



**Department of Justice Canada
Client Feedback Survey**

Departmental Results – Cycle II (2009-2012)

Prepared by the Performance Management and
Reporting Division, Office of Strategic Planning
and Performance Management

May 2012



Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
SECTION 1 – CONTEXT FOR THE SURVEY INITIATIVE	2
SECTION 2 – PERFORMANCE AGAINST SERVICE STANDARDS	3
SECTION 3 – OTHER FINDINGS OF INTEREST.....	7
CONCLUSION	9
ANNEX A – METHODOLOGY	10
ANNEX B – COMPARISON OF CYCLE I AND II RESULTS.....	13
ANNEX C – CLIENT FEEDBACK: LEGAL ADVISORY SERVICES	15
ANNEX D – CLIENT FEEDBACK: LITIGATION SERVICES.....	17
ANNEX E – CLIENT FEEDBACK: LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING SERVICES.....	19
ANNEX F – CLIENT FEEDBACK: REGULATORY DRAFTING SERVICES....	21
ANNEX G – PROFILE OF SERVICE USERS FOR CYCLE II.....	23
ANNEX H – RESPONSE RATES BY PORTFOLIO AND DEPARTMENT/AGENCY FOR CYCLE II.....	24

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Justice Canada supports the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada as the chief law officer of the Crown both in terms of the ongoing operations of government, as well as the development of new policies, programs and services for Canadians. Specifically, the Department provides legal advice to the Government and all federal government departments and agencies, represents the Crown in civil litigation and before administrative tribunals, drafts legislation, and responds to the other legal needs of federal departments and agencies.

The Department provides an integrated suite of legal advisory, litigation and legislative services to the Minister of Justice and to all federal departments and agencies to support them in meeting the Government's policy and programming priorities and to advance the overall objectives of the Government. Services are provided through:

- a network of departmental legal services units co-located with client departments and agencies;
- specialized legal expertise within national headquarters; and
- a network of regional offices and sub-offices providing legal advisory and litigation services to federal departments and agencies across the country.

The Department is committed to providing high-quality legal services to support government. As one of a series of ongoing initiatives to support this commitment to service quality, the Department has implemented the legal services Client Feedback Survey as a standardized approach to obtaining client feedback on its legal services. The Survey seeks client input on the legal services provided by the Department against three key dimensions of service quality: accessibility/responsiveness, usefulness, and timeliness.

The Department of Justice conducts the Survey on a cyclical basis with federal departments and agencies being surveyed once every three years. Cycle I of the Survey initiative spanned from September 2006 to March 2009 and closed with the publication of the Cycle I departmental level report in August 2009. The current Report presents the feedback results for Cycle II of the Client Feedback Survey, reflecting data collected between November 2009 and September 2011.

The Survey findings presented throughout this report demonstrate that, by and large, the Department is meeting the needs and expectations of its clients. While there are some areas where the results fall just shy of the Department's performance target, client feedback has been largely positive and is generally consistent with the ratings collected during Cycle I of the Survey initiative.

SECTION 1 – CONTEXT FOR THE SURVEY INITIATIVE

The legal services Client Feedback Survey is intended to help the Department to incorporate client perceptions into decision-making about the delivery of legal services, to identify areas where service improvements may be needed, and to monitor, with clients, progress in meeting client needs and expectations over time.

The Client Feedback Survey is fully aligned with the set of common Service Standards¹ identified in all memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the Department of Justice and client departments and agencies for the provision of legal services. The Survey therefore permits the Department to obtain feedback on performance against those standards and provides senior managers with ongoing and reliable information on client perceptions relative to service commitments identified in MOUs.

Within a broader context, the Client Feedback Survey responds to the Treasury Board Secretariat of Canada's (TBS) *Policy Framework for Service Improvement in the Government of Canada*, which holds Deputy Heads accountable for ongoing measurement of service performance as a means of identifying and implementing service improvements. In addition to the Department's commitment to providing high quality legal services, each year, through the Management Accountability Framework assessment, TBS assesses the extent to which the Department is monitoring and acting upon feedback from its clients.

Finally, the Client Feedback Survey is a key element of the Department's Performance Measurement Framework, which is prescribed by the TBS's *Policy on Management, Resources and Results Structures*. Specifically, the Client Feedback Survey is one source of evidence² used to demonstrate the Department's achievements regarding the delivery of high quality legal services to government.³

¹ See *Service Standards for the Provision of Legal Services in Government*: <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/dept-min/service.html>.

² Department of Justice Canada 2010-11 Departmental Performance Report

³ See Recommendation 5.62 in Chapter 5 of the May 2007 Report of the Auditor General of Canada.

SECTION 2 – PERFORMANCE AGAINST SERVICE STANDARDS

Survey Response

Between November 2009 and September 2011, 26,012 potential respondents at the EX minus 2 level and above from across 40 client departments and agencies were invited to participate in the Department of Justice Canada Client Feedback Survey (Cycle II).⁴ In total, 12,390 respondents completed the questionnaire, resulting in an overall response rate of 48%.⁵ Of these respondents, 4,786 individuals reported having used Justice legal services in the twelve months preceding the administration of the Survey (39% usage rate).⁶

The term “respondent” encompasses all participants who completed the Survey, while the term “service user” refers to those who indicated having used the Department of Justice’s legal services in the twelve months preceding the administration of the Survey. Of the 4,786 service users, 4,503 (94%) reported using legal advisory services, 841 (18%) reported using litigation services, 364 (8%) reported using legislative drafting services and 531 (11%) reported using regulatory drafting services (Exhibit 1).

*Exhibit 1: Number of Service Users by Service Type**

All Service Users	Legal Advisory Services	Litigation Services	Legislative Drafting Services	Regulatory Drafting Services
4,786 (100%)	4,503 (94%)	841 (18%)	364 (8%)	531 (11%)

*Percentages do not add to 100% as service users could select more than one type of legal service.

Understanding Performance Results

The Department has identified a performance target of 8.0 on a 10-point scale for each of the three overall dimensions of client satisfaction investigated and for the individual elements⁷ of each dimension on which client feedback is sought. The three overall dimensions are: 1) Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services; 2) Usefulness of Legal Services; and 3) Timeliness of Legal Services. Throughout the report, a colour-coding scheme for the presentation of results has been adopted (see tableau to the right). This provides a visual means of portraying the results.

Colour-Coding of Results
Strong (mean ratings of 8.4 to 10)
Positive (mean ratings of 7.9 to 8.3)
Moderate (mean ratings of 7.3 to 7.8)
Opportunities for Improvement (mean ratings of 6.5 to 7.2)
Attention Required (mean ratings less than 6.5)

⁴ Within the National Capital Region, invitations were sent only to potential respondents at the EX minus 1 level and above. For details on the methodology used in the approach and execution of the Survey, please refer to Annex A at the end of this report.

⁵ In Cycle I, 19,462 potential respondents were invited to participate in the Survey, of which, 6,482 returned a completed questionnaire (33% response rate). Of those who responded, 3,562 indicated they had used Justice legal services (55% usage rate).

⁶ Unless otherwise noted, all reported results for Cycle II are based on the feedback from the 4,786 service users.

⁷ The term “element” refers to an individual question within the Survey.

Overall Performance Results

Common service organizations, as outlined in the TBS’s *Common Services Policy*, are accountable for providing quality services that meet the requirements and specifications of clients. As portrayed in Exhibit 2, client feedback on the overall quality of legal services provided was “strong,” surpassing the departmental target and demonstrating the Department’s commitment to delivering high-quality legal services to its clients. Moreover, there has been a significant improvement in client satisfaction with the overall quality of legal services since Cycle I.

Exhibit 2: Overall Quality*

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Overall Quality of Legal Services provided †	8.4 (0.0)**	8.2 (0.0)

*Overall quality refers to a global assessment asked of service users and is an individual survey question.

**Margins of error are presented in brackets throughout this report. Please refer to Annex A for a discussion on margins of error.

†Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

Exhibit 3 provides a comparison of the composite ratings for each of the overall dimensions of client satisfaction investigated.⁸ The results are based on all service user feedback collected during Cycle II, as provided by the 4,786 responding service users, compared against the feedback collected during Cycle I, as provided by the 3,562 responding service users.⁹

Exhibit 3: Overall Composite Ratings

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services	8.7 (0.0)	8.8 (0.0)
Usefulness of Legal Services	8.0 (0.0)	8.2 (0.0)
Timeliness of Legal Services	7.8 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)

As presented, the Cycle II results largely mirror the feedback collected in Cycle I and illustrate that the Department is generally in line with the 8.0 target for the overall dimensions of service quality on which feedback was sought.¹⁰ Client feedback for Cycle II regarding the accessibility/responsiveness of legal services was “strong”, surpassing the departmental target with an overall rating of 8.7. The finding regarding the usefulness of legal services was “positive”, meeting the departmental target with an overall score of 8.0. However, the composite result for the timeliness of legal services has decreased slightly from “positive” to “moderate” since Cycle I, falling shy of the departmental target.

⁸ Composite ratings were calculated by obtaining an overall average for all scores within each dimension.

⁹ Survey respondents were asked to identify and provide feedback based on any of the four legal service types (legal advisory, litigation, legislative drafting, and regulatory drafting services) used in the twelve months preceding the administration of the Survey. The results presented for each Cycle in Exhibit 3 reflect all service user feedback combined, regardless of the service type selected by a respondent.

¹⁰ Please refer to Annex B for a complete breakdown of results by dimension for Cycles I and II.

Performance Against Service Standards

As the government’s legal advisor, the Department strives to provide accessible, useful and timely legal services to help ensure clients have the legal support needed to make informed decisions. To facilitate the delivery of legal services of the highest calibre, the Department is guided by a core set of Service Standards, a key component of the performance arrangements between the Department and its clients. Exhibit 4 (below) presents an overview of the client feedback results for survey Cycles I and II exclusively against the Department’s published Service Standards.¹¹

<i>Exhibit 4: Performance Against Service Standards</i>	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services		
We provide legal services in either official language in accordance with applicable policies on language of work.	9.3 (0.0)	9.4 (0.0)
We treat you with courtesy and respect at all times.	9.1 (0.0)	9.2 (0.0)
We provide regular and informative progress reports or ongoing feedback in respect of your request for service. †	7.3 (±0.1)	7.5 (±0.1)
Usefulness of Legal Services		
We provide clear and practical guidance on resolving legal issues.	8.1 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
In the provision of legislative services, we develop legislative and regulatory drafting options appropriate to your policy and program objectives, and propose appropriate solutions for legal and drafting issues raised.	8.3 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
In the provision of legal advisory and litigation services, we involve you in the development of legal strategy and positions.	7.8 (±0.1)	7.8 (±0.1)
We identify means to prevent and resolve legal disputes at the earliest opportunity. †	7.9 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
We identify opportunities to implement policies and programs by administrative rather than legislative or regulatory means.	7.7 (±0.2)	7.7 (±0.2)
Timeliness of Legal Services		
We respond in a timely manner to requests for legal services.	7.8 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)
We negotiate and meet mutually agreed upon deadlines.	7.9 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)

†Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

Cycle II client feedback on performance against Service Standards ranged from “moderate” to “strong” and is largely consistent with the results collected in Cycle I. Since Cycle I, the results have decreased slightly for five of the ten Service Standards, four of the ten Service Standards have remained unchanged, and the result on the Service Standard specific to legislative and regulatory drafting services has increased. There are four specific Service Standards where the client feedback was found to be “moderate” – falling slightly below the established target:

- we provide regular and informative progress reports or ongoing feedback in respect of your request for service;

¹¹ Exhibit 4 presents the results against the Department’s Service Standards only, reflecting the content as it appeared during Cycle II, and does not reflect all survey questions that were investigated.

- in the provision of legal advisory and litigation services, we involve you in the development of legal strategy and positions;
- we identify opportunities to implement policies and programs by administrative rather than legislative or regulatory means; and
- we respond in a timely manner to requests for legal services.

The Cycle I and II results for legal advisory, litigation, legislative drafting and regulatory drafting services are presented in Annexes C through F.

SECTION 3 – OTHER FINDINGS OF INTEREST

Knowledge of Service Standards

The TBS’s *Policy Framework for Service Improvement in the Government of Canada* notes that the identification and communication of Service Standards is an important element in an overall service quality strategy. In 2008-09, the Department developed a set of common Service Standards that have been rolled out across the country and incorporated into memoranda of understanding between the Department of Justice Canada and client departments and agencies for the provision of legal services.

To gain a sense of the degree to which users of legal services are familiar with the Department’s mutually agreed upon Service Standards, service users were asked to rate their knowledge of the Service Standards for the delivery of legal services to their department/agency.

Of the 4,786 service users who responded, 32% rated their knowledge as “good” or “very good,” while nearly 50% of users rated their knowledge of Service Standards as “fair” or “poor” (Exhibit 5). The remaining 20% of service users were “unable to assess” or did not rate their knowledge of Service Standards.

Exhibit 5: Knowledge of Service Standards

Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Unable to Assess/ Not Stated
515 (11%)	1,010 (21%)	1,108 (23%)	1,219 (25%)	934 (20%)

Of particular interest, service users who indicated that they had a “good” to “very good” knowledge of Service Standards were, in general, more satisfied with the legal services provided by the Department. Likewise, those who rated their knowledge as “fair” were, on the whole, more satisfied with the legal services provided than service users who rated their knowledge as “poor.” These findings support the need for continued efforts focussed on the communication of Service Standards to clients across government.

Understanding of Legal Risks

Legal risk management is an important element of managing ongoing operations and the development of new policy, program and service delivery initiatives across government. Responsibility for legal risk management is shared between the Department of Justice and its client departments and agencies. The Department plays an important role in developing tools, demonstrating leadership, as well as providing client departments with advice and assistance in identifying and mitigating key legal risks. Client departments are responsible for the day-to-day management of their legal risks as part of an integrated risk management framework. A good client understanding of key legal risks helps ensure that decision-makers are able to factor the legal implications into their chosen courses of action in delivering policies, programs and services to Canadians.

To gain a better sense of the context within which legal risk management is occurring across government, the Survey asked service users to self-assess their level of understanding of the key legal risks facing their department/agency.

Of the 4,786 service users who responded, 62% of service users self-assessed their levels of understanding of the key legal risks as “good” or “very good.” 27% self-assessed their understanding of those risks as “fair” or “poor,” and the remaining 11% indicated that they were “unable to assess” or did not state their level of understanding (Exhibit 6).

Exhibit 6: Understanding of Legal Risks

Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Unable to Assess/ Not Stated
1,000 (21%)	1,951 (41%)	1,021 (21%)	272 (6%)	542 (11%)

Service users who self-assessed as having a “good” to “very good” understanding of the key legal risks facing their department/agency were, in general, more satisfied with the legal services provided by the Department. Similarly, those who rated their understanding as “fair” were, overall, more satisfied with the legal services provided than service users who rated their understanding as “poor.” The Department places a priority on working in close partnership with clients to ensure an understanding of their legal risks.

CONCLUSION

The findings from Cycle II of the Client Feedback Survey permit the Department to assess changes in satisfaction levels against the baseline measures of client satisfaction collected during Cycle I. The results of Cycle II demonstrate that the Department is, by and large, meeting client expectations and needs.

In general, the client feedback shows that the Department offers high-quality legal services. Against the departmental Service Standards and the overall composite ratings, there are no areas where client feedback indicates “opportunity for improvement” or “attention required.” Nevertheless, there are some areas where performance falls below the target, receiving “moderate” ratings.

Overall, the results indicate that clients are satisfied with the legal advisory, litigation, and legislative drafting services provided by the Department. The Survey findings reflect the Department’s commitment to providing high-quality legal services to support government.

ANNEX A – METHODOLOGY

Introduction

With the expert guidance of the Statistical Consultation Group at Statistics Canada, the Department of Justice developed a standardized questionnaire and methodology for collecting client feedback on the degree to which the delivery of legal services is meeting the needs and expectations of clients. Statistics Canada played an important role by reviewing and challenging the proposed approach throughout the design and implementation stages, vetting the analyses of survey data and reviewing and commenting upon the presentation of findings contained in all reports.

The Department launched the second cycle of the Client Feedback Survey in November 2009. Potential respondents received invitations to complete the standardized questionnaire, which covers the legal advisory, litigation, legislative drafting, and regulatory drafting services provided by the Department of Justice Canada.

The first cycle of the Survey was launched in 2006, beginning with the Aboriginal Affairs Portfolio as the pilot project. Based on lessons learned during the first survey cycle, there were some changes made to the questionnaire and to the survey administration process. The questionnaire has been aligned to the Department's Service Standards, offering an opportunity to obtain feedback on performance against the Standardized Legal Service Agreements. The survey administration process has also been improved, resulting in much higher response rates.

Potential Respondents and Census Approach

Invitations were sent to potential respondents at the EX minus one and equivalent levels through to Deputy Heads of client departments and agencies in the National Capital Region (NCR) and across the country. However, in an effort to maximise the response from clients outside the NCR and to give regional management a more accurate portrayal of client perceptions of legal services, invitations to complete the questionnaire were also sent to employees at EX minus two and equivalent levels who were located in the regions.

The Department of Justice adopted a census approach¹² to the Survey because the target population is of a manageable size and potential sources of error associated with sampling are avoided. The Survey was administered via a web-based questionnaire housed on a Department of Justice server.

In total, 26,012 invitations to complete the questionnaire were successfully delivered via email to potential respondents across the country. Of these, 12,390 completed the questionnaire, resulting in an overall response rate of 48%. This is a significant improvement in the response rates achieved during Cycle I (33%) and boosts confidence in the precision of the Survey results.

Approximately 39% of respondents reported having used departmental legal services in the 12 months preceding the administration of the Survey. Unless otherwise noted, all reported results for Cycle II are based on the feedback from these 4,786 service users.

¹² A census approach refers to systematically collecting and recording information from all members of a given population, as compared to sampling, which seeks to collect information only from a subset of a given population.

Interpreting Results

The Survey collected feedback from clients using a 10-point Likert scale¹³ with two anchors: not at all satisfied (1) and completely satisfied (10). Feedback was sought along three key dimensions of service quality—accessibility/responsiveness, usefulness, and timeliness—and collected through a number of individual elements of client satisfaction, many of which relate directly to the Department’s Service Standards for legal services. Further to this, service users were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the overall quality of legal services.¹⁴

It should also be noted that a weighting strategy adopted for the first Client Feedback Survey cycle has been discontinued at the recommendation of Statistics Canada. As a result, any references to the Cycle I and II survey scores, ratings, or results for elements of satisfaction now refer to comparable unweighted data. Due to this change in methodology, some results may differ from previously published values.

Margins of Error

In reviewing the results presented throughout this report, it is important to remember that survey results represent estimates of client population perceptions of service delivery. As such, there is an important caveat to bear in mind, namely the calculated margins of error. The magnitude of the margin of error is generally affected by the extent of variability¹⁵ in respondent feedback and by the overall size of the respondent group.

There are two key elements to calculating the margins of error from survey findings. First, there is the **confidence level** which, in the most simplistic terms, refers to the extent to which it is believed the same results would be obtained if the Survey were administered repeatedly. For the purposes of the Department of Justice Client Feedback Survey, a 95% confidence level was adopted for calculating results. Consequently, a **statistically significant difference** indicates that there is a less than 5% probability ($p < 0.05$) that the result occurred by chance. Second, and more importantly, there is the **confidence interval**, which refers to the range in which the results will fall if the measurements are repeatedly taken.¹⁶

The confidence intervals presented account for variability related to non-response. Had all service users responded to the Survey, there would be no variability, as all opinions would be accounted for. In the calculation of the confidence interval, it is assumed that non-response is independent of respondent characteristics but is affected by use of legal services (i.e. actual

¹³ There is a great deal of debate in the academic and professional literature regarding the relative merits of using 3, 4, 5, 7 and 10-point scales to measure attitudes and perceptions. After reviewing the literature and undertaking consultations with a variety of groups, the Department adopted a 10-point scale. Pre-testing of the questionnaire determined that respondents were able to interpret and understand the scale. Additionally, the 10-point scale will permit the Department to track even small changes in client perceptions over time.

¹⁴ This element refers to a global assessment asked of service users and is an individual question, not a composite rating.

¹⁵ Variability refers to the variation in the opinion scores of respondents that were surveyed.

¹⁶ For the purposes of this project, caution is recommended in interpreting any results that have a calculated margin of error greater than ± 0.4 . Note that large margins of error may also represent wide variation in the opinions of respondents, indicating a large disparity between the satisfied and the unsatisfied groups.

service users are more likely to answer the questionnaire). It is a reasonable assumption that a relatively large proportion of non-respondents are non-users. The Finite Population Correction Factor has been applied in the calculation of the margin of error in order to take the size of the total number of potential users into account; otherwise the margins of error would be overstated.

ANNEX B – COMPARISON OF CYCLE I AND II RESULTS

The Department of Justice Canada strives for excellence in the practice of law. The Department is committed to providing the government with an integrated suite of legal advisory, litigation and legislative drafting services of the highest calibre.

Presented by overall dimension of client satisfaction, the table below provides an overview of the client feedback collected during Cycle II, as provided by the 4,786 responding service users, against the feedback collected during Cycle I, as provided by the 3,562 responding service users. For both Cycles, all service users identified that they had received legal services during the 12 months preceding the administration of the Survey.¹⁷

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Overall quality of Legal Services provided. †	8.4 (0.0)	8.2 (0.0)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services		
Official languages: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the accessibility of legal services in the official language of your choice.	9.3 (0.0)	9.4 (0.0)
Courteousness/Respectfulness: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the courteousness/respectfulness of legal service providers.	9.1 (0.0)	9.2 (0.0)
Service Provider: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the ease with which the correct service provider to meet your needs was identified.	8.6 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Electronic.	8.7 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Telephone.	8.7 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: In person.	8.8 (±0.1)	n/a
Regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services. †	7.3 (±0.1)	7.5 (±0.1)
Usefulness of Legal Services		
Fully understood the nature of the problem/issue for which you received assistance. †	8.3 (0.0)	8.5 (±0.1)
Advised you of issues/developments which may impact your department/agency. †	8.2 (±0.1)	8.4 (±0.1)
Worked with you to identify legal risks.	8.3 (±0.1)	8.2 (±0.1)
Involved you in the review/development of legal options to mitigate identified legal risks.	8.0 (±0.1)	n/a
Involved you in the development of legal strategy and positions.	7.8 (±0.1)	7.8 (±0.1)
Identified means to prevent or resolve legal disputes at the earliest opportunity. †	7.9 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
Identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate. †	7.7 (±0.1)	8.0 (±0.1)

¹⁷ Survey respondents were asked to identify and provide feedback based on any of the four legal service types (legal advisory, litigation, legislative drafting, and regulatory drafting services) used in the twelve months preceding the administration of the Survey. The results presented for each Cycle in Annex B reflect all service user feedback combined, regardless of the service type selected by a respondent.

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Provided clear and practical guidance on resolving the legal issue.	8.1 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
Provided consistent legal advice. †	8.3 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)
Identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than legislative means.	7.8 (±0.3)	7.8 (±0.2)
Identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than regulatory means. †	7.7 (±0.3)	7.1 (±0.5)*
Proposed appropriate solutions for legal and drafting issues raised.	8.2 (±0.2)	8.0 (±0.2)
Developed legislative drafting options appropriate to your policy and program objectives.	8.3 (±0.2)	8.2 (±0.2)
Developed regulatory drafting options appropriate to your policy and program objectives. †	8.3 (±0.2)	7.8 (±0.4)
If applicable, provided recommendations on whether to appeal or seek judicial review.	8.4 (±0.2)	n/a
Timeliness of Legal Services		
Responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services.	7.8 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)
Negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines. †	7.8 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)
Met mutually agreed-upon deadlines.	7.9 (±0.1)	8.0 (±0.1)

*High margins of error can result from an insufficient number of responses and/or high variability between users' responses. For this reason, scores with margins of error exceeding ±0.4 are less reliable, and have a limited potential for analysis. Scores that fit this description are indicated by an asterisk.

†Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

In assessing the overall quality of the legal services provided, overall client satisfaction has significantly improved since Cycle I (8.4 versus 8.2 on a 10-point scale). Moreover and consistent with the findings from Cycle I, against the additional 25 elements of service quality investigated during Cycle II, the Department is generally meeting or surpassing the 8.0 target.

There are seven specific elements where the client feedback was “moderate” – falling slightly below the established target. Specifically, these include:

- regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services;
- involved you in the development of legal strategy and positions;
- identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate;
- identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than legislative means;
- identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than regulatory means;
- responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services; and
- negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.

ANNEX C – CLIENT FEEDBACK: LEGAL ADVISORY SERVICES

The Department acts as the government's legal adviser, providing legal counsel and support. It is responsible for providing legal advisory services and preparing legal documents for all federal government departments and agencies on a broad range of issues. The following table presents an overview of the Cycle II client feedback provided by the 4,504 service users who identified that they had received legal advisory services in the twelve months preceding the administration of the Survey. Presented for comparison purposes are the Cycle I results for legal advisory services.

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Overall quality of Legal Advisory Services provided. †	8.4 (0.0)	8.2 (0.0)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services		
Official languages: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the accessibility of legal services in the official language of your choice.	9.3 (0.0)	9.5 (0.0)
Courteousness/Respectfulness: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the courteousness/respectfulness of legal service providers.	9.1 (0.0)	9.2 (0.0)
Service Provider: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the ease with which the correct service provider to meet your needs was identified.	8.6 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Electronic.	8.7 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Telephone.	8.7 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: In person.	8.8 (±0.1)	n/a
Regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services. †	7.2 (±0.1)	7.5 (±0.1)
Usefulness of Legal Services		
Fully understood the nature of the problem/issue for which you received assistance. †	8.3 (±0.1)	8.5 (±0.1)
Advised you of issues/developments which may impact your department/agency. †	8.2 (±0.1)	8.4 (±0.1)
Worked with you to identify legal risks.	8.3 (±0.1)	8.3 (±0.1)
Involved you in the review/development of legal options to mitigate identified legal risks.	7.9 (±0.1)	n/a
Involved you in the development of legal strategy and positions.	7.7 (±0.1)	7.8 (±0.1)
Identified means to prevent or resolve legal disputes at the earliest opportunity. †	7.9 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
Identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate. †	7.7 (±0.1)	8.0 (±0.1)
Provided clear and practical guidance on resolving the legal issue.	8.1 (±0.1)	8.1 (±0.1)
Provided consistent legal advice.	8.3 (±0.1)	n/a
Timeliness of Legal Services		
Responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services.	7.7 (±0.1)	7.8 (±0.1)
Negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines. †	7.7 (±0.1)	7.9 (±0.1)
Met mutually agreed-upon deadlines.	7.9 (±0.1)	8.0 (±0.1)

†Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

In assessing the overall quality of the legal advisory services provided, overall client satisfaction has significantly improved since Cycle I, receiving a “strong” rating of 8.4 out of 10. Moreover and consistent with the findings from Cycle I, the Cycle II results indicate that the Department is generally in line with or surpassing the departmental target of 8.0 on the additional 19 elements relating to legal advisory services.

There are four specific elements where the client feedback was “moderate” – falling slightly below the established target. Specifically, these include:

- involved you in the development of legal strategy and positions;
- identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate;
- responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services; and
- negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.

Against the following Service Standard, client satisfaction has decreased from 7.5 in Cycle I to 7.2 in Cycle II, with feedback indicating that there may be “opportunity for improvement”:

- regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services.

ANNEX D – CLIENT FEEDBACK: LITIGATION SERVICES

The Department represents the Crown in litigation and before administrative tribunals. These activities directly and indirectly support the federal government by defending the Crown’s ability to continue to provide programs, services and benefits to Canadians in the face of court challenges. The table below presents an overview of the Cycle II client feedback provided by the 841 service users who identified that they had received litigation services in the 12 months preceding the administration of the Survey. Presented for comparison purposes are the Cycle I results for litigation services.

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Overall quality of Litigation Services provided.	8.3 (±0.1)	8.4 (±0.1)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services		
Official languages: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the accessibility of legal services in the official language of your choice. †	9.3 (±0.1)	9.4 (±0.1)
Courteousness/Respectfulness: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the courteousness/respectfulness of legal service providers. †	9.0 (±0.1)	9.2 (±0.1)
Service Provider: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the ease with which the correct service provider to meet your needs was identified.	8.5 (±0.1)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Electronic.	8.4 (±0.2)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Telephone.	8.5 (±0.2)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: In person.	8.6 (±0.2)	n/a
Regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services.	7.7 (±0.2)	7.7 (±0.2)
Usefulness of Legal Services		
Fully understood the nature of the problem/issue for which you received assistance. †	8.3 (±0.1)	8.5 (±0.1)
Advised you of issues/developments which may impact your department/agency.	8.2 (±0.1)	8.4 (±0.1)
Worked with you to identify legal risks.	8.1 (±0.1)	8.2 (±0.1)
Involved you in the review/development of legal options to mitigate identified legal risks.	7.9 (±0.2)	n/a
Involved you in the development of legal strategy and positions.	7.9 (±0.2)	8.0 (±0.2)
Identified means to prevent or resolve legal disputes at the earliest opportunity. †	7.9 (±0.2)	8.3 (±0.2)
Identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate. †	7.8 (±0.2)	8.3 (±0.2)
Provided clear and practical guidance on resolving the legal issue.	8.1 (±0.2)	8.2 (±0.1)
Provided consistent legal advice.	8.3 (±0.1)	n/a
If applicable, provided recommendations on whether to appeal or seek judicial review.	8.4 (±0.2)	n/a
Timeliness of Legal Services		
Responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services. †	8.1 (±0.1)	8.4 (±0.1)
Negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines. †	7.8 (±0.2)	8.3 (±0.1)
Met mutually agreed-upon deadlines. †	8.0 (±0.2)	8.3 (±0.2)

†Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

In assessing the overall quality of the litigation services provided, overall client satisfaction has decreased slightly since Cycle I, resulting in a “positive” rating of 8.3 on a 10-point scale. Against the additional twenty elements relating to litigation services, the Department is generally in line with or surpassing the target of 8.0.

There are three specific elements where the client feedback was “moderate” – falling slightly below the established target. Specifically, these include:

- regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services;
- identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate; and
- negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.

Although the Cycle II findings are largely consistent with the feedback collected during Cycle I, there have been notable decreases in the ratings of the following three elements:

- identified means to prevent or resolve legal disputes at the earliest opportunity;
- identified opportunities to use dispute resolution practices, where appropriate; and
- negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.

ANNEX E – CLIENT FEEDBACK: LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING SERVICES

The Department of Justice Canada is responsible for the review and drafting of legislation for the government. Legislation is drafted to respect the Constitution, be understandable, operate coherently and effectively with other related laws, to meet the linguistic and legal requirements for laws that speak to both official language communities, and operate effectively in both common law and civil law jurisdictions.

The following table presents an overview of the Cycle II client feedback provided by the 364 service users who identified that they had received legislative drafting services in the twelve months preceding the administration of the Survey. Presented for comparison purposes are the Cycle I results for legislative drafting services.¹⁸

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Overall quality of Legislative Drafting Services provided. †	8.5 (±0.2)	8.2 (±0.1)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services		
Official languages: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the accessibility of legal services in the official language of your choice.	9.2 (±0.2)	9.4 (±0.1)
Courteousness/Respectfulness: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the courteousness/respectfulness of legal service providers. †	8.7 (±0.2)	9.1 (±0.1)
Service Provider: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the ease with which the correct service provider to meet your needs was identified.	8.4 (±0.2)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Electronic.	8.6 (±0.3)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Telephone.	8.6 (±0.3)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: In person.	8.8 (±0.2)	n/a
Regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services.	7.6 (±0.3)	7.7 (±0.2)
Usefulness of Legal Services		
Fully understood the nature of the problem/issue for which you received assistance.	8.3 (±0.2)	8.3 (±0.1)
Advised you of issues/developments which may impact your department/agency.	8.2 (±0.2)	8.3 (±0.1)
Worked with you to identify legal risks.	8.1 (±0.2)	8.2 (±0.1)
Involved you in the review/development of legal options to mitigate identified legal risks.	8.0 (±0.2)	n/a
Provided consistent legal advice. †	8.3 (±0.2)	8.0 (±0.1)
Identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than legislative means.	7.8 (±0.3)	7.7 (±0.2)
Proposed appropriate solutions for legal and drafting issues raised.	8.2 (±0.2)	8.1 (±0.2)
Developed legislative drafting options appropriate to your policy and program objectives.	8.3 (±0.2)	8.2 (±0.2)

¹⁸ For Cycle II, the results for legislative and regulatory drafting services are presented separately, whereas in Cycle I, the results were combined.

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Timeliness of Legal Services		
Responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services. †	8.2 (±0.2)	7.8 (±0.2)
Negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.	8.0 (±0.2)	7.8 (±0.2)
Met mutually agreed-upon deadlines.	8.1 (±0.2)	7.9 (±0.2)

†Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

In assessing the overall quality of the legislative drafting services provided, overall client satisfaction has significantly improved since Cycle I (8.5 versus 8.2 on a 10-point scale). Moreover and largely consistent with the findings from Cycle I, against the additional 18 elements related to legislative drafting services, the Department is generally meeting or surpassing the 8.0 target.

There are two specific elements where the client feedback was “moderate” – falling slightly below the established target. Specifically:

- regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services; and
- identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than legislative means.

ANNEX F – CLIENT FEEDBACK: REGULATORY DRAFTING SERVICES

The Department of Justice Canada is responsible for the review and drafting of regulations for the government. Regulations are drafted to respect the Constitution, be understandable, operate coherently and effectively with other related laws, to meet the linguistic and legal requirements for laws that speak to both official language communities, and operate effectively in both common law and civil law jurisdictions.

The following table presents an overview of the Cycle II client feedback provided by the 531 service users who identified that they had received regulatory drafting services in the 12 months preceding the administration of the Survey. Presented for comparison purposes are the Cycle I results for regulatory drafting services.¹⁹

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Overall quality of Regulatory Drafting Services provided. †	8.5 (±0.1)	7.8 (±0.4)
Accessibility/Responsiveness of Legal Services		
Official languages: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the accessibility of legal services in the official language of your choice.	9.3 (±0.1)	9.2 (±0.2)
Courteousness/Respectfulness: Please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the courteousness/respectfulness of legal service providers.	8.9 (±0.2)	8.8 (±0.3)
Service Provider: Please rate your level of satisfaction with the ease with which the correct service provider to meet your needs was identified.	8.5 (±0.2)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Electronic.	8.7 (±0.3)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: Telephone.	8.6 (±0.3)	n/a
Satisfaction with access mode: In person.	8.8 (±0.3)	n/a
Regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services. †	7.7 (±0.2)	7.1 (±0.5)*
Usefulness of Legal Services		
Fully understood the nature of the problem/issue for which you received assistance.	8.3 (±0.2)	7.9 (±0.4)
Advised you of issues/developments which may impact your department/agency.	8.3 (±0.2)	8.0 (±0.4)
Worked with you to identify legal risks.	8.2 (±0.2)	7.9 (±0.4)
Involved you in the review/development of legal options to mitigate identified legal risks.	8.0 (±0.2)	n/a
Provided consistent legal advice. †	8.3 (±0.2)	7.6 (±0.4)
Identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than regulatory means. †	7.7 (±0.3)	7.1 (±0.5)*
Proposed appropriate solutions for legal and drafting issues raised. †	8.3 (±0.2)	7.7 (±0.4)
Developed regulatory drafting options appropriate to your policy and program objectives. †	8.3 (±0.2)	7.8 (±0.4)
Timeliness of Legal Services		
Responded in a timely manner to requests for legal services. †	8.0 (±0.2)	7.5 (±0.4)

¹⁹ For Cycle II, the results for legislative and regulatory drafting services are presented separately, whereas in Cycle I, the results were combined.

	Cycle II (2012)	Cycle I (2009)
Negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.	7.8 (± 0.2)	7.4 (± 0.4)
Met mutually agreed-upon deadlines.	8.0 (± 0.2)	7.5 (± 0.4)

*High margins of error can result from an insufficient number of responses and/or high variability between users' responses. For this reason, scores with margins of error exceeding ± 0.4 are less reliable, and have a limited potential for analysis. Scores that fit this description are indicated by an asterisk.

+Denotes a statistically significant difference between Cycle II and Cycle I client feedback.

In assessing the overall quality of the regulatory drafting services provided, overall client satisfaction has significantly improved since Cycle I (8.5 versus 7.8 on a 10-point scale). Importantly, there has been an increase in client satisfaction on all 18 additional elements relating to regulatory drafting services since Cycle I.

There are three specific elements where the client feedback was “moderate” – falling slightly below the established target. Specifically:

- regularly provided informative progress reports or ongoing feedback informing you of the status of your request for services;
- identified opportunities to implement policies or programs by administrative rather than regulatory means; and
- negotiated mutually agreed-upon deadlines.

ANNEX G – PROFILE OF SERVICE USERS FOR CYCLE II

The table below provides a breakdown of service users by classification, location, and type of services received.

	Number	Percentage
Classification		
• EX Cadre (including EX equivalents)	1,814	38%
• Non-EX	2,972	62%
Total	4,786	100%
Location*		
• National Capital Region	2,945	62%
• Regions	1,800	38%
• Outside Canada/ Undisclosed	41	1%
Total	4,786	100%
Type of Service Received**		
• Legal Advisory	4,503	94%
• Litigation	841	18%
• Legislative Drafting	364	8%
• Regulatory Drafting	531	11%
Total	4,786	100%

*Total may not equal 100% due to rounding.

**Percentages do not add to 100% as service users could select more than one type of legal service. No information about the general population is available for service usage.

**ANNEX H – RESPONSE RATES BY PORTFOLIO AND DEPARTMENT/AGENCY
 FOR CYCLE II**

Portfolio/Department/Agency	Population	Response Rate²⁰	Users of Services²¹	Period²²	Target Population
1. Aboriginal Affairs Portfolio	1,320	646 (49%)	419 (65%)	Oct. 10	EX minus two and above levels
Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	1,320	646 (49%)	419 (65%)		
2. Business and Regulatory Law Portfolio	14,462	7,756 (54%)	3,126 (40%)	Nov. 09 – Feb. 10	EX minus two and above levels
Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada	1,135	604 (53%)	170 (28%)		
Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency	288	127 (44%)	41 (32%)		
Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	39	31 (79%)	28 (90%)		
Canadian Food Inspection Agency	598	378 (63%)	184 (49%)		
Canadian Heritage	363	173 (48%)	93 (54%)		
Canadian International Development Agency	302	151 (50%)	73 (48%)		
Canadian Space Agency	258	153 (59%)	49 (32%)		
Competition Bureau	134	98 (73%)	75 (77%)		
Department of Fisheries and Oceans	1,165	636 (55%)	268 (42%)		
Environment Canada	1,441	714 (50%)	205 (29%)		
Foreign Affairs and International Trade	511	244 (48%)	84 (34%)		
Health Canada	1,454	640 (44%)	274 (43%)		
Human Resources and Skills Development Canada	984	484 (49%)	184 (38%)		
Industry Canada	964	550 (57%)	230 (42%)		
Infrastructure Canada	98	65 (66%)	28 (43%)		
Library and Archives Canada	12	8 (67%)	4 (50%)		
National Research Council	99	44 (44%)	29 (66%)		
Natural Resources Canada	1,149	526 (46%)	148 (28%)		
Parks Canada	517	304 (59%)	153 (50%)		
Public Works and Government Services Canada	1,369	846 (62%)	321 (38%)		
Quebec Region Economic Development Agency	188	120 (64%)	95 (79%)		
Transport Canada	1,041	628 (60%)	296 (47%)		
Veterans Affairs Canada	353	232 (66%)	94 (41%)		

²⁰ Number of respondents having completed and returned a questionnaire. Response rates are presented in brackets.

²¹ “Users of Services” represents the number and percentage of respondents who indicated having used Justice legal services at least once in the twelve months preceding the Survey. Calculation of percentage is based on the number of respondents.

²² Period (month and year) during which the Survey was conducted.

Portfolio/Department/Agency	Population	Response Rate ²⁰	Users of Services ²¹	Period ²²	Target Population
3. Public Safety, Defence and Immigration Portfolio²³	8,126	2,766 (34%)	618 (22%)	Feb. 11	EX minus two and above levels
Canada Border Services Agency	261	122 (47%)	50 (41%)		
Canadian Security Intelligence Service	345	127 (37%)	54 (43%)		
Citizenship and Immigration Canada	339	138 (41%)	78 (57%)		
Communications Security Establishment Canada	186	104 (56%)	64 (62%)		
Correctional Service of Canada	282	115 (41%)	46 (40%)		
National Defence and the Canadian Forces	6,426	2,027 (32%)	236 (12%)		
Parole Board of Canada	38	23 (61%)	16 (70%)		
Public Safety Canada	249	110 (44%)	74 (67%)		
4. Tax Law Services Portfolio	485	341 (70%)	177 (52%)	May 11	EC-01 to EC-06
Canadian Revenue Agency	485	341 (70%)	177 (52%)		
5. Central Agencies Portfolio	1,619	881 (54%)	446 (51%)	Sept. 11	EX minus two and above levels
Canada School of Public Service	115	44 (38%)	6 (14%)		
Department of Finance Canada	273	127 (47%)	86 (68%)		
Financial Consumer Agency of Canada	13	9 (69%)	9 (100%)		
Financial Transactions and Reports Analysis Centre of Canada	117	68 (58%)	44 (65%)		
Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada	348	218 (63%)	80 (37%)		
Public Service Commission	175	115 (66%)	60 (52%)		
Treasury Board Secretariat	578	300 (52%)	161 (54%)		
TOTAL	26,012	12,390 (48%)	4,786 (39%)		

²³ The Royal Canadian Mounted Police were not surveyed during Cycle II.