigned.

5. Clarify the distribution of full-time and minimum time members at each of the three sites.

Clarification Summary Response: Our proposed program design is as follows:

Los Angeles: 143 M/T members, 13 F/T members

Narratives

Bay Area: 72 M/T members, 5 F/T members

San Diego: 48 M/T members, 2 F/T members.

The program diagram submitted with our original application shows the proposed distribution of members among all participating service sites.

6. Provide justification for the cost/MSY increase from last year.

Clarification Summary Response: JusticeCorps' cost/MSY has increased from \$12,532 to \$13,431. Our re-compete application proposes an expanded program that adds 41 M/T members and 3 F/T members. By adding San Diego county to the program we have also proposed increased staffing costs in line with what is necessary to transition a regional program from an EAP program to a fully operational program. This proposed program expansion represents a collection of densely populated, high-need counties that make up 48% of the entire state. Accordingly, JusticeCorps will be providing more service to more people in need.

BUDGET CLARIFICATION ITEMS:

1. Section 1-B: Personnel Fringe Benefits - Clarify the "other benefits" in the personnel section of the budget and explain what is the 0.18% for minimal admin costs. Clarify the "Lump Sum Payout" for Alameda.

Clarification Summary Response: The "Other Benefits" for AOC personnel reflects Vision Coverage, Life Insurance, and FlexElect.; The Alameda "lump sum payout" reflects accrued vacation time paid out to people when they leave employment or retire.

2. Section 1-C: Staff Travel - Explain the discrepancy between the 8 staff budgeted for hotel and flight, and the 16 budgeted for registration to the CNCS-sponsored event. Furthermore, specify the CNCS-sponsored event and whether the airfare budgeted for the correct number of staff is reasonable.

Narratives

Clarification Summary Response: Each year, CaliforniaVolunteers holds a conference for its portfolio, either in Southern California or Northern California. Our staff is split approximately in half between these regions, so we budget for registration fees for the entire staff and for airfare and hotel for the half of the staff members who will have to travel and stay overnight. Airfare is based on rates procured by the AOC's contracted travel agent.

3. Section 1-C: Member Travel - Member travel to sites from home is budgeted, which is not allowable. Only travel between sites is allowable. Clarify member travel "parking to Central Courthouse" and San Diego member travel "Parking costs of \$8,800". The amount budgeted seems high.

Clarification Summary Response: We understand the restrictions on member travel costs and have removed that item from the budget.

4. Section 1-E: Supplies - Clarify that the AC logo is on the gear being purchased

Clarification Summary Response: Please see Updated Budget Narrative

5. Section 1-F: Contractual and Consultant Services - Clarify the duplicate costs of LA University Reps salaries included in both the "personnel expenses" and "consultant services" sections of the budget. Are the university reps employees or consultants of the project? The narrative states they will be "hired," but clarification is needed and consolidated to one section of the budget. Either turn this into a true contract line item not exceeding \$617 or move it to Section I. Salaries and Fringe.

Clarification Summary Response: The budget narrative has been updated to reflect University rep costs only in the Contractor and Consultants line item. University reps are part-time workers acting as liaisons between members, partner universities, and program Staff. They are either employees of an independently contracted University or Legal Aid Partner or are directly contracted with as independent

Narratives

contractors.

6. Section 1-G Member and Staff Training - Clarify why the number of reflective session binders does not match the total number of members at each site. Costs include reimbursing universities for reflection sessions on campus (\$100-\$300 per university). Please clarify these costs, and why there is a separate cost for reflective sessions.

Clarification Summary Response: Binders are not for reflection sessions only--they are for general members training (to house orientation materials and materials gathered during ongoing trainings throughout the year.) Additional binders are needed to distribute for refilled slots, to replace binders lost by members, to distribute to potential and current partners, and also to distribute on an as-needed basis to site supervisors and other staff. Some courts have binders left over from other years so amount budgeted may be closer to number of members. Reflection session costs include printing/copying materials, supplies (such as flip charts and markers), and other costs incurred by university reps who conduct reflection sessions. These are distinct from program supplies used at the program level (e.g., at program headquarters) and are reimbursed to the university reps who front the money to buy reflection supplies.

7. Section 1-H: Evaluation - Clarify why evaluation costs are not budgeted. An external evaluation is required annually given the amount requested.

Clarification Summary Response: The budget narrative has been updated to reflect evaluation consultant costs as matching funds. (External consultant costs are paid out of other funds and will show as match.) Please note that the daily rate stated in the budget narrative is an average that reflects costs for entire evaluation team working with the contracted firm.

8. Section 1-I: Other Program Operating Costs - Clarify that all members and grant-funded staff pass a

Narratives

criminal background check regardless if costs are not included in the budget.

Clarification Summary Response: Please see updated Budget Narrative for clarification

9. Section II-B: Member Support Costs - Clarify why the LA site is exempt from FICA; only 7 members are budgeted for FICA. Provide documentation to support that all members are covered by workers' compensation. Programs not required to provide workers' compensation also need to obtain Occupational, Accidental, Death, and Dismemberment coverage for members to cover in-service injury or incidents and have proof of documentation.

Clarification Summary Response: Los Angeles County agencies were affected by the Social Security Amendments of 1983, which resulted in the "Windfall Elimination Provision." Basically, the County became exempt from FICA (that is, it no longer was required to pay into Social Security). Los Angeles Superior payroll is still handled as a function of the county, and so the court remains exempt from FICA.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT CLARIFICATION

NOTE*** THE FIELD FOR PREV. YRS. DATA IN THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES WAS NOT AVAILABLE. HERE ARE THE PREVIOUS YEAR DATA FOR THE JUSTICECORPS PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Assisting Self-Represented Litigants

Prev. Yrs. Data OUTPUT: In 2008-09 77,775 litigants served

Prev. Yrs. Data INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME: In 2008-09 38,829 instances of information and referral (85%) were verified as accurate

Prev. Yrs. Data END OUTCOME: In 2008-09 28,700 legal packets (91%) were verified as accurate and complete by the site supervisor.

Narratives

JusticeCorps Member Training & Development

Prev. Yrs. Data OUTPUT: In 2008-2009, 232 members completed orientation. The graduation cohort of 204 members completed all training.

Prev. Yrs. Data END OUTCOME: In 2008-2009, 84% of members completing both pre-tests and post tests increased their scores by at least 20 percentage points.

Volunteer Recruitment

Prev. Yrs. Data OUTPUT: In 2008-2009, 26 ongoing volunteers were recruited for 1,670 hours of service. In 2008-2009, 84 one-time volunteers were recruited for 443 hours of service

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT CLARIFICATION--MAY 2, 2011

Assisting Self-Representing Litigants Measure

1. CNCS QUERY: The Output: tracks two targets: 80,000 contacts and 34,000 packets of information.

JUSTICECORPS RESPONSE: Correct. The output tracks 80,000 instances of assistance ("contact") and 34,000 completed legal forms. Rather than "packets of information," the 34,000 forms are complex legal documents that must be completed accurately and completely for a case to continue to move through the system.

2. CNCS QUERY: The Intermediate Outcome only deals with the efficacy of the 34,000 packets and the subsequent impact on the litigants.

JUSTICECORPS RESPONSE: Correct. The 34,000 "packets" are legal forms--complex legal documents that must be completed accurately and completely for a case to move through the system and generate the program's impact that "Assisted litigants are better prepared to proceed with their cases."

Narratives

3. CNCS QUERY: The program should consider streamlining the output and intermediate outcome to track the 34,000 packets. The program may also want to develop a new output and intermediate outcome to track the impact of the 80,000 contacts.

JUSTICECORPS RESPONSE: The initial count of 34,000 and 80,000 respectively refers to legal documents completed and instances of assistance. The intermediate outcome addresses the accuracy and completeness of the legal documents. The output of 80,000 instances of assistance includes a number of things, such as referrals or translation support, that help litigants move to the stage of completing forms, which is key in moving a case forward.

The JusticeCorps program is designed to support litigants dealing with a number of sensitive issues, including domestic violence, divorce, and child welfare. The program design provides assistance to move through these cases with assistance only--the members are not assigned as attorneys and are not expected or trained to follow cases to completion. Given that litigants may make multiple visits to the self-help centers, the design is such that the public can be served independent of where they might be in their case.

The measure of "accurate and complete" ensures increased access to justice for everyone coming to court. Its impact is the primary one for our program, that: "assisted litigants are better prepared to proceed with their cases."

BUDGET CLARIFICATION ITEMS--MAY 2, 2011

CNCS QUERY: In the budget line item "Section 1 -- I: Other Program Operating Cost", please ensure that your program has appropriately budgeted for required criminal history background checks, including FBI checks for all staff and members supported by this grant. Please make this change directly

Narratives

in the application budget and budget narrative in eGrants.

JUSTICECORPS RESPONSE: Because of the nature of our program--members serving at court-based self-help centers--all members and staff have always been required to undergo a full background check, including an FBI check. (In order to work or volunteer at a California court, you must undergo this multi-level check. This was true well in advance of the CNCS requirement that went into effect in April of this year.) As this is a necessity for service or employment at the court, we have not included costs in our budget, either as grant or match funding. For the most part, this is considered an in-kind contribution on the part of program partners, although our operational grant budget does include a small amount to help offset these costs. Our required match is well covered through other areas including Personnel Costs, Member Costs, and Living Allowances. However, we can verify that all members and staff undergo required checks and the community they are serving is safe in their hands.

Continuation Changes

YEAR 2 CONTINUATION CHANGES

3a. ENROLLMENT

Currently, the program is at 88% enrollment--all 21 F/T slots are filled and 33 M/T slots remain open. This is in line with our program design, as our LA program reserves 20-25 M/T slots for their summer program, which brings in a corps of M/T members who complete their 300-hour commitment over an 8-10-week period. Recruitment will begin in January for those slots, and they will remain open until late June 2011.

3b. RETENTION

The JusticeCorps program's current retention rate is 99%.

3c. COMPLIANCE WITH 30-DAY ENROLLMENT-EXIT POLICIES

Narratives

Our program does have two members out of compliance. The first was due to a communication error among LA program staff caused the misunderstanding that one member had dropped from the JusticeCorps program during our 30-day probationary period and subsequently, staff did not enroll her. Just one day after the 30-day deadline, staff realized they had confused this member with another dropped member and immediately enrolled her.

The second was due to Egrants denying enrollment because of a mismatch on the member's name and social security number. Egrants help desk staff let our program staff know that only the member could make this change to her information. Unfortunately, the member did not make the change quickly enough to stay within the 30-day window.

Our entire program staff recognizes it is vitally important to remain in compliance with AmeriCorps enrollment rules. The situation caused us to re-examine our 30-day probationary-period policy, which we developed in order to ensure confidence in the members who are enrolled, to avoid a negative effect on our retention early in the program year. As we have discussed previously with our Program Associate, we are planning to revise our program-wide process for enrollment, to find a balance that still allows us a probationary period but also leaves enough time to rectify errors as they arise. Our program has been in compliance with the 30-day rule for the last several program years running, and we do think that both of these situations can be attributed to missteps that may naturally occur with a newly expanded program. However, we definitely want to ensure we do not repeat the same mistakes in coming program years.

D. PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Our performance measures remain largely the same for 2011-2012. We have made one slight change to the description of our high-need target. In the process of gathering data on litigants who receive

Narratives

language assistance and of litigants whose cases have an impact on children, we realized it is most accurate to break the number into two distinct groups, rather than striving for one round number that includes both. Our high-need target will now read:

(b) High-need target population: Litigants whose cases involved families and children, and litigants who are "Limited English Proficient" (LEP). LEP persons are defined as individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English.

(c) # of direct high need beneficiaries: (a) 10,000 LEP litigants; (b) 15,000 litigants whose cases have an impact on families and children.

Following is progress through October 2010 on our 2010-2011 Performance Measures:

(1) Primary PMW--Assisting Self-Represented Litigants

High-Need Beneficiaries

"LEP" Litigants Assisted: 1,606 (Target of 10,000--16% of target met)

Assistance on Cases Involving Families and Children: 4,481 (Target of 15,000--30% of target met)

Output:

[1] Total Instances of Assistance = 9,806 (Target of 80,000--7% of target met)

[2] Total Number of Legal Forms Packets Completed = 5,330 (Target of 34,000--16% of target met)

Intermediate Outcome:

Percent of Legal Forms Packets Rated "Accurate" = 4,539 (Target of 85% or 28,990 of 34,000--85% accuracy rate thus far, 13% of total target met)

Narratives

(2) Secondary PMW--Member Development and Training

249 members have attended orientation, for a total of 3,984 hours (Target of 4,560 for full cohort--87% of target met)

(3) Secondary PMW--Volunteer Recruitment

(a) Number of One-Time Volunteers Recruited: 12 (Target of 50--24% of target met)

(b) Number of One-Time Volunteer Hours Completed: 84 (Target of 300 hours--28% of target met)

(a) Number of Ongoing Volunteers Recruited: 30 (Target of 25--target met)

(b) Number of Ongoing Volunteer Hours Completed: 270 (Target of 900 hours--30% of target met.

Hours include 8 ongoing volunteers recruited through 2009-2010 program, who are not counted in current ongoing volunteers.)

E. BUDGET

We propose adding a new staff position increase the AOC capacity for managing our expanded program. The "Statewide Co-Director" .20 FTE position to support our current efforts to heighten the AOC's role in oversight, site monitoring and compliance, and program and fiscal reporting. This position would be occupied by AOC Senior Court Services Analyst Ms. Martha Wright, and would represent a new and additional body of work for her. We are working on internal requests to support a portion of this position with matching funds--until that process is complete and approved the position is funded in our continuation budget at 12%.

Performance Measures

SAA Characteristics

- AmeriCorps Member Population - None Geographic Focus - Rural
 Geographic Focus - Urban Encore Program

Priority Areas

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education
<i>Selected for National Measure</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Healthy Futures
<i>Selected for National Measure</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Stewardship
<i>Selected for National Measure</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Veterans and Military Families
<i>Selected for National Measure</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Opportunity
<i>Selected for National Measure</i> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
<i>Selected for National Measure</i> <input type="checkbox"/> |

Grand Total of all MSYs entered for all Priority Areas 0

Service Categories

Other Human Needs Primary Secondary

Assisting Self-Represented Litigants

Service Category: Other Human Needs

Measure Category: Needs and Service Activities

Strategy to Achieve Results

Briefly describe how you will achieve this result (Max 4,000 chars.)

Our nation has a well documented 'justice gap.' There are too few legal aid programs and pro bono services to meet the needs of those who cannot afford an attorney and are not entitled to public representation. The Legal Services corporation reports that nearly 1 million people are turned away from legal aid programs every year in the U.S. In California, where urban area unemployment and poverty rates are rising faster than those in other states, less than one-third of the legal services needs of low income residents are met. In fact, according to the State Bar, there is only one legal aid lawyer for every 8,361 Californians in need. Because the recent economic downturn is adding additional stressors to marriages and parenting responsibilities and also putting mortgage and rent payments in serious jeopardy, resultant legal issues involving family and housing are proliferating. In California, 4 million people come to court each year without an attorney to represent them, typically because they cannot afford one. The judicial council reports that in family law cases up to 80% of all those coming

Briefly describe how you will achieve this result (Max 4,000 chars.)

to court are self-represented. In housing law cases over 90% are self-represented. Navigating the court system alone is daunting for anyone, especially for those going through an emotional or financial crisis, those with minimal education or those who speak English as a second language. The service provided by JusticeCorps members helps people coming to court without lawyers make their way through the system and to move on from their legal matters to a place of stability in their lives.

JusticeCorps members play a critical role in improving the capacity of the centers to provide access to justice for all Californians, regardless of their resources. JusticeCorps members serve in a variety of capacities in the court-based self-help centers with a focus on the following activities:

- 1) Triage: Conducting the initial assessment of litigants' needs and directing them to another JusticeCorps member or attorney who can assist them , or making a referral
- 2) Providing litigants with information about options and referrals to appropriate services outside the courts;
- 2) Assisting to identify and complete legal forms and procedures, one on one or in workshops;
- 3) Observing in the courtroom and providing litigants with information after courtroom sessions.
- 5) Providing phone assistance to litigants

In many cases, members may be providing some or all of these types of assistance to the same litigant during one visit or multiple subsequent visits.

Results

Result: Output

Self help center litigants will receive assistance with their legal matter.

Indicator: The number of instances of assistance provided by JusticeCorps members.

Target: JusticeCorps members will provide 80,000 instances of assistance.

Target Value: 80000

Instruments: Member tally form, to collect data on number of instances of assistance provided by JusticeCorps members.

Completed by: JusticeCorps members.

Frequency: Daily (members complete tally forms for each shift they serve.)

PM Statement: JusticeCorps members will provide 80,000 instances of assistance to self-represented litigants.

Prev. Yrs. Data

Result: Intermediate Outcome

Self help center litigants will receive assistance to complete packets of legal forms completely and

Result: Intermediate Outcome

accurately.

Indicator: The number of packets of legal forms completed "accurately and completely" by self-

Target: 85% (28,990/34,000) of packets of legal forms completed with JusticeCorps members'

assistance will be assessed as "accurate and complete" by the site supervisor on first review.

Target Value: 28990

Instruments: Member Service Tally Sheet to collect data on accuracy and completeness of legal documents as assessed by the site supervisor.

Completed by: JusticeCorps members

Frequency: Daily (members complete Member Service Tally Sheets for each shift they serve.)

PM Statement: Members will assist in completion of 34,000 packets of legal forms, 85% (28,990) of which will be assessed as accurate and complete by the site supervisor on first review.

Prev. Yrs. Data

Result: Intermediate Outcome

help center litigants with the assistance of JusticeCorps members.

Result: Output

Self help center litigants will receive assistance to complete legal paperwork.

Indicator: The number of packets of legal forms completed with the assistance of JusticeCorps

Target: Members will assist in completion of 34,000 packets of legal forms.

Target Value: 34000

Instruments: Member tally form, to collect data on number of packets of legal forms completed with the assistance of JusticeCorps members.

PM Statement: Justice Corps members will assist self-help center litigants to complete 34,000 packets of legal forms.

Prev. Yrs. Data

Result: Output
members.

Required Documents

Document Name

Status

Evaluation

Already on File at CNCS

Labor Union Concurrence

Already on File at CNCS